Whiteness in teacher education discourses: An analysis of the discursive usage and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*

Sandra Fylkesnes

Whiteness in teacher education discourses: An analysis of the discursive usage and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*

Sandra Fylkesnes

OSLOMET

Thesis submitted for the degree of philosophiae doctor (Ph.D.)
Educational Sciences for Teacher Education
Faculty of Education and International Studies
OsloMet - Oslo Metropolitan University

Spring 2019

"Cultural diversity might point to quite different things, and it might have great consequences what content one chose to give the concept."

<div align="right">(Eriksen, 2009, p. 106)</div>

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master – that's all."

<div align="right">(Carroll, 1965, p. 159)</div>

"Mirror, mirror, on the wall. Who is the fairest of them all?"

<div align="right">(The Brothers Grimm's "Snow White," cited in Delgado & Stefanic, 1997, no p. number given)</div>

For my mum, Elin who passed last summer (July, 2017). Thanks for telling Us to get out of Our small town and into the wider world in order to broaden Our perspectives. For telling Us to get an education.

For my nieces and nephews and for the children of Our next generation who have skin complexions often defined (by many of Us as) of colour and "different" and who therefore might have a different racial experience from the Whites of Us.

For my family and friends who believe Ourselves to be individuals – for Us, I hope to shed light on Our grouped positionality and on how Our everyday (often minimal and personal) investments are inextricably related to Whiteness and are therefore implicated in a continuous racialisation of this world.

For Mo and Ricardo and others who have lived through Whiteness in ways hardly imaginable to racially White persons.

For greater racial justice, and hence, a more just society.

Summary

In this PhD thesis, I study the workings of Whiteness in teacher education discourses through the usage and meaning making of one term: *cultural diversity*. As such, I draw attention to the importance of a minimal and assumingly unimportant aspect of Our habitual social communication. A basic presumption herein is that the imperial and colonial legacy of race and racism remains a *historical pedagogy of amnesia* that manifests through subtle discursive patterns in Our everyday *dysconscious* racist usage and meaning making of terms. To study the usage and meaning making of terms is important because conceptualisations of terms constituted in knowledge-producing institutions work through educational curricula and practice, and teachers' dispositions are fundamentally about meaning making related to feelings that affect pedagogical behaviour in ways that ultimately effect social and racial justice.

The workings of Whiteness are interrogated through the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* produced in educational discourses via three discursive knowledge-promoting domains of teacher education: (1) international research articles, (2) policy and curriculum documents, and (3) teacher educator interview transcripts. The thesis includes four articles: one critical interpretative literature review, one policy and curriculum document analysis, and two discourse analyses of individual teacher educator interviews.

In the first article, I review the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* across 67 international research studies on teacher education published in the period of 2004–2014. In this analysis, I find that *cultural diversity* is generally not defined but is related to a set of other undefined terms. Moreover, *cultural diversity* (and its related set of terms) is used extensively as part of binary oppositional discourses that, on the one hand, represent *cultural diversity* through notions of detriment – of racialisation and Othering, difference and inferiority – and, on the other hand, represent student teacher(s) and student(s) through notions of privilege and assumptions of superiority. Based on these findings, I discuss how the undefined nature of *cultural diversity* and its usage, as part of binary oppositional discourses, reveal how *cultural diversity* is assumed to be about a racialised Other (contrary to student teacher(s) and student(s)) in teacher education research discourses. I argue that this discursive production is one way in which Whiteness works through researchers' discursive practices of division and exclusion, produced by their initial *dysconscious* choices and investments in terms. I also argue that this extensive practice of Othering is "evidence" of the way in which Whiteness is persistently promoted through a discursive ideology of White supremacy produced in articles that generally claim to promote social justice.

In the second article, I analyse the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in six Norwegian policy and curriculum documents considered to be part of the 2010 teacher education reform. In this analysis, I find (similar to the findings of the review article) that *cultural diversity* is neither explicitly elaborated on nor defined according to its ubiquity of usage but is related to and used interchangeably with a set of other undefined terms that all connote notions of Otherness. However, in this article, the main focus is on the finding related

to how Whiteness – in the way it works through the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* – is manifested in three discursive patterns of representation. Importantly, these patterns highlight (1) three hierarchically arranged pupil group categories, (2) descriptions that place these pupil group categories as either superior Norwegian or as inferior non-Norwegian, and (3) the role of student teachers as *political actors of assimilation*. In this article, I point to how these discursive patterns of representation – despite being covered by a polished surface representing the Norwegian self-image as one of peace, solidarity, and egalitarianism, part of the Nordic Model and Nordic Exceptionalism – work together in subtly racist ways, thus promoting ideas of assimilation as racial stratification that, in turn, supports an overall ideology of White Norwegian supremacy.

In the third article, we (my supervisors and I) analyse the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in transcripts of individual interviews with 12 teacher educators. Treating the transcripts as empirical data, we find that *cultural diversity* is used through a double meaning making pattern that, on the one hand, gives meaning to *cultural diversity* as explicitly positive, important, and desirable for teacher education. Yet, on the other hand, the term is assumed to be about the Other, who is subtly represented as negative and challenging, cognitively less developed (than an assumed Us), and knowledgeless. Based on these findings, we suggest that when *cultural diversity* is explicitly represented as something positive, important, and desirable in Norwegian teacher education, this pattern of meaning making, precisely because it rests on subtler assumptions and meaning of *cultural diversity* as a racialised Other, can be interpreted to mirror the "ideal" Whiteness way in which *cultural diversity* ought to be represented. Importantly, despite teacher educators seeming to express their wish to approach *cultural diversity* in positive and inclusive ways, their *dysconscious* usage and meaning making of the term nonetheless produce discursive patterns of Othering and exclusion that reflect the opposite. Related to these findings, we question whether student teachers' subtle learnings about *cultural diversity*, obtained through their teacher education programmes, may influence their future teaching.

In the fourth article, we (my supervisors and I) draw on the same sets of data as in previous Article 3 and analyse these using a socio-cognitive linguistic theoretical framework. In this article, we analyse how teacher educators use *cultural diversity* and reflect on what their discursive practices might tell us about their conceptual understanding of it. Based on the analysis of the transcribed interview data, we find that teacher educators talk about *cultural diversity* as something relating to pupils and parents who are considered different from themselves culturally, socially, linguistically, cognitively, "migrationally", visibly, and religiously. Thus, we theorise that teacher educators talk about *cultural diversity* through seven discourse practices of Othering (DPOs). We point to how teacher educators, when they talk about *cultural diversity* in this way, create two binary oppositional groups. Herein, the teacher educators are placed in an Us-group, represented implicitly and described as "ordinary", and those whom they view as fitting into the *cultural diversity* category are placed in the Other-group, represented explicitly and described as "unordinary". We argue that teacher educators need more than an appreciation of diversity to counteract discrimination and inequality created through the usage and meaning making of terms such as *cultural diversity*.

In this thesis' extended abstract discussion chapter, I discuss and compare the four articles' main findings in relation to the wider Norwegian and international context. Here, I outline two main points of this thesis: (1) how the usage of assumingly "innocent" terms might work to support already wider social patterns of White supremacy and (2) how Whiteness actually works in a "glocal" manner. That is, I argue that the core workings of Whiteness are quite similar irrespective of national context – at least within so-called Western countries: It discursively constructs a discursive object of racialised Otherness, whilst simultaneously maintaining a polished surface mirroring ideas of Us (Whites) as supreme. Importantly, this surface covers the realities of Our "dirty and violent" past and, hence, "blinds" Us to unjust patterns of the present.

Drawing on discourse theoretical methodologies and critical Whiteness political perspectives, the findings of this PhD-thesis contribute to empirically documenting how the *historical pedagogy of amnesia* – the legacy of imperialism and colonialism – currently works through the *dysconscious* usage and meaning making of assumingly "innocent" terms, such as *cultural diversity*. The findings reveal how this, in turn, produces "hidden" racialised discursive patterns that constitute discursive objects of Otherness, which simultaneously, implicitly, and subtly construct ideas of Us as subjects and, as such, centre the workings of Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy.

Methodologically, the thesis contributes a discursive methodology for performing a discursive micro-analysis of the workings of Whiteness to the field of teacher education, both nationally and internationally. Specifically, it also contributes to a "protocol", a step-by-step description of the analytical strategies that can be applied by research peers in future analyses of empirical textual data.

The thesis contributes a thorough theorisation of the concept of Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy to the field of teacher education research by combining post-structural perspectives on discourse with critical perspectives on Whiteness. In the Norwegian context in particular, it contributes to the research by introducing Whiteness as a theoretical and analytical tool that allows researcher 8and other political knowledge-promoting actors) of teacher education for "seeing" how the legacy of imperialism and colonialism – of *race* and *racism* – currently works through subtle discursive practices of Othering and exclusion.

Sammendrag

I denne PhD-avhandlingen undersøker jeg hvilke virkninger Hvithet har i lærerutdanningsdiskurser gjennom bruken og meningsgivingen av en term: *kulturelt mangfold.* Således, retter jeg oppmerksomheten mot tilsynelatende uviktige aspekter ved Vår vanlige sosiale kommunikasjon. Et grunnleggende perspektiv i denne avhandlingen er at arven fra den *historiske pedagogiske amnesi* manifesterer seg i subtile diskursive mønstre i Vår dagligdagse, *mellombevisste* (: *dysconcious*), rasistiske bruk og meningsgiving av termer. Dette er viktig fordi konseptualisering av termer som er nedfelt i kunnskapsproduserende institusjoner, virker gjennom undervisningsplaner (: *educational curricula*) og praksis, og fordi læreres forståelse (: *dispositions*) hovedsakelig handler om meningsgivning relatert til følelser, som igjen påvirker pedagogisk og didaktisk atferd på måter som til syvende og sist har en innvirkning på sosial og rasemessig rettferdighet.

Avhandlingen undersøker hvordan Hvithet virker i lærerutdanningsdiskurser gjennom bruken og meningsgivingen av *kulturelt mangfold* via tre diskursive kunnskapsfremmende områder av lærerutdanningen: (1) internasjonale forskningsartikler, (2) dokumenter om policy og undervisningsplaner, og (3) transkripsjoner av intervjuer med lærerutdannere. Avhandlingen omfatter fire artikler: en kritisk fortolkende litteraturgjennomgang, en analyse av dokumenter om policy og undervisningsplaner, og to diskursanalyser av individuelle intervjuer med lærerutdannere.

I den første artikkelen undersøker jeg bruken og meningsgivingen av *kulturelt mangfold* i 67 internasjonale studier om lærerutdanning publisert i perioden 2004–2014. Gjennom denne analysen finner jeg at *kulturelt mangfold* generelt ikke er definert, men at det relateres til et sett med andre ikke-definerte termer. Videre er bruken av *kulturelt mangfold* (og dets relaterte termer) omfattende brukt som et ledd i binære opposisjonelle diskurser som på den ene siden representerer *kulturelt mangfold* gjennom forestillinger om ulemper – om rasialisering og Annerledesgjøring, ulikhet og underlegenhet – og som på den andre siden representerer lærerstudenter og andre studenter gjennom forestillinger om privileger og antatt overlegenhet. Med utgangspunkt i disse funnene drøfter jeg hvordan den udefinerte siden ved *kulturelt mangfold* og dets bruk som en del av de binære opposisjonelle diskursene, avslører hvordan *kulturelt mangfold* antas å være en rasialisert Annerledeshet (i motsetning til lærerstudent[ene] og student[ene]) i lærerutdanningens forskingsdiskurser. Jeg hevder at denne diskursive produksjonen er ett eksempel på hvordan Hvithet virker gjennom diskursive inndelings- og ekskluderingspraksiser, som et resultat av deres umiddelbare mellombevisste valg av, og dermed også meningsgivingen av, termer. Jeg hevder videre at denne omfattende praksisen med Annerledeshet fungerer som "evidens" for hvordan Hvithet fortsatt blir fremmet gjennom en diskursiv Hvit overlegenhetsideologi som fremkommer i artikler som generelt hevder å fremme sosial rettferdighet.

I den andre artikkelen analyserer jeg bruken og meningsgivingen av *kulturelt mangfold* i seks norske dokumenter om policy og undervisningsplaner som er ansett å være del av lærerutdanningsreformen fra 2010. I denne analysen finner jeg (i likhet med funnene i den

nevnte litteraturgjennomgangen) at *kulturelt mangfold* hverken er eksplisitt utdypet eller definert i forhold til det området termen brukes, men at den relateres til og kan byttes ut med et sett med andre termer som alle knytter an til ideer om Annerledeshet. Likevel ligger hovedfokuset i denne artikkelen på funnene som forholder seg til hvordan Hvithet – måten det virker på gjennom bruken og meningsgivingen av *kulturelt mangfold* – manifesterer seg i tre diskursive representasjonsmønstre. Sentralt er hvordan disse mønstrene belyser: (1) tre hierarkisk ordnede elevgrupper, (2) beskrivelser som plasserer disse elevgruppene enten som overlegne og norske eller som mindreverdige og unorske, og (3) lærerstudentens rolle som *politisk assimileringsaktør*. I denne artikkelen peker jeg på hvordan disse diskursive representasjonsmønstrene – til tross for at de er dekket av en glattpolert flate som representerer den norske selvforståelsen som å være fredfull, solidarisk og egalitær, og som en del av den nordiske modellen og nordisk eksepsjonalisme – virker sammen på subtile rasialiserte måter og fremmer ideer om assimilasjon som en rasialisert laginndeling som igjen støtter opp under en overordnet diskursiv Hvit norsk overlegenhetsideologi.

I den tredje artikkelen analyserer vi (mine veiledere og jeg) bruken og meningsgivingen av *kulturelt mangfold* i transkripsjoner av individuelle intervjuer med 12 lærerutdannere. Vi behandler transkripsjonene som empiriske data og finner at *kulturelt mangfold* blir brukt gjennom et meningsgivende mønster med dobbeltbetydning som på den ene side gir mening til *kulturelt mangfold* som noe eksplisitt positivt, viktig og ønsket innenfor norsk lærerutdanning. Samtidig antas det også å handle om den Andre, som her er subtilt representert som noe negativt og utfordrende, kognitivt mindre utviklet (enn et antatt Oss), og som kunnskapsløs. Med utgangspunkt i disse funnene argumenterer vi for at når *kulturelt mangfold* blir presentert som noe positivt, viktig og ønsket i norsk lærerutdanning, kan dette meningsgivende mønstret – nettopp fordi det hviler på mer subtile antagelser og meningsgivinger om en Annen – bli tolket dithen at det gjenspeiler en "ideell" Hvithetsmåte som *kulturelt mangfold* burde fortolkes på. Et viktig poeng her er at til tross for at lærerutdannere later til å uttrykke ønske om å tilnærme seg *kulturelt mangfold* på positive og inkluderende måter, skaper deres mellombevisste bruk og meningsgivingen av termer likevel diskursive mønstre av Annerledesgjøring og eksklusjon som tyder på det motsatte. I forbindelse med disse funnene stiller vi spørsmål ved hvorvidt det lærerstudenter på subtilt vis lærer om *kulturelt mangfold* i lærerutedanningen, kan påvirke deres undervisning i fremtiden.

I den fjerde artikkelen bruker vi (mine veiledere og jeg) samme datasett som i den tredje og analyserer det ved hjelp av et sosiokognitivt, lingvistisk og teoretisk rammeverk. Vi analyserer her hvordan lærerutdannere bruker *kulturelt mangfold,* og vi reflekterer over hva deres diskursive praksiser kan fortelle oss om deres konseptuelle forståelser av det. Basert på analysen av transkriberte intervjuer, finner vi at lærerutdannere snakker om *kulturelt mangfold* som noe som er relatert til elever og foreldre som anses å skille seg fra dem selv kulturelt, sosialt, språklig, kognitivt, "migrasjonsmessig", visuelt og religiøst. Med utgangspunkt i disse funnene teoretiserer vi at lærerutdannere snakker om *kulturelt mangfold* gjennom syv diskursive praksiser av Annerledesgjøring (DPAer). Vi peker på hvordan lærerutdannere, når de snakker om *kulturelt mangfold* på denne måten, skaper en dikotomi mellom to binære motsatsgrupper. Her er lærerutdannere plassert i en Oss-gruppe,

representert implisitt og beskrevet som "ordinære". De som lærerutdannere mener passer inn i kategorien *kulturelt mangfold,* er plassert i en Andre-gruppe, representert eksplisitt og beskrevet som "uordinære". Vi hevder at lærerutdannere trenger å kunne mer enn å verdsette mangfold om de skal kunne motvirke diskriminering og urettferdighet skapt gjennom bruk og meningsgiving av termer som *kulturelt mangfold.*

I denne avhandlingens diskusjonskapittel drøfter og sammenligner jeg hovedfunnene i de fire artiklene satt inn en bredere norsk og internasjonal kontekst. Her peker jeg på to hovedpoeng ved denne avhandlingen: (1) hvordan bruken av tilsynelatende "uskyldige" termer kan virke på en måte som støtter opp under allerede bredere sosiale Hvite overlegenhetsmønstre, og (2) hvordan Hvithet faktisk virker på "glokale" måter. Jeg argumenterer med andre ord for at kjernen i hvordan Hvithet virker, er ganske lik uavhengig av nasjonal kontekst – i alle fall i såkalte vestlige land: Det skaper et diskursivt Annerledeshetsobjekt samtidig som det holder fast ved en polert fasade som gjenspeiler ideer om Oss (Hvite) som overlegne. Viktig her er at denne fasaden dekker over realiteter ved Vår "skitne og voldelige" fortid, og på den måten gjør dette Oss blinde for urettferdige mønstre i Vår nåtid.

Ved å trekke på diskursteoretiske metodologier og kritiske politiske Hvithets-perspektiver, bidrar funnene i denne avhandlingen til empirisk å dokumentere hvordan den historiske pedagogiske amnesi – den imperiale og koloniale arven – i dag virker gjennom en mellombevisst bruk og meningsgiving av tilsynelatende "uskyldige" termer som *kulturelt mangfold,* og hvordan dette i sin tur produserer "skjulte" rasialiserte diskursive mønstre som etablerer diskursive objekter av Annerledeshet. Effekten av dette er i sin tur også indirekte og subtilt konstruerte ideer om Oss, og som sådan sammenfatter Hvithetets virke som en Hvit diskursiv overlegenhetsideologi.

Metodologisk bidrar avhandlingen med en diskursiv metodologi for å kunne foreta en diskursiv mikroanalyse av hvordan Hvithet virker innenfor feltet lærerutdanning både internasjonalt og nasjonalt. Mer spesifikt bidrar avhandlingen med en "protokoll", en trinnvis beskrivelse av de analytiske strategiene som kan brukes av forskerkolleger i fremtidige analyser av empiriske tekstuelle data.

Teoretisk bidrar analysen til feltet lærerutdanningsforskning ved å sørge for en grundig teoretisering av begrepet Hvithet, forstått som en diskursiv Hvit overlegenhetsideologi. Det skjer ved at den kombinerer poststrukturelle perspektiver med kritiske perspektiver på Hvithet. Til den norske konteksten spesielt bidrar avhandlingen med å introdusere Hvithet som et teoretisk og analytisk redskap som gjør det mulig å "se" hvordan den imperiale og koloniale arven – av *rase* og *rasisme* – virker i dag gjennom subtile diskursive praksiser av Annerledesgjøring og ekskludering.

Prologue

This prologue is inspired by the methodologies of counterstorytelling, often found within Critical Race Theory (CRT), and by the feminist methodology of memory work. Counterstories may be fictional or based on real-life experiences. Their main purpose is to oppose existing *master narratives* (e.g. of Whiteness) by exemplifying and highlighting real-world problems (Gillborn, 2008). Feminist memory work methodology (e.g. Berg, 2008), similar to counterstorytelling, aims to counter master narratives (e.g. of patriarchy) and expose the ways in which these work in Our personal everyday lives. This methodology involves the process of remembering and writing down specific lived episodes.
Whilst the CRT counterstory in itself provide a second layer frame for understanding, the textual production of memory work is followed by a theoretically-based analysis.

In this prologue, I want to give some space to stories that have been told to me throughout the years by my acquaintances, my close friends, family members and colleagues (both within the academy and at the gym where I used to take some classes). Interestingly, some of these stories (e.g. 1, 2, 6 and 9) have been shared as some kind of response to me telling them what my PhD thesis was *really* about (not only about the term *cultural diversity*, but what is constructed and constituted through the usage and meaning making of it). I believe We all have similar stories like these circulating within Our everyday experience, told by acquaintances, close friends, family members, or colleagues – often in nice social settings, such as across the dinner table.

The following stories are meant to situate this PhD thesis in relation to the everyday Norwegian discursive context. In this prologue, I will add minimal comments to the stories but let them rest with you, hoping that as a you read this thesis, the stories' structural function and importance will become clearer, because, I believe that the acquisition of a more critical lens through which to view these stories is one main tool that this thesis offers you. Nevertheless, I provide my own critical theoretical reflections of them in this thesis Post scriptum.

1. After explaining to my colleague at the gym that I actually was studying the term *cultural diversity* and its embeddedness in racialised discursive patterns, they told me how their mum was not a racist and that she worked in a kindergarten where there was a little Somali boy. At work one day, this little Black boy (as my colleague referred to him) approached their mom crying and explaining that the other children had bullied him for being a negro. My colleague told me that their mom had responded to the little boy by telling him that he need not be sad because the truth of the matter was that he actually was a negro. The response of the boy was, according to my colleague, that he acted surprised, somewhat happy and that he went back to continue playing with the other children. Focusing on the claim of how my colleague's mom was not racist, I asked my colleague whether this situation would have "looked" different had the term *negro* been changed to the term *homo,* and if the Somali boy had been a White Norwegian boy. For example, by saying to little Ola [a White Norwegian-sounding name] not to worry because, in fact, he actually was a *homo*.

2. Another story was told to me by my colleague at a so-called *multicultural school* (in the Norwegian context, a "multicultural school" refers to a school that has a high percentage of pupils who are defined, according to Statistics Norway, as being immigrants of 2nd- and 3rd-generation immigrants). Again, this story was told to me as some kind of response to me telling my colleague what my PhD research was *really* about. This

colleague also started their story by telling me that their mom was not racist because they had lived and worked as a missionary in African countries for several years, on several occasions. Nonetheless, after experiencing a sudden illness and placed in the hospital, my colleague's mum had experienced what my colleague referred to as *some kind of instinctive fear* from waking up to a Black face leaning in close to her own face. This Black face had, according to my colleague, caused their mom to scream out loud in horror. However, their mother's reaction was not, according to my colleague, grounded in a fear of Black faces, but was about being back on the African continent.

3. One family member is a child of another generation. In "their time", eugenics was not only popular but was considered as scientific knowledge. This family member often likes to tell me stories or anecdotes with the purpose (I think) of triggering a discussion between us. For example, they have said things such as *Arabs are not to be trusted! Face to face they will smile at you and pretend they are your best friend. However, when you turn your back on them they will attack* [read stab] *you from behind*. This anecdote has also been told to me by another family member on several occasions and is often concluded with the comment: "Arabs are not tame." This family member has often told me the following story: *I remember the arrival of the first negro in* [the name of his home town]. *We were only youngsters and we were so afraid. We hid behind the timber barrels at the dock waiting to see if he was tamed.*

4. Another close family member once stated that *I should know that African ladies, they are so angry, like, all the time, and that therefore it must be kind of understandable why Black men would not stay with them*. This anecdote came "out of the blue" and I had and still have no idea what its message was supposed to be. However, it must be mentioned that due to illness, their brain was in a type of amnesiac state which made them say random things.

5. When I was younger and studying, I shared an apartment with someone who, at the time, had an unofficial relationship with a someone. They often talked about how much they liked this person but also about how everything was so complicated. When I asked them what was complicated, since it seemed to me that they always had such a nice time together, they responded by saying that I should know that they could never go home with a *negro*. I was puzzled and asked if they were serious, because, after all, this person they were dating was adopted and did have a typical Norwegian name. To this they responded that *that is just not something one does*.

6. Another colleague of mine, after they had commented on the interesting aspects of my project, told me that I should know that they were not a racist, but actually really open and that they had once had one of *those*, an intimate relationship with an African American [male]. However, my colleague commented that this relationship was nothing special, that it was not as *they* say.

7. An acquaintance of mine in the Norwegian police force poured out over dinner one night most of their stereotypes about "immigrants". All of them degrading. After they had eased their heart, they commented that their opinions probably were the result of what the profession had made of them. That it had instilled within them a whole lot of prejudice.

8. Over a beer, a friend of mine stated that they did *not see colour*. However, as the conversation developed, nonetheless they repeatedly pointed out the fact that the person they were talking about was a hijab-wearing Muslim.

9. Drinking coffee with my colleague, discussing our challenges and strategies in relation to our work with the PhD's texts, my colleague told me they had been working on a development project for several years in an African country. However, they also told me that it was almost a terrible thing to say, but the women in the village where they worked were so fertile that they almost got pregnant by men only looking at them.

10. Another friend of mine is not considered White, despite having arrived in the country at the age of two and being culturally assimilated. They experience always being held back at border customs, often having to go

through extensive interrogations performed by various agents. Once, when traveling on business with their boss, their boss asked my friend why they were stopped so often at customs and why they were held for so long. My friend got quite annoyed, because to them, the reason for these incidents was quite obvious. Thus, they therefore responded to their boss with a question about whether the boss *really had to go there* [talk about the issue], because their boss, according to my friend, should have known why they did not want *to go there*. Particularly because during work-related social events, their boss seemed to enjoy occasionally pointing out that my friend *had no idea* because they were *immigrant*. Interestingly, the boss's response to the *do we have to go there* question was to ask my friend whether they really were sure that they actually did not have *anything* in their bag.

Preface

This thesis can be seen as a sequel to my master's thesis, written when undertaking my Multicultural and International Education course, where I studied the conceptualisation of the "locally" and frequently used Norwegian term *det flerkulturelle* (: *the multicultural*) in Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents (Fylkesnes, 2011). The master's programme's multicultural education literature and its accompanying lectures often left me confused and "unsatisfied" with what appeared to be a lack of conceptual clarity in the literature's usage of central terms.

The findings in the master's thesis were framed within the multicultural educational literature. However, this literature left me unsatisfied and incapable of properly describing and pointing to, under one coherent theoretical framework, why the findings on how *the multicultural* was generally constructed as a non-Norwegian Otherness (cf. Said, 2003) and as part of Norwegian society, but nonetheless was not part of Norwegian identity and the nation-building story about Us had come about, and why these findings mattered. However, as I later discovered through my interaction with the literature on Whiteness (at a critical multiculturalism for teacher education course that was part of my PhD education), the discursive patterns from my master's thesis's empirical data that had remained untouched did so not because these patterns were deemed irrelevant, but simply because, at the time, I did not have access to the theoretical and conceptual tools to enable me to "see" them as discursive patterns of *race* and *racism* – of *Whiteness.*

Following the workings of Foucault (power/knowledge), Althusser (on ideology), Gramsci (the concept of hegemony), Bourdieu (on language and its symbolic power), Laclau and Mouffe (*Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*), Deleuze and Guattari (*A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*), Berger and Luckmann (*The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*), as well as scholars of post-structuralism (e.g. St. Pierre, Saussure, Foucault, Laclau and Mouffe), I have come to better understand the importance of both the academic and everyday meaning making's inextricable relationship with the productive workings of ideology, power/knowledge, dominance and the maintenance of hegemonic "truths" in its continuously social hierarchical constructions of in and out groups (e.g. the simultaneous subtle construction of Us – the White European *race* – through processes that extensively name and define Otherness).

Central to this thesis is a concern with the researcher's gaze. I have been inspired by the research perspectives of Gullestad (2002, 2004) and her critical view on the Norwegian national self-image and identity construction; Said (2003) and his critical empirically-founded theories of how the textual constructions of the Orient (the Other) rest on subtle ideas and assumptions that simultaneously co-construct the Occident (Us); and by Frankenberg's (1993) study of White middle-class women's life stories and the centrality of race in their assumingly race-less life stories. Moreover, this thesis's researcher perspective is also inspired by what I understand as Allen's (2004) critique of how multicultural- and social justice-oriented

educational research has symptomatically focused on the pedagogy of the oppressed (cf. Freire, 1970) yet unintentionally (re)produced Whiteness. With this thesis, I hope to counter such productions – what I refer to in this PhD thesis as a "dysconscious" form of everyday racism (Essed, 1991; King, 2004). Therefore, I take Allen's (2004) argument about how research needs to focus its gaze on the *pedagogy of the oppressor* (Allen, 2004) seriously. However, to research something that is believed not to be visibly present, such as race (e.g. Frankenberg, 1993), and to focus on the pedagogy of the oppressor is not an easy task because it involves exposing how, under a "polished surface" and within a "muddled" (Gullestad, 2010, p. 60) system, Whiteness thrives.

This thesis researcher's gaze that focuses on the pedagogy of the oppressor is also inspired by the works of Foucault, Althusser and Gramsci, in that they all point to how the workings of power/knowledge, ideology and hegemony produce "truths" and how such truths are always accompanied by certain accepted practices. Thus, this type of researcher gaze is a continuation of the paradox that I highlighted in my master's thesis regarding how We, as young scholars in the academy, are encouraged by Our professors to be critical, however, only of what they tell Us is worthy of critique (Fylkesnes, 2011). What has been deemed worthy of critique has, in my experience, never included directing the researcher's gaze towards the *pedagogy of the oppressor*. Through this thesis, however, I have attempted to alter what is considered the accepted boundary of criticality within Norwegian (and wider Nordic) academia. In line with critical Whiteness studies (CWS), theorists of discourse analysis and other post-structuralist perspectives, one overall aim of this PhD thesis' research is to challenge the oppressive *racial status quo* and hence to highlight established yet subtle discursive boundaries, provoke a little and encourage discussion. Importantly, this endeavour has always had the overall goal of promoting greater racial justice. I hope that my PhD thesis contributes to this goal.

Acknowledgements

No work is ever carried out in isolation; neither is this thesis. Therefore, I would like to thank all those who contributed to this PhD thesis. Undertaking this PhD has, for various life-dimensional reasons, been the most challenging period of my grown-up life. However, what is important for me to stress is that due to the tribulations that I experienced, I have gained a tremendous amount of knowledge and reached new insights on so many levels. Positively, despite the challenges, I have achieved important accomplishments on various planes.

To my supervisors *Anne Birgitta Nilsen* and *Sølvi Mausethagen*, thank you for your continuous support and, not least, for your patience. Thank you Anne Birgitta for taking me on as your student "mid-way" and for being such an important support in various arenas of academic life. I truly appreciate your often brutally honest yet very important advice. I will remember it throughout my career. Thank you Sølvi for always sharing your work, networks, knowledge, and insights and for always having a positive outlook throughout the process. When working with you, nothing seemed impossible. Your outlook will continue to inspire me.

Thanks *Janelle Scott*, and all members of your UC Berkeley, Graduate School of Education research group for welcoming me so warmly, sharing your work and letting me comment on it, and for reading and commenting on mine.

Thank you NATED and track 4 leaders *Peter Maassen* and *Andreas Lund* for making your PhD students aim high, to try Our best and for making Us believe that We could do it (: to publish in highly ranked international journals). You have taught Us a lot. Thanks to my NATED track 4 peers for reading and commenting on my work, and for letting me read and comment on yours. To *Wenche Thomassen,* thank you for reading and commenting on my work and for sending me sweet Messenger texts, always at times when I needed it the most. A very special thank you to *Kjetil Engelandsdal*, who, despite working from a very different research tradition, is always so supportive and who has, more than once, read and enthusiastically commented on my work.

Thank you *Gunn E. Søreide* for so thoroughly reading and critically commenting on my work, both mid-term and closer to the end. Your comments have been most appreciated and helpful.

To my PhD programme peers, thank you all so much for your interest, support and for Our discussions. Particularly, thank you *Halla Holmarsdottir, Lynel Chavala, Randi Havnen* and *Øystein Winje* for reading and critically commenting on my writing more than once. Thank you for your interest and for being so supportive. Your continuous support is so important to me.

Thanks to Justice Through Education (JUSTED) and *Gunilla Holm* for inviting me to join team 5 (Perceptions and Constructions of Marginalisation and Belonging in Education), for arranging summer schools and for giving me the opportunity and experience of critically commenting on Bree Picower's summer school's keynote and her book (*Practice What You*

Table of contents

List of articles:

Article 1:

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71,* 24–33. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.005

Article 2:

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy.* Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/02680939.2018.1482503

Article 3:

Fylkesnes, S., Mausethagen, S., & Nilsen, A. B. (2018). The double meaning making of the term cultural diversity in teacher educator discourses. *Nordic Journal of International and Comparative Education, 2*(1), 16–38. doi:10.7577/njcie.2284

Article 4:

Nilsen, A. B., Fylkesnes, S., & Mausethagen, S. (2017). The linguistics in othering: Teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, *8*(1). doi:10.7577/rerm.2556

1. Introduction

This thesis's focus is on the workings of Whiteness in teacher education discourses through the usage and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*[1]. Its main concern is in highlighting the importance of disrupting the continuous reproduction of the unjust racial status quo through a deconstruction of what I, in this thesis, refer to as "dysconscious racism" (King, 2004); the discursive practices that, in Our[2] Western part of the world, ensure the persistence of the *mythologies* (Barthes, 2000) of White supremacy (cf. Gillborn, 2008, see also Leonardo, 2016) that have the effect of privileging (mainly but not only) White people (Chubbuck, 2004; Gillborn, 2005; Roediger, 2007).

Even though quite an extensive and growing body of research exists that analyses Whiteness as a discourse (e.g. Leonardo, 2016), for example, within institutions (e.g. Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Dyer, 1993, 1997), and in relation to educational policy (e.g. Brown & De Lissovoy, 2011; Gillborn 1998, 2005, 2008, 2016; Orozco, 2011; Preston, 2008; Smith, 2013), only a handful of studies focus specifically on how Whiteness manifests in teacher education discourses (Cross, 2005; de Freitas, 2005; Haviland, 2008; Smith, 2013). Generally, the attention given to the workings of Whiteness is limited within the Nordic context.

International researchers of teacher education have pointed to how there in teacher education, research continues to persist a lack of conceptual clarity (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Grant, Elsbree, & Fondric, 2004; Smolcic & Katunich, 2017) and how such a lack might reflect limited culturally-relevant theoretical and conceptual knowledge among central actors within teacher education (Smolcic & Katunich, 2017). Even though some studies do critically research the usage and meaning making of central terms in teacher education discourses (e.g. Matus & Infante, 2011), there is little research that relates analysis to critical theories of Whiteness. Such research is important because We know that conceptualisations of terms constituted in knowledge-producing institutions work through educational curricula and practice (e.g. Afdal & Nerland, 2014), and that teachers' dispositions are fundamentally about meaning making related to feelings that affect pedagogical behaviour (e.g. Eberly, Rand, & O'Connor, 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that ultimately effect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010). Thus, there is a need for more insight into how

---

[1] Henceforth in this thesis, whenever I write *cultural diversity*, I always refer to it as a term. Thus, I will italicise it. However, when I highlight and discuss other terms, I will refer to them by stating that they are terms (e.g. the term *race*, the term *ethnicity* etc.). These terms will also be italicised.

[2] Inspired by Matias (2016a), to recognise racialised language, I will, strategically capitalise words highlighting the White racial formation. However, whilst Matias (2016a) attempts to combat White supremacy in language by lowercasing racially dominant groups, I will instead, in this PhD thesis, capitalise these. This is because as critical researchers of Whiteness argue, Whiteness, similarly to power, works most efficiently when silenced and "invisible". Thus, to dismantle and make it visible, its workings must be named and defined. Moreover, because I am concerned with deconstructing the pedagogy of the oppressor (Allen, 2004) in this thesis, I will also attempt to counter the central, yet doxic promoted belief that Whites are not raced (read *grouped*), but individuals. Therefore, I will draw attention to how Whites are grouped by both capitalising and italicising the group-significant pronouns: We, Us, Our, White, Whiteness. (Whites and others might be raised to believe We exist as individuals; however, Our racial formation is indeed grouped.) I will also capitalise the terms *Other* (cf. Said) and *Othering* to highlight that these categories are racial products of the discursive ideology of White supremacy.

Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of central discursive and "innocent" terms such as *cultural diversity* in various domains of teacher education.

1.1 Whiteness and *cultural diversity*

In this thesis, the workings of Whiteness in teacher education discourses through the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* have been interrogated by focusing on three discursive knowledge-promoting domains: (1) international research articles, (2) Norwegian national policy and curriculum documents, and (3) Norwegian teacher educator interview transcripts. Importantly, within these three domains, *cultural diversity* is placed as central, however its content is not defined.

Based on this PhD thesis's empirical findings of how *cultural diversity* is generally not defined but used interchangeably with other terms that generally denote an inferior racialised Other (Said, 2003), this thesis argues that the discursive usage and meaning making of this term contributes in constituting Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy. This theoretical argument is empirically-based and related to research that points to how historically-constructed social imageries portray the Norwegian self-image as one presenting itself both nationally and internationally as superior when it comes to promoting peace, solidarity and egalitarianism (Gullestad, 2002). This social imaginary also places Norway as part of the *Nordic Model,* a welfare state model based on egalitarianism, and as part of *Nordic Exceptionalism*, that is, outside of colonial and imperial complicity. Importantly, within the Norwegian (and wider Nordic) context, the term *race* is considered taboo and refuted as a theoretical analytical concept, *racism* is generally understood as referring to explicit actions of hate, and the colourblind nationalistic ideology of *imagined sameness* (Gullestad, 2002, 2004) stands strong.

This PhD thesis contributes with conceptual and analytical tools for "seeing" and understanding how Whiteness works to "blind" those complicit in it through forms of subtle institutionalised forms of racism in everyday teacher education discourses. As such, it can be read as a counterstory to the *historical pedagogy of amnesia* (Leonardo, 2004) as well as the imagined myth of the Norwegian self-image and *imagined sameness* ideology. The thesis also points to important implications for teacher education when it comes to the overriding goal of promoting social and racial justice[3].

With this thesis, I hope to bring attention to how the historically "forgotten" violent sides of history are invisibly present as patterns in current discursive workings of Whiteness: It is related to the usage and meaning making of central and apparently innocent discursive terms such as *cultural diversity.* To shed light on how discourses of the past continue to work in the present (cf. Gee's (2011) **D**iscourse/**d**iscourse conceptualisation) is important because I believe that it is only through disrupting the injustices of the past that We might counter the

---

[3] The interchangeable usage of the terms *social* and *racial* in this thesis points to the central perspective of CWS on how the "Racial imagery is central to the organisation of the modern world" (Dyer, 1997, p. 1). In other words, and as will be made clear later in this thesis, race is understood as central to the social formation.

legacy of Whiteness and thereby direct Our path towards greater future racial justice.

1.2 Aims and research questions

This PhD project's aim of deconstructing (cf. Rolfe, 2004) Whiteness by focusing on its workings in teacher education discourses through interrogating the minimal and "everyday" habitual discursive usage and meaning makings of *cultural diversity* implies that this term functions as a central entry point for analysis (Fairclough, 2013). As such, it also functions as a synecdoche that represents a wider discursive constellation. Even though this PhD project's starting point is concerned with one term, its initial analysis links to a larger project of *semiotics* – how discursive signs' (e.g. terms such as *cultural diversity*) usage and meaning making constellations (e.g. discursive patterns) (Fairclough, Jessop, & Sayer, 2010; Peräkylä & Ruusuvuory, 2017), discursively produced both at the macro and micro levels, "encourage" people to take action to achieve certain political goals[4] (Fairclough et al., 2010; Peräkylä & Ruusuvuory, 2017; e.g. Törrönen, 2000, 2003). Inspired by critical researchers of Whiteness, this thesis not only addresses questions related to who education benefits (Apple, 2014) but how actors invest in Whiteness (Leonardo, 2004) – what is done and how it is done. It also reflects upon questions concerning *why*[5] this is done (King, 2004). Consequently, the findings are linked to the historical, political and ideological contexts. The focus of the project is related to research on Whiteness published in both a Norwegian and international (mainly Western) contexts.

The overall question that this PhD project seeks to answer is:

How does Whiteness work through the term *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses*?*

The following research questions are addressed across the articles:

(1) What are the main discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in the teacher education discourses?

(2) In what ways may Whiteness be understood to work through the different knowledge-promoting discursive domains of: international teacher education research articles, teacher education policy and curriculum documents and teacher educator interview transcripts?

---

[4] What is important to mention in this regard is how Anders Behring Breivik, prior to his terrorist actions, wrote down quite an extensive "manifesto" that, according to Muller Myrdahl (2014), "calls to arms in the defense of white supremacy" (p. 488). Yet some researchers (e.g. Moi, 2012) argue that Breivik's terrorist actions were intended as a marketing campaign for his "manifesto". However, related to this thesis's concern with semiotics, a relevant question would thus be to reflect on whether his "manifesto" also initially worked as a motivation for his terrorist actions.

[5] Importantly, to address questions of why things are done is not the same as addressing the possible intensions behind actions. Whilst asking questions related to intensions possibly points to the actors' desired (intended) outcomes, asking questions about *why* refers to how the historical, political and ideological contexts – how Discourses work in present discourses (Gee, 2011) – possibly inform everyday habitual language use.

The above questions have been modified and restructured in relation to the research questions and the findings of the four articles on which this thesis builds[6].

1.3 Thesis composition

This thesis comprises a total of four articles. The first article is concerned with the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in teacher education research discourses and the possible implications this might have for teacher education and teacher education research with respect to social and racial justice. The second article is concerned with how the concept of Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in Norwegian policy and curriculum documents, and what implications this may possibly have for teacher education policy in relation to racial justice in Norway and elsewhere. The third article is concerned with how *cultural diversity* was used and given meaning in teacher educator interview transcripts and the possible implications such usage and meaning making may have for teacher education. The fourth article is concerned with how teacher educators use *cultural diversity* and what their discursive practices might tell Us about their conceptual understanding of it. Table 1 provides an overview of the four articles' titles, research questions, empirical data and the main findings.

Table 1: Overview of the articles' research questions, empirical data and main findings

Articles	Guiding questions	Empirical data	Main findings
Article 1 Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity*	How is *cultural diversity* used and made meaning of in teacher education research? What are the possible implications of the use and meaning of *cultural diversity* for teacher education in relation to social justice?	67 international research articles published between 2004 and 2014.	*Cultural diversity* is (1) generally not defined but is (2) related to a set of other undefined terms, and (3) part of two main binary oppositional discourses that generally produced *cultural diversity* as a racialised Other in contrast to the student teacher(s) and the student(s). Despite researchers attempting to promote social justice, it facilitates and constitutes a discursive politics that re-centres Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy.

---

[6] In this thesis, usage refers to how *cultural diversity* is placed in the analysed texts (e.g. its centrality and marginality) and the way it is related to other terms. Meaning making refers to how *cultural diversity* is given meaning, explicitly or implicitly. Domain is a concept adapted from Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation of the discursive formation and refers to more or less agreement on a certain discursive meaning of a social phenomenon within a more or less defined discursive area (e.g. produced by a set of texts, documents, or a team of colleagues).

Article 2			
Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum	How does Whiteness work through the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in the six Norwegian policy and curriculum documents?	Six teacher education reform documents.	*Cultural diversity* was mainly related to three hierarchically-arranged pupil categories represented as: (1) more or less Norwegian; (2) cognitively able or challenged; (3) invisible, yet present as abstractions, or visibly present through bodily features, and; (4) as entitled or restricted in relation to "property". Additionally, the student teacher was found to be assigned a role as "a political actor of assimilation". The policy and curriculum documents are, on the one hand, presented as promoters of social justice. Yet, on the other hand, they are subtly both the products and producers of a racialised discourse of categorisation, hierarchy, Othering and exclusion.
Article 3			
The double meaning making of *cultural diversity* in teacher educator discourses	How is *cultural diversity* used and given meaning in teacher educator discourses?	Transcripts of 12 individual interviews.	*Cultural diversity* was made meaning of through a double meaning making pattern that pointed to how *cultural diversity* was both explicitly presented as something positive, important and desirable, and more subtly represented as the Other.
Article 4			
The linguistics in Othering: Teacher educators' talk about *cultural diversity*	How do teacher educators use *cultural diversity*? What may their discursive practices of *cultural diversity* tell us about their conceptual understanding of cultural diversity?	Transcripts of 12 individual interviews.	Teacher educators, like other members of society, express their conceptualisations of *cultural diversity* mainly through seven discursive practices of Othering.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

The extended abstract of this PhD thesis consists of eight chapters that contextualise, clarify the theoretical perspectives, outline the methodology of the research process and discuss the overall contribution of it based on its four articles. Following this introductory chapter, chapter 2 provides an ideological contextualisation of this PhD thesis. Chapter 3 gives an overview of recent peer-reviewed research articles on Whiteness from the Norwegian as well as the wider international contexts for the time period from 2004–2017. In chapter 4, I discuss the theoretical perspectives of this thesis. Chapter 5 outlines and reflects upon the methodological considerations of this thesis. Chapter 6 summarises the four articles and their

main findings and discussion points. Chapter 7 discusses the findings from the four articles. Lastly, chapter 8 provides some concluding remarks and reflects on the research's main contributions, implications and limitations, and provides suggestions for further research.

2. Ideological contextualisation of the thesis

To study the workings of Whiteness in a Norwegian teacher education context is of particular importance when seen in relation to the representation of the Norwegian self-image. Firstly, Norway is represented as part of what is known as the *Nordic Model* and *Nordic Exceptionalism*. Moreover, it is also important because of how, in Norway, as well as in the wider Nordic context, *race,* refuted as a theoretical and analytical concept, *racism,* understood merely as explicit actions of hate*,* and the ideological myth of *imagined sameness* work in inextricable, colourblind and nationalistic ways to forge ideas of White Norwegian superiority.

2.1 Two social imaginaries: The Nordic Model and Nordic Exceptionalism

The *Nordic Model* refers to a post-World War II social democratic political strategy (Sejerstad, 2005) that sought to "rebuild and modernise society by means of science, rationality, and democratic participation" (Imsen, Blossing, & Moos, 2017). Representations of Norway as part of the Nordic Model thus involve ideas of its society being built on social democratic ideological/political (Sejerstad, 2005) post-World War II principles. Researchers argue that this led to the establishment of a well-developed and functioning welfare state with free comprehensive education and equal access to higher education for all (e.g. Antikainen, 2006; Imsen et al., 2017; Telhaug, Mediås, & Aasen, 2006), regardless of, for example, social, cultural, and ethnic background, gender, geographical location or ability (Imsen et al., 2017; Vedøy & Møller, 2007). Central to the Nordic Model is how the welfare state and the political system is based on an ideology of how social solidarity, equality/sameness [: *likhet*][7], trust and collaboration are believed to stimulate economic growth and a sense of social security for its citizens (Klemsdal, 2009). Within the Nordic Model doctrine, education is central. It is represented as both a social common good, and the means for making social mobility possible, thereby ensuring a reduction in social differences (Imsen et al., 2017). The state is generally strongly involved in forming and defining the nationally-framed curriculum, which generally highlights the importance of social justice, equity, equal opportunities, inclusion, nation-building and democratic participation (Imsen et al., 2017; Telhaug et al., 2006). Such values are manifested in the Norwegian Educational Law (Lovdata, 2013) and its accorded national teacher education curriculum (Ministry of Education and Research, 2009, 2010). Interestingly, the Nordic Model has, in recent decades, been "branded" as a product representing certain values and norms with respect to national identity construction (Browning, 2007). It is suggested as a recipe for success for other European countries to follow (e.g. Gullestad, 2006; Telhaug et al., 2006).

Representations of Norway as part of *Nordic Exceptionalism* also portray an image of Norway as being distinctly different from the rest of Europe based on promoted ideas of how

---

[7] Gullestad (2002) has discussed the problematics of the Norwegian term *likhet* referring to both equality and sameness because of the term *likhet's* double meaning. The term, she argues, is connected to the Norwegian nationalistic myth of "imaginary sameness" and implies a meaning such as "to fit in together" (*å passe sammen*) and "to share the same ideas" (*ha sammenfallendesynspunkter*). Gullestad (2002) argues that in the Norwegian context, this idea of *likhet* often implies that being defined as "too different" means representing a problem and that open conflicts are seen as threats to central Norwegian values such as "peace and quiet" (p. 47).

Norway is "a superpower of human rights" (Mulinari, Keskinen, Irni, & Tuori, 2009, p. 8), a leading provider of aid in relation to its Brutto National Product (Eide & Simonsen, 2008), and as a place that is particularly peaceful, extremely rich and wealthy, and racially White (Eriksen & Neumann, 2011; Gullestad, 2002). Moreover, because Norway generally ranks on top with respect to indexes related to the economy, development, happiness, social progress, low degrees of corruption and gender equality (e.g. Iqbal & Todi, 2015), and because it was generally not affected by the economic crises in the 1980s and in 2008 (Eriksen & Neumann, 2011; Telhaug et al., 2006), its represented self-image might be understood as producing a doxic idea of Norway being slightly superior to its neighbouring Nordic countries.

From post-colonial perspectives, the representation of Norway as part of *Nordic Exceptionalism* involves ideas of how the country is portrayed as being historically detached from both imperialism and colonialism (Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2016). This constructed national memory represents a historical *pedagogy of amnesia* (Leonardo, 2002, p. 34) – a deliberate remembering and forgetting of events – currently works to further promote and constitute a Norwegian identity based on ideas of Norwegians as victims of colonialism and war, as anti-racist peace-promoters and as solidarity-focused (Gullestad, 2004). The current deliberate remembering, works, for example, in how the murder of Benjamin Hermansen[8], the terrorist Utøya massacre[9] and the beating of Jacob Kuteh[10] are *remembered* as explicit actions of racism, performed by Norwegian Whites positioned at the margins of society[11]. The current deliberate forgetting works through how these same events are *not discussed* (not even by 2018) in schools in relation to historical frames that critically address Our common national Norwegian legacy of systematic domination, violence and oppression against Our country's minority Others (e.g. the Indigenous Sami people, and the Norwegian national minority groups of Jews, Kvens/Norwegian Finns, Forest Finns, Roma (Gypsies) and Romani people/Tater) – but how We have instead produced historical monuments that cast shadows that veil and cover up Our inhumane acts (e.g. Pihl, 2002). Importantly with regards to *the Nordic Model* and *Nordic Exceptionalism* is that Norway's history of dominance and violence against Our minority populations is no different to that of other Western countries (Gullestad, 2002; Jensen, 2005; Svendsen, 2014): We have always managed to assimilate Our minority populations by *any means necessary* (e.g. Jensen, 2005; Pihl, 2010).

According to Nordic post-colonial researchers, the *mythodological* (Barthes, 2000) doxic lies of the *Nordic Model* and *Nordic Exceptionalism* work as a kind of *welfare state nationalism* to categorise people in specific types of ways (e.g. immigrant, multicultural) (Mulinari et al., 2016). This categorisation is not one that assimilates, but one which includes, but through, for example, racist processes of social subordination (e.g. Mulinari & Neergaard, 2005). Such

---

[8] http://www.osloby.no/nyheter/10-ar-siden-Benjamin-ble-drept-5108445.html#.U0_ZdldfZ8E
[9] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011_Norway_attacks
[10] https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/jeg-er-fryktelig-redd-de-sa-at-sanne-som-meg-ikke-er-velkommen-i-verdal/61754035
[11] This remembering is related to how the concept of racism in Norway is generally understood as overt acts based on hate and not on everyday practices of marginalisation and discrimination based on assumptions of difference such as skin colour (e.g. Gullestad, 2002; Tajik, 2001; van Riemsdijk, 2010).

categorical racism – which I theorise as a discursive racial stratification in this PhD thesis's Article 2 – is generally not recognised as such. What Nordic post-colonial researchers refer to as *welfare state nationalism* (Mulinari et al., 2016, p. 5)*, when related to the Norwegian context, may be what Gullestad (2002) coined as the Norwegian "imagined sameness" ideology. This ideology, she described as an ethnocentric, colourblind and nationalistic myth of homogeneity. This national myth is tied to the myths of the Nordic Model and Nordic Exceptionalism and to the rejection of the *race* concept, merely understanding *racism* as explicit actions of hate. I discuss these relations below.

2.2 *Race*, *racism* and the Norwegian myth of *imagined sameness*

In the Norwegian and the wider Nordic (academic) context, *race* is deemed taboo (Dowling, 2017; Gullestad 2004; Muller Myrdahl , 2014; Svendesen, 2014; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011) and therefore refuted as an analytically valid concept (Muller Myrdhal, 2014). This refusal is often based not only on how the term is associated with past mistakes of colonialism that the Norwegian (and the wider Nordic) context nonetheless sees itself as historically innocent of (Keskinen et al., 2016: Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2012; Palmberg, 2009), but also (e.g. in the context of the academy) on how *race* is argued to connote references to the World War II Nazi ideas of the existence of biologically different human species, and how, since there are no human *races*, We should not speak of *race* (Goldberg, 2015). Herein, these arguments are deemed as both untrue and nonsensical. We talk about *race* when *not* talking about it (Goldberg, 2015). Thus, discourses that explicitly appear to be unconnected with *race* might nonetheless subtly grant a particular racist definition of Us as opposed to Them (Gillborn, 1995).

As already touched upon, *racism* in the Norwegian context is generally understood as explicit actions of hate performed by persons at the margins of society. These understandings of racist actions make it "easy" to perceive, for example, the murder of Benjamin Hermansen, the terrorist Utøya massacre and the beating of Jacob Kuteh as examples of such kinds of racism. However, researchers argue for the need to start understanding such forms of a racism as symptoms of a much bigger structural problem (Muller Myrdahl, 2014; Pennington, 2007; Scheurich, 2002). For example, Scheurich (2002) argues that:

> White racism is not primarily individual acts or beliefs; those are only social effects. White racism is the Onto-Logical; it is built into the very nature of the social reality. It is Epistemo-Logical; it is built into the very nature of accepted and legitimated assumptions about how [W]e come to know reality. It is *institutional*, *societal*, and *civilizational*. US institutions from the Government to the schools are White racist ones. (p. 3)

Nordic post-colonial researchers point to how due to imperial and colonial denial, the Nordic countries have never undergone a period of critiquing Our colonial complicity (Mulinari et al., 2016). This, they claim, creates a legacy that makes possible interpretations of racist practices as non-racist. In the Norwegian context, such interpretations might be exemplified by how degrading words such as *neger* [: negro] are interpreted as merely descriptive (Gullestad, 2006) and not as an epithet that verbally "incarcerates blacks in a web of racist stereotypes that tap into topoi of blacks as either the eschewed or exotically essentialized

'Other'" (Thomas, 2016, p. 231). Importantly, such interpretations align with the myths of the Nordic Model and Nordic Exceptionalism and colourblind ideas of the Norwegian self-image, which some researchers also refer to as *Norwegian goodness* (Gullestad, 2002; Muller Myrdahl, 2014; Wirtozek, 2011) – a *goodness*, apparently preserved for racially White Norwegians only (see Muller Myrdahl, 2014).

The *imagined sameness* ideal can be understood as a national ideology based on the Norwegian self-image and on racial principles of White Norwegian superiority, accompanied (in line with the workings of Whiteness elsewhere) by unearned privileges. The *imagined sameness* ideology is related to the Nordic Model values of egalitarianism and equality. However, in the Norwegian context, the term *equality* is "conceived of as sameness … an unquestioned assumption that people need to be more or less similar in order to get along well" (Gullestad, 2006, p. 304), hence the welfare state nationalism concept. These ideas are inherently part of the Norwegian consciousness that manifests, for example, in the following proverb: *like barn leker best* [directly translated as: *children who are similar make the best playmates*], which Gullestad (2006) explains implies that "children which are like each other play more happily than other children" (p. 304). Thus, the *imagined sameness* ideology also implies that difference, or even deviation, is seen as a threat to its workings. Rugkåssa (2012) argues that groups that historically and currently have not lived up to the ideal social Norwegian norms are deemed as abnormal or deviant, and not as alternative. In Norway, researchers also argue that the *imagined sameness* ideology manifests through how discourses about *normality* and *deviation* conflate with discourses about *sameness* and *difference* (Sirnes, 1999; Vike, Lidén, & Lien, 2001) and through the promotion of ideas of how *deviation* is considered as something to be removed or treated (Sirnes, 1999).

As mentioned, *deviation* (e.g. Indigenous people and the national minorities) from the ethno-nationalistic colourblind Norwegian imagined sameness ideology has historically been "removed" or "treated" by processes that have managed to assimilate Norwegian bodies of Otherness by *any means necessary*. However, the imagined sameness ideal has its limitations. These limitations are currently on display, because, contrary to the previous assimilated Others, a new Other – immigrants who are visibly present through their bodies of colour – is more challenging to dominate and completely assimilate into the ethnic White nationalistic ideal of *imagined sameness*. As such, the presence of the Other becomes a threat, not necessarily to people's access to and consumption of resources (e.g. the welfare state model), but to the very metaphor by which We live (Leonardo, 2016): It is the Norwegian self-image as White and superior that is at stake. In other words, the presence of the Other, in the form of a non-assimilative body of colour on Norwegian territory, pressures White Norwegians to disrupt the *pedagogy of amnesia* (and its accompanied *imagined sameness ideology*) that helps to maintain the "idyllic" Norwegian self-image as one of a peace-promoting, solidarity-loving and egalitarian people and as an exception to the imperial and colonial legacy. Importantly, to people of colour, the Norwegian doxic self-image lie as White and superior is highly visible (Ahmed, 2004; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014), however so-called ethnic (read: racially White) Norwegians are most likely blinded to its workings. Thus, herein lies a significant potential, namely that people of colour might assist Norwegians in seeing its exclusionary

workings.

In this PhD thesis, the *mythodological* (Barthes, 2000) doxic lies of the Nordic Model and Nordic Exceptionalism (including the refusal of *race* as a theoretical and analytical concept, and the understanding of *racism* as explicit actions of hate) work as *welfare state nationalism* (Mulinari et al., 2016, p. 5) through teacher education discourses. These discourses contribute to the continuous construction of a form of institutionalised racism that not only creates and reproduces race, but also works to constitute a discursive ideology of White supremacy. This ideology, I argue, might be understood to work through what Gullestad (2001) has coined as the "imagined sameness": an ethnocentric (: White racist), colourblind nationalistic myth.

3. Literature review

The main research question of this thesis pursues how Whiteness works through *cultural diversity* in teacher education-produced discourses. The empirical context of this thesis's studies (Articles 1–4) has been both international (mainly Western countries (Article 1)) and national (Articles 2–4). Generally, this thesis is positioned within both a Norwegian and an international (and for now, Western) context, as its articles, despite some being based on studies in the Norwegian context, are generally related to international research and its readership.

As Article 1 reviews international peer-reviewed articles' usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in teacher education, this review chapter examines national, international and peer-reviewed articles on Whiteness. Due to the limited research on the workings of Whiteness in Norwegian teacher education, I expanded the review in this context to include *all* existing peer-reviewed published empirical articles on Whiteness, as well as one PhD thesis. The international review focuses on articles on Whiteness in teacher education.

I first outline a brief rationale for undertaking the literature review. Second, the search methods and final selection of the articles are accounted for. Third, the articles from the Norwegian context are presented. Fourth, articles from the international context are presented. Lastly, the literature from the two contexts is compared to determine the areas and the means for further future research both in the Norwegian and international contexts.

3.1 Why review the literature?

Drawing on insights from researchers discussing literature review (e.g. Boote & Beile, 2008; Charmaz, Thornberg, & Keane, 2017; Mausethagen, 2013; Thompson, 2012, 2017) the aim of this thesis's literature review is not only to provide a general overview of recently published research on Whiteness in teacher education – often referred to as the "state of the art" – but to assist the discussion and its relationship to the related research area, its key concepts and lines of argument (Mausethagen, 2013; Thompson, 2012, 2017). The literature review will critique the literature, wherever necessary (Charmaz, Thornberg, & Keane, 2017), with the purpose of pushing the research field forward (e.g. Cochran-Smith et al., 2015). Of particular importance and focus is the theorisation and conceptualisation of Whiteness in both the Norwegian and international contexts.

3.2 Search method

The literature review was approached through systematic data-gathering-inspired strategies (e.g. Gough & Thomas, 2013; Gough, Thomas & Oliver, 2012a, 2012b). Articles were gathered through database searches in the data bases Academic Search Premier, ERIC and NORART, with some additional searches in the Oslo Metropolitan University library's search motor Oria. The searches aimed mainly at capturing international and national published empirically-based research articles on Whiteness in teacher education in both the Norwegian and English languages and in peer-reviewed journals. The main searches for the relevant literature were confined to the periods 2004–2014 and 2014–2017, and were generally performed in August 2014, with follow-up searches in February 2018. The 71 (n = 10 from

the Norwegian context, n = 61 from the international context) articles included in this thesis's review chapter are not only (but are mainly) empirically-based and related to teacher education. However, most importantly, they all theorise the concept of Whiteness. The criteria for article inclusion and exclusion are outlined in Table 2. The description of the search process, the produced results and the final selection of studies is described in Appendix 1. Schematic overviews of the final selected articles are found in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3. Whilst the rationale for the exclusion of articles in the Norwegian context are argued below, an overview of articles excluded from the international context and the reasons for their exclusions are provided in Appendix 4.

Table 2: Inclusion and exclusion criteria (table inspired by Zlatanovic, Havnes, & Mausethagen, 2016)

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Rationale
Peer-reviewed articles	Other formats (e.g. editorials, book reviews etc.)	Ensure scientific quality and decrease the risk of inappropriate conclusions
Norwegian and English languages	Other languages	Published for a Norwegian and an international audience
Focus on general or elementary teacher education, or that explicitly inform teacher education	Other focus (music, arts or English as a second language (ESL) teacher education)	Relevance to the PhD thesis's guiding questions
All articles theorising Whiteness[12]	*Articles just mentioning Whiteness*	*To map the limited peer-reviewed research on Whiteness in the Norwegian context generally*
Articles published between 2004 and 2018	Articles published before 2004	Relevance to the current context of the PhD thesis and its focus on research on elementary teacher education
Empirical and theoretical/conceptual articles	Purely descriptions of teaching materials, class sessions and lectures	Contribution to the field of research
Articles that theorise the concept of Whiteness	Articles that only mention Whiteness (e.g. as part of the articles' context or findings)	Relevance to the current context of the PhD thesis's literature review aim

3.3 Studies on Whiteness in the Norwegian context

Surprisingly, a fair number of articles (n = 17) from the Norwegian context either mention or more thoroughly address the workings of Whiteness in various fields. However, hardly any of these articles address this issue from the context of education or teacher education. For example, the search found only one peer-reviewed article that takes on a theoretical perspective on Whiteness in relation to kindergarten pedagogy (Rossholt, 2010) and one for physical teacher education teachers (Dowling, 2017). The articles that address the workings of

---

[12] These italicised points are exceptions for articles from the Norwegian context.

Whiteness in the Norwegian context were published in the two latter decades, between 2002 and 2017. Interestingly, almost half of these articles (n = 7) do not use Whiteness as a theoretical perspective assisting the articles' analyses and discussion, but only mention the term once or twice as a means to describe a general tendency or feature of their findings (Bjørkøy, 2011; Døving, 2016; Fylkesnes, Iversen, Bjørnes, & Nygren, 2015; Gullestad, 2004; Hoel, 2014; Larsen, 2013; Valestrand, 2011)[13]. Despite these articles being excluded from this review, they are nonetheless regarded as important to mention because they testify to a growing awareness of the relevance of using Whiteness as a theoretical concept that more appropriately describes a phenomenon existing (also) in the Norwegian context.

In the next section, in line with the purpose of this review chapter, I focus on the articles that actually use the concept of Whiteness as a central theoretical framework. I start by providing a general overview of the main characteristics of the articles included in this review.

3.3.1. General overview of the articles

The articles reviewed for this thesis that use the concept of Whiteness as a central theoretical framework of their analysis (n = 10) are from various fields of research: feminist research (Berg, 2008), kindergarten research (Rossholt, 2010), nursing (van Riemsdijk, 2010), religious studies (Iversen, 2012; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011), cultural and oriental languages studies (Tolgensbakk, 2014)[14], migrational studies (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017), media studies (Muller Myrdahl, 2014) and physical education teacher education (Dowling, 2017). These articles, similarly to their areas of research, have various aims ranging from issues of how to: understand one's own participation in or avoidance of everyday situations that work to maintain Whiteness (Berg, 2008; Dowling, 2017); show the embodiment of Whiteness in pedagogues' responses to children's crying (Rossholt, 2010); understand and argue about why certain religious identities are able to remain invisible whilst the Others' are treated as a public affair (Iversen, 2012; Vassenden & Anderson, 2011); understand how, why and to what extent White (im)migrants are included in and excluded from the Norwegian majority population to a greater extent than are other (im)migrants of colour (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Tolgensbakk, 2014; van Riamsdijk, 2010), or; argue that Whiteness is the very presumed prerequisite for being Norwegian (Muller Myrdahl, 2014).

These articles, all of which are based on relatively small qualitative projects, draw on different methodological approaches such as memory work (Berg, 2008), and various versions of ethnography (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Rossholt, 2010) that included participant observation (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Rossholt, 2010), semi-structured in-depth individual interviews (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017) and more unstructured talks with informants (Rossholt,

---

[13] These articles point to how Whiteness for example is: a concern with certain subtle patterns of values (Bjørkøy, 2011; Fylkesnes et al., 2015); an implicit dimension or even a precondition of what it means to be Norwegian (Døving, 2016; Hoel, 2014) linked to European layers of racialisation (Gullestad, 2004), or; an issue that is generally excluded from Norwegian feminist research (Larsen, 2013).

[14] Tolgensbakk's (2014) study is a doctoral thesis published from within the Department of Cultural Studies and Oriental Language at the University of Oslo.

2010). Some articles also use different forms of observations such as participant observation (van Riemsdijk, 2010), participant self-observation (Berg, 2008), non-structured observation (Iversen, 2012), or versions of interviews such as individual interviews combined with focus-group interviews (Vassenden & Andersson, 2011), individual interviews focusing on life experiences (Tolgensbakk, 2014), group interviews (Dowling, 2017), or, they review newspaper coverage of one particular social event (Muller Myrdahl, 2014).

3.3.2 Theoretical usage of *Whiteness*

Throughout the reviewed corpus of research on Whiteness in the Norwegian context, five themes are generally addressed. Researchers are, for example, concerned with (1) addressing and problematising issues related to race, (2) the various manifestations of Whiteness as privilege, (3) the way in which Whiteness was enacted through body language, (4) researcher positionality, and (5) how Whiteness in the Norwegian context could be understood as working through ideas of goodness.

Whiteness as a matter of "doing" and "addressing" race
Despite *race* generally being taboo and an unrecognised theoretical analytical concept in the Norwegian and wider Nordic context (see Article 2; Dowling, 2017; Gullestad, 2004; Muller Myrdahl, 2014; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011), half of the articles included in this review nonetheless argue that Whiteness is a process of racialisation (Berg, 2008; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; van Riemsdijk, 2010; Dowling, 2017) or a concern relating to ways of "doing race" (Berg, 2008; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014). For example, Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir (2017), researching issues related to Icelandic migrants in Norway, point to how media discourse in Norway uses *genes* as a code word for *race*, how informants intersect *race* with *class* and how both reveal how a "hierarchy of acceptability" for migrants exists that positions some groups (in this case, Icelanders) as highly desirable compared to other migrants.

Interestingly, the very fact that *race* is refuted as valid as an analytical concept in the Norwegian context is one of several central issues addressed and critiqued by Muller Myrdahl (2014). In her article analysing central Norwegian newspaper coverage immediately after Anders Behring Breivik's bombing and massacre on 22 July 2011, and immediately prior to his trial, Muller Myrdahl (2014) finds that Whiteness is a prerequisite for being Norwegian and that this idea is both interrupted and re-established during this period. The reason for this, Muller Myrdahl (2014) argues, is that in the Norwegian context, when *race* is rejected as a theoretical analytical concept, the consequence is that the workings of Whiteness remain invisible because there will be no tools available that actually can make its workings visible.

Whiteness as a privilege of invisibility and silence, and as a marker of Otherness
Researchers on the workings of Whiteness in the Norwegian context (in line with major trends in the international critical research of Whiteness) generally point to how Whiteness provides privilege for those in "possession" of it (cf. Rodriguez & Villaverde, 2000). Whiteness, researchers claim, provides actors with privilege because it is treated as *if* it is unmarked, invisible and, therefore, it is also often silenced and ignored (Berg, 2008; Dowling,

2017; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Iversen, 2012; Muller Myrdahl, 2014; Tolgensbakk, 2014; van Riemsdijk, 2010; Vannsenden & Andersson, 2011). Whiteness, as such, is argued to be normalised and naturalised (Dowling, 2017; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Iversen, 2012; Rossholt, 2010; Tolgensbakk, 2014). Importantly, these invisible and therefore normalised features of the workings of Whiteness both hide it as a location of power (van Riemsdijk, 2010), whilst it also simultaneously explicitly and extensively marks all those deemed racially Other (Dowling, 2017; Iversen, 2012; Tolgensbakk, 2014; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011).

8 out of the 10 articles included in the review generally exemplify this above-described hidden privilege of Whiteness (Berg, 2004; Dowling, 2017; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Iversen, 2012; Tolgensbakk, 2014; van Riemsdijk, 2010; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011). Studying Polish (van Riemsdijk, 2010), Swedish (Tolgensbakk, 2014) and Icelandic (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017) economic immigrants' processes of integration into Norwegian society, some articles find that the very feature of being White actually provided these immigrants with an advantage compared to their fellow immigrants of colour. For example, van Riemsdijk (2010) found that the process of the partial inclusion of Polish immigrants (e.g. in the work place) works to more fully exclude immigrants of colour who were not able to benefit from their White "invisible" skin privilege. Nonetheless, van Riemsdijk (2010) points to how in contemporary Norway Polish immigrants, "like the Irish in the USA prior to their 'becoming white' … have not yet become the Norwegian national norm" (p. 132), but that they are marked as Other based on stereotypes about belonging to the nation that implicitly codes (Western European) Norwegians as "whiter[15]" than (Eastern European) Poles.

Also, in theorising Whiteness as an invisible privilege, Tolgensbakk (2014) found that Swedes in Norway, because they were considered as *so* similar to the Norwegians in contrast to other immigrant groups, were given opportunities to be incorporated into "the Norwegian", in contrast to the Polish immigrants, without even having to "work" for it. These Swedish immigrants, unlike other immigrants, were also found to be perceived by Norwegians as a particularly popular and desirable immigrant group because they were assumed to have a social position "high up in the non-expressed hierarchy of minority groups in Norway" (Tolgensbakk, 2014, p. 215). Tolgensbakk (2014) argues that the Swedes' hierarchically high immigrant status had much do to with the historical and current brotherly relationship that Norwegians share with Swedes. Interestingly, Tolgensbakk also finds that Swedish immigrants "of colour" experienced that their Swedish language was a significant marker that "trumped" their "foreign-looking" skin colour.

Along similar lines as the Swedes in Tolgensbakk's (2014) article, Guðjónsdóttir (2014) and Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir (2017), in their study of Icelandic economic immigrants to Norway in the aftermath of the Icelandic financial crisis in 2008, found that these immigrants were also perceived as highly desirable compared to other immigrant groups. This desirability was based on common historical beliefs – in other words, a myth – of Icelanders and

---

[15] The term "whiter", as used by van Riemsdijk (2010), I understand as referring to a racial status and not to skin complexion.

Norwegians belonging to the same "people". Moreover, Guðjónsdóttir (2014) and Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir (2017) also found that their informants stressed the importance of having common sets of "genes" and that this belief was central to the inclusion of Icelandic immigrants in Norwegian society. Drawing on Gullestad (2002), Guðjónsdóttir (2014) argues that this might be grounded in how contemporary debates in Norway "focus on culture and ancestry [that] often provides an overlapping common ground between racism and nationalism" and that "[t]the acceptance attributed to visual, cultural and ancestral sameness that Icelanders experience, therefore must be understood in relation to how other immigrants and minorities are excluded through mirroring racialized discourses about culture and difference" (Gullestad, 2002, cited in Guðjónsdóttir, 2014, p. 179). Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir (2017) further stress that the emphasis of having common "genes" also evokes "the shared history of Nordic countries' engagement with Eugenics in the beginning of the twentieth century" (p. 797).

A further two articles exemplify the co-workings of the hidden privilege of Whiteness and its role in making the Other's identity visible (Iversen, 2012; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011). In their studies of religious identity in White Norwegians and minorities in Norway, Vassenden and Andersson (2011) and Iversen (2012) find that having the opportunity to hide one's own religious identity is a privilege reserved for White Norwegians only. This privilege is something that religious minorities are not granted because, in contrast to the religious White Norwegians, their religious identities are already treated as a public affair.

Whiteness as embodiment

Rossholt (2010), studying the facial expressions in pedagogues' responses to children crying in kindergarten, finds that "'whiteness' is about acting in a certain way as a form of cultural and symbolic capital and about identification … or a social norm" (p. 108) and that the body is the means through which the materialisation of such Whiteness works. Rossholt (2010) finds that Whiteness – the way it materialises through kindergarten pedagogues' bodily expressions – works through racist practices of inclusion and exclusion (cf. Goldberg, 1993, 2009) manifested in how children's' crying, for example, is met by the "sweet" or "not so sweet" faces of the pedagogues in the kindergarten. Moreover, Rossholt (2010) also finds that when the practitioners respond to or talk about the children's crying, they do so in a "dualistic" manner (p. 102)[16] that can be understood as the pedagogues' taken-for-granted ways of thinking and talking, practices she claims reflect discourses of Whiteness that intertwine with their understandings of age and gender.

Problematising the researcher's positionality

An important aspect of critical research in general and critical research on Whiteness in particular is the recognition of research as a political enterprise and the importance of acknowledging, or even better, problematising the researcher's positionality within it (Blair, 2004)[17]. Concerned with these aspects of Whiteness, Berg (2008) points to the issues arising when a researcher (herself), situated within a feminist epistemology, researches *race*. In her

---

[16] Rossholt (2010) does not explain what she means by "dualistic" in her article.
[17] Researcher positionality is one central theme that I address in this thesis's Article 1.

article that aims to address questions of "how to do" research on Whiteness and issues of translating Whiteness through the feminist methodology of "memory work" (which she explains as the writing down of specific episodes followed by text analysis), Berg discusses aspects of how such a translation turned out to be a greater emotional challenge than was anticipated. This was because she, as a female feminist researcher, usually took on the perspective of the vulnerable when interrogating the abusive power of masculinity. However, analysing her own "memory work" through a critical Whiteness theoretical perspective, Berg (2008) was exposed to a surprising finding of how her own, everyday dominant White and feminist positionality actually worked to what she regarded as a "masculine immigrant". What she discovered through the analysis of her memory work was how she, whilst making claims of "femininity" (her feminist positionality), contributed (along the lines of the workings of masculinity) to constituting Whiteness – a position of domination[18]. Berg (2008) argues that "the articulation of whiteness is related to the recognition of the responsibility for inflicting invisible [feminist position] work on others, on those who are not written into the majority category of white" (p. 220). In other words, by drawing on critical Whiteness perspectives, Berg's (2008) own invisible yet dominant power position as a White feminist was revealed to her – a position she had earlier understood as one of "subjugation" and therefore not capable of "domination".

Whiteness as White Norwegian goodness

Muller Myrdahl (2014), in her article discussing Norwegians' reactions to the 2011 terrorist actions performed by Anders Behring Breivik, theorises Whiteness in the Norwegian context as mainly working through ideas of it being White Norwegian goodness, constructed through the co-construction of Norwegianness and Whiteness. Thus, being good equals being White equals being Norwegian. Muller Myrdahl (2014) argues that the Norwegian perception of goodness as White *injured* the national imagery of it as the terrorist himself was a White Norwegian. However, this was not the only way that the national imaginary of White Norwegian goodness was injured. It appeared to be a shocking experience to many Norwegians that the media initially also portrayed Norwegian goodness in relation to this tragedy through representations of bodies of colour – bodies that Muller Myrdahl (2014) argues that are otherwise always represented as non-Norwegian. Importantly, Muller Myrdahl (2014) finds that in the aftermath of this terrorist act, the workings of Whiteness in the Norwegian context has testified to how goodness displayed by people of colour was Whitened simply by the silencing or avoidance of these (of colour) bodily representations in media narratives.

3.4 Summary

To summarise, thus far, the review of the literature on Whiteness in the Norwegian context has identified what appears to be a growing researcher awareness of the existence and relevance of using Whiteness as a theoretical concept that describes researched phenomena. Nonetheless, the current body of research that goes beyond mentioning the concept to actually

---

[18] Interestingly, she did so simply by remaining silent during an everyday racist incident that was not really deemed relevant to her personal activity and achievement at the particular point when it took place.

theorising about the concept in relation to a specific field of study is generally scarce, particularly within education. Thus, in the Norwegian context, there is generally a need for more research that thoroughly theorises the workings of Whiteness. Given the limited research on the workings of Whiteness in teacher education in the Norwegian context, I also conducted a systematic review of the international literature on this issue within this field. However, due to the number of relevant studies included in the review (n = 61) and the limited space within this PhD thesis's "extended abstract" format, I have chosen to focus the review on the main trends in relation to researchers' theorisation and conceptualisation of Whiteness across the literature.

3.5 Studies on Whiteness in teacher education in the international context

To review international peer-reviewed research on Whiteness is relevant to this thesis because most of the articles (Articles 1–3) are positioned in relation to this field and its respective readership[19]. Since critical studies on Whiteness in international contexts have a longer history than that of studies on Whiteness Norwegian contexts, the international studies reviewed herein will therefore not only assist in mapping and outlining themes and areas in need of more interrogation in the Norwegian context, but they will also point to areas in need of more research in internationals context as well.

3.5.1 General overview of the articles

The body of articles (n = 61) reviewed on the workings of Whiteness in the international context are all published in the field of teacher education. The follow-up searches in 2018 showed that between 2015–2017, there was an increase in articles published internationally (19 articles; n = 6 in 2015, n = 8 in 2016, and n = 5 in 2017). More precisely, almost one third of the total 61 articles were published within these three latter years. Interestingly within the periods of 2004–2010 and 2011–2017, there actually was an equal number of studies published: 31 and 30 from each of the seven-year periods, with peaks in 2007 and 2016, wherein 8 and 9 articles were published, respectively.

All studies are based on contexts considered as "Western". More specifically, whilst almost all articles are based on studies with an American context (n = 46), a handful are based on studies with a UK context (n = 6.5) and an Australian context (n = 4.5), and only a couple are based on studies where Canada (n = 2) and South Africa (n = 1) are the contexts. Most articles focus on student teachers, but also on teacher educators, and sometimes on both, but also teacher education curricula, children's books and counterstories. Importantly, all articles address issues related to implications for teacher education.

The reviewed articles in the international context, similarly to the articles in the Norwegian context, have various aims, ranging from issues related to how teacher students understand, reflect upon and discuss Whiteness (Aveling, 2004; Carter et al., 2007; Dixon & Dingus, 2007; Flintoff, Dowling, & Fitzgerald, 2015; Glenn, 2012; Han & Leonard, 2016; Harris, 2011; Horton & Scott, 2007; Juarés & Hayes, 2015; Laughter, 2011; le Roux, 2016; Picower,

---

[19] Article 4 is positioned within international research on critical discourse and critical socio-cognitive-oriented linguistics.

2009; Raible & Irizarry, 2007; Rogers & Christian, 2007; Schulz & Fane, 2015; Terwilliger, 2010), deconstruct its workings (Adair, 2008; Aveling, 2006; Bisonnette, 2016; Carter et al., 2007; Juarés & Hayes, 2015; Matias et al., 2014; Pennington, 2007; Picower, 2009; Rogers & Christian, 2007; Schulz & Fane, 2015; Smith, 2013; Terwilliger, 2010), or point to how the idea of it pertains to student teacher practice (Amos, 2015; Brown, 2006; Crowley & Smith, 2015; Galman, Pica-Smith, & Rosenberger, 2010; Hickling-Hudson, 2005; Lea, 2004; Lea & Grieggs, 2005; Mazzi, 2008; Pennington et al., 2012; Picower, 2009; Smith & Lander, 2012; Ullucci, 2010), and how practices in turn construct Whiteness (Amos, 2010, 2016; Barnes, 2017; Buheler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Castango, 2008; Havliand, 2008; Hill-Jackson, 2007; Lander & Santoro, 2017; Mathias & Mackey, 2016; McVee, 2005; Michie, 2007; Miller, 2017; Solomona, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). These articles also seek to show how teaching practices might inform reflections on Whiteness (Bersh, 2009; Charbeneau, 2015; Matias & Grosland, 2016; Matias & Mackey, 2016; Pearce, 2012; Puchner, Szabo, & Roseboro, 2012; Smith, 2014). Some articles moreover theorise about the concept of Whiteness with the goal of informing teacher education (Brown, 2014; Cross, 2005; Juarés & Hayes, 2015; Matias, 2016a, 2016b; Matias et al., 2016).

Similar to the Norwegian context, almost all articles draw on relatively small qualitative projects (ranging from a focus on one informant to almost 50), but a couple of articles (e.g. Hill-Jackson, 2007; Puchner et al., 2012; Solomona et al., 2005) draw upon what may be considered as larger data (ranging from approximately 90–200 participants). Nonetheless, all studies are framed within various qualitative methodologies, where most have a triangulated design (Adair, 2008; Amos, 2010; Bissonnette, 2016; Brown, 2006; Buheler et al., 2009; Galman et al., 2010; Haviland, 2008; Horton & Scott, 2007; Marx, 2004; Pearce, 2012; Picower, 2009; Schedrow, 2017; Schulz & Fane, 2015; Smith, 2014; Terwilliger, 2010), ranging from the analysis of sets of data from field notes, audio- and videotape recording, interviews, and teaching materials, to a variety of observations combined with interviews. Some articles draw on studies analysing texts (Bersh, 2009; Hickling-Hudson, 2005; Lea & Grieggs, 2005; McVee, 2005; Miller, 2017; Rogers & Christian, 2007; Solomona et al., 2005; Ulucchi, 2012), individual interviews (Amos, 2016; Aveling, 2004; Charberneau, 2015; Lander & Santoro, 2017; le Roux, 2016; Mathias et al., 2014; Michie, 2007; Raible & Irizarry, 2007), focus groups or group interviews (Harris, 2011; Smith & Lander, 2012). Other articles draw on material from self-studies or self-reflections (of teachers' own teachings) (Aveling, 2006; Barnes, 2017; Flintoff et al., 2015; Matias & Mackey, 2016), counterstories (Fashing-Varner, 2009; Han & Leonard, 2016; Hayes & Juarés, 2009; Matias et al., 2016), discourse analysis (Cross, 2005; de Freitas, 2005; Haviland, 2008; Smith, 2013), ethnography (Castango, 2008; Pennington, 2007; Pennington, Brock, & Ndura, 2012) or analyse student teachers' discussions (Glenn, 2012; Puchner et al., 2012). A few studies also review the literature (Brown, 2014), implement action research (Lea, 2004), do a case study (Crowley & Smith, 2015), analyse student teacher usage of videos (Matias & Grosland, 2016), conduct pre- and post-surveys of a set of multicultural teaching sessions (Hill-Jackson, 2007) or conduct (a one-year) longitudinal studies (Laughter, 2011). As pointed to in relation to the articles' aims, some articles are also theoretical contributions (Carter et al., 2007; Dixon & Dingus, 2007; Maezzi, 2008; Matias, 2016a, 2016b).

In the next section, in line with the purpose of this review chapter, I focus on synthesising the corpus of the articles' theorisations and conceptualisations of Whiteness.

3.5.2 Main theorisations and conceptualisations of Whiteness
In what follows, I have organised the synthesis of the review in relation to the articles' main concepts used in their theorisations of Whiteness: *privilege, racism, power, discourse*, *identity* and *ideology*. As is evident in the synthesis below, these terms and their conceptualisations are generally theoretically related to one another and articles often theorise Whiteness in relation to more than one of these concepts.

Whiteness as White privilege
Almost half of the articles (n = 29) theorise Whiteness as White privilege. Herein, White privilege is defined as a social identity and position (Brown, 2006; Carter et al., 2007) that White people maintain simply by refusing to acknowledge or by ignoring the unearned privileges that these identities and positions afford them (Horton & Scott, 2007; Michie, 2007). This ignorance, Michie (2007) argues, is actually grounded in the selective presence or absence of racism. Puchner et al. (2012) theorise that one way that such a selective presence or absence of racism manifests is through how Whites (in US society) are socialised into an identity as the dominant group and consequently believe they are entitled to their privilege. Moreover, because Whiteness is built into institutions (Cross, 2005), its continued dominance is underscored (Solomona et al., 2005), thus making it easy for White people to ignore how their White privilege is afforded to them at the expense of people of colour (Rogers & Christian, 2007).

Some researchers describe Whiteness, the way it works to maintain the privileged social identity and the position of Whites, as a culture (Brown, 2014; de Freitas, 2005; Lea & Grieggs, 2005) – a set of cultural contextualised norms, values and beliefs that work to reproduce and support the practices maintaining White institutionalised privilege and advantage (Lea & Grieggs, 2005). Whiteness as privilege, because it is an embedded part of the dominant culture, is normalised (Brown, 2014) to the extent that it makes White privilege appear natural (Glenn, 2012) and works to centre White privilege at the cost of other cultures (de Freitas, 2005). Flintoff et al. (2015) refer to the "luxury" of how Whiteness as privilege works: It gives White people the normative platform from which they may exclude and define (Laughter, 2011).

Whiteness as racism
More than half of the articles reviewed (n = 32) theorise Whiteness as relating to *racism* and such a theorising of Whiteness remained consistent within the reviewed articles across time. Whiteness as racism is found within the reviewed literature to be theorised as an insidious part of everyday reproduction (Amos, 2010). Within the reviewed research, Whiteness as racism is generally theorised as working in twofold ways: On the one hand, it is claimed to promote ideas of how Whiteness represents normality (de Freitas, 2005). For example, in that it serves as the normative colourblind standard that does not acknowledge White privilege (Puchner et al., 2012). On the other hand, Whiteness as racism works by ways of

marginalising Otherness and difference (de Freitas, 2005), based on the conferred dominance/non-dominance of the groups to which individuals belong (Bissonnette, 2016). Whilst the first form of racism may be understood as White loyalty, the latter may be understood as (indirect of direct, explicit or implicit forms of) discrimination and exclusion, which generally works by measuring and marking the racial Other as angry, for example as, unreasonable and unqualified (Hayes & Juárez, 2009), or by not considering the voices and experiences of the minoritised as important enough to, for example, redraft a curriculum so that these individuals are included (Pearce, 2012).

International researchers of Whiteness seem to disagree on the ways that Whiteness as racism manifests. For example, Pennington et al. (2012) argue that Whiteness manifests as individual racism and that it is expressed both overtly and covertly. However, Schulz and Fane (2015) contest that Whiteness as racism rarely manifests in overt acts, but that it is instead elided beneath an inclusive rhetoric that conflates openly oppressive discourses with those relating to multiculturalism, diversity or human rights. Lander and Santoro (2017) argue that Whiteness as racism manifests as paradoxical microaggressions that, dependent on context, contributes to doubly construct the Other as both hyper visible, and as invisible. Pennington (2007), drawing on Scheurich (2002), contends that Whiteness as racism is structural in that it is built into the very ontological and epistemological "nature" that constitutes the White social "reality" and that therefore Whiteness as racism is not represented in individual acts or beliefs, as these are only its social effects, Whiteness as racism is to Pennington (2007) rather embedded as "natural" features of nations' institutions, from the macro to the micro level.

Whiteness as power
Around one third of the articles reviewed (n = 24) theorise Whiteness in relation to power. Herein, Whiteness as power is theorised to work best when invisible (Cross, 2005) and silenced (Flintoff et al., 2015). Whiteness as invisible and silenced has, like privilege, a normalising function in that it serves as the norm (Lander & Santoro, 2017) – it is the standard against which racially Others are judged and that works to justify the status quo (Castango, 2008). Thus, Whiteness as power within the reviewed research on Whiteness in teacher education is theorised as the feature of racism (described above) that does not necessarily focus on naming and defining the Other, but rather promotes ideas of it as normality (de Freitas, 2005). Following these ideas, Crowley and Smith (2015) argue that Whiteness as power works as the unmarked marker of the racial Other: It is the unnamed, universal moral referent.

Haviland (2008) argues that Whiteness as power maintains its hegemonic position through a variety of techniques or strategies of White talk (Smith & Lander, 2012). Such techniques and strategies involve discourses of colourblindness (the avoidance of speaking of race but nonetheless drawing upon White normalcy), using an assumingly inclusive rhetoric (Schulz & Fane, 2015), evading critique (e.g. avoiding discussions about their White privilege and power as a collective group (Lander & Santoro, 2017)), refusing self-reflexivity (Barnes, 2017) and reducing racism to specific individuals and intentional acts when confronted with it (Amos, 2016). Other techniques or strategies White people use are to ensure that they

collectively possess and control the material, legal, and structural resources and social positions, and thereby maintain Whiteness as normative and positive (Buehler et al., 2009; Smith, 2014), this despite claiming not to operate as a group but merely as individuals (DiAngelo, 2010, 2011). Importantly, Ullicci (2012) points to how these techniques and strategies of Whiteness hold material and economic implications that differentiates between White and non-White people.

Whiteness as discourse

Approximately one third of the reviewed articles (n = 20) theorise Whiteness as discourse. Herein, Whiteness as discourse is generally theorised in relation to interpersonal communication, or as something concerned with ideology. For example, Bersh (2009) theorises Whiteness as discourse as something that manifests through various interactional styles (e.g. embodied actions (cf. Berg, 2008) and spoken interactions) shared as mainstream discourses within the dominant White in-group. Whiteness as discourse theorised in this way is thus performative; what Amos (2010) refers to as the White group's accomplishment of the reproduction of everyday racism (e.g. manifesting in unrecognised acts of white racial bonding (Sleeter, 1994)). Terwilliger (2010) argues that Whiteness as such is inscribed in the lived experiences and the sedimentation of raced ideas that over time make self-critique difficult. Exemplifying this difficulty, Pearce (2012) points to how critical studies on Whiteness in teacher education have found that White teacher students have a desire to resist the idea of Whiteness as a dominant discourse and that they tend to minimise the issue of race inequity through appeals to individualism and meritocracy.

Smith (2013) argues that since discourses are intimately related to the distribution of social power and hierarchy, they are always and everywhere ideological. This ideology is, for example, maintained through hegemonic stories (Picower, 2009) of White supremacy (Hickling-Hudson, 2005). Matias and Grosland (2016) define White supremacy as the overarching institutional and systemic processes of White superiorisation that they claim exist particularly in education. Crowley and Smith (2015) argue that such discourses create a "structured blindness" in which Whites often fail to recognise their discursive participation in maintaining a racial hierarchy where they are positioned at its apex (Matias et al., 2014).

Whiteness as ideology

Slightly less than one fourth of the articles (n = 13) theorise Whiteness as ideology. Critical researchers of Whiteness argue that Whiteness as ideology is White racial dominance over racial Others (Castango, 2008; Rogers & Christian, 2007) that works through marginalisation, objectification, dehumanisation and oppression of the racial Other to the extent that it both ignores and endures its own power and privilege (Cross, 2005; Ullucci, 2012). Whiteness as ideology is theorised as operating through the economic, political and social system. According to Hickling-Hudson (2005), Whiteness as ideology must be named and recognised as both overt and covert if the field is to disband its normalising practices. Such normalising practices exemplify *one* way that Whiteness as ideology serves to justify the dominance of one group over others (Castango, 2008). However, as Matias (2016b) argues, since We are all operating under the system of White supremacy, the intersecting features of Whiteness

complicate its workings. For example, Galman et al. (2010) point to how intersections of racial and gendered experience in White women's lives reveal that they actually are aware of the effects of patriarchy but nonetheless may not acknowledge these, because doing that actually might reveal their own complicity in an ideology of White patriarchal supremacy.

Whiteness as ideology is moreover theorised to serve as a form of social amnesia that allows White people both to forget and ignore how they are implicated in the maintenance of systems of privilege and oppression (Castango, 2008). Even though Whiteness as ideology may work differently in relation to different contexts, it is, nonetheless, based on a mind-set of White superiority. This mind-set, le Roux (2016) argues, emerged from the historical link between slavery and the privileges of Whites in their subordination of Blacks as objects of property.

Whiteness as identity
Whiteness as identity within the reviewed body of articles is theorised as being the only version of right, good and worthy, to the exclusion of other versions of being (Adair, 2008). Also, it is theorised as a racial identity that goes unnamed, unnoticed and unspoken (Miller, 2017) – similar to the workings of power being silenced or absent, or "that which is not spoken" (Mazzei, 2008, p. 1129). Terwilliger (2010) argues that to identify as White involves living a monocultural life that takes Whiteness for granted and that consequently involves Whites having little or no understanding of their own culture (Buheler et al., 2009). Importantly, Charbeneau (2015) stresses that Whiteness as identity does not only include a micro level personal racial identity, but one involving a social location related to certain patterns of interactions in the context of macro-level political–economic structures as well as cultural representations and norms. As such, Whiteness as identity is both a "social construction and a lived reality, a subjective experience and a set of objective power structures and relationships that organize and influence institutions and individuals" (Charbeneau, 2015, p. 655).

Whiteness as identity theorised in this way may easily be enacted in the educational system by how teachers behave as actors of a colonising force that works to maintain the status quo, according to Terwilliger (2010). To be identified as White thus implies what le Roux (2016) refers to as the possession of the property of "being white", where to have a White identity as a vested interest means having an identity constituted by the legitimation of expectations of power and control.

3.6 Central features of the reviewed literature
The review of the articles from the Norwegian context has identified a need for more articles that theorise Whiteness, particularly in relation to teacher education. The broader review of the international articles' theorisation of Whiteness in teacher education has been important in order to identify aspects of research on Whiteness in teacher education that might be further explored, both in the Norwegian as well as in the international context.

3.6.1 Aims

Whilst the articles from the Norwegian context generally focus on how Whiteness manifests through various practices (e.g. by the researcher, kindergarten pedagogues, or in the wider Norwegian social sphere), the international research, despite also focusing on how Whiteness manifests, is generally more concerned about how actors (e.g. teacher educators and student teachers) understand Whiteness and about the relationship between ideas and practice. For example, from the international context, several articles address how ideas of Whiteness pertain to student teachers' practice, how practices construct Whiteness and how teaching practices in turn might inform reflections on Whiteness. In the Norwegian context, contrary to the international context, no articles aim to theorise Whiteness with the goal of contributing to new ways of understanding its workings and of informing a field. In the international context, the theoretical articles seek to inform teacher education. Whilst articles reviewed in the international context explicitly aim to deconstruct Whiteness, this is not an explicitly stated aim in the Norwegian context.

3.6.2 Methods

Methodologically, all reviewed articles, in both contexts, are qualitative in design and generally rely upon small projects. Due to the differences in the number of articles published in the Norwegian and international contexts, there are, in the international articles, more varied usage of methodologies. Nonetheless, in both contexts the articles mainly report from studies that use some form of triangulated methodology. In the Norwegian context, such an approach is generally explicitly referred to as ethnography, however, in the international context, despite some researchers referring to their methods as ethnography, researchers generally do not name the particular methodological approach used, but nonetheless provide thick descriptions of the methods involved in their studies. In both contexts, researchers use self-research and reflection as methods. Even though individual interviews are used in both contexts, articles in the international context rely on studies that solely draw on interview data from individual or group interviews, however, these articles seldom draw on data from both interview types. The use of counterstories, discourse analysis, action research, video analysis, pre- and post-teaching surveys and longitudinal studies as methods are only applied in the international context. In the Norwegian context, one article focused on textual analysis (Muller Myrdahl, 2014). Internationally, some articles study text, but few apply discourse methodologies as tools for analysis.

3.6.3 Theory

Despite that research on Whiteness in the Norwegian context, like the research in the international context theorises Whiteness as a matter of privilege in relation to certain positions, the research on Whiteness as privilege in the Norwegian context, in contrast to the international research, does not theorise this privilege in relation to institutionalisation or to its accrued material advantages. Nonetheless, within both contexts, the theorisation of Whiteness as privilege points to the normativity and normality of White people's social position. However, whilst this normativity in the Norwegian context is related to wider social definitions of the Other's difference only, in the international context, emphasis is also put on how such definitional practices (performed by Whites) work to exclude.

In both the Norwegian and the international context, Whiteness as racism is defined as a matter of White normality. Whilst research from both contexts also relates Whiteness as racism to practices of discrimination (in the Norwegian context) and practices of marginalisation (in the international context), Whiteness as racism is, in the international research, generally quite clearly defined as being a twofold matter – (a) a concern about both definitions of Whiteness as normality and (b) a concern with ways of marginalising Otherness and difference –, the reviewed research from the Norwegian context does not define Whiteness as racism as a twofold matter but theorises it generally, in line with the observations of Van Dijk (1992), as a matter of denying its existence altogether (e.g. Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Muller Myrdahl, 2014). This denial of racism, researchers studying the Norwegian context argue, manifests through how researchers focus on *culture* and *difference*, not on *racism* (Gullestad, 2004; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014). Moreover, whilst some studies in the international context couple Whiteness as racism to the ontological and epistemological aspects of the White social reality, this is not addressed in the Norwegian research context. However, one study from the Norwegian context couples Whiteness as racism to what is referred to as ideas of a social hierarchy.

In both contexts, Whiteness as power is theorised as unmarked (in the Norwegian context) or invisible and silenced (in the international context) and as related to the distribution of resources. However, this distribution, whilst not clearly described in the Norwegian research, is, in the international context, particularly linked to descriptions of techniques and strategies that Whites use in order to maintain their social strategic positions. However, whilst Whiteness as power (unmarked) in the Norwegian research is described as hegemony and based on ideas of a social hierarchy, Whiteness as power (invisible and silenced) is, in the international context, emphasised as being productive. Moreover, whilst Whiteness as power in the Norwegian context is described as involving both the ability to define as well to a provider of interesting insights and as having control over information, it is in the international context described as a matter of judgement of the Other that thereby functions as a justification for the status quo.

Whilst Whiteness as discourse in the international reviewed research is theorised as a matter of performativity (e.g. interactional styles of the dominant White group and other accomplishments of everyday racism) and as related to ideology, Whiteness as discourse in the Norwegian research context is theorised as a nationalistic and racist narrative of sameness through which the majority population is intertwined with the exclusion of migrants. In both contexts, Whiteness as discourse is theorised as so central to the everyday that it makes self-critique difficult. However, whilst Whiteness as discourse is argued to be linked with discourses of White supremacy that in turn are reproduced in the mainstream in the Norwegian context, it is argued to be centred around a rhetoric that appeals to individualism and meritocracy in the international context.

Whilst Whiteness as ideology is not mentioned in the reviewed body of Norwegian research, in the international research it is theorised as a mind-set of White superiority that is systemic

(and therefore invisible), works through patriarchy and that takes on a historical amnesia that allows for the maintenance of White racial dominance over racial Others.

In both contexts, Whiteness as identity is theorised as unnoticed (in the Norwegian context) and unnamed, unspoken and silenced (in the international context). However, in the Norwegian context, the unnoticed identity is related to the White majority that has a hidden religiosity (contrary to the minority's public religiosity). In the international research it is related to being deemed as the only version of right, good and worthy. Whilst Whiteness as identity is theorised as the persistence of both the internal and external innocent image of Nordic Exceptionalism (the idea of this region being outside of the historical context of colonialism) in the Norwegian research context, it is, in the international research context, theorised as an identity built upon a form of socialisation into domination, constituted by the very legitimation of White expansion and control. In the Norwegian research, Whiteness as identity is also theorised as being about claims regarding descent that highlight biological links to specific geographical communities.

3.7. Summary
This review has pointed to how there is a need for more research on Whiteness in the Norwegian context, particularly in relation to teacher education. More research is required that addresses Whiteness in relation to the links between how actors of teacher education's ideas influence practice, and in contrast, research that investigates how practice might inform reflections and ways of understanding the workings of Whiteness. Moreover, there is also a need for research that more thoroughly theorises the workings of Whiteness in the Norwegian context, particularly in relation to ideology and how this intertwines with concepts such as racism, power, discourse and identity. In this regard, this PhD thesis contributes to the theorisation of Whiteness in the Norwegian context. It does so by linking theoretical perspectives on Whiteness in teacher education from the international context to research on Whiteness in the Norwegian context. Moreover, by understanding discourse as a form of practice, it can be argued that this thesis interrogates the inextricable relationship between discursive ideas and discursive practice, and vice versa, in that it has focused on how Whiteness works in discourses in written text that nonetheless are produced by actors in teacher education. Lastly, there is a need for more research that applies methodological analytical strategies of discourse capable of capturing the minimal ways that ideology, racism, and power subtly manifest in discourses through micro nuances and cues in language use. This thesis contributes with such an analytical strategy in that its methodology captures and highlights the importance of such usage of terms and their related patterned meaning making production.

In the next chapter, I outline this thesis's overall theoretical perspectives. I start by explaining its ontological and epistemological approach to discursive meaning making. Then, I conceptualise the understanding of "discourse" in this thesis, before I relate this understanding to this thesis's conceptualisation and positionality in relation to its study of Whiteness. Lastly, I outline the central arguments for deconstructing Whiteness in the

Norwegian context and the three discursive domains of teacher education that this thesis focuses on.

4. Theoretical perspectives

As a reminder, this PhD thesis aims to answer the overall question of how Whiteness work through (the usage and meaning making) of *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses. However, the attention given to Whiteness would not have been made possible had I not initially studied the main discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in teacher education-produced discourses. In other words, even though the articles (Articles 1–3) quite thoroughly theorise the concept of Whiteness, theoretical perspectives on discourse and its analysis have nonetheless been central points of entry for this thesis's textual analysis of the discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*.

As the articles quite thoroughly theorise the concept of Whiteness in relation to their areas of study, this chapter aims to clarify the relationship between the thesis's analysis of *cultural diversity*, the conceptualisation of discourse and its positionality in relation to the theorisation of Whiteness. As such, by pointing to the ways that *cultural diversity* is understood as a discursive site through which Whiteness works, this chapter will contribute to stimulating and informing the thesis's overall discussion and its contribution.

First, I outline Laclau and Mouffe's theorisation of how discourses form. Then, I clarify this thesis's more general conceptualisation of discourse. Here, I draw on perspectives from both discourse theory (henceforth DT) and critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA). Third, I link theories of discourse to this thesis's theoretical conceptualisation of Whiteness and position this PhD thesis within the field of critical Whiteness studies (henceforth CWS). Lastly, the theoretical perspectives on Whiteness are linked to arguments pointing to the relevance and importance of not only researching but also deconstructing the workings of Whiteness in the Norwegian context.

4.1 Theoretical perspectives on discursive meaning making

In this thesis, the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) theory on how discourses form (particularly pages 105–140) has been an important ontological and epistemological foundation (an epistemic lens) through which the textual data has been read (Articles 1–3). Laclau and Mouffe (2001), in their work, attempt to fuse theories of Marxism and structuralism – theories that provide both a starting point for thinking about the social and for theorising meaning making – with the focus being on arriving at a comprehensive post-structuralist theory through which "the whole social field is understood as a web of processes in which meaning is created" (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2010, p. 25). Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theory can thus be described as a fusion of post-Marxist and post-Saussurean linguistics.

Laclau and Mouffe (2001) have developed a set of theoretically-related concepts that may be used as tools both for comprehending and for analysing how meaning making takes place in and across various discursive domains (e.g. between research, policy and practice). These tools are applicable to any social levels, which Fairclough (2013), for example, separates into textual micro, social-practice meso and socio-cultural macro levels of discourse. Moreover, Laclau and Mouffe (2001) embrace quite a wide understanding of discourse, seeing it as more than primarily a concern with texts and their particular related social and cultural practices –

which Fairclough (2013) refers to as the order of discourse. Discourse to Laclau and Mouffe (2001) can be described as a general matter of political power struggles for meaning making, and hence, representation of central discursive signs. The Laclau and Mouffean (2001) view on how terms and objects, as a result of these discursive political meaning making power struggles, are represented and (re)produced is placed as central to this thesis. It agrees with both Eriksen's (2009) view on how "[c]ultural diversity might point to quite different things, and it might have great consequences what content one chose to give the concept" (p. 106) and Dyer's (1997) argument that "How we are seen determines in part how we are treated; how we treat others is based on how we see them" (Dyer, 1993, cited in Gillborn, 1995, p. 18). In other words, in this thesis, discourses, their meaning making and ways of representation are believed not only to construct, but also to constitute, and hence implicate discursive actors of teacher education's (e.g. teacher educators, teachers and student teachers) practice. This, I discuss later.

4.1.1 Discourse theoretical tools for analysis
Embracing the Saussurean post-structural idea of the relationship between the signifier and the signified, *as if* this structure existed, Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that in the process of discursive formation there exists a continuous political power struggle between discursive signs in their attempt to "establish" a hegemonic meaning making formation of central discursive signs. Importantly, due to the continuous political power struggle, a hegemonic meaning making formation is never entirely possible but always a utopia. Thus, the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) discursive formation always features fluidity and change. However, prior to any discursive constitution, there must be *articulation*. Articulation refers to "any practice establishing a relation among elements such as that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice" (Laclau & Muoffe, 2001, p. 105). The Lalcau and Mouffean (2001) discourse, then, is the "totality resulting from the articulatory practice" (p. 105). In this thesis, I refer to this totality as a *constellation of terms.*

According to Laclau and Mouffe (2001), a discourse is established around a central discursive sign called a *nodal point*. The nodal point is in itself void of meaning, yet it has "a 'universal' structuring function within a certain discursive field" (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001, p. xi). Hence, it is this central discursive sign that the political meaning making struggle for hegemony centres around. Laclau and Mouffe (2001) theorise that surrounding the nodal point there are discursive signs – *moments, element, floating signifiers* and a *chain of equivalence* – that have different degrees of meaning making influence on the nodal point, dependent on their frequency, proximity and manner of relation to each other and other discursive signs. For this thesis, this implies that the conceptualisation of *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses might not only be found in explicit definitions of the term, but just as well through the usage and meaning making of the terms to which it is related.

The *moments* are signs that have the most meaning making influence on the nodal point. This is because they are relatively fixed in meaning and related to one another and because they support each other's meanings. Moments, constellated as a group, structure the discourse – what Laclau and Mouffe (2001) refer to as a temporal meaning making *closure* – surrounding

the nodal point.

The *elements*, in contradiction to the moments, are discursive signs whose meanings are not close to being fixed. These discursive signs exist "outside" of the temporal discursive meaning making closure, within what Laclau and Mouffe (2001) refer to as the *field of discursivity*. Herein, they are particularly open to discursive meaning making influences of discourses from other domains that attempt to invest their meaning in them and thereby transform them to moments that suit their specific nodal point.

Sometimes some discursive signs (nodal points, moments, or elements) are particularly open to various meaning making ascriptions. Laclau and Mouffe (2001) refer to these signs as *floating signifiers*. Importantly, a discursive sign might be a nodal point in one field, but simultaneously be a floating signifier when positioned between two different fields' political discursive meaning making power struggle over this particular sign. In this thesis, *cultural diversity* even though it is a nodal point in teacher education discourses, might nonetheless be a floating signifier between the field of teacher education and anthropology (including within these fields).

Occasionally, elements that are equivalents cling together and form a *chain of equivalence* (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) – a kind of logic of difference – where elements may be used interchangeably without altering the meaning of the discourse. Importantly, the chain of equivalence has the consequence that it reduces the number of positions and possible number of multitudes of combinations of relations between the discursive signs' political space surrounding the discourse but resulting in a hegemonic formation (e.g. it might be the interchangeable use of terms such as *cultural diversity* and *multicultural*, *race* and *ethnicity*). The chain of equivalence thus creates, similar to the logic of binary oppositions (MacLure, 2003), an alternative and always opposing and negative "domain of meaning" to the discursive formation.

4.2 Conceptualisation of discourse in this thesis

The conceptualisation of *discourse* in this thesis draws mainly upon Foucauldian perspectives, but also on various theorists who draw upon his works. Of particular importance is the understanding of how power/knowledge work through discourse. Moreover, Althusserian (1970) perspectives of ideology are drawn upon in order to theorise how discourse and social practice are inextricably interrelated. In the following, I conceptualise discourse in relation to the concepts of ideology, power/knowledge, "truth", hegemony, Othering, race and racism.

4.2.1. Discourse, ideology and power/knowledge

As pointed to earlier, in this thesis, *discourse* is regarded as a temporal result of the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) meaning making struggle – which they refer to as discursive formation. In line with Laclau and Mouffe (2001), discourses are understood in the Foucauldian (1980) sense as forming the objects of which it speaks, implying that both the construction and constitution of social phenomena are dependent on its structures. Hence, discourses are also

understood as affecting social practice. Discourses have a structuring function (Pais & Valero, 2012) in that they can shape, not only how and "what can be said and thought", but also social relationships: "[T]hey constitute both subjectivity and power relations" (Foucault, 1989, p. 49).

A central feature of discourse, as it is conceptualised in this thesis, is the idea that it is featured by ideology and hence by the concept(s) of power/knowledge. Since ideology in this this thesis draws on the Althusserian (1970) concept, this implies an understanding of it as always dependent on subjects that act in accordance with it. Importantly, ideology has the effect that it makes people become convinced of ideas, despite them being aware that these ideas are featured by "untruthfulness" (Torfing, 1999). As such, ideology has a persuasive effect.

That discourses are featured by ideology also implies that they are imbedded by the Foucauldian (1989) concept(s) of power/knowledge. To Foucault, power/knowledge are inextricably related: Power is always a function of knowledge and knowledge is always an exercise of power. Importantly, the Foucauldian conception of power is not to be understood as exclusively oppressive, or as an object to be possessed by a person. The Foucauldian power is productive, meaning that knowledge runs through it. Hence, power/knowledge, being central features of discourse, run throughout the social body as a whole, and according to Foucault (1980), "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions, attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (p. 39). In this sense, this thesis's conceptualisation of discourse may be thought of as a kind of habitus (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Related to this thesis's research on teacher education, discourse is understood as affecting knowledge-promoting actors' dispositions and their related pedagogical behaviour.

That discourses are productive and that they constitute the social (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) implies that they produce discursive political actors (e.g. producers and consumers of teacher education discourses) that are more or less ideologically bound (e.g. researchers, teacher educators, student teachers) (Althusser, 1970; MacLure, 2003). These actors are perceived as political because through their pedagogical behaviours they may both enact or resist macro-level discourses at the micro level (cf. Braun, Maguire, & Ball, 2010). As such, they might ensure that the legacy of big Discourses either lives on as elements infused, as discursive patterns, into the small discourses (Gee, 2011)[20], or they might ensure their death.

Foucault (1980) theorises that each society (including its various discursive domains) has its own "regime" or "general politics of truth" (p. 31). However, what is important concerning discourses is that, because they are featured by ideology and power/knowledge, they frame not only "what can be said and thought but also ... who can speak, when, where and with what

---

[20] Gee (2011) theorises a distinction between big-D Discourses and small-d discourses where Discourses refers to historically well-established and integrated language combinations, actions, ways of interacting, "objects", beliefs and values that pertain to everyday discourses. According to Gee (2011), the Discourse concept is meant to link the analysis of discourse (language use) to a wider historical context.

authority" (Foucault, 1989, p. 49). Therefore, the "truthfulness" of discourses is related to the "status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (Foucault, 1980, p. 31). What this means in relation to this thesis is that the political actors (e.g. researchers, teacher educators and student teachers), because they are embedded within institutional discourses themselves, produce and (re)produce ideological power/knowledge discourses that "make true" (Hall, 2001, p. 76) and determine what is accepted as "true" (Torfing, 1999).

Whether discourses produce "truths" that are accepted as such depends on their ability to establish hegemony (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001), which, according to Laclau and Mouffe (2001), is the ultimate goal of the discursive power struggles over meaning making and representation. Thus, a discourse is hegemonic when it is accepted as "truth" (cf. Foucault, 1980) to the extent that it is treated as both "natural" and "neutral", or as "commonsense" – and therefore it is also often left unchallenged. Even though the concept of hegemony originated from Gramsci (1971, 2011) and originally referred to how dominant classes used discursive processes to produce popular consent for the unequal distribution of power and wealth, the understanding of hegemony in this thesis is recontextualised (Bernstein, 2000; Fairclough, 2013) to comply with the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) view that understands discursive hegemony as being formed through political power struggle processes of meaning making, both within and across various domains of social life. This means that hegemonic discourses, similarly to ideology, forge social practices and, because of their "natural", "neutral" and "commonsense" features, they might "blind" political actors to the fact that their discursive positionality might actually be the result of political struggles of meaning making (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). "The analysis of discourse, thus offers a means for analysing the conjunction between political ideology and commonsense" (Gillborn, 1995).

4.2.2 Discourse and autonomy

Between theorists of DT (e.g. Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) and CDA (e.g. Fairclough, 2013), there is generally a disagreement with regards to the extent that discursive subjects might take on an authentic role. In DT, for example, the understanding of the subject is that it is mainly ideologically bound. Hence, its extent of autonomy in the world lies close to the Althusserian (1970) idea of *interpellation* – meaning that its social practices are generally framed and constituted by the hegemonic discourses in which it lives. In other words, according to DT perspectives, discourses are believed to constitute the subjects' habitus (cf. Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Nonetheless, because discourses are continuously subjected to the political struggle for meaning making, the subject of DT is always exposed to change (Mouffe, 2008).

Theorists of CDA (e.g. Fairclough, 2013; Van Dijk, 2006) criticise such a perspective on the subject and theorise that not all discourses are ideological. Therefore, the subject, rather than being interpellated by discourse, operates in a dialectical fashion with it. This means that the subject is capable of altering discursive structures and vice versa. Said with Barthes (2000), the CDA subject is both the *master and slave of language*.

In this thesis, the perspective on the subject lies somewhere in between the perspectives of DT and CDA. The subject, which I, in this thesis, generally refer to as a political actor[21] (Latour, 2005; Torfing, 1999) is understood as capable of both resisting and altering discourses. However, whether, or to what extent it does, depends on the hegemonic "impact" of the discourse; the extent to which it appears natural, normal and as commonsense to the subject. It is also dependent on the subject's sense of discursive criticality – its ability to detect and recognise the ideological and power/knowledge features of discourses. This means that if a discourse is accepted as the "truth", in that it is preceded as natural, normal and commonsense, the subject might most likely have a *dysconscious* attitude towards it, and therefore it will most likely not challenge it. Importantly, this "non-action" is nonetheless considered to be a politically-loaded choice: A form of social consent – to the hegemonic discursive "truth regime".

The concept of *dysconsciousness* (King, 2004) is central to this thesis's understanding of the political actor. The concept *dysconscious* refers to "an uncritical habit of mind (including perceptions, attitudes, assumptions and beliefs) that justifies inequity and exploitation by accepting the existing order of things as given" (King, 2004, p. 73). It involves an absence of ethical judgement and the identification and hence commitment to "an ideological viewpoint that admits no fundamentally alternative vision of society" (King, 2004, p. 34). With respect to the analysis of discourse, the political actor's dysconsciousness manifests in how it may promote discourses (or statements) that are contradictory, however without initially realising this itself. For example, the subject might explicitly express a commitment to equality, justice and anti-racism, but nonetheless it might simultaneously subtly contribute to (actively or passively), support, or (re)produce discoursers of inequality, injustice and racism (e.g. Blommaert & Verschueren, 2014). However, what is important for this thesis is that the political actor's dysconsciousness becomes conscious the very moment it is made explicit and confronted with it. This is one of the things that I hope this thesis will to contribute to.

4.2.3 Discursive myths, social imaginaries and binary oppositions

Fairclough (2013) theorises that there are different discursive strategies for maintaining hegemonic discourses. One such strategy that is in line with the Gramscian (1971) conceptualisation of hegemony is to make people agree upon the social "truth regime" (Foucault, 1989), whilst simultaneously also repressing and excluding discursive differences (cf. Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). Examples of such discursive "truth regimes" (that actually are false) are "myths" and "social imaginaries". According to Laclau (1990), the myth seeks to construct a totality by assigning itself a unified and positive identity in order to overcome the notion of how that which is external to it is not concordant with it. Thus, the myth is itself an imaginary – a doxic lie. Jørgensen and Phillips (2010) explain that "on the one hand, it [the myth] is a distorted representation of reality, but on the other hand, this distortion is inevitable

---

[21] In this thesis, the term *political actor* is a concept that is a combination of Torfing's (1999) concept of political and Latour's (2005) actor concept. Political refers to decision making in an undecidable terrain (e.g. discourse) and actor refers to the idea of how all subjects and objects all act on the world. Referring to the discursive subject as a political actor thus implies that it is never neutral and that it can be made accountable. Active or "passive", alive or "dead", the political actor has a political impact on its surroundings: It is never neutral.

and constitutive because it establishes a necessary horizon for us to act" (p. 39). The myth influences what is regarded as meaningful to discuss and the manner in which it can be discussed. It also has the social function that it generally constructs an imaginary hegemonic group identity. Importantly, the myth may reach the level of a social imaginary when it manages to construct an overall hegemonic formation beyond that of group differences (Laclau, 1990). A social imaginary might be a myth representing ideas of national goodness, homogeneity and superiority. Such social imaginaries are famously theorised internationally by Anderson (1983) and his conceptualisation of the "imagined communities", and nationally by Gullestad's (2002) Norwegian "imagined sameness" (see chapter 2 in this thesis).

The social imaginary is similar to the discursive processes of the meaning making of terms and discursive formations, in that they all attempt to define their boundaries by excluding difference. Myths and the social imaginary exclude difference effectively by constructing an opposing Other – an "enemy" outside its bounded meaning making construction (Mouffe, 1993, p. 50). As such, the myth or social imaginary dichotomous construction function similarly to binary oppositions.

In this thesis, binary oppositions are perceived as central to the conceptualisation of discourses and binary oppositions may be understood as unfair pairs of terms, sets of terms and as ways of representations. Binary oppositions are often argued to always be established around a superior term, sets of terms, or ways of representations that in turn are always related to terms, sets of terms and ways of representing a lesser and deviant Other (MacLure, 2003). However, as Said (2003) has famously exemplified, the construction of the racialised binary opposition, in his case, the colonial discursive representation and construction of the Orient/Occident, is *not* merely established around superior terms or ways of representing the superior. Contrarily, the Saidean racialised binary opposition – which he terms Orientalism – is established around an assumingly inferior Other (the Orient). Drawing on ideas from psychoanalytical perspectives on how self-knowledge is dependent on the presence of the Other, theorists of discourse (e.g. Hall, 2004) argue that the construction of the Other has the effect that it simultaneously constructs the self – an Us (Frankenberg, 1993). In other words, the Us and the Other are constructively produced dichotomous "objects" of discourses that are constituted through practices of naming, defining and, hence, dominating the Other. Nonetheless, what is of importance with regards to the binary opposition that is relevant to this thesis is that it constructs a hierarchy of meaning, and through it, it also performs epistemic violence (Fanon, 1963; Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2004; MacLure, 2003).

In the next section, I link this thesis's conceptualisation of discourse with critical theoretical perspectives on Whiteness.

4.3 Whiteness and discourse

When discourse analysts interrogate discourses, they might interrogate them in relation to a certain theme (e.g. a discourse on "health" or a discourse on "the body"). Importantly, their interrogation of a "local" discourse (e.g. of "the body") might reveal a more "overall" discursive ideology (e.g. about "health"). Such a "local-overall" approach to discourse is

exemplified by the works of Foucault (1977), for example, through how an "overall" ideology of "discipline and punishment" was revealed through his "local" study of, for example, "the birth of the prison". Similarly, this thesis's discursive analysis of the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* might reveal an "overall" discursive ideology of Whiteness[22].

4.3.1 Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy

In this thesis, in line with central critical researchers of Whiteness, the colonial and imperial legacy of race and racism (Leonardo, 2002) is understood as central workings of the concept of *Whiteness*. Whiteness is thus understood as a social construct (Frankenberg, 1993; Matias et al., 2014; Mathias & Grosland, 2016), a White European identity constantly in-the-making (Goldberg, 2006), an ideology of White supremacy (Ansley, 1992; Leonardo, 2004) and a global racial discourse (Leonardo, 2004) that works at the intersection of contemporary, national, political and economic interests (Ansley, 1992). Sleeter (2011), drawing on Frankenberg (1993), describes Whiteness as comprising three dimensions:

> (1) a set of social relations in which people are categorized hierarchically by race, and those who are accepted as white collectively hold power and control over material resources; (2) an ideology that renders white power and white people's participation in an oppressive system as invisible to them; and (3) an identity when people of European descent accept these relationships, this ideology, and ways of life lived within this system of relations as "normal". (p. 424)

Whiteness can thus generally be described as both a White racial positionality – a structurally advantaged and privileged "place from which white people look at ourselves, at others, and at society" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 1). As such, Whiteness may be understood as a White racial discourse of oppression and degradation, a discursive positionality from which racially White people accordingly act.

Linked to the above conceptualisation of discourse, Whiteness in this thesis is theorised as a "glocal"[23] discursive ideology of White supremacy. To conceptualise Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy involves the belief that in discourses there exists a continuity of the modern categorisation project. This project has the effect that it continuously works to constitute race as the socially-constructed foundation upon which people are grouped and given status according to a hierarchy (Dyer, 1997; Goldberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2002). Importantly, the race of the categorisers is always placed at the racial hierarchical apex (Dyer, 1997). The discursive ideology of White supremacy works to maintain the racial White group's imagined supremacy and hegemonic social position through discursive binary oppositional practices that extensively name and define its discursively constructed Other (cf. Said, 2003) (its discursive enemy) as lesser, deviant and inferior. This practice is a form of subtle domination, because it entails that attention is drawn away from the active naming "racialless" White subject to a constructed and passive named discursive object (Foucault, 1989; Frankenberg, 1993; Goldberg, 2009). In line with discourses in general, the discursive ideology of White supremacy thus embraces the Foucauldian understanding of

---

[22] In agreement with Gee (2011), patterns of the big **D**iscourse of Whiteness (its historical and cultural legacy) are always present in local discursive meaning making of cultural diversity.
[23] The term "glocal" in this thesis refers to the fusion of the terms *global* and *local*.

power/knowledge as productive, in that it constructs and constitutes "objects" of Otherness by means of meaning making.

The discursive ideology of White supremacy works in Saidean (2003) binary oppositional ways through how it attempts to constitute the following "truth regime" (Foucault, 1980): "[T]o talk about race is to talk about all races except the white" (Dyer, 1997, p. 16). Thus, race is an attribute generally applied to Other races than to the White race. In other words, it is the Other that is seen, named, defined and marked by its assumed visible difference. In turn, "White people are not raced, [W]e are just people" (Dyer, 1997, p. 1). Being placed at the hierarchical apex thus involves a status of normality (de Freitas, 2005) – an "invisible", normative standard against which the Other is measured and compared (Dyer, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993; Puchner et al., 2012). Importantly, such an invisible feature and status of the discursive ideology of White supremacy is that it lends members of the White race the power/knowledge discursive abilities to not only name, categorise and define difference (Goldberg, 1993, 2009) but also to judge and blame it (hooks, 2013).

The concept of *racism* is thus central to this thesis's theorisation of Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy. Whiteness as such is understood as discursive discrimination and domination against those named, categorised and defined as racially Other. It is also understood as an embedded part of the discursive ideology of White supremacy in that it is considered as normal and ordinary, but nonetheless manifests in minimal, subtle, omnipresent, systemic and commonplace practices of everyday hegemonic discourses (Bangeni & Kapp, 2007; Gillborn, 2005, 2008; Leonardo, 2002; Picower, 2009).

The racism in the discursive ideology of White supremacy works in twofold ways that, on the one hand, promote subtle discursive ideas of Whiteness as normality (de Freitas, 2005) that serve as a normative colourblind standard (Puchner et al., 2012), and on the other hand, marginalise and exclude its constructed Other, mainly by defining it as different to its established standard of normality. The racism of the discursive ideology of White supremacy thus supports a "hidden" system of privilege and oppression (Leonardo, 2009). As a system of privilege, the racist feature of the discursive ideology of White supremacy is related to ways of representing certain identities and their assumed accorded social positions. Hence, these representations point a finger to the fact that it is those that are ascribed a White racial identity who benefit from the racial formation. Importantly, the system of privilege and its politics is unguaranteed by political actors' racial identity. Thus, even though one might be "of colour", one might nonetheless identify with Whiteness. Consequently, this logic might explain why some people of colour might participate in maintaining the racist discursive ideology of White supremacy (e.g. how people of colour might – in the same ways as White people – contribute in constituting Whiteness through their subtle – or not so subtle – racist articulations). Regardless of whether the discursive ideology of White supremacy is produced by Whites or by people of colour, its workings upkeep racial relations and their accorded racial consequences (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Leonardo, 2009).

The racism of the discursive ideology of White supremacy works through everyday

dysconscious discursive practices that mark difference and as such *define* the boundaries for inclusion and exclusion based on who are considered members and non-members of the dominant social group (Goldberg, 1993, 2009). Because such exclusionary practices are based on definitions of difference, they establish the mark of entitlement and restriction, endowment and appropriation, and hence dominance and subjugation. According to Goldberg (1993, 2009), such definitions of difference are the central features of racist discourses.

What makes the discursive ideology of White supremacy so difficult to pin down and challenge is its twofold or double workings (Lander & Santoro, 2017): That it is both loyal to its constructed ideal identity as well as excluding its defined Otherness. This is because it makes it possible for political actors to explicitly promote an inclusive rhetoric related to issues of multiculturalism, diversity or human rights that both conflates and hides its features of oppression (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Schulz & Fane, 2015). Related to this thesis, the double workings of Whiteness might manifest in the discursive ideology of White supremacy through how political actors might explicitly articulate their positive attitudes towards *cultural diversity* whilst similarly subtly giving meaning to it as a degraded and racialised Other. The discursive ideology of White supremacy is moreover hard to pin down, because it is, at least in the Western part of the world, generally hegemonic and therefore assumed to reflect normality, neutrality and commonsense. Consequently, as long as the discursive ideology of White supremacy is hegemonic people might be "blinded" to its workings and therefore not be able to challenge it workings.

Moreover, like any other discourse, the discursive ideology of White supremacy features flexibility and change and therefore it is continuously exposed to both change and transformation (e.g. Iganitev, 1995). Explained by Laclau and Mouffe (2001), Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy works in ways similar to the *floating signifier* in that it, depending on context, is "always more than one thing and never the same thing twice" (Ellisworth, 1997, cited in Leonardo, 2013, p. 88).

Critical researchers of Whiteness suggest that one way to reveal the invisible workings of Whiteness through discourses is to understand it as a kind of meaning making property (Vaught, 2012) – as an abstraction that works like "late capital", "with scopes, not scales" (Leonardo, 2002, p. 41) – that is minimal, yet omnipresent (Gillborn, 2005). Understanding Whiteness in this way , and as such possibly reveal the processes through which political knowledge-promoting actors, of teacher education, regardless of their dysconsciousness (King, 2004), invest in terms, and hence, in Whiteness. This perspective is regarded as central to this PhD thesis's interrogation of the processes through which Whiteness works to constitute meaning making of *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses, and how these processes in turn possibly support the privileged social positions of the racially White group.

4.4 Aims of critical Whiteness studies
The concept of Whiteness is central to the research field of CWS, a branch of Critical Race Theory (CRT). CWS differs from CRT in that, instead of aiming to deconstruct how White

supremacy is enacted and felt by people of colour, it aims to deconstruct how Whites are racialised as hegemonic and normal and, thus, how they participate in constituting their own White supremacy (Matias et al., 2016). In other words, CWS attempts to make the ideological power/knowledge feature of Whiteness visible to White people because, as critical researchers of Whiteness often argue, White people are often blinded to its workings. Contrary, to people of colour, Whiteness is highly visible and not something new, therefore they might assist Whites in "seeing" how they can work to counter its institutionalised oppression (Leonardo, 2009).

Moreover, CWS researchers oppose the "traditional" multicultural and social justice researcher's view that often researches the marginalised and aligns their researcher gaze with the pedagogy of the oppressor (cf. Freire, 1970). CWS researchers instead generally aim to put their research gaze on the pedagogy of the oppressor (Allen, 2004), on what Frankenberg (1993) argues is the very "site of dominance" (p. 6). In this thesis, the site of dominance that this thesis puts its gaze on is the discursive ideology of White supremacy. It does so by focusing on how central knowledge-promoting political actors (e.g. researchers, policy makers and educators) articulate and represent *cultural diversity* in ways that confirm and constitute their own racial positionality.

In line with post-structural theories of discourse (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001), the centrality of CWS is its concern with deconstruction. In brief, deconstruction refers to the research practice that involves questioning and disrupting how institutionalised produced discourses of power/knowledge and the ways these implicitly work to centre and sustain a discursive ideology of White supremacy are handled. More specifically, it involves paying attention to how discursively constructed "objects" (Goldberg, 1993, 2009) are named, defined and hence constructed as the racialised Others (cf. Said, 2003) and to point a finger at how dysconscious (King, 2004) discursive practices ensure the persistence of the discursive *mythologies* (Barthes, 2000) of White supremacy (cf. Gillborn, 2008; see also Leonardo, 2016). Within CWS research, such deconstructionist work on Whiteness is regarded as important because it is precisely these discursive constructions that have the effect that they, in line with discourses, generally affect social practice in ways that ultimately privilege the superior groups in society. CWS shares this perspective with critical discourse analysts (e.g. Fairclough, 2013). However, what is important is that in CWS, this group is explicitly named as the White racial group (Chubbuck, 2004; Gillborn, 2005; Roediger, 2007).

Critical researchers of Whiteness and discourse analysts share the aim of challenging the existing status quo. For example, by questioning discursive power/knowledge productions within institutions. Common for CWS and discourse analysts thus is the detection and deconstruction of social dominance through the analysis of the workings of power and hegemony. In this thesis, the focus is put on how Whiteness works to constitute discursive objects through hegemonic meaning making by understanding *cultural diversity* as a site through which the power/knowledge of Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy works.

4.4.1 This thesis's positionality within critical Whiteness studies

As mentioned, a general aim of CWS is to contribute to the promotion of racial justice. However, within the field there are different stances towards the means through which this endeavour might be achieved. In relation to this question, different critical researchers of Whiteness theorise that different "schools of thought" or "camps" exist within CWS. For example, Rodriguez (2000) categorises CWS into three schools of thought: 1) social constructionism, (2) new abolonism, and (3) cultural and critical theorism, where Whiteness is understood in the first camp as an unmarked and unnamed category that works through political actors' performativity. Herein, emphasis is put on deconstructing the productive power/knowledge workings of Whiteness through efforts of naming and defining it and thereby assigning *everyone* a place in the relation of race (e.g. Frankenberg, 1993; Scheurich, 1993). Within the second school thought, Whiteness is generally understood as nothing but false and oppressive (Igantiev & Garvey, 1996; Roediger, 1994). This school of thought disagrees with the first school in that it does not believe that efforts around naming and defining and deconstructing Whiteness (and thereby assigning everyone a place in the relation of race) is sufficient for promoting racial justice. This school of thought instead believes that the only option to achieve the goal of racial justice is to abolish the White race. For example, the school suggests that White people need to start committing treason to their own race. Within the third school of thought, Rodriguez (2000) argues that researchers are informed by the first school, but believe that in order to promote racial justice, White students must, instead of learning about its workings, be presented with new and alternative ways through which to imagine and think about Whiteness (Giroux, 1997a, 1997b; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, 1998). This school of thought also believes that such an approach to Whiteness may rearticulate its potential as a "progressive racial identity" and as such link it "to a broader democratic project" (Rodriguez, 2000, p. 15).

Leonardo (2013) does not categorise the field of CWS into three schools, but instead argues that two "camps" of answers generally exist to the following question: What should be done about Whiteness? One being to abolish Whiteness (cf. Rodriguez's (2000) school of new abolonism), the other, to rearticulate it (Rodriguez's (2000) first and third schools of thought). The perspective of abolishing Whiteness is problematic and has been criticised for being just another logic through which the Old abolonism works, in that the Old abolonists did, despite speaking out and voting against slavery, nonetheless ensure their own central and strategic privileged social positionality, thus further implicitly enforcing the system of racially unjust stratification. The second answer to the question of what to do with Whiteness that believes in the reticulation of it, is twofold. Whilst researchers within Rodriguez's (2000) school of cultural and critical theorism highlight the importance of caring for Whites who go through the emotional process where they feel guilt and shame due the historical violence and domination that Whites have performed on their co-citizens "of colour" by providing them with alternative identities through which they can enact Whiteness. The social constructionism school of thought believes that feelings of guilt and shame are necessary processes for Whites (and for others aligning with Whiteness) in order for them to be completely capable of empathising with people of colour. However, instead of providing individuals with alternative identities for Whiteness (a strategy that, according to the school

social constructionism, would only work to recentre the working of Whiteness), the school of social constructionism suggests that (particularly White) students need theoretical and analytical concepts that equip them with solid tools for deconstructing and understanding the workings of Whiteness whilst also "distancing" themselves emotionally so as to also overcome their feelings of guilt and shame (hooks, 2013).

The school of social constructionism may thus be read as disagreeing with the cultural and critical theorism school of thought in that the latter seems to highlight the importance of caring for Whites (and others aligning with Whiteness) hence downplaying the importance of White fragility and emotionality as a strategy of racial dominance but up-playing how Whites must be cared for by providing them with new and alternative ways through which to imagine and think about Whiteness. To the schools of social constructionism and new abolinism, however, such as approach to rearticulate Whiteness would be nothing but recentering the workings of Whiteness and to (*re)place White people in the front seat*. This thesis agrees with the perspective within CWS that argues for the importance of deconstructing Whiteness, the importance of Whites going through feelings of guilt and shame but overcoming these feelings. It thus agrees with the importance for White students (and others who dysconsciously align with Whiteness) to be given the theoretical and conceptual tools that will enable them to deconstruct their Whiteness, and hence discover their racial positionality and overcome their emotionality. As such and inspired by the words of Sleeter (personal communication, February 22, 2014), this thesis argues for the importance of White students (and others who dysconsciously align with Whiteness) learning how to take a back seat.

4.4.2 Why deconstruct Whiteness in the Norwegian context?

In line with researchers of Whiteness in the Norwegian context's arguments relating to how researchers have avoided seriously engaging with racism[24] due to the belief in Norwegian (and Nordic) historical innocence in relation to colonialism and imperialism, and thus being innocent of race (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017), this thesis argues that researchers' unwillingness to apply the concept of race in the Norwegian context is based on similar "logics": *a historical pedagogy of amnesia* (Leonardo, 2004). This amnesia is understood to currently work through ideas of the Norwegian self-image and the ideology of imagined sameness. Importantly, and as I argue in Article 2, such an amnesia has the serious effect that it consequently allows race to slip in "through the back door" (Gullestad, 2004, p. 177). To centralise the concept of not only race, but also its historical compliance in Whiteness in the Norwegian context is important in order to reconceptualise and distance the term (*race*) from the biased ideas of it being related to Nazi ideas of the existence of biologically different human species. Moreover, to study Whiteness in a Norwegian context is also regarded as important because when *race* is rejected as a theoretical analytical concept, the consequence is that the discourse of Whiteness remains invisible due to the lack of available tools that actually can make its workings visible (Muller Myrdahl, 2014). Thus, to use Whiteness and its accompanying conceptualisations of *race* and *racism* as theoretical and

---

[24] However, when researchers do involve themselves more seriously with concepts of racism, the tabooed feature of race leaves them avoiding the term *race* altogether (e.g. Bangstad & Døving, 2015; Pihl, 2010).

analytical tools in relation to the international literature's conceptualisation of Whiteness is important because it might assist Norwegian (and Nordic) researchers in both deconstructing and producing new discourses that promote the following idea that "racial differences are human constructed creations rather than eternal, essential categories" (Bonilla-Silva, 2014, p. 8). Importantly, with respect to social/racial justice, the meaning making of *cultural diversity* – a discursive site through which Whiteness, and hence, race and racism works – is that race has "real-life" effects (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2009). As repeatedly mentioned in this thesis, international research on teacher education has taught us the following: Terms and their conceptualisations have the potential to travel through ideology, curricula and practice (Afdal & Nerland, 2014; Goodlad, 1969), and teachers' and educators' dispositions affect their pedagogical practices (Eberly et al., 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that in turn may affect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010). Thus, as long as researchers in the Norwegian (and wider Nordic) context continue to argue that race "belongs" to World War II Nazi ideas of the existence of biologically different human species, it is perhaps not surprising that studies from the Norwegian context find that Norwegian citizens continue to emphasise being of the same descent or of sharing similar genes (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017), brotherhood (Tolgensbakk, 2014), and skin colour (van Riemsdijk, 2010) as the central boundaries for the inclusion and exclusion of immigrants in Norwegian society.

In this thesis, when Whiteness is conceptualised as a racial ideology of White supremacy, its deconstruction thus involves paying attention to how discursive "objects" that otherwise would remain hidden – (Goldberg, see Article 2), are named, defined and hence constructed as the racialised Others (cf. Said, 2003). In the next chapter, I discuss the methodological premises that this thesis's study is based upon.

5. Methodology

This methodology chapter brings together the *ontological* and *epistemological* stances of this thesis, as well as the more practical methods applied for gathering and analysing data. Firstly, it outlines the study's theoretical and epistemological perspectives. Then, its research design is described. Third, it accounts for this thesis's data. Fourthly, it outlines and provides an example of the analytical approach applied to text in the thesis. Lastly, it discusses issues related to researcher reflexivity.

5.1 Theoretical interpretative paradigm

The qualitative research inquiry of this thesis takes its stance within a critical theoretical interpretative paradigm, which comprises theoretical perspectives from DT, CDA and CWS. Within critical theory, the term *critical* refers to the ability to question the hidden assumptions and purposes embedded in well-established theories and forms of practice (Bronner, 2011) – in other words, to challenge the workings of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980). In this thesis, being critical is thus a matter of questioning the subtle institutionalised workings of ideology (Althusser, 1970), more precisely, the institutionalised workings of the discursive ideology of White supremacy. As theorised in the theory chapter but that has perhaps not been fully "spelled out" is that, central to this thesis's *ontological* approach is the belief that power/knowledge (cf. Foucault, 1980) are central and inextricable components that structure the social (Leonardo, 2009). In this thesis, central to the power/knowledge structuring is that it centres around the concept of *race* (Dyer, 1997; Goldberg, 1993, 2009). *Epistemologically*, it rejects the distinction between theory and practice as if these were two separate poles of a dualism (Leonardo, 2009). This epistemological perspective implies that research is never value-free, but always involves a political activity (Blair, 2004), and hence that the researcher must always be viewed as a normative actor with political intensions (Guba, 1990). This is due to the fact that the researcher is always her/himself involved in discursive meaning making (Fairclough, 2013). However, because the researcher is perceived as an embedded part of ideologically-bound knowledge-producing institutions (Althusser, 1970; MacLure, 2003) – a place in which discourses often come to be seen as natural, normal and as commonplace (e.g. Bangeni & Kapp, 2007) – her/his political intensions might be subtle and therefore also implicitly expressed, both to her/himself and to others.

Understanding research as a political activity implies the central ontological and epistemological view that data cannot speak for itself, but that it is always the researcher that makes the stories (Merriam, 2009). Therefore, in this thesis, all forms of representation within research, be it descriptions or analysis (e.g. of data), always involve a political activity of interpretation. Therefore, for the researcher to be clear about her/his positionality, the critical theoretical interpretative paradigm appreciates and encourages the application of theories (Leonardo, 2009). This thesis and its accompanying articles apply perspectives from CWS (except Article 4), discourse analysis and CDA to make visible its ontological and epistemological positionality.

Focusing on how power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980) structures the social, researchers within a critical interpretative paradigm are not generally interested in individuals, but rather in how the oppressive social structures, through which power and knowledge work are nonetheless maintained by social actors' social actions (as is the case for all articles in this PhD thesis). They are interested in how these structures reproduce and privilege certain social groups whilst oppressing others (Canella & Lincoln, 2017). Researchers within a critical theoretical interpretative paradigm do not take on the imperialist "will to save others". Rather, they align with resistance and marginality (Canella & Lincoln, 2017). Within the field of education, the Freirean (1970) *pedagogy of the oppressed* approach to inquiry is considered a main inspiration in this regard. However, because this PhD thesis is framed within theoretical perspectives from CWS, takes on an alternative approach to inquiry. It draws on the works of Foucault, Said, Frankenberg and Gullestad, and approaches the inquiry with the focus being on deconstructing *the pedagogy of the oppressor* (Allen, 2004) (e.g. the knowledge produced by political actors within different domains of teacher education). Through such an approach to inquiry, the research gaze is focused directly on the site of dominance (Frankenberg, 1993): The research gaze is turned away from the frequently researched and racialised object (e.g. *cultural diversity*) to the rarely researched racialised subject (e.g. We, the White researchers that write about and hence produce the racialised Other) (cf. Aveling, 2004; Morrison, 1993). Thereby, the ontological and epistemological foundational approach framing this PhD thesis is considered a central counter-hegemonic strategy for disrupting the reproduction of oppressive social structures. In this thesis, the discursive ideology of White supremacy.

In line with researchers working within a critical theoretical interpretative paradigm, the target of this thesis is to attempt to alter the existing oppressive social structures (Merriam, 1991) that privilege certain social groups. It will do so by questioning, deconstructing and reconstructing what is already "established" as hegemonic knowledge (Leonardo, 2009). This thesis thus focuses on discourse (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) as the site in which it aims to question, deconstruct and reconstruct oppressive social structures of "established" hegemonic knowledge. Studying the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*, it draws on the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) theorisation of the discursive formation in order to gain insight into how hegemonic knowledge is established at a discursive micro level. Furthermore, it draws on CWS in order to gain insight into how micro level meaning making relate to the oppressive social structures at the macro level. Moreover, it is in this sense that this thesis links to the Barthesian (2000) concept of *mythologies*. It is also, as pointed out earlier, why this thesis bridges the Geeian (2011) conceptualisation of **D**iscourse with **d**iscourse.

5.2 Research design

The thesis is qualitative in manner and focuses on meaning making across three knowledge-promoting discursive domains of teacher education, defined as (1) international research articles, (2) Norwegian national policy and curriculum documents, and (3) Norwegian teacher educators. Its research design is defined as a flexible set of guidelines (e.g. aims and research questions), strategies of inquiry, methods of data collection and the analysis of the empirical data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2017). In order to clarify the research design, the four articles' aims,

the empirical data, research focus, analytical strategy, tools and concepts are outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Overview of research aims, data, analytical focus, strategy, tools and concepts

Data/Aim	Empirical Data	Empirical Research Focus	Analytical Strategy	Analytical Tools and Concepts
Article 1 (Study 1) Clarify how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* by making visible what meaning is given to this term	67 international research articles published between 2004 and 2014	Prominently and frequently used terms related to *cultural diversity* How *cultural diversity* and its related terms are described Similarities and differences in the usage of *cultural diversity* and its related terms The general usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*	Word search Choice of words Comparison Synthesis	Representations Binary oppositional discourses
Article 2 (Study 2) Make visible and deconstruct how Whiteness is embedded in patterns of power and domination Point to possible implications for current teacher education in Norway and elsewhere	Six teacher education reform documents: One White Paper (2009), one national curriculum document (2010), two programme plan documents (2010) and two subject-specific plan documents (2010)	Prominently and frequently used terms related to *cultural diversity* How *cultural diversity* and its related terms are described and how they are categorised Emerging overall discursive patterns	Word search Map terms and their relations Synthesis	Representations Metaphors Categorisation Discursive pattern
Article 3 (Study 3) Contribute to knowledge about teacher educators' meaning making and dispositions regarding *cultural diversity*	Transcripts of 12 individual interviews	What teacher educators seem to want to clearly communicate Values and norms communicated implicitly	Word search Map terms and their relations	Othering Objectification Assumptions Normalisation
Article 4 (Study 3) Contribute to knowledge on teacher educators' competence in *cultural diversity* by	Transcripts of 12 individual interviews	The usage of *cultural diversity*	Word search Make list of adjectives	Nouns Pronouns Adjectives

examining how they construct Others	What may discursive practices tell us about the conceptual understanding of	Possessives
Contribute to a methodological approach to differentiating the concept of Othering in educational settings	*cultural diversity*	Othering

As shown in table above, this PhD project draws on different sources of data from three different discursive domains of teacher education (international research, national policy and curriculum documents and teacher educators). In the following sections I will argue and account for the reason why these particular sets of empirical data (or text), positioned within these three discursive knowledge-promoting domains of teacher education, are understood as important and relevant to do research on. I start by outlining, in more detail, the rationale used for researching international research articles, policy and curriculum documents, as well as individual interview transcripts. Thereafter, I describe how I have analysed the textual data.

5.3 About the data collected

From a critical theoretical interpretative paradigm, the research articles, the policy and curriculum documents and the transcripts of individual interviews are all viewed as domains where power and knowledge work by ways of representation and meaning making. As such, these textual domains can be interpreted as "sites" that in themselves represent political agency. In other words, the empirical texts analysed as part of this project may, by themselves, be understood as "bodies" – "bodies without organs", to use a Deleuze and Guattarian expression (1988) – that have similar functions to those of political actors. This understanding of text implies the recognition of the ontological and epistemological influence of the material on the social (cf. Latour, 2005). However, the textual bodies have their creators – their knowledge-promoting political actors – who are all considered as, at least partially, accountable for their produced textual body's impact on the social.

In this thesis, I have treated all written text as empirical data (Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2017). "Text", herein, refers to the written language of the research articles (Article 1), policy and curriculum documents (Article 2) and transcribed interview material (Articles 3 and 4). To treat text as empirical data is in line with the critical research paradigm because it focuses not on individuals, but on the ideologically-bound social structures (discursively produced patterns) through which power/knowledge work.

5.3.1 Why research international research?

A critical interpretative review is one way of describing the first domain of this PhD project's inquiry of 67 internationally peer-reviewed articles (Article 1). However, it may also be described as a what Pais and Valero (2012) refer to as "researching research". Whilst I both in this thesis's Article 1 and the literature review chapter have argued for the relevance and importance of reviewing the literature related to an area of research (see also Article 1), in this

section I will argue about the importance of researching international peer-reviewed research articles.

Articles published in international peer-reviewed journals are assumed to hold high research rigour and quality. Quality here refers to how these articles have, prior to their publication, undergone rigorous double-blind peer reviews. Rigour refers to how these articles, when published, are also often treated as representing new knowledge within their respective field of research (e.g. teacher education). To research international research articles implies, in line with the critical interpretative perspective, an engagement, not only with the deconstruction of discursively power/knowledge-produced "truths" promoted in research, but also with the contributors to its production and distribution (e.g. researchers as well as the wider research community). Moreover, research articles, because they are regarded as contributing to new knowledge, might inform policy, and hence practice (Gulson & Webb, 2012). From a critical interpretative perspective such as CWS, attention being placed on political actors is important, not only because of how research is understood as always implicated in political activity (Blair, 2004), but because political knowledge-promoting actors – through their research articles (e.g. by their choice of words and their usage) – might be a contributing factor for certain forms of injustice to exist (e.g. epistemic injustices).

Thus, to research international research follows critical researchers' notion of the impossibility of neutrality in research (Blair, 2004; Foucault, 1980; Hall, 1992) and of how discourses feature ideology and power/knowledge. Research domains (e.g. a bounded set of research articles) and their constitutive knowledge-promoting actors (e.g. researchers, the authors of these articles) can, as mentioned, be seen as "active participants" – as political actors (Blair, 2004) – as their discursive productions contribute to political discursive productions of meaning making (cf. Fairclough, 2013).

Drawing on Foucault's (1989) notion of how discourses frame "who can speak, when, where and with what authority" (p. 49) and that the "truthfulness" of discourses is related to the "status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (Foucault, 1980, p. 31; Hall, 1992; Neumann, 2001) implies that discourses produced by researchers in the academy, such as international peer-reviewed articles of high rigour and quality, because of their status as representors of knowledge, hold considerable "truth-persuasive" power. What this means is that institutionalised discourses of knowledge such as research articles, promoted under the authoritative "label" referred to as "research" and "knowledge", do more than simply form objects (Foucault, 1989, p. 49). They constitute the social (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) and thereby influence practice, framing and shaping what and how We see, say, imagine and invent educational practice (Pais & Valero, 2012). Therefore, to research international research should not only be about stating the art of a research field, but also to point to implications of possible (oppressive) discursive patterns that have been identified (Pais & Valero, 2012). Related to CWS, to research international research is important because it might give insight into how political actors in different contexts discursively invest in Whiteness (Leonardo, 2004) and, through it, how they might contribute (at least discursively) to maintaining a system of privilege and oppression (Castango, 2008; Leonardo, 2009). In

line with the critical theoretical interpretative paradigm, the research on international research articles in this PhD thesis aimed to point to possible implications of the (oppressive) discursive patterns that were identified (Pais & Valero, 2012) as a discursive ideology of White supremacy. In other words, there are good reasons for researching the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* within the domain of international research on teacher education.

5.3.2 Why analyse policy and curriculum reform documents?
The second discursive knowledge-promoting domain of this PhD project's inquiry (Article 2), the analysis of policy and curriculum documents, can be described as a discursive document analysis. It analyses six policy and curriculum documents understood as constituting a policy chain (cf. Arneback & Quennerstedt, 2016) and to represent central documents of the Norwegian teacher education reform of 2010.

Like international research articles, documents are produced and consumed, and hence they impact the social. Moreover, the extent to which a document impacts the social is dependent on its authority, function and content. However, the content of a document is always historically and contextually situated (Prior, 2003). Policy and curriculum document analysis may function as a means to investigate trends and values (Mausethagen, 2013) in relation to issues in teacher education (e.g. issues related to discourses on *cultural diversity*). Since policy and curriculum documents in Norway are often authored through mediations between different political actors of teacher education's (e.g. politicians, researchers and educators; see Fylkesnes, 2011) views and interests, a central feature of such documents is often polyphony[25] (Bakhtin, 1984; Mausethagen, 2013). In this PhD research project, one obvious and overall example of such polyphonic communication can be read as how, on the one hand, the analysed documents are positioned as promoters of social justice, but how they simultaneously, on the other hand, more implicitly produce subtle patterns of Othering and exclusion – patterns of racialised discourses.

The six analysed policy and curriculum documents analysed in this thesis's Article 2 are referred to as a *policy chain* (cf. Arneback & Quennerstedt, 2016) because of how they represent different policy levels, are linked through how they all are part of the Norwegian national teacher education reform of 2010 and because of their intertextuality (Fairclough, 2013). As such, these reform documents were interpreted as a central testimonial of a "new" discourse (Neumann, 2001) on Norwegian primary school teacher education. These six documents consist of one White Paper, one national teacher education curriculum document, two teacher education institutional programme plans and two subject-specific plans[26]. The particular authority and function of each document is outlined in Article 2 (p. 8). The six policy and curriculum documents are relevant to analyse because they are perceived as

---

[25] Polyphony (: "mutivoicedness") is a common feature found in language use in general (e.g. Articles 1–4).
[26] The institutions' programme plans and the subject-specific plans are part of a lager set of data that includes informants. With respect to the informants' confidentiality, the identity of these four documents are kept confidential.

normative value-laden documents of power that through their productive discourses on *cultural diversity* can potentially affect teachers' (and other consumers') discourses, dispositions and, hence, their pedagogical practices (Eberly et al., 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that in turn may affect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010).

5.3.3 Why analyse individual interview transcripts?

Within the so-called interview society (cf. Atkinson & Silvermann, 1997), interviews have become the most used instrument in qualitative research (Alvesson, 2002; Forsey, 2012). Arguments for interviewing are, for example, based on the idea that they provide opportunities for creating and capturing insights of a depth and level of focus rarely achieved through other means of data collection (e.g. surveys, observational studies, or causal invitations) (Forsey, 2012). The interview is a guided conversation, however formal, because it is the researcher who is expected to master "the craft" of interviewing, which is what Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) describe as the art of asking questions and listening. However, interviews are also negotiated sites where power, gender, race and class intersect. How the interviews were designed, planned and conducted, as well as the interview guide is outlined in Article 3.

The intersubjective non-oral and non-word-oral aspects of communication are often a central part of qualitative interview data collection (e.g. in phenomenologically-oriented interviews; Seidmann, 2013). However, despite having performed "the craft" of interviewing (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, see Article 3), the intersubjective non-oral and non-word-oral aspects of communication of the interview *in situ* have not been deemed relevant for the data collection because of this project's particular interest in analysing the discursive structures produced through one term's usage and meaning making. As stated earlier, the interview transcripts have been treated as empirical data, as texts that "are approached *in their own* right and not as a secondary route beyond the text like attitudes, events or cognitive processes" (Potter & Wetherall, 1987, p. 160).

In this PhD project, it is the structures of power/knowledge that work through discursive patterns and not in the individual characters or features in the interviewee's communication and talk *in situ* that is of interest. Nonetheless, focusing the analysis on the discursive patterns in the transcribed interviews does not separate my researcher positionality from the interconnectedness with power/knowledge present in an interview situation (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Neither does it free me from the interconnectedness with power/knowledge in relation to research production. After all, it is me, the interviewer, who chooses the topic to be discussed; who (intentionally) designs the interview guide, decides the order of the interview questions asked, and determines the analytical approach and theoretical framework deemed appropriate. Moreover, it is me, as a researcher, who writes up and represents, in my own researcher's voice (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2017), the findings.

Another issue with regards to the power/knowledge present in the interview situation is concerned with the question of the possibility of informants' authenticity. For example,

questions related to the extent to which informants tell the interviewer their own opinions or whether they tell the interviewer what they think the interviewer "wants to hear". This issue is a concern in all interview situations. It is important to keep in mind that this thesis interrogates the usage and meaning making of one particular term, implying that despite teacher educators explicitly attempting to discursively present what they assume to be ideal pedagogical practices, their subtle patterns and ways of representation, when analysed discursively, might reveal the opposite – as exemplified in this thesis' Articles 3 and 4.

5.4 Analytical approach to the empirical texts

A common critique of textual analysis, particularly textual discourse analysis, is the lack of a "protocol" that describes the actual procedures or steps of analysis that were carried out in the process of arriving at one's findings. However, Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2017) argue that projects that treat their texts as empirical data are more likely to be transparent in their analytical approach. In this thesis, I provide an analytical protocol, a *three-step reading strategy* (Table 4) in order to remain transparent with regards to the analytical approach used.

The Faircloughian (2013) step-by-step systematic approach to textual analysis, as also used by Mausethagen and Granlund (2012) and Søreide (2007), has worked as an inspiration for analysis in all four articles, and for systematically organising and translating the Laclau and Mouffean DT (as outlined in section 4.1.1 Discourse theoretical tools for analysis) into a more practical analysis.

Semiotics might be the term that can most broadly describe the general analytic strategy (three-step reading strategy) used for all of this thesis's textual analyses. Semiotics, even though it is a broad field, is generally concerned with signs (e.g. terms) and their usage and meaning making (Fairclough et al., 2010; Peräkylä & Ruusuvuory, 2017) – with detecting and mapping what I refer to in this thesis as the constellations of terms. What semiotics can do is to identify how structures, or *discursive patterns* (e.g. Article 2), produced at both the macro and micro levels "encourage" people to take action to achieve certain political goals (Fairclough et al., 2010; Peräkylä & Ruusuvuory, 2017; e.g. Törrönen, 2000, 2003). In this thesis, for example, such a discursive link between the macro and micro level can be found both between the three research domains (see all articles: Articles 1–4), as well as within at least two of the domains (see Articles 2 and 3)[27]. Semiotics can also exemplify how certain discursive structures are linked with wider social identities (e.g. Eberly et al., 2007; Georgakopoulou, 2007). Such structures are identified in Article 3 (in the analysis of the transcribed interviews) through, for example, how the pattern of the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in teacher educator-produced discourses generally mirrors the

---

[27] An example of how discourses produced at the macro level may "encourage" people to take action in order to achieve certain political goals at the micro level are found in Article 2. Here, the subtle discursive patterns in the analysed policy and curriculum documents produce ideas of the student teacher role being one that promotes specific actions of assimilation of difference (e.g. of exclusion and submersion of the multicultural pupil category into special education). Furthermore, as I will address in the Discussion, the racialised patterns of Othering detected in the discourses produced within the international research (the macro level) is reproduced both in the discourses in the national policy and curriculum domain (the meso level) as well as by discourse produced in the domain of teacher educators (the micro level).

patterns detected at the discursive meso and macro level – in the policy and curriculum documents (Article 2) and in international research (Article 1).

5.4.1 Discourse as an analytical approach

A common approach for analysing written text is discourse analysis. Discourse analysis generally focuses on uncovering the features of text that maintain coherence in units larger than the sentence (Brown & Yule, 1983). It is precisely from this point that discourse analysis has its starting point within the social constructionist interpretative paradigm – a paradigm that is generally interested in understanding the processes of meaning making (Lincoln et al., 2017). However, as argued for earlier, it is when the findings from the initial discourse analysis are firstly related to perspectives from the critical theoretical interpretative paradigm, in this PhD project, CWS, that its focus moves form a concern with understanding meaning making to a concern with how texts of different kinds, through their meaning making and ways of representation, constitute the social (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) and thus (re)produce power and inequalities in society (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

The initial analytical approach to the textual analysis may be described as initially starting from a social constructionist interpretative paradigm. However, as the analysis progresses, in steps 2 and 3 of my analytical strategy and when the meaning making constellations started to form discursive patterns, these patterns were conceptualised in relation to theoretical perspectives and concepts from CWS[28]. The initial analysis, when seen through a theoretical lens, not only put the focus on the meaning making in the discourse, but also directed the focus to how meaning making was related to the workings of power/knowledge within existing oppressive social structures (Merriam, 2009) and thus have implications for inclusion and exclusion, privilege and deprivation – for social and racial justice. This process is described by Denzing and Lincoln (2017b) as the process where the researcher, who is a historically and socially situated researcher, through the integration of philosophical presumptions and material practices, produces the subject matter of inquiry, and through these practices, she/he produces the realities and representations that are the subject matter of inquiry – the research object, which in this thesis is Whiteness.

As noted earlier, the initial textual approach for the analysis of the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* draws on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation of how the term's meaning(s) are negotiated and constructed. The operationalisation (see Fylkesnes, 2011, pp. 55–59) of this theory into a "protocol" or practical method for analysis involved a "translation" of the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) theorisation of *discourse formation* into a *three-step reading strategy* (see Table 4; inspired by Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012; Søreide, 2007). More specifically, what was done was that the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) discourse theoretical concepts (*nodal points, moments, elements* and *floating signifiers*) were brought in as epistemic lenses through which the text is read. These epistemic lenses, despite

---

[28] Relating discourse theory and analysis to another (in a sense external) layer of theory is inspired by Foucault's (1989) claim of how "discourse in general and scientific discourse in particular, is so complex a reality that we not only can but should approach it at different levels with different methods" (p. xiv).

not being explicitly applied and operationalised as an analytical tool, have been implicitly present throughout all the textual readings.

All the empirical data of the thesis has been approached through the *three-step reading strategy* (Table 4), however, with a slightly adjusted aims, empirical research questions and concepts to fit the specific inquiry of each of the three discursive domains and the focus of the study. The first reading of this strategy was concerned with mapping and detecting the discursive relations of *cultural diversity* to other central terms that appeared prominent and frequently in relation to it. During this first reading, excerpts were selected for a deeper analysis of how *cultural diversity* and its related terms were described. Following Laclau and Mouffe (2001), the *nodal point*, *cultural diversity* – which was generally found to be an *empty signifier* – its related *moments* and their accorded descriptions were selected for a deeper meaning making analysis. In the second reading, the focus was put on how *cultural diversity* and its related terms (its *moments*) as excerpt descriptions probably gave meaning to *cultural diversity*. Here, similarities and differences were detected and organised in tables. These tables assisted in the synthesis process. From there, discursive patterns of how *cultural diversity* was made meaning of emerged. The third reading built on the previous two readings and synthesised these main patterns that had been identified. Thereafter, these patterns were related to the theoretical/analytical concepts of CWS.

Table 4: The three-step reading strategy

	Aim	Strategy for analysis	Empirical research questions
1st reading	Get an overview of terms and content related to *cultural diversity*	Word search Choice of words	What terms are prominently and frequently used in relation to *cultural diversity*?
2nd reading	Identify how *cultural diversity* is used through representations of closely related terms	Representations Comparison	How are *cultural diversity* and other related terms described? What similarities and differences in the use of *cultural diversity* exist?
3rd reading	Synthesise and discuss the use and thereby meaning making of *cultural diversity* across the selected studies	Synthesis of discursive patterns	How is *cultural diversity* generally used and thereby made meaning of?

Since the texts, positioned within different discursive domains of teacher education, have different styles in language and address different targeted addressees, the analysis of them involved different challenges. For example, the analysis of the international research articles had challenges related to volume (67 articles), their interchangeable use of terms, and in how their claimed theoretical frameworks or aims were not really met within the text. The analysis of the policy and curriculum documents had challenges related to their general linguistic vagueness and polyphonic features, their use of inflated undefined terms, their extensive use

of floating signifiers and in relation to translation. The analysis of the interview transcripts had challenges related to focusing on textual analysis, because I, as an interviewer, had already interacted with informants in the interview *in situ*, as well as with the audio records of these interviews. These interactions made me feel biased when reading the transcriptions, because the images of the informants non-verbal and non-word communication kept popping up in my head. Moreover, often the transcribed sentences did not make sense, in that informants appeared to stop abruptly, self-censure things they started to say, or in that they appeared to suddenly change the theme of discussion in the middle of a sentence during the conversation[29]. An example of how I have analysed the textual data is provided in Appendix 5.

5.5 Reflexivity

Research reflexivity may broadly be defined as how a field begins to raise questions, not only about its primary object of study, but also about the field itself and its status as science (Bloor, 1976; Bourdieu, 2001). More specifically, and in this thesis, reflexivity is related to the researcher's role and is defined as the ability to critically reflect on one's own role as a researcher throughout the research process (Mausethagen, 2013). It is the ability to critically reflect on the experiences as both inquirer and respondent, as teacher and as learner – to come to terms with not only the choices that are made throughout the research process (e.g. in the interplay with theories, research data and with fellow human beings), but also with the complexity in the processes that entails being a rigorous researcher – one that produces knowledge of high quality.

According to Lincoln, Lynham and Guba (2017), to arrive at research reflexivity is a process of discovery: "Discovery of the subject (and sometimes with the problem itself) and discovery of self" (Lincoln et al., 2017, p. 143) because the researcher resituates and rediscovers herself/himself within the text through her/his ways of representation. Thus, reflexivity can be described as a matter of bestowing the ability to embrace the Deluze and Guattarian (1988) concepts of *becoming* and *multiplicity* – the constant continuous research processes though which I, as a researcher, recreate myself and have the ability to take on multiple research perspectives and triangulate them in relation to the data being analysed.

Reflexivity thus demands that I, as a researcher, continuously interrogate my own research production, particularly in relation to how this production is shaped around binaries, contradictions and paradoxes (Lincoln et al., 2017), and the ways that these come to impact, for example, future teacher education discourses. Reflexivity, then, is about my ability to critically question the discourse(s) in which I am *dysconsciously* (King, 2004) embedded (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2010). Reflexivity is therefore also concerned with ways of writing and

---

[29] I am wondering whether these discursive moves could be interpreted as discourse strategies of White talk (McIntyre, 1997) described as "derailing the conversation, evading questions, dismissing counterarguments, withdrawing from the discussion, remaining silent, interrupting the speaker and topics, and colluding with each other in creating a 'culture of niceness'" (p. 46). This might work well, particularly when theorised in relation to Muller Myrdahl's (2014) theorisation of Norwegian Whiteness being White niceness.

presenting, and with the ability to critically reflect on my own research production and the "objects" I possibly construct through it.

5.5.1 Doubt as reflexivity

Locke, Golden-Biddel and Feldmann (2008) argue that doubt, when experienced as not feeling certain and that therefore motivates a search for understanding, plays a central role in the process of excellent theorising, and is a necessary "drive" in inquiry. In this PhD thesis, doubt has been a central drive not only in terms of motivating questions of both reflexivity and validity (e.g. whether I interrogate what I claim to interrogate; whether the findings have emerged through the analysis alone or whether they have been arrived at through the application of theoretical lenses, or both), but with respect to reflexivity motivating questions concerning findings and the representation of these (e.g. whether I really have found what I claim to have found). As such, doubt in this thesis is related to questions regarding the final research product (e.g. whether I have reconstructed what I claim to have deconstructed). However, perhaps most importantly in relation to this project, doubt has been important with respect to questions concerning constituency – whether I fulfil and stay in line with the project's aims and claims, and particularly in how I use and make meaning of terms.

Doubt has often left me pondering about patterns in data for weeks and has led me to repeat steps of my analysis to once again confirm the analytical possibilities or boundaries. For example, doubt led me to produce a textual body (of more than 50 pages) that described, in neat detail, the step-by-step process of my actual analysis and its route towards the condensed findings represented in the articles. However, not surprisingly, this document turned out to be too complicated for anyone but myself to make sense of. Nonetheless, the document was useful for me as a foundation upon which an analytical scheme was made. Thus, the document assisted me in the synthesis of the discursive patterns found in the data that Article 2 is based on.

5.5.2 Validity

Validity, as related to this PhD thesis's inquiry, is concerned with issues of the relationship between theory, methods and interpretation and questions of whether the theoretical perspectives and the analytical approach are compatible (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2010; Mausethagen, 2013). It relates (within qualitative research) not to questions regarding whether research findings can be considered as "true", but to questions regarding whether the findings may be considered as knowledge, or more precisely, knowledge secured to the extent that the researcher herself/himself would have constructed a social policy or legislation based upon it (Lincoln et al., 2017). However, some researchers positioned within a critical interpretative paradigm argue that validity criteria, because they represent a regime of "criteriology" (Schwandt, 1996), need to be ruptured as a heterogenic "regime of truth" (Lather, 1993, p. 674). That the researcher, rather than following a set of given criteria, should focus on bridging ethics with epistemology and thereby engage in researcher self-reflexivity. Thus, validity is not only about the rigour or quality of the research. Validity as self-reflexivity, Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) suggest, can be accomplished by "testing" one's knowledge-claims through *communicative validity* (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 253) for

example though formal and informal conversations with research peers, both within and outside one's field of research in both international and national contexts. Communicative validity thus refers to how the validation by researchers, reviewers and educators on the work and their interpretations of how the research – for example, how its framework (theoretical and methodological) – manages to explain and create new frameworks (Mausethagen, 2013; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). That is, whether research peers find the research sound, inspiring, innovative and capable of raising critical and *reflexive* (cf. Bourdieu, 2001) questions that push the field of research forward.

The communicative validity in this thesis has been tested through how the work with this thesis's early design, research questions, analysis and later on, how the articles have been presented and discussed in various academic forums: a national research school (National Graduate School in Educational Research (NATED)); summer schools (JUSTED); European and Nordic educational conferences (e.g. European Conference in Educational Research (ECER)); the Nordic Educational Research Association's (NERA) conference; a Nordic intercultural conference (Nordic Intercultural Communication Conference (NICC)); a research group in UC Berkeley; and in text seminars during my PhD programme (OsloMet) with senior and other PhD researcher peers, both from within and outside the field of education generally as well as from the "field" of multicultural and intercultural education. Such conversations have been very fruitful, particularly in relation to ways of navigating and framing the analysis and arguments targeted for different audiences. It has also been tested through processes of double-blind peer review that the manuscripts had undergone prior to publication, and through processes of communicating and receiving feedback from peers when writing abstracts for international conferences such as the ECER. Moreover, discussing my research with people outside academia (e.g. friends, family and colleagues) has also proved to be useful for ensuring communicative validity.

5.5.3 Ethics

Closely related to issues of research validity is the issue of ethics in research. Scholars within the critical theoretical interpretative paradigm argue for the importance of a critical ethical foundation related to power and oppression, and the avoidance of constructing similar patterns of power and oppression as those it attempts to abolish (Canella & Lincoln, 2017). This thesis claims to follow both the critical theoretical interpretative paradigm's ideal of a critical ethical foundation as well as the set of formal research criteria obliged to research projects situated within Norwegian research institutions.

This thesis, being historically and socially situated within the context of Norwegian teacher education research, has, in line with all social research in Norway (and elsewhere), general ethical guidelines that it must follow. For example, it has been approved by the NSD (Norwegian Centre for Research Data) (see Appendix 6), and it follows the ethical guidelines produced by NESH (The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees). Moreover, as part of a PhD programme, the thesis has additionally followed the ethical guidelines mandated by its institution.

In the next section, I discuss some ethical considerations in relation to the three research domains.

5.5.4 Ethical considerations in relation to the articles

Since this PhD project is situated within the critical theoretical interpretative paradigm and its interest is merely in social structures (e.g. discursive patterns) (Lincoln & Denzin, 2017), the main ethical concern is related to issues of individuals' confidentiality. For example, in Article 1, where I generally criticise teacher education researchers (the researchers and the surrounding community) for how the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in peer-reviewed articles contributes to the production of a discursive ideology of White supremacy, I do refer to some authors in places where I use parts of their text as empirical examples of the detected discursive patterns. This usage of references and textual examples are from articles, despite mentioning the individual authors' works, and they are put forward with the intension of providing the readership with transparency in relation to the analyses that were performed. Even though research, once published, may be considered as "public", the referencing of them in my article (Article 2) might nonetheless be interpreted as an unjust exposure of some researchers over and above others. At the intersection of these ethical issues of transparency versus confidentiality, some experts and their authors were chosen due to how their texts relatively clearly exemplified the general findings across all articles under review. Furthermore, references were also provided according to the respective journal's referred style and its reviewers' requests. As I claim in this PhD thesis's literature chapter, it is important for the literature review to critique the literature in order to push the research field forward (e.g. Cochran-Smith et al., 2015). In the second article, it is not only the authors' cited in the text that are exposed, the rest of them are added to the article's attached detailed appendix. Herein, the full references to the articles, the articles' claimed theoretical frameworks, aims, location of the studies, and publication journals, as well as my analysis of the articles' main use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* are provided.

Most of the data from the Norwegian context (e.g. the two programme and the two subject-specific plans analysed in this PhD thesis, as well as the 12 interviews) was retrieved and recruited from the same two institutions (A and B). Thus, since Norway is a scarcely populated country and teacher education institutions are relatively small and few, the provided descriptions of the selected teacher education institutions have been kept to the minimum. Moreover, the institutionally-related documents – the two programme plans and the two subject-specific plans – that were used have not been referred to anywhere in the PhD thesis's text, including the articles. This means that in Article 2, where textual examples from these four documents are provided, no references are provided. Such caution in relation to information was taken to ensure that the interviewees' confidentiality was ensured. Confidentiality was something that was promised to them in an information letter about this PhD project and their participation in it – a letter they all singed (see example in Appendix 7).

In Articles 3 and 4, we maintained the pattern of providing minimal information about the informants. Here, we have stated that institution A upholds a "multicultural" programme profile and pointed to how we interviewed the 12 teacher educators but did not provide any

information beyond the fact that these interviewees are teacher educators teaching student teachers in the largest (60-credit Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge) course in the national Norwegian teacher education programme. From a critical theoretical interpretative perspective, the central information about these interviewees that is relevant to this PhD project is the teacher educators' positionality (e.g. they are members of the White majority group, hold positions within institutions and are experts as teachers in that they teach student teachers the skill of teaching) and how they possibly influence their student teachers.

6. Findings in the articles

In this chapter, I summarise the four articles' main findings, points of discussion and arguments. The order in which the four articles that are part of this PhD thesis are organised are done so with inspiration from Goodlad's (1979) hierarchical curriculum domains. A rationale for this understanding may be found in Appendix 8.

6.1 Article 1

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71,* 24–33.

In this PhD thesis's first article, I review the use and meaning making of *cultural diversity* across 67 international research studies on teacher education published in the period from 2004–2014. In this analysis, I find that *cultural diversity* is generally not defined but related to a set of other undefined terms (e.g. *multicultural, race/racial, difference, class, linguistic, ethnic/ethnicity, gender, critical thinking and practices, socioeconomic, other, immigrants, social justice, behaviour, English language learners (ELLs), religion, poor, sexual orientation* and *ability/disability*). Moreover, I also find that the usage of *cultural diversity* (and its related set of terms) is used extensively as part of binary oppositional discourses where, on the one hand, *cultural diversity* is mainly related to terms such as *multicultural, student of colour, race, other, ethnicity, difference/different* and *minority*, and on the other hand, student teacher(s) and student(s) are related to terms such as *monolingual, European American, hegemonic mainstream, privileged, normal and relatively homogenous ethnic background, higher socioeconomic status, predominantly White* and as the *dominant majority*. As such, these sets of terms and their descriptions constructed binary oppositional discourses that, on the one hand, represent *cultural diversity* through notions of detriment – of racialisation and Othering, difference and inferiority – and, on the other hand, represent student teacher(s) and student(s) through notions of privilege and assumptions of superiority.

Based on these findings, I discuss how the undefined nature of *cultural diversity* and its usage, as part of the binary oppositional discourses, reveal how *cultural diversity* is assumed an identity as a racialised Other (contrary to student teacher(s) and student(s)) in teacher education research discourses. I argue that this discursive production is one way that Whiteness works through researchers' discursive practices of division and exclusion, produced by their initial dysconscious choices and investments in terms. This extensive practice of Othering that was found, I claim, is the "evidence" of the persistent workings of how Whiteness is promoted through a discursive ideology of White supremacy. Interestingly, these discourses are produced in articles that are understood as promoting social justice.

Questions are asked with regards to why so many researchers do not locate, situate and discuss *cultural diversity* in each specific ubiquitous study – something that I would expect to be a minimum requirement in peer-reviewed research articles – and also why no one treats *cultural diversity* as an abstract term on a higher conceptual and theoretical level. Moreover, I also point to the extended research community's responsibility with regards to the

(re)production of this discursive ideology of White supremacy and reflect about whether these institutionally-bound discourses may, precisely because of their implicit and subtle features, come to be "installed" over time as discursive patterned ideas "into [teacher] students' (and other consumers of these discourses') heads" and whether they may affect their dispositions and hence manifest though a "dysconscious" racist pedagogy (e.g. in micro nuances in modes of speaking and acting).

I pursue this by addressing the implications for teacher education, which I suggest are mainly the following two things: Teacher education needs to provide student teachers with (1) critical knowledge about the realities of history in ways that counter the historical pedagogy of amnesia and reveal the power and domination of Whites, and (2) critical tools for deconstruction (similar to those promoted in the article) that enable them to question and disrupt the institutionalised produced discourse of power/knowledge and the ways this implicitly centres and sustains a discursive ideology of White supremacy. This I argue is important if students are ever to learn to take a stance against its workings.

6.2 Article 2

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy.* Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/02680939.2018.1482503

In the PhD thesis's second article, I analyse the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in six Norwegian policy and curriculum documents considered to be part of the 2010 teacher education reform. In this analysis, I find (similar to the findings of the review article) that *cultural diversity* is neither explicitly elaborated on nor defined according to its ubiquity of usage. Instead, it is related to and used interchangeably with a set of other undefined terms, mainly the term *multicultural,* but also *multilinguistic, immigrant, cultural and linguistic diversity, linguistic minority, minority* and *diversity.* However, in this article, the main focus is on the finding of how Whiteness, the way it works through the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*, is manifested in three discursive patterns of representation. Importantly, these patterns highlight: (1) three hierarchically-arranged pupil group categories, (2) descriptions that place these pupil group categories as either superior Norwegian or as inferior non-Norwegian, and (3) the role of student teachers as *political actors of assimilation.* In this article, I point to how these discursive patterns of representation work together in subtle racist ways that promote ideas of assimilation as racial stratification that in turn supports an overall ideology of White Norwegian supremacy – which I provocatively describe to be ideas of "a *flawless* White European *Herrenvolk*" (p. 6).

Based on these findings, I discuss possible implications for teacher education policy in relation to (1) classroom practice, (2) national ideology, and (3) future policy implementation. With regards to implications for classroom practice, I point to a central, yet troubling paradox: How, on the one hand, Norwegian teacher education is supposed to ensure critical thinking as a central component of its programme; the law-binding mandate of education promotes

democracy, equality, a scientific way of thinking and the deterrence of all forms of discrimination, and hence, how these ideas together support a Norwegian self-image as one of peace-promotion, solidarity, and an egalitarian people who are part of Nordic Exceptionalism and the Nordic Model. The analysis of the policy and curriculum documents in this article, contrary to their stated positionality, shows that these documents implicitly and discursively produce and promote patterned ideas of racial hierarchy, uncritical actions, autocracy, social inequality and racism. I argue that these findings are troubling because policies, including their discursive patterns of categorisation and representations, are often enacted by central knowledge-promoting actors in teacher education (e.g. teacher educators and student teachers), and as such they contribute to preserving the unequal racial *status quo* of unequal educational outcomes.

With regards to implications for the national Norwegian ideology, I point to how the imagery of Norway as part of Nordic Exceptionalism and the Nordic Model, the refusal of *race* as an analytical concept and the understanding of racism as explicit actions of hate can be understood as re-producing a historical pedagogical amnesia that *blinds* Norwegians to the idea of Whiteness working as a social construct at the intersection between Norway's national past and its contemporary political and economic interests. This amnesic behaviour, I argue, silences the workings of Whiteness and, in turn, leads to an understanding of contemporary Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents as anti-racist promoters of social justice. I suggest, in line with the international literature, that White supremacy, also in this Norwegian context, is made invisible and normalised through discursive routines because it only manifests through subtle discursive micro level meaning making patterns. Importantly, these micro level patterns discursively support the ideological workings of White supremacy (e.g. the ideal Norwegian self-image, the pedagogy of amnesia and the colourblind nationalistic ideal of *imagined sameness*) at the political macro level.

With regards to implications for future policy implementations, I point to two aspects highlighted in the international literature as central for future teachers' knowledge and competency about the promotion of racial justice: (1) Future teachers need knowledge about the realities of history that counter the existing "pedagogy of amnesia". Related to the Norwegian context, this means that future teachers must be able to link the *pedagogy of amnesia* and the doxic ideal of *imagined sameness* and understand how such ideologies currently forge a "polished" national self-image that hides a "dirty" and violent colonial and imperial past. (2) Future teachers must learn to accept the fact that We are all racially positioned and that, through Our positionality, We partake in the domination and subjugation of the Other by producing racialised discursive patterns that name and define it as such. I argue that future teacher education policy should include historical perspectives that disrupt the pedagogy of amnesia and that future teachers must gain the competency to utilise critical discourse analytical tools for deconstruction (e.g. similar to those offered in the article) as a means through which to detect the racialised patterns produced by teacher education policy discourses, as well as by themselves. That is, if the goal of teacher education is to promote the social justice it claims to promote.

6.3 Article 3

Fylkesnes, S., Mausethagen, S, & Nilsen, A. B. (2018). The double meaning making of the term cultural diversity in teacher educator discourses. *Nordic Journal of International and Comparative Education, 2*(1), 16–38. doi:10.7577/njcie.2284

In this PhD thesis's third article, we analyse the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* as discursively used by teacher educators in the transcripts of 12 individual interviews. Treating the transcripts as empirical texts, we find teacher educators use *cultural diversity* through a double meaning making pattern that, on the one hand, gives explicit meaning to *cultural diversity* as something explicitly positive, important and desirable for teacher education. Yet, on the other hand, *cultural diversity* is more subtly assumed to be about the Other, and is represented as negative and challenging, as cognitively less developed (than an assumed Us) and knowledgeless Other.

Based on these findings, we suggest that when *cultural diversity* is explicitly represented as something positive, important and desired in Norwegian teacher education, this pattern of meaning making, precisely because it rests on subtler assumptions and meaning making of *cultural diversity* as Other, thus can be interpreted to mirror the "ideal" Whiteness ways in which *cultural diversity* ought to be represented. Importantly, this ideal representational surface shields the more non-ideal subtle ways that *cultural diversity* was also found to be represented as the Other in the teacher educator discourses.

We point to how despite teacher educators seeming to express their wish to approach *cultural diversity* in positive and inclusive ways, their usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* produced discursive patterns of Othering and exclusion that reflect the opposite. Related to this, we question whether what the student teachers subtly learn about *cultural diversity* through their teacher education programme may influence their future teaching, and what, in turn, their future pupils will learn about the workings of Whiteness. Moreover, we suggest that teacher education needs to provide crucial conceptual and analytical tools that will allow for the revealing of the subtle working of Whiteness in discourses produced in both the institutions and by themselves.

6.4 Article 4

Nilsen, A. B., Fylkesnes, S., & Mausethagen, S. (2017). The linguistics in othering: Teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, *8*(1). doi:10.7577/rerm.2556

In this PhD thesis's fourth article, we draw on the same sets of data as in Article 3 and analyse these using a socio-cognitive linguistic theoretical framework. The article might be considered as a linguistic theoretical and methodological contribution to the field of linguistics[30]. In this article, we analyse how teacher educators use *cultural diversity* and reflect on what their discursive practices might tell us about their conceptual understanding of

---

[30] This is the research field of my main supervisor.

it. Based on the analysis of the transcribed interview data, we find that teacher educators talk about *cultural diversity* as something concerning pupils and parents who were considered different from themselves culturally, socially, linguistically, cognitively, migrationally, visibly and religiously. From this, we theorise that teacher educators talk about *cultural diversity* through seven discourse practices of othering (DPOs). We point to how teacher educators, when they talk about *cultural diversity* in this way, create a dichotomy of two binary oppositional groups where the teacher educators are placed in an Us-group that can be described as representing the implicit and "ordinary", and *cultural diversity* (denoting the different Others) represents the explicit and "unordinary" Other-group. For example, teacher educators seemed to think that *cultural diversity* was about the Others in that they talked about how pupils and their parents had different cultures compared to themselves. They emphasised ethnicity and foreign cultural barriers and spoke in a manner that suggested that only the Others had a culture. Herein, these Others were represented by the use of the explicit pronoun They.

We argue that in order for teacher educators to counteract discrimination and inequality created through the use and meaning making of terms (such as *cultural diversity*), they *need more than an appreciation of diversity.* They also need linguistic tools that allow them to critique power relations and the accorded discourses that work to "hold down" certain groups in society. We also argue that, for teacher educators, such counter-knowledge is particularly important to bestow because they are holders of a trifold power: (1) they are members of the majority, (2) they hold positions within institutions, and (3) they are considered pedagogical "experts" in that they teach pre-service teachers the knowledge and skills of teaching. We also claim that teacher educators' ways of Othering may influence pre-service teachers' futures in school teaching.

We conclude by suggesting that further research should focus on the actual teaching practices of teacher educators in order to develop a more comprehensive picture of the discursive practices of Othering.

7. Discussion

In the preceding chapters of this PhD thesis's extended abstract, I have placed the study within the relevant literature, elaborated on the theoretical background, addressed methodological issues and presented a summary of the main findings and arguments of the four articles. Together, these preceding chapters inform the following discussion. As a reminder, the overall guiding question that this PhD project attempts to answer is: How does Whiteness work through the term *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses? Moreover, the two following sub-questions were asked with the intention of stimulating the following discussion: (1) What are the main discursive usage and meaning makings of *cultural diversity* in the teacher education discourses? (2) In what ways may Whiteness be understood to work through the different knowledge-promoting discursive domains of teacher education?

In this chapter, I will discuss these questions across the four articles.

7.1 The main usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*

This PhD project's analysis has generally found that the way that *cultural diversity* is used and given meaning to is surprisingly similar across all three discursive domains of teacher education. Firstly, from the analysis of Articles 1–3, a general pattern that was found was how *cultural diversity* was neither defined nor reflected upon. Secondly, also across Articles 1–3, the terms *cultural diversity* and *multicultural* were found to be used interchangeably. Thirdly, a common feature found across the analysis of all four articles was how *cultural diversity* was always related to a set of other undefined terms that, although varying within the four articles, to a great extent overlapped, particularly with respect to what these terms connoted (see Appendix 9 for an overview of terms used in relation to *cultural diversity* across all four articles.) These findings are interesting not only because they point to the fourth and fifth findings of this thesis, namely how the usage of these terms – their constellations – forms discursive patterns that points *cultural diversity* in the direction of the same discursive object – a racialised Other – but also because these sets of terms are all part of the same racialised binary oppositional discourses, that in effect simultaneously constructs Us (Frankenberg, 1993).

As discussed in this thesis's theory chapter, central to this thesis is the belief that the usage of assumingly innocent terms, their relation and hence their constellations, despite their assumed meaninglessness, nonetheless produce a structuring pattern that forms the basis upon which meaning making and comprehensions are further built. These ideas draw on the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) understanding of how the initial micro meaning making of terms (e.g. the relationship between the nodal point, moments and elements) is inextricably related to wider macro meaning making formations (e.g. myths and social imaginaries) and how these processes in turn are always related to the concept of hegemony. That is, how discursive formations are "established" as accepted "truths" to the extent that they are treated as natural, neutral and as commonsense. Hence, terms, their relations, constellations and their discursive formation are always a result of the workings of power/knowledge (cf. Foucault, 1980, 1989) and ideology and hence are always inextricably related to political actors' (/subjects') social

practice (Althusser, 1970). When these understandings of discursive formations are related to the understanding of Whiteness as a kind minimal, yet omnipresent (Gillborn, 2005) meaning making property (Vaught, 2012) in which actors invest (Leonardo, 2002), how political knowledge-promoting actors of teacher education invest in terms is thus central to this thesis's deconstruction of the ways that Whiteness works through *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses.

In the following, I start by discussing the patterns of terms used in relation to *cultural diversity* across the three discursive domains researched in this thesis (Articles 1–4).

7.1.1 The usage of term across all articles

In this PhD study, in addition to the undefined nature of *cultural diversity* and the interchangeable usage of the terms *cultural diversity* and *multicultural,* the set of other undefined terms that both overlapped and somewhat varied across the different discursive domains were various forms of *linguistic* (Article 1) such as *linguistic diversity* (Article 2), *multilinguistic* (Articles 2, 3 and 4) and *bilingual* (Article 4). The term *immigrant* was used in the international research articles (Article 1), the Norwegian policy and curriculum documents (Article 2), as well as in the transcribed teacher educator interviews (Article 4). Various versions of *behaviour* such as *behaviour challenges* and *behaviour* and *challenges* were terms used in both the international research articles as well as in both analyses of the teacher educator interview transcripts (Article 3 and 4). Moreover, the terms *difference*, *socioeconomic*, *ethnic/ethnicity* and *other* were used both in the international research articles (Article 1) as well as in the transcribed teacher educator interviews (Article 4). However, *race/racial, critical thinking, social justice, class, poor, religion, sexual orientation* and *ability/disability* were terms that were only used in the international research articles (Article 1).

In research from the Norwegian context, the term *minority* was used both in the policy and curriculum documents as well as in the transcribed teacher educator interviews (Articles 3 and 4). However, the terms *cultural and linguistic diversity* and *linguistic minority* were only used in the policy and curriculum documents. In both analyses of the teacher educator interview transcripts (Articles 3 and 4), the terms *integration, inclusion, nationality, country* and *resource* were used in relation to *cultural diversity*. However, whilst the terms *special education*, *dialogue* and *from another country* were terms used in the analysis of the teacher educator interview transcripts in Article 3, the terms *pizza, experience, music, dance, barriers, values, pupils, pupil groups, parents, children, competence, racism, crisis, prejudice, depression, violence, belonging, majority, discrimination, difficulties, dyscalculia, dyslectic children's' development, emotional, less, stigmatising, low, adapted, Norwegian, foreign, skin colour, non-Western, new national values*, *Islam* and *violence* were used in the analysis of the teacher educator interview transcripts in Article 4[31].

---

[31] The reasons as to why there were more terms that were found used in relation to *cultural diversity* in Article 4, compared to Articles 1–3, has to do with the analytical strategy used. Whilst the analytical strategy used in Articles 1–3 is generally based on the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) DT and takes the term *cultural diversity* as

Despite there being some differences in the usage of terms related to *cultural diversity* across the articles, particularly between the international and the Norwegian contexts, and between the two analyses of the teacher interview transcripts (Articles 3 and 4), the common feature of these sets of terms used in relation to *cultural diversity* is, as already mentioned, nonetheless how their connotations all point towards the same discursive pattern: To how *cultural diversity* assumingly refers to a discursive object identified as a racialised Other. This discursive pattern, I address in the next section.

7.1.2 Emerging discursive object: *Cultural diversity* as a racialised Other

In this thesis, I claim to put the focus on how Whiteness works to constitute discursive objects (Goldberg, 1993, 2009) through hegemonic meaning making of *cultural diversity*. I also theorise that Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy works to maintain the racial White group's hegemonic social position through discursive means of domination related to discursive practices that extensively name, define and represent *cultural diversity* in ways that not only construct but also constitute it as a racialised Other (cf. Said, 2003) (e.g. as lesser, deviant and inferior to the assumed and invisibly present, normal and ordinary racially White counterpart; see Article 3). In this section, I aim to make visible how the terms and their usage point to discursive patterns or subtle points of objects that, according to Goldberg (2006), otherwise would easily be overlooked due to how their normalised and taken-for-granted routines of usage (Gillborn, 2005) merely manifest through subtle discursive micro level meaning making patterns that, thus make them "invisible". Thus, with respect to how *cultural diversity* and its related set of terms refer it to a discursive object identified as a racialised Other, there are quite a few features of the usage of terms across the articles that need to be further elaborated on. I focus on the main differences in the usage of terms across the international and the Norwegian contexts and particularly on what ideas the non-usage of *race* yet sets of other terms used in the Norwegian context might, possibly invoke.

Whilst, in the international research articles, *cultural diversity* is related to the term *race/racial* – a term that generally is founds to be used interchangeably with *ethnic/ethnicity* (a term that is paradoxically *not* considered taboo in the Norwegian context) – this term is not used in the Norwegian discursive domains researched in this thesis. As also touched upon in Article 2, non-usage of the term *race/racial* across this PhD thesis's researched Norwegian context is not surprising and might be explained by how the term is generally considered as taboo (Dowling, 2017; Gullestad, 2004; Muller Myrdahl, 2014; Svendesen, 2014; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011) and on the arguments of how it connotes references to the World War II Nazi ideas of the existence of biologically different human species, and moreover how, since there are no distinctive human species, *race* must not be spoken of. The non-usage of *race* in the Norwegian context is interesting when related to how central critical researchers of race, racism and Whiteness argue that in so-called post-racial and colourblind societies, "We talk (about) race when not talking (about) it" (Goldberg, 2016, p. 1). It does therefore not matter

---

the entrance point of analysis (Fairclough, 2013), the analytical strategy in Article 4 focuses on searching for adjectives used across all of the transcribed material in contexts where questions were asked about *cultural diversity* and as such the search for terms was across a broader body of the transcribed interview material. Thus, this analytical strategy provides more hits on terms compared to the analytical strategy applied in Articles 1–3.

whether a discourse makes direct usage of racial imaginaries or language or not, but the role of *race* within that discourse matters. This is because discourses, whilst explicitly appearing to be unconnected with *race,* might simultaneously grant a particular racist definition of Us as opposed to Them (Gillborn, 1995, p. 20)[32].

Given that Norwegian society, since the term *race* is a taboo (and since it sees itself innocent of the historical complicity in implicitly in imperialism and colonialism), considers itself to be a post-racial and colourblind society (Dowling, 2017; Harlap & Riese, 2014), it is interesting how, despite the term *race/racial* is not being used, this thesis's research nonetheless finds that in this context, the terms *multicultural, multilinguistic, immigrant, minority, cultural and linguistic diversity* (Article 2), *another nationality, from another country* (Article 3), *skin colour, non-Western, new national, foreign, behavioural challenge, barriers, difficulties, differences/difference, values, Islam* and *violence* (Article 4) – terms that all point *cultural diversity* in the direction of a racialised Otherness – are.

Of these terms, *multicultural, multilinguistic, immigrant, minority, another nationality, from another country, non-Western, new national, foreign, new national* and *Islam* all allude to research arguing how the term *race* in Norway and Europe has historically often been used interchangeably with the terms *nation* and *folk* (Gullestad, 2004; Wodak & Reisigl, 1999), and how the ideologies of *nationalism* and *racism* (e.g. the Norwegian colourblind, nationalistic ideology of imagined sameness) both overlap and reinforce each other by how their common ground is an "implicit or explicit focus on descent and symbolic kinship" (Gullestad, 2004, p. 193). This is because all these sets of terms point to ideas of how *cultural diversity* is being classified as an entity belonging outside of ideas that are assumed to constitute the Norwegian nation and the Norwegian folk. As such, this set of terms also points to ideas of how *cultural diversity* is placed outside descent and symbolic kinship, in other words, outside the Norwegian (racially White) imagined sameness ideology (Gullestad, 2002) – outside Norwegianness.

The non-usage of *race/racial,* yet of *skin colour* in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian context (Article 3 and 4) is surprising when coupled with how research points to how the Norwegian imagined sameness ideology is generally colourblind – implying that We do neither see race, nor skin colour – (Dowling, 2017; Harlap & Riese, 2014), and to how, in the Norwegian context, the term *skin colour,* just like the term *race,* is also generally considered as taboo (Gullestad, 2002). This taboo works similarly to that related to *race*, in that explicit references to skin colour by the usage of the term *skin colour* are preferably replaced with implicit references to it and with terms such as *the multicultural* and *immigrant* (e.g. Gullestad, 2002) – terms that nonetheless invoke ideas of the existence of both race (defined as the existence of hierarchical groups of people) and of skin colour (of "brownness" – complexions considered Other to assumed as neutrally White (Dyer, 1997)). Importantly, even though in the Norwegian social context a discourse generally exists that on the surface pushes forth ideas of colourblindness and arguments of how We do *not* see colour and that

---

[32] What is also important is who uses the discourses (Foucault, 1980). However, I will return to this to later in the discussion.

We treat people the same regardless of "ethnicity"[33] (Dowling, 2017), recent studies counteract this view. In the Norwegian context, notions of skin colour, despite on the surface being claimed to be insignificant, are often implicitly referred to and found to be a central aspect of the everyday as a feature generally inscribed to the bodies of those considered racially Other (Rysst, 2016)[34]. Importantly, across the articles of this thesis, the terms *skin colour, multicultural* and *immigrant,* and all other terms used in relation to *cultural diversity* (e.g. *multilinguistic*, *immigrant, minority, cultural and linguistic diversity, another nationality, from another country*, *skin colour, non-Western, new national, foreign, differences/difference, Islam* and *violence*) all have similar functions: They function as metonyms for "not looking Norwegian" (Gullestad, 2006, p. 314). As such, these set of terms through their constellation work to discursively mark *cultural diversity* as a racial category (Goldberg, 1993, 2009) representing Otherness and difference (e.g. of "skin brownness"), testify to how *cultural diversity* is promoted as something that is neither considered to be related to Norwegian descent nor to Norwegian symbolic kinship.

Moreover, the non-usage of *race,* yet sets of other terms (mentioned above) in relation to *cultural diversity* point it in directions that align with findings from recent research from the Norwegian context of how not only *culture* but also *genes* (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017) are used as code words for *race*, particularly with respect to nationality, belonging and ideas of compatibility in processes of integration into Norwegian society (e.g. Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Tolgensbakk, 2014)[35]. More specifically, this research also points to how certain White immigrants, particularly Swedes and Icelandic people, are warmly welcomed and easily included in Norwegian society (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Tolgensbakk, 2014), and how the Poles (similar to the Irish in the US context), are only partly integrated into the Norwegian society, yet in many ways also, due to their sameness in terms of skin "invisibility", more privileged with respect to integration and inclusion into Norwegian work spaces compared to their immigrant colleagues "of colour" (van Riemsdijk, 2010). If related to the Norwegian imagined sameness ideology context, when not only the cultural terms

[33] Interestingly, despite the term *race* being taboo in the Norwegian context, the term *ethnicity* is not. However, "ethnicity" generally has a similar connotation to race (defined as a hierarchical social grouping of people). For example, it is not taboo to call someone "ethnical Norwegian", despite this usage referring to a racially White person considered to be of Norwegian descent. Thus, this usage and non-usage of the terms *ethnicity* and *race* in the Norwegian context is interesting when related to the findings of how the terms *race* and *ethnicity* are, similarly to the terms *cultural diversity* and *multicultural*, generally used interchangeably in the international context (see Article 1). Thus, even though race is a term that is not used in the Norwegian context, it seems to imply similar meanings as the concepts of race do in the way in which it is defined within the theoretical perspectives of CWS theory.

[34] Working form a critical Whiteness perspective in this PhD thesis, I believe a central issue to point the finger at in this regard is how, despite researchers' attempts to achieve a critical gaze regarding the workings of race in the Norwegian context (e.g. Døving, 2017; Gullestad, 2002, Harlap & Riese, 2014; Rysst, 2016), for example, by arguing for the importance of starting to, in the Norwegian colourblind ideological context, admit that We actually do see skin colour (e.g. Harlap & Riese, 2014), these researchers fail to recognise the importance of naming, defining and thus, "seeing" Whiteness, but rather they continue, in a subtle Orientalist manner that relates ideas of race and skin colour only to features of the Other (Said, 2002) and not to the White racial Us.

[35] Similarly, Gullestad (2005) argues that the term *immigrant* is used a code for *race* in the Norwegian context because it commonly implies "'Third world' origin, different values from the majority, 'dark skin'" (p. 50) and as such that the term implied persons deviating visually from the invisible racially White Norwegian norm (Guðjónsdóttir, 2014).

multicultural and *cultural and linguistic diversity* (Article 2), but also the terms *multilinguistic, immigrant, minority* (Article 2), *another nationality, from another country* (Article 3), *skin colour, non-Western, new national,* and *foreign* are used in relation to *cultural diversity*, the understanding of *cultural diversity* hints at notions of how certain cultures and "genes" are considered as non-Norwegian.

Additionally, the non-usage of *race* in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian context *,* yet the usage of the terms *behavioural challenges* (Article 3), *behaviour* and *challenges* (Article 4) and *barriers, difficulties, violence*[36]*, dyscalculia,* and *dyslectic children's' development* (article 4)*,* can be argued to work together in ways that define *cultural diversity* as racially Other by the way these terms invoke degrading and exclusionary ideas of *cultural diversity*. More specifically, when *cultural diversity*, is related to the terms *behavioural challenges* (Article 3), *behaviour* and *challenges* (Article 4) as well as *barriers, difficulties, violence, difficulties, dyscalculia,* and *dyslectic children's' development*, this evoke ideas of *cultural diversity* not only being non-Norwegian and non-White, but moreover as something that is particularly hard to integrate (e.g. *behavioural challenges*, *barriers, difficulties, violence*) and as representing a cognitively lesser Other (e.g. *dyscalculia, dyslectic children's' development*). These usage of terms across the articles of this thesis, and what ideas they possible invoke, are, similar to the findings in Article 2 of how *cultural diversity* is related to discursive categorisations of pupil groups of where the linguistic minority pupil group category (a sub-group of the multicultural pupil group) is discursively represented as one to be subjugated by the student teacher (who is understood to have a role as a political actor of assimilation of stratification) into special education. Thus, the usage of terms and the discursive ideas they possible invoke are of important to make visible with respect for future racial justice. Particularly because they seem to resemble similar institutional racist patterns as that found in both international and national research of the persistence of how pupils "of colour" are overrepresented in special education (Baratan, 2008; Pihl, 2010).

The non-usage of *race/racial*, yet the usage of the above-mentioned sets of terms, as well as the usage of the terms *racism* and *discrimination* in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian context (the teacher educator interview transcripts (Article 4)) is interesting when knowing that *racism* in Norway is understood as explicit acts of hate and *not* (as is the case in critical studies on Whiteness) as subtle, minimal, omnipresent and normal everyday practices (e.g. the usage and meaning making of terms), which nonetheless marginalise and discriminate difference based on, for example, notions of skin colour (e.g. Gullestad, 2002; Tajik, 2001; van Riemsdijk, 2010). Such subtle everyday phenomenon would be referred to as racism within CWS, but in the Norwegian context it is described by the usage of the term *discrimination*. Thus, non-usage of the term *race/racial* but the terms *racism* and

---

[36] The usage of the term *violence* in relation to *cultural diversity* assists in promoting *cultural diversity* as something representing the opposite of Norwegianness because it points *cultural diversity* to representing the opposite of Norwegian values being a general appreciation of *peace and quiet* (Gullestad, 1992) and with how many people's belief that Norway is a particularly peaceful place (Browning, 2007; Eriksen & Neumann, 2011; Gullestad, 2002).

discrimination in the Norwegian context might be understood to testify to how these terms refer to two separate meaning making domains in the Norwegian context – that racism is about explicit actions of hate and is not recognised, for example, as being about subtle discursive usage and meaning making of terms. Scheurich (1993) argues the importance of recognising how explicit actions of hate (the definition of racism in the Norwegian context) are only social effects, or symptomatic of a much bigger problem (Muller Myrdahl, 2014) because of how Whiteness is built into the very ontological and epistemological foundation of White (Norwegian) social "reality" (Scheurich, 2002). Thus, when the terms *racism* and *discrimination* in the Norwegian context refer to two separate meaning making domains this implies that as long as *race* remains taboo, then the subtle, minimal, omnipresent everyday practices, despite being systemic, will not, contrary to critical Whiteness theoretical perspectives be recognised as racism – they will only be understood as discrimination. Thus, a conceptual separation exists between *racism* and *discrimination,* made possible by the denial of *race/racial,* and the way these terms are used in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian teacher educator interviews is therefore interesting, because it contrasts with how recent research finds that Norwegian youth define racism as "any discrimination based on culture, ethnicity, skin colour, or religion", something they claim to experience as a "very present facet of contemporary Norwegian society" (Svendsen, 2014, p. 10). These definitions of racism merge the division between the concepts of racism and discrimination, thus aligning more closely with the CWS definitions of race and racism. Interestingly, these youth's teachers – contrary to their students (the youths) – reserve the term *racism* only for "severe skin colour discrimination with links to notions of biological races" (Svendsen, 2014, p. 10) – a definition of racism (severe discrimination) that ignores the subtle racialised discursive patterns related to the usage of terms related to *cultural diversity*.

One possible example of how the subtler forms of racism are not recognised as such in the Norwegian context might be found through how, in the Norwegian context (Article 4) the more religious specific term *Islam* is used in relation to *cultural diversity,* compared to how in the international context (Article 1) the more general term *religion* is used. The usage of *Islam* and not *religion* in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian context is interesting when related to how research from this context points to how identifiers of Islam bear negative connotations associated with features of non-Whiteness and non-Norwegianness and that young Norwegian Muslims, contrary to their White religious peers, are often confronted with and have to justify their religiosity (Vassenden & Andersson, 2011). Moreover, this research also points to how whilst White religious identity is generally possible to hide and hence, keep private (Iversen, 2012; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011), non-White religious minorities' identities (e.g. Muslim) are treated as a public affair (Iversen, 2012; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011). Furthermore, in the wider (Norwegian and) European context public debates about Islam and communities of colour (Indregard, Wergeland, & Wold, 2012) have, since 9/11 increasingly featured racist views and logics (e.g. the reductionist and uncritical coupling of Islam with the views of Al-Qaeda) and have consequently increasingly marginalised and excluded people of colour from social participation (e.g. Muller Myrdahl, 2010; Tajik,

2004)[37]. In this sense, when the term *Islam* is found to be used instead of *religion* in relation to *cultural diversity*, in this thesis's researched Norwegian context, such usage might be read as a political discursive activity that through the explicit mentioning of the term *Islam* works not only to maintain Muslim religious identity objectified as a public affair, but also to "activate" connotations of *cultural diversity* being associated with non-Norwegianness and non-Whiteness, and hence a term bearing a negative meaning. This non-Norwegianness and non-Whiteness understanding of *cultural diversity* may be argued to be even further enforced when related to how researchers' from the Norwegian context argue that Whiteness is the very precondition for what it means to be Norwegian (Døving, 2013; Hoel, 2014) and that racism in the Norwegian context is often generally an issue of racism against Muslims (e.g. Bangstad, 2014; Dowling, 2017; Eriksen, 2011; Eriksen &Naumann, 2011; Guðjónsdóttir, 2014; Muller Myrdahl , 2014; Mårtensson, 2014). Such forms of racism are, in the European context, often referred to as a *muslimification of racism* (Essed & Trienekens, 2008; Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; Vassenden & Andersson, 2011). Thus, the usage of the term *Islam* and not *religion* in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian context when related to this thesis's theoretical conceptualisation of discourse, suggests that *cultural diversity*, when related to the term *Islam,* might be understood as representing the Norwegian social imaginary's myth of an ultimately constructed enemy (Mouffe, 1993). However, as I have touched upon in Article 2 and as I will point to later, this enemy (*Islam/Muslim*) might most likely nonetheless not be seen as the main threat to the Norwegian imagined sameness ideology.

Interestingly also is how whilst in the international context, *cultural diversity* is related to the dual term ability/disability (e.g. Michael-Luna & Marri, 2011), it is in the Norwegian context related to the terms *resource* and *competence* (Articles 2 and 4) as well as to *special education* (Article 3) and to *difficulties, dyscalculia* and *dyslectic children's' development* (Article 4). These usages of terms might (in both the international and Norwegian contexts) be understood as a double-patterned usage of terms applied by knowledge-promoting actors and might be seen as reflecting discursive patterns of both possibility and positivity (e.g. represented by the terms *ability*, *resource*, *competence*), as well as impossibility and negativity (e.g. represented by the terms *disability*, *difficulties, dyscalculia, dyslectic children's' development*). Such double meaning making representational patterns of *cultural diversity* are also found in the analysis of the meaning making of *cultural diversity* in both the policy and curriculum documents through representations of the multicultural pupil group's two sub-pupil groups: *the multilinguistic pupil group* and the *linguistic minority pupil group,* and in the teacher educator interview transcripts (Article 3), where *cultural diversity* was explicitly represented as positive, desirable, and important as well as more implicitly as racially Other. Together, these double meaning making patterns of *cultural diversity* mirror the discursive logics also found in research from the Norwegian context on how teachers, for example, promote general views of equal treatment (e.g. when White Norwegian students

---

[37] Interestingly, these same racist logics are echoed in Anders Behring Breivik's "manifesto" produced prior to (and possibly motivating) his terrorist actions (Muller Myrdahl, 2014).

might also have learning difficulties), whilst simultaneously highlighting that it is, for example, "the African student" that is *the problem* (Dowling, 2017, p. 261).

Furthermore, in this PhD thesis's researched Norwegian context, the usage of the term *values* in relation to *cultural diversity* in the teacher educator interview transcripts (Article 4) is also of note when related to the emphasis put on values within the Nordic Model as well as in this thesis's analysed Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents. The Nordic Model's values imply the promotion of social justice, equity, equal opportunities, inclusion, nation-building and democratic participation (Imsen et al., 2017; Telhaug et al., 2006). These values are also promoted in the Norwegian Educational Law through its focus on compassion, democracy, equality, a critical and scientific way of thinking, as well as the deterring of all forms of discrimination (Lovdata, 2013). In the Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents, values, or more precisely, a clear *value-foundation*, is represented both as *foundational ways of thinking, values that unite us as a society* (Ministry of Education and Research, 2009, p. 11) and something that is fundamentally *good* with respect to both *diversity* and *difference*. Paradoxically, it is also represented as the means through which the student teachers can manage the task of assimilating that considered as cultural difference into something assumingly desirable within the Norwegian context (e.g. *positive resources* or *constructive cultural meetings in the classroom,* see Article 2, pp. 19–20). Thus, these double descriptions of this value-foundation may be understood as a cultural form of racism (Gullestad, 2004) manifested in an explicit rhetoric of positivity related to *cultural diversity* work as a polished surface conflating and hiding subtle discursive features of oppression (Bonilla-Silva, 2014; Schulz & Fane, 2015).

Whilst in the international research articles, the term *social justice* is used in relation to *cultural diversity* (and is generally mentioned as a central value of the Nordic Model), the terms *integration* and *inclusion/inclusive* are the terms used in the Norwegian context (Articles 3 and 4). The usage of the terms *integration* and *inclusion/inclusive* rather than *social justice* is interesting when understanding that the Norwegian self-image prides itself on egalitarianism, and as already being quite socially just (cf. the Nordic Model), but nonetheless how, in practice, these terms (*integration* and *inclusion/inclusive*) carry no difference in meaning to the term *assimilation*, at least not in terms of practical implications (Gullestad, 2002). Importantly, *integration* and *inclusion/inclusive* are terms that, in line with *assimilation,* always point to a process that is in the hands of the Other and not in the hands of Ours. Meaning that it is the assumed racialised Other that is expected to do the integrative work, to become like Us, hence implying that We need not change. These ideas are even further promoted when related to the policy and curriculum documents' representations of the student teacher role – as a political actor of assimilation. Related to the CWS perspective that focuses the researcher's gaze on the pedagogy of the oppressor (Allen, 2004), a relevant question to highlight is what *cultural* diversity (defined as a racialised Other) is assumed to be integrated/assimilated? In Article 2, I suggest that this process might not necessarily be

> about *acquiring* the ideal of *imagined sameness* … but about the processes of *acquiring* that allows the nationalistic and colourblind imagined sameness ideology to thrive and survive as it works to ensure the hegemonic status quo of the White Norwegian racial group. As such, assimilation, in the way this term

is used as an analytical concept in this article, refers to a form of assimilative discursive racial stratification. (p. 19)

In other words, the term *integration* and *inclusion/inclusive*, conditioned on knowledge about how these terms connote similar meanings to the term *assimilation,* may refer to a form of assimilative discursive racial stratification.

In this chapter, a final remark must be made in with respect to the terms *pizza, music* and *dance* being used in relation to *cultural diversity* in the Norwegian context (Article 4). These terms are interesting because they point to central ideas of the benevolent forms of multicultural education that highlight superficial "cultural exchange" activities such as "Heroes and Holidays", "Taco Tuesdays" and other festivities that celebrate various "cultures". These forms of multicultural education have been heavily criticised (e.g. Gorsky, 2006, 2008; Nieto, 2006) because, despite being filled with good intensions (Gorsky, 2008), result in exotification and fail to recognise what the founding mothers and fathers of multicultural education originally argued for. Namely, the equal opportunity for all students to learn in school (Banks, 2004; Grant & Sleeter, 1998; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 1996). Patterns of exotification are furthermore also exemplified in Article 3 through how teaching about *cultural diversity* is generally represented as being preconditioned by the physical and visible presence of the racially different Other – in "live" bodily forms of students from different countries and other nations or in the forms of "dead" material object such as "photos of different pupils, [through] where you see that they have a different background" (Article 3, p. 25).

Taken together, the above outlined patterns of terms used and their oftentimes related and overlapping connotations across all articles in both the international and the Norwegian contexts are interesting, not only because they exemplify how terms used by knowledge-producing institutions are reconceptualised (Bernstein, 2000) and sometimes transformed (e.g. *diversity* and *plurality*[38]) and as such have the potential to travel through ideology, curricula and practice (Goodlad, 1969; Afdal & Nerland, 2014). They are interesting because they work to exemplify how even initial usage of terms – their constellations – might work in similar ways as more "established" discursive patterns of meaning making to constitute ideas of *cultural diversity* as a racialised Other (cf. Said, 2003). In all the interrogated discursive domains of teacher education examined in this thesis, *cultural diversity* is assumed to be about the racialised non-Norwegian, non-White Other. Whilst critical researchers of race (e.g. Dyer, 1993; Goldberg, 2009) argue that the descriptive statements about Others delimit the way We perceive them, and hence, the way We treat them, I argue that such structuring delimitations do not necessarily have to involve full descriptions, or easily understandable meaning making statements: They are constituted already at the discursive micro level – through terms and their subtle, yet systematic usage – by their initial discursively-formed constellations. Thus, terms and their initial discursive usage and constellation(s) confirm and

---

[38] Based on the principle of how terms have the potential to be reconceptualised (Bernstein, 2000; Fairclough, 2013), transformed and how they work through curriculum and practice (Afdal & Nerland, 2014), the term *plurality*, used in the teacher education interview transcripts (Article 4), might be seen as a transformation of the term *diversity* that is used in the policy and curriculum documents.

enforce their further discursive meaning making. To recognise the importance of the usage and meaning making of terms are both relevant and important because of how We know that teachers' dispositions are fundamentally about meaning making related to feelings that affect pedagogical behaviour (e.g. Eberly et al., 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011). in ways that ultimately effect both social (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010) and hence racial justice

However, in this thesis, I have not only analysed terms and their usage, I have also analysed their discursively-produced meaning making patterns of representations. This usage of terms and their patterns, I claim, points to how *cultural diversity* is part of racialised binary oppositional discourses across this thesis's four articles. I discuss these findings in the next section.

7.1.3 *Cultural diversity* used as part of binary oppositional discourses

As argued in the theory chapter, the racialised binary oppositional discourse – in other words, the binary oppositional discourse of Whiteness – is not established around something superior (e.g. a term, sets of terms, or ways of representations) (MacLure, 2003). It is, as Said (2003) has extensively exemplified, established around discursive representations of an assumingly inferior Other – a discursive object constituted through extensive practices of naming, defining and hence, dominating this object of Otherness that in effect simultaneously construct Us (Frankenberg, 1993). Based on this PhD project's findings, including the preceding discussion section about what ideas the usage of terms related to *cultural diversity* across the four articles might bring to light in the Norwegian context, this thesis argues that the discursive ideology of White supremacy works to construct a hierarchy of meaning and thereby also performs a form of epistemic violence (Fanon, 1963; Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2004; MacLure, 2003).

In this thesis, *cultural diversity* was found to be part of racialised binary oppositional discourses across all articles. For example, in the first interrogated discursive domain of international research articles, the binary oppositional discourses involving *cultural diversity* not only marked the boundaries for what this term was, but they, just as much, marked the boundaries for what *cultural diversity* was not (e.g. *monolingual, European American, hegemonic mainstream, privileged, normal and relatively homogenous ethnic background, higher socioeconomic status, predominantly White, dominant majority, mainstream*). Related to critical perspectives on race, racism and Whiteness, these boundaries thus produced a dichotomous discourse of detriment and privilege (Goldberg, 2009), between representations of *cultural diversity* that assumes it to be a racialised Other, and student(s) and teacher student(s) (Article 1, p. 31).

In Articles 3 and 4, these same binary oppositional discourses were found through similar lines of discursive logics as those of Article 1. Herein, *cultural diversity* was constructed as a racialised Other that rested against an assumed, invisibly present, normal and ordinary Us. More specifically, in Article 3, *cultural diversity* was found to be part of racialised binary oppositional discourses that represented *cultural diversity* as Other through the notion of it being (a) "less developed", (b) visible bodily, and, (c) knowledgeless (minority parents) and

therefore assumed to be cognitively less capable of comprehending "certain things" (e.g. to what their assumed literacy hindrance means to their children's initial reading and writing stage (Article 3, p. 27). These representations of *cultural diversity* rested on assumptions of Us as (a) "developed", (b) bodily invisible, and (c) knowledgeable (student teachers). In Article 4, despite that We did not mentioning race (as We do not draw on critical theories of Whiteness in this article), I argue that these same racialised binary oppositions are present and exemplified through the seven DPOs that represent *cultural diversity* in relation to pupils and parents who are assumed to be different from the normal and ordinary teacher educators themselves (1) culturally, (2) socially, (3) linguistically, (4) cognitively, (4) migrationally, (5) visibly and (6) religiously. Importantly, from a critical Whiteness theoretical perspective, when racialised discursive features of Othering are present yet not named, such (e.g. Our) a discursive "silence" becomes the very discursive means through which Whiteness habitually lives and thrives. Thus, Our non-mentioning of race and Whiteness in this article may thus be understood discursively as constituting and (re)centring the workings of Whiteness as a "silent" and "invisible" norm. As such, when not mentioned, race may be argued to contribute towards establishing what Matias, Montoya and Nishi (2016) refer to as the "Lord Voldemort" (p. 6) of teacher education – a kind of power/knowledge phenomenon that gains power by being spoken of. Consequently, such silencing discourses, because they are *not* simply practices that produce a kind of difference in the loyal friendship between a You and a Me at the interpersonal micro level (cf. the logic of Mead's (1934) theory of symbolic interactionism), but discursive patterns of Othering related to the larger social macro structures work to centre and reproduce Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy. In other words, and a argued in Article 1, when the discourse of racialised Othering (of Whiteness) passes by unnamed (yet not unnoticed) in teacher educator research articles, this implies that the systemic nature of Whiteness as dysconscious everyday racism is denied (Essed & Trienekens, 2008).

In Article 2, at least three binary oppositional discourses related to *cultural diversity* were found. Interestingly, these discourses were identified as quite different to those detected in the other discursive domains (Articles 2, 3 and 4) in that they constructed a hierarchy between an Us and the Others and between representations of more and less desirable groups of Others. The first two might be argued to be found in the boundaries drawn between, firstly, the Norwegian **and** the Sami and the multicultural, and, secondly, between the Norwegian and the Sami **and** the multicultural pupil group categories. Within these binary oppositional discourses, the Norwegian pupil group was represented as superior compared to the Sami pupil group category, and the Norwegian and Sami pupil groups were represented as superior compared to the multicultural pupil group category. As I argue in Article 2, these hierarchical categorisations are exemplified both by the terms to which they are related (see Table 3 in Article 2, p. 16) as well as representations of them as more or less Norwegian, cognitively able or challenged, invisible, yet present as abstractions, or visibly present as bodies, and as entitled or restricted in relation to the ownership, use and enjoyment of *property* (Harris, 1993; see Article 2, p. 17). The third binary oppositional discourse detected in this article was one that constructs a dichotomy between the multicultural pupil group category's two sub-groups, whereby the multilinguistic pupil group was represented as a resource contributor to

the school and the linguistic minority pupil group was represented as a user of the school's resources. Thus, in Article 2, the racialised binary oppositional discourses related to *cultural diversity* generally reflect a racial hierarchy where the Norwegian pupil group is placed on top, the Sami pupil group in the middle, and the multicultural resource contributor (the multilinguistic pupil group) was placed just below the middle, with the resource user being placed at the bottom of *the society's well* (cf. Bell, 1992).

Thus, this PhD thesis has, through its interrogated usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* across the three discursive domains of teacher education, empirically detected how *cultural diversity*, a part of binary racialised oppositional discourses, generally creates a discursive patterned representation that places the assumingly normal, ordinary and invisible White racial group as superior to the visible, unordinary and different Other. In the Norwegian context, these racialised binary oppositional discourses may be seen in relation to research from this context that points to Norway as a racialised context where groups of immigrants[39] are perceived as more or less desirable for Norwegian society (Guðjónsdóttir & Loftsdóttir, 2017; van Riemsdijk, 2010). For example, in Article 2, the representation of the multicultural pupil group's two sub-pupil group categories may be seen as representing something that is more (the resource contributor) or less (the resource user) desirable for Norwegian society.

A general and overall feature of the racialised binary oppositional discourses found across all discursive domains of this PhD thesis's interrogated discursive domains rests, similarly to the working of Orientalism (Said, 2003), on subtle discursive patterns that assume the presence of a White, normal and ordinary Us (Frankenberg, 1993). As Goldberg (1993, 2009) argues, representations of difference through degrading and exclusionary patterns are central to racist/racialised discourses. As such, this is one way that Whiteness generally works as a discursive ideology of White supremacy through the usage and meaning making of one term: *cultural diversity*.

7.2 The workings of Whiteness across the three discursive domains

In this PhD thesis, the patterned usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* across the articles has been found to be surprisingly similar. Even though the terms used in relation to *cultural diversity* somewhat differ, their connotations nonetheless generally point in the same direction: They subtly promote ideas of how *cultural diversity* is assumed an identity as a

---

[39] Importantly, Statistics Norway's definition of immigrants has been criticised in the Norwegian context for including second-generation immigrants in their definitions, and for promoting the subtle view that family and descent are more important than citizenship in order to be considered as Norwegian (Gullestad, 2002). Being defined as an immigrant thus involves exclusion in relation to Norwegianness. When revisiting Statistics Norway, the 2013 update defines immigrants according to the following six categories: (a) born in Norway with two Norwegian-born parents, (b) immigrants, (c) Norwegian-born with immigrant parents, (d) born outside Norway (: utenlandsfødte) with one parent born in Norway, (e) born in Norway with one parent born outside of Norway (: utenlandsfødt), and (f) born outside Norway (: utenlandsfødte) with two Norwegian-born parents, including adoptees. Those groups of Norwegian citizens that do not identify with any of the above listed categories are referred to as "the other population" (Statistics Norway, 2013). Here, Statistics Norway includes third-generation immigrants (category (a) born in Norway with two Norwegian-born parents) into their updated definition, thus further stressing the importance of family and descent as central features of Norwegianness.

racialised Other. Moreover, the usage of terms and their constellations and thus the assumed identity of *cultural diversity* as a racialised Other are also all part of racialised binary oppositional discourses (Said, 2003). Thus, Whiteness has been found in this PhD thesis to work in quite similar ways in all three discursive domains of teacher education that were researched (international research articles, Norwegian national policy and curriculum documents, and Norwegian teacher educators' reflections on teaching practice).

The findings of the similar discursive patterns for the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* across all articles is interesting and important in that they point to how discursive patterns on *cultural diversity*, initiated and produced in an international context (Article 1), might possibly affect the discursive patterns produced locally (Articles 2–4) in the Norwegian context. Seen from the theoretical perspectives of CWS, these findings confirm and make possible the understanding of the workings of Whiteness as a global discourse (Leonardo, 2004). In other words, the discursive ideology of White supremacy, similarly to policy, seem to have the feature of being "glocal", in that it is never just local but always also global (Rizvi & Lindgaard, 2010). As such, this PhD thesis can be seen as a response to the critique pointing to the impossibility of studying a US-initiated concept, Whiteness, in other "unique" contexts such as that of Norwegians. Importantly, despite the existence of a doxic belief that Norway (including the wider Nordic context) is exceptional to the complicity of imperialism and colonialism, a growing body of critical research actually points to how Norway, perhaps to a larger extent than what has recently been believed, participated in imperialism and colonialism, not only on Norwegian soil, but also world-wide (e.g. Eidsvik, 2012).

I would nonetheless stress that whether a unique Norwegian Whiteness exists is a question that requires a twofold answer. Based on the empirical findings of this study, I believe that the discursive domains studied have exemplified how the minimal discursive logics through which Whiteness works are similar in all Western contexts (at least in discursive contexts that apply the English or Norwegian languages). Here, Whiteness works by producing discursive objects of racial Otherness (cf. Said, 2003). However, I do agree with critics who argue that each national context is different. This difference, I argue, lies mainly in these contexts' promoted social imaginaries (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) and in the ways that their related mythologies (Barthes, 1959) work to promote and constitute a specific ideologically based imaginary community (cf. Anderson, 1983; Gullestad, 2002). Internationally, Whiteness discursively works to promote and constitute an overall White European identity (cf. Goldberg, 2006); nationally, it works to promote and constitute a White Norwegian identity.

As I highlight in Article 2, in Norway, the colourblind nationalistic mythologies might be described as how Whiteness works as a discursive ideology of White supremacy to support *Herrenvolk* ideas, promoted *not* through ideas of superiority that justify the historical pedagogy of amnesia related to complicity with colonialism and imperialism, which might be how these ideas work in nations where the colonial and imperial history is not denied. Rather, the Norwegian *Herrenvolk* ideas work by promoting a historical pedagogy of amnesia that supports the doxic myths of Norwegians being part of Nordic Exceptionalism, the Nordic Model and with a self-image imagined as egalitarian, particularly good and as a people who

both represent and support solidarity. Promoting Norwegian society in this way represents an ideal image of Whiteness that nonetheless places Norwegians (understood as "ethnic" White Norwegians) at the European racial hierarchical apex (Dyer, 1997; Eriksen & Neumann, 2011; van Riemsdijk, 2010). However, the realities of history reveal Norwegian complicity with global imperialism and colonialism (Mulinari et al., 2016; Vuorela, 2016) as well Our historical dominance and violence against Our minority populations. In these ways, the workings of Whiteness are no different to those of other Western countries.

Together, the findings of the articles point to how Whiteness works in subtle ways to discursively promote an ideology of White supremacy. However, as argued in the theory chapter, this PhD project is not only concerned with the discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*, but moreover, with the issue of how behind this usage and meaning making are political knowledge-promoting actors (Blair, 2004) of teacher education (e.g. researchers, policy makers and teacher educators), who, regardless of their dysconsciousness (King, 2004), invest in terms (Leonardo, 2004; Vaught, 2012) and hence in Whiteness. Therefore, in concluding, I will not only point to this PhD thesis's contributions, but also to possible implications of this thesis for these political knowledge-promoting actors, before I provide some reflections on this, some possible points of weakness and possible future research projects.

8. Concluding remarks

This thesis aimed to interrogate the workings of Whiteness in teacher education discourses through the usage and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*. The main research question that has guided the thesis was: *How does Whiteness work through the term cultural diversity in teacher education discourses?* The findings in the articles and the discussion in the previous chapter have contributed to new and increased understandings of how subtle institutionalised forms of racism(s) continue to persist in the form of "invisible" discursive patterns of Whiteness. It has also pointed to how these minimal patterns, similar to how the Geean (2011) **D**iscourse works within the **d**iscourse, might be related to broader patterns of ideology, both internationally and nationally (in Norway). Thus, in this thesis, I have paid particular attention to how the assumingly unimportant everyday micro usage and meaning making of assumingly "innocent" terms, such as *cultural diversity*, might work to sustain broader overall discursive ideologies of White supremacy. I have also attempted to theorise the importance of interrogating Whiteness as a legacy of colonialism and imperialism, in the Norwegian context. In this final chapter, I offer some concluding remarks related to the main empirical, theoretical and methodological contributions of this thesis. I also address some possible implications of the findings with respect to social and racial justice for international researchers, policy makers, teacher educators and student teachers. Lastly, I reflect on some of the limitations of the study and point to possible directions for future research on Whiteness for teacher education, and beyond.

8.1 Contributions of the thesis

In these following sections, I summarise the main contributions of this thesis.

8.1.1. Empirical contributions

Empirically, through Articles 1–4, this thesis has contributed knowledge about how Whiteness works through the usage and meaning making of one single term, *cultural diversity,* across three discursive domains of teacher education, both in international contexts and the national context of Norway. Moreover, the usage and meaning making of terms, such as *cultural diversity*, has only been investigated to a limited extent in previous research in these contexts, and specifically within the field of teacher education. The empirical findings of how *cultural diversity* is not defined but related to sets of other undefined terms, and how these terms all point towards a similar discursive object, namely a racialised Other (Said, 2003), are interesting, because it points to how the minimal workings of Whiteness are not necessarily contextually unique; rather, they seem to operate through similar discursive logics. Thus, these empirical findings might provide a response to the questions regarding the possibility of researching Whiteness within different and assumed unique contexts, and particularly within the context of Norway. Another interesting finding is the contradiction in how the political knowledge-promoting actors of teacher education (e.g. researchers, policy makers, teacher educators) seem to believe they promote discourses of knowledge that contribute to social/racial justice, when their discursive productions related to *cultural diversity* subtly produce the opposite effect: patterned discourses of Othering and exclusion. In this way, this PhD thesis has revealed how hegemonic discourses bring to the surface the

ideal ways in which Whiteness works and, thus, how it blinds its actors to its workings due to its normal, natural and commonsense features. Moreover, although the term *race* is being treated as taboo, implying that its workings are not recognised in the Norwegian context, this thesis has pointed to how its "invisible" workings are omnipresent and part of Our everyday, habitual, normal, ordinary, commonsense and commonplace discourses about *cultural diversity* in teacher education.

8.1.2 Theoretical contributions
Theoretically, by merging perspectives on discourse with critical perspectives that conceptualise Whiteness, this thesis has contributed theoretical concepts and methodological tools (cf. Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) that can be used to analyse the discursive workings of Whiteness at the micro level. More specifically, this thesis bridges epistemological and ontological micro perspectives on discursive meaning making, in other words, the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) theorisation of discursive formation and its theoretical definitions of discourses with critical theoretical perspectives on Whiteness. In doing so, it provides the international research community with new theoretical insights into how Whiteness works to "blind" those complicit in it through forms of subtle institutionalised racism in everyday teacher education discourses. Moreover, the thesis has contributed theoretical insights that allow for understanding how these minimal, yet omnipresent forms of racism continue to thrive in "invisible" discursive patterns, produced in domains and by political knowledge-promoting actors of teacher education that generally position themselves as promoters of social justice.

For the Norwegian research context, this thesis has provided the field of teacher education with theoretical tools and a conceptualisation of Whiteness as a legacy of Norway's imperial and colonial past, through which race and racism are central. In doing so, it contributes to revealing how Our self-image as supreme to Others, particularly with respect to egalitarianism, imperialism and colonialism – and hence to *race* and *racism* – is also a doxic lie.

8.1.3 Methodological contributions
Methodologically, this PhD thesis translates the Laclau and Mouffean (2001) discourse theoretical tools (see section 4.1.1 of this thesis) into a three-step reading strategy, bridging these understandings with theoretical analytical perspectives from critical research on Whiteness. Thus, it offers international and national researchers conceptual and strategic tools to analyse the usage and meaning making of terms such as *cultural diversity* at the discursive micro level. Consequently, this thesis demonstrates that it is important to perform such a discursive micro analysis because it enables the detection of subtle points of the discursive objects that would otherwise easily be overlooked (Goldberg, 2006) and, for example, taken as mainstream political discursive routines (Gillborn, 2005).

8.2 Possible implications for teacher education
Research on cultural diversity in teacher education points to how teachers' dispositions are fundamentally about meaning making related to feelings that affect pedagogical behaviour

(e.g. Eberly et al., 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that ultimately effect social (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010) and hence racial justice. Given that aim of teacher education is to counter injustice (e.g. to promote compassion, democracy, equality and a critical and scientific way of thinking, and to deter all forms of discrimination [Lovdata, 2013]). The role of political knowledge-promoting actors in teacher education is to support this overall goal. Thus, political knowledge-promoting actors in teacher education would benefit from making central key aspects central to their work. These aspects I discuss in the next section.

8.2.1 Possible implications for teacher education researchers
The workings of Whiteness through the analysis of the discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in international research on cultural diversity in teacher education have provided knowledge about how international teacher education researchers, despite attempting to promote social and racial justice, promote subtle discursive ideologies of White supremacy where *cultural diversity* is represented as a racialised Otherness. Importantly, this discursive production is most likely not the intention of teacher education researchers. Rather, it is the result of their non-definitions, yet assumptions, about what *cultural diversity* is assumed to refer to.

Even though central teacher education researchers already point to how in teacher education research *cultural diversity* is generally found to assume being about students who are racially and culturally different from researchers themselves (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015), this thesis' findings point to how teacher education researchers might be unaware of the extent to which the research they contribute to, and that claims to promote social justice, does not define this central term (see Article 1) and, moreover, how such undefined usage contributes in maintaining and (re)promoting patterned discourses that have the opposite effect of what they claim to promote. Thus, researchers on cultural diversity in teacher education, (implicitly) investigated in this thesis, might thus, also not know how their work possibly partakes in the production of an overall discursive ideology of White supremacy.

Based on the findings of this study, and with regards to its possible implications for teacher education research with respect to social and racial justice, it can be argued that researchers could become more aware of how non-reflexivity with respect to writing, might actually contribute to the very things they believe themselves to be countering. This is particularly true in regard to the way these researchers continue not to define central terms used in relation to their ubiquity of study; they simply assume that the central terms mean something. Thus, teacher education researchers might benefit from a greater recognition that We – also Us Whites – are *all* racially positioned, and that this affects the way We see and act on the world (cf. Scheurich, 1993; McVee, 2014). Moreover, researchers might also benefit from more deeply recognising how research is a political activity (Blair, 2004) and that their dysconscious choice of one term over another invests them with moral and political allegiances (MacLure, 2003) and, thereby, with a possible dysconscious allegiance to Whiteness.

Teacher education researchers aiming to promote social and racial justice could also be supported by becoming familiar with the theoretical insights and conceptual tools that allow them to make explicit their own racialised discursive positionality in ways that, in turn, allow them to critically reflect upon and analyse how their own research possibly produces racialised "objects", such as the ones detected in this thesis. Such self-reflexive knowledge is important for researchers if they are to discursively counter their own (and others') implicitly adopted (dis)positions (McVee, 2014) that dysconsciously contribute to the racial status quo in which, in general, the White group's social and economic position is hegemonic (Ansley, 1992).

8.2.2 Possible implications for teacher education policy makers
The findings of the workings of Whiteness through the analysis of the discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in the policy and curriculum documents have provided knowledge about how teacher education policy makers might, in line with international teacher education research, dysconsciously promote subtle ideas of *cultural diversity* as a racialised Otherness. More specifically, this thesis has pointed to how *cultural diversity* often is tied to discursive patterns that categorise pupil groups hierarchically and to a student teacher role that is understood as a political actor of assimilation (e.g. Article 2). Importantly, similar to researchers of teacher education, the discursive productions of teacher education policy makers probably do not reflect the political discursive outcomes that these policy makers initially intended to produce. After all, Norwegian teacher education, with its teacher education policy tied to the Norwegian Education Act, aims to promote compassion, democracy, equality and a critical and scientific way of thinking, and to deter all forms of discrimination (Lovdata, 2013).

Given that the aim of Norwegian teacher education is to promote compassion, democracy, equality, a critical and scientific way of thinking, and to deter all forms of discrimination (Lovdata, 2013), the study's findings can be used to argue that future teacher education policy makers could benefit from (in addition to the possible implications that have been suggested for teacher education researchers) becoming aware of how teacher education policy and curriculum documents authorise certain sets of values (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Due to their hegemony, these values are taken for granted as normality and common sense; however, like ideological discourses, they affect people's behaviour (e.g. teacher educators and students' pedagogical) behaviour (Gulson & Webb, 2012) – and not always in ways that are oriented towards social and racial justice. In other words, policy makers could benefit from more deeply understanding how power/knowledge works through their produced teacher education policy and curriculum documents (Brown & De Lissovoy, 2011; Foucault, 1989). As this thesis notes, teacher education policy makers could benefit from knowledge about how policies might assist in countering contemporary workings of the *historical pedagogy of amnesia* (Leonardo, 2002). For example, teacher education policy makers could consider how future teacher education policy and curriculum documents could include critical historical perspectives that could possibly disrupt Our current deliberate "forgetting" and "remembering" of Our complicity with imperialism and colonialism. Related to this thesis' deconstructionist perspective, it is important that policy makers (re)direct their focus on how

to provide future teacher educators and their student teachers with the capacity to link such *historical pedagogy of amnesia* with, in the Norwegian context, the national Norwegian self-image and its doxic *imagined sameness* ideology in ways that enable them to understand how these ideologies currently work through discourses (e.g. through double meaning making patterns of *cultural diversity*) that forge a "polished" national self-image whilst, simultaneously, hide how Our "dirty" and violent colonial and imperial past. And, moreover, how these ideologies continue to discursively work in the present (cf. Article 2). In this way, teacher education policy makers would (re)direct the focus on what Frankenberg (1993) refers to as the very site of dominance – what Allen (2004) refers to as at the pedagogy of the oppressor.

8.2.3 Possible implications for teacher educators and student teachers

The workings of Whiteness through the analysis of the discursive usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* in the discursive production of teacher educators have provided knowledge about how teacher educators promote a double meaning making pattern of *cultural diversity*. This pattern explicitly promotes *cultural diversity* as something positive, important and desirable for teacher education. Yet, it also assumes that *cultural diversity* is about a racialised Other, represented through more subtly discursive patterns that represent it as negative and challenging, cognitively less developed and as knowledgless (in comparison to an assumed Us). This double meaning making of the term is promoted through subtler discursive patterns. Importantly, the meaning making of *cultural diversity*, which explicitly promotes it as something positive, important and desirable for teacher education, is argued to mirror the "ideal" Whiteness (e.g. the ways in which *cultural diversity* ought to be represented [Article, 3]), that, similar to the Norwegian self-image and *imagined sameness* ideology, work to shield the more non-ideal subtle ways that *cultural diversity* represented.

Based on the findings of the double meaning making patterns of *cultural diversity* in teacher educators' discursive production, and with respect to possible implications for future teacher educators, it might be argued that teacher educators who desire to promote *cultural diversity* as something positive, important and desirable for teacher education would benefit from frequently and systematically investigating the ways that their own dispositions are fundamentally about discursive meaning making. Doing so would enable them to understand how this affects their pedagogical behaviour (e.g. Eberly et al., 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that ultimately effect social (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010) and racial justice. Similar to international researchers, teacher educators might also benefit from a greater recognition about how We are *all* racially positioned, and how this positionality affects the way We see and act in the world (cf. Scheurich, 1993; McVee, 2014). More specifically, teacher educators who want to promote *cultural diversity* as something positive, important and desirable for teacher education could benefit from more deeply recognising how racial positionality impacts the explicit and implicit pedagogy We promote.

Moreover, similar to researchers, teacher educators might also benefit from acquiring theoretical and conceptual tools that allow them to recognise how they are political actors. Importantly, teacher educators, despite expected to enact certain teacher education policies

(that, at least in the Norwegian context is nationally framed), including sets of taken for granted "good" and "well-meaning" values (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) – that not always are social and racial justice oriented, or have such outcomes – could rather take on a counterhegemonic social and racial justice, anti-Whiteness endeavour. To realise such and endeavour, teacher educators could benefit from theoretically based insights related to how power/knowledge subtly works through their social and racially embedded dysconscious positionality (e.g. as members of the racial White majority, holders of positions within national state institutions and considered, by student teachers and others, to be pedagogical "experts" [Article 4]). Thus, teacher educators could come to understand how they might actually have an impact on student teachers' knowledge and dispositions, and their future in-class pedagogy. It is important for teacher educators to bestow such self-reflexive knowledge because what student teachers learn in a teacher education programme might manifest though their dysconscious everyday pedagogy of subtle racism – detectable through micro nuances in modes of speaking to and about what they possibly believe to be *cultural diversity's* manifested "phenomenon" (e.g. racialised pupil group categories). That teacher educators bestow knowledge of such "invisible" forms racism is important with respect to social and racial justice, because it inflict upon its victim a form of epistemic violence (Fanon, 1963; Frankenberg, 1993; Leonardo, 2004; MacLure, 2003).

In order to actually promote *cultural diversity* as something positive, important and desirable for teacher education, teacher educators of social and racial justice could also benefit from acquiring discursive conceptual tools and analytical strategies (similar to those offered herein). This (together with the knowledge suggested above), would allow them to emotionally distance themselves (hooks, 2013) in ways that enable them to critically question how they and others collectively invest in terms, and thus, in the dysconsciously production of discourses that are featured with tacitly-embedded domination of the deemed Other (Frankenberg, 1993; Said, 2003).

8.3 Possible shortcomings of thesis and possible future projects

Approaching the end of this PhD thesis, in this final section I will provide some self-critical reflections regarding the strengths and weaknesses of this project. In order to further develop a specific area of research, it is necessary to review the choices that have and have not been made and, thereby, also the directions that have and have not been taken (Mausethagen, 2013).

Firstly, this thesis' study of the term *cultural diversity* was initiated at a time when it appeared that this term was gradually being replaced by the term *diversity* in both the international and Norwegian contexts. Had I started this project now, I could, perhaps have re-evaluated whether it would be more fruitful (with respect to the theoretical and empirical aspects) to analyse the usage and meaning making of the term *diversity* instead of *cultural diversity*. However, given the central argument of the importance of studying the workings of Whiteness (the current workings of race and racism), I believe that studying the usage and meaning making of the discursive term *cultural diversity,* rather than *diversity* only, led me to actors' ideas related to culturality and racial Otherness. Had this thesis investigated the term

diversity, I suspect that what would have been included and perhaps dominated the political knowledge-promoting actors of teacher education's usage and meaning making of this term would probably to a much greater extent have been related to representations of individuals' "unique" differences, ability/disability issues, and issues related to LGBTQI. Most likely, it would not have been related to representation of racialised Otherness, and hence to the workings of Whiteness – of race and racism – found through this thesis' investigation.

Secondly, the interrogation of the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* across the three different discursive knowledge-promoting domains of teacher education could have been supplemented with additional domains, such as the discourses produced by student teachers and those found in teaching materials. Moreover, the study, could have be triangulated beyond the triangulation of theoretical perspectives (the CWS perspective and discourse theoretical perspectives) that were used herein. It could also have produced comparative studies (e.g. articles that compare policy discourses with those produced by teacher educators) and triangulated methodologies of textual discursive analysis with discourse analytical inspired analyses of practice (e.g. observations of teaching). Perhaps, such approaches could more comprehensively inform the field about how the discursive ideology of White supremacy works. Although triangulated research already exists, very little current research has applied the methods used in this PhD thesis to investigate different domains of teacher education. However, as suggested in Article 3, observation of teaching practices might be an interesting future research project. Recording and transcribing language use from teaching sessions *in situ* (as a main source of gathering observational textual data for discourse analysis) would be an interesting way to interrogate everyday habitual and dysconsciously produced discourses of power/knowledge (and possibly of Whiteness) from within the classroom. Moreover, interviews that critically challenge and intervene with the participants' viewpoints, as well as analyses of interviews where the participants are included in the process, could be interesting ways of attempting to trigger processes of reflection and change in the political actors that teach future teachers ways to become counterhegemonic political knowledge-promoting actors of social and racial justice.

Thirdly, in the Norwegian context the pronoun, We generally prefer to keep the uncomfortable issues of race and subtler forms of racism hidden and silenced. After all, We like to perceive Ourselves *not* as promoters of *Herrenvolk* ideas, but rather as tolerant lovers of diversity and as believers in social and racial justice (cf. Leonardo, 2004). However, currently initiated debates[40] on decolonisation of the Norwegian academy have possibly put a face on what the mind-set of Whiteness and its *historical pedagogy of amnesia* might look

---

[40] The initial event, Decolonisation of the Academy, by the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), https://www.prio.org/Events/Event/?x=8643. Examples of articles following the PRIO event: Articles demonstrating support of the idea, https://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/debatt/i/Rxwg55/Moderne-vitenskap-utviklet-seg-samtidig-med-slavehandel-og-utnyttelse-Det-er-pa-tide-a-dekolonisere-akademia--Ida-Roland-Birkvad-og-Cindy-Horst, https://khrono.no/saih-avkolonisering-beathe-ogard/ja-til-kunnskap-og-flere-perspektiver-i-norsk-akademia/237482. Articles against the idea, https://www.minervanett.no/avkolonialisering-av-vitenskapen-er-en-elendig-ide/; https://morgenbladet.no/ideer/2018/08/en-unodvendig-debatt; https://www.aftenposten.no/meninger/debatt/i/EoAkmP/-Avkoloniseringsideologien-truer-universitetene--Forskere-ved-Universitetet-i-Oslo.

like (Gullestad, 2002)[41]. Related to this context, this thesis addresses highly relevant contemporary issues with respect to how Whiteness currently works in "invisible" ways through the example of *cultural diversity* in teacher education discourses. As such, this thesis is a valuable contribution for researchers wanting to study related issues in areas of teacher education, and possibly beyond.

In conclusion, my hope for future political knowledge-promoting actors of teacher education is that they – both actors "of colour" as well as those that are racialised as White – continue to focus on directing their critical gaze on the very the site of dominance (the pedagogy of the oppressor) in order to counter the subtle discursive ideological workings of White supremacy. This is important because, as of today, and as this research has pointed out, in current teacher education, despite the good intentioned attempts to promote social justice, the overwhelmingly presence of Whiteness (Sleeter, 2001) still seems to exist. However, since most Whites are likely blinded to the exclusionary workings of Whiteness, which is highly visible to "people of colour" (Matias et al. 2014), there is significant potential for people of colour to assist Us Whites in seeing its workings.

I hope that this thesis has increased awareness of and contributed to new knowledge and insights about the importance of a minimal and assumingly unimportant aspect of Our habitual social communication: the usage and meaning making of assumingly "innocent" terms. Specifically, I hope that, with this thesis, I have shed light on how the historically "forgotten" violent sides of history are "invisibly" present as patterns in current discursive workings of Whiteness, related to current usage and meaning making of central and apparently innocent discursive terms, such as *cultural diversity*. Knowledge about how discourses of the past continue to work in the present (cf. Gee's [2008] **D**iscourse/**d**iscourse conceptualisation) is important because I believe that it is only through disrupting the injustices of the past (Muller Myrdahl, 2014) that We might counter Our continuous legacy of discursive. In doing so, it might be possible to also dismantle the epistemic forms of violence and oppression and direct Our path towards more socially and racially just teacher education.

---

[41] Or, perhaps the decolonisation of the academy have possibly put a face on what hooks (2013) refers to as an "imperialist White [Norwegian] supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (p. 161).

Post scriptum

As mentioned in the Prologue, when telling people what I actually study – that I not only study the usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity* but also the racialised discursive patterns produced through this usage and meaning making –, some people tell me stories from their own everyday lives where they have assumingly encountered cultural diversity. These stories seem to be meant as some kind of confirmation that they understand the issue I study. However, I often do not understand the stories' intended messages and moreover, they (the stories) quite paradoxically appear to me as inherently racist.

Drawing on Scheurich's (2002) understanding of how (White) racism is not primarily individual acts – to him individual acts are only social effects – but the central feature of White ontology and epistemology, to the extent that it legitimises assumptions about how We know the world, the stories told in the prologue are interesting because, even though they are told by individuals, they testify to the omnipresent, colourblind, and racist structures dysconciously present in contemporary White European everyday produced discourses – structures that are well documented in international research.

Drawing on central theoretical perspectives of discourse and critical research on Whiteness, a common function of all stories told in the prologue is how they confirm existing stereotypes and colourblind forms of racism that already circulate in contemporary Norwegian society. These stereotypes not only work in racist discursive ways that define Our notions of difference and Otherness (negro, Black face, Arabs, angry or hyper fertile African women, sexualised African American men, immigrant and hijab-wearing Muslim woman), but also they more implicitly describe the Other through degrading representations of it. For example, the story where (1) the mother of my colleague tells the boy in the kindergarten that he really is a negro; (2) the mother of my colleague wakes up at the hospital and screams out in instinctive fear due to the sight of a Black face (according to my colleague, not due to the Black face but) out of fear of being back on the African continent; (3) the story where my family member talks about how Arabs are not to be trusted and how as kids they questioned the tameness of the first negro in town; (4) the statement that came out of the blue about how African ladies are so angry; (5) my roommate could not take a negro home as that is just not something one does; (6) my colleague that had a relationship with one of those African Americans and how this was not as they say; (7) the story where my acquaintance in the police force poured out his stereotypic view on immigrants; (8) how my friend claimed not to see colour, but still mentioned the hijab; (9) my colleague telling me about the hyperfertility of African women and; (10) the story of how my friend is made suspicious by their own boss, may all be read as representations of Othering and degradation that promote the following systemic patterned ideas of how: (1) the negro lives and thrives in some peoples imagination, here through the representation in the body of a child, defined by its adult kindergarten pedagogue; (2) the African continent must be a bad place to be (particularly when ill) (and how a Black face is scary when it appears as a matter out of place (Douglas, 1966)); (3) the Arabs are generally both aggressive and unpredictable and how the negro must be closer to animal than We Whites because, the negro is not tamed; (4) African ladies are generally

believed to be aggressive; (5) to take a negro home is simply unorthodox; (6) African American men are sexualised; (7) immigrants are not fully civilized; (8) colourblindness and post-racialness is promoted (paradoxically) through the naming of Otherness; (9) African women are potentially breeding machines, ready to be fertilised at any given moment, and; (10) of how those who are deemed as visibly Other, despite their cultural sameness, in certain situations always become the ones to blame (hooks, 2014).

Importantly, these stories, does not only define difference and Otherness. They also plant ideas pointing to notions of distrust. For example, the promoted ideas that point to how neither Arabs nor immigrants are to be trusted (e.g. Arabs might seem nice but they will still stab you when you least expect it and the immigrant, even though he is well integrated and culturally assimilated, might have something in his bag). Moreover, some of these stories plant ideas of the Other through processes of embodiment – representations of the Other though bodily references that invoke ideas of how it is merely driven by instincts and the laws of nature, and not, contrary to Whites, by rationality. Examples of embodiment are present in these stories through how they merely question the tameness of the negro, stress the angriness and hyperfertility of African women and focus on the sexual aspects of a relationship with the African American male. Importantly, all these representations of the Other, in effect, work to produce and sustain an ideology of White superiority.

The inclusion of these stories in this foreword, I believe, might also exemplify the various dysconscious everyday habitual racist (Essed, 1991; King, 2004) forms that Whiteness manifests, and remind Us how often We allow for such racist stories to pass in Our own life in order to allow us to continue Our "business-as-usual" (Delgado & Stefanic, 2000). Importantly, me letting them pass in my own everyday life without necessarily giving any effort to countering them is just another testimonial of my own contribution to maintaining and constituting the workings of Whiteness and hence in sustaining White supremacy. To point to how Our Norwegian everyday society is submerged in subtle, minimal and omnipresent forms of racism that construct and maintain the workings of race is important because it is something We all do, on a daily basis. Therefore, I believe that to talk about race – as a concept that refers to the legacy of imperialism's and colonialism's hierarchical categorisation of groups of people, in where Whites are placed at its apex – must, as it is in the Norwegian and wider Nordic context, no longer be taboo. That is, if Our goal as a democracy actually is to create a more egalitarian and racially-just society.

I hope these stories (as well as this thesis) have triggered an awareness in you that motivates you to want to not only revisit these stories and others in your life, but also to start countering such everyday workings of Whiteness, if not in other (often White Norwegian) people's stories, then at least in the production of your own.

References

Adair, J. (2008). White pre-service teachers and "de-privileged spaces". *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(4), 189–206. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23479181

Afdal, H. W., & Nerland, M. (2014). Does teacher education matter? An analysis of relations to knowledge among Norwegian and Finnish novice teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 58*(3), 281–299. doi:10.1080/00313831.2012.726274

Ahmed, S. (2004). Declarations of Whiteness: The non-performativity of anti-racism. *Borderlands E-Journal, (3)*2. Retrieved from http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/ahmed_declarations.htm

Allen, R. (2004). Whiteness and critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 121–136. doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00056.x

Althusser, L. (1970). Ideology and ideological state apparatus (notes towards an investigation). In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds., 2011), *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 204–222)*.* West Sussex: Whiley-Blackwell.

Alvesson, M. (2002). *Postmodernism and social research.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Amos, Y. T. (2010). "They don't want to get it!" Interaction between minority and White pre-service teachers in a multicultural education class. *Multicultural Education, 17*(4), 31–37.

Amos, Y. T. (2016). Voices of teacher candidates of color on White race evasion: "I worried about my safety!" *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(8), 1002–1015. doi:10.1080/09518398.2016.1174900

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. London: Verso.

Ansley, F.,L. (1992). White supremacy (and what we should do about it). In R. Delgado, & S. Stefanic (Eds.), Critical white studies. Looking behind the mirror (pp. 592e595). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Antikainen, A. (2006). In Search of the Nordic Model in Education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. 50* (3). 229-243. doi: 10.1080/00313830600743258

Apple, M. (2003). Freire and the politics of race in education. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 6*(2), 107–118. doi:10.1080/13603120304821

Apple, M. (2014). *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. New York: Routledge.

Arneback, E., and A. Quennerstedt. (2016).Locations of Racism in Education: A Speech Act Analysis of a Policy Chain." *Journal of Education Policy* 31 (6): 773–788. doi:10.1080/02680939.2016.118 5670.

Arnesen, E. (2001). Whiteness and the historians' imagination. *International Labor and Working-Class History, 60,* 3–32.

Atkinson, P., & Silvermann, D. (1997). Kundera's immortality: The interview society and the invention of the self. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3, 304-325.* doi: 10.1177/107780049700300304

Aveling, N. (2004). Being the decedent of colonialists: White identity in context. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, (7)*1, 57–71.

Aveling, N. (2006) "Hacking at our very roots": rearticulating White racial identity within the context of teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education.9*(3). 261-274. doi: 10.1080/13613320600807576

Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bangeni, B., & Kapp, R. (2007). Shifting language attitudes in linguistically diverse learning environment in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, (28)*4, 253–269. doi:10.2167/jmmd495.0

Bangstad, S. (2014). Fighting words: What's wrong with freedom of expression? *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, *40*(2), 266–282. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.851475

Bangstad s. & Døving, C.A. (2015). Hva er rasisme [What is racism]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Banks, J. (2004). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3–30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Baratan, G. D. (2008). The song remains the same: Transposition and the disproportionate representation of minority students in special education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 11*(4), 337–354. doi:10.1080/13613320802478820

Barnes, M. E. (2017). Practicing what we preach in teacher education: A critical Whiteness studies analysis of experiential education. *Studying Teacher Education*, *13*(3), 294–311. doi:10.1080/17425964.2017.1365701

Barthes, R. (2000). *Mythologies*. London: Vintage Classics.

Bell, D. (1992). *Face at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Berg, A-J. (2008). Silence and articulation: Whiteness, racialization and feminist memory work. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, 16*(4), 213–227. doi:10.1080/08038740802446492

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bersh, L. C. (2009). Deconstructing Whiteness: Uncovering prospective teachers' understandings of their culture: A Latina professor's perspective. *Multicultural Perspectives, 11*(2), 107–112. doi:10.1080/15210960903028792

Bissonnette, J. D. (2016). The trouble with niceness: How a preference for pleasantry sabotages culturally responsive teacher preparation. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *12*(2), 9–32.

Bjørkøy, A. M. B. (2011). Da Hoa og Negermann forsvant: Om revisjon av Egner og neger [When Hoa and Negroman dissapreared: About a revision of Egner and the negro]. *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift, 4*(28), 359–369.

Blair, M. (2004). The myth of neutrality in educational research. In G. Ladson-Billings & D. Gillborn (Eds.), *The Routledge Falmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 243–251). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Blommaert, J., & Verscheueren, J. (2014). A pragmatics of the culturally other [E-Platform]. In J. Angermuller, D. Maingueneau, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The discourse studies reader: Main currents in theory and analysis* (pp. 369–377). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bloor, D. (1976). *Knowledge and social imagery*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bonnett, A. (1996). White studies: The problems and projects of a new research agenda. *Theory, Culture & Society, 13*(2), 145–155.

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2008). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational Researcher*, *34*(6), 3–15.

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Science of science and reflexivity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdueau, P., & Warquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Braun, A., Maguire, M., & Ball, S. J. (2010). Policy enactments in the UK secondary school: Examining policy, practice and school positioning. *Journal of Education Policy, 25*(4), 547–560. doi:10.1080/02680931003698544

Bronner, S. E. (2011). *Critical theory: A very short introduction*. EBookCentral: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral-proquest-om.ezproxy.hioa.no/lib/hioa/reader.action?docID=679437

Brown, A. L., & De Lissovoy, N. (2011). Economies of racism: Grounding education policy research in the complex dialectic of race, class, and capital. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(5), 595–619. doi:10.1080/02680939.2010.533289

Brown, E. R. (2006). The place of race in teacher identity: Self-narratives and curricular intervention as a practice of freedom. *Teacher Education and Practice, 19*(2), 257–279.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, K. D. (2014). Teaching in color: A critical race theory in education analysis of the literature on pre-service teachers of color and teacher education in the US. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *17*(3), 326–345. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.832921

Browning, C. S. (2007). Branding Nordicity Models, Identity and the Decline of Exceptionalism. *Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*. *42*(1). 27–51. doi: 10.1177/0010836707073475

Buehler, J., Gere, A. R., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). Normalizing the fraughtness: How emotion, race, and school context complicate cultural competence. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(4), 408–418. doi:10.1177/0022487109339905

Canella, G. S., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2017). Ethics, research regulations, and critical social science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 83–96). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Carroll, L. (1965). *Alice in Wonderland: Through the looking glass*. London: Dent.

Carter, S. P., Honeyford, M., McKaskle, D., Guthrie, F., Mahoney, S., & Carter, G. D. (2007). "What do you mean by Whiteness?": A professor, four doctoral students, and a student affairs administrator explore Whiteness. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *26*(2), 152–159.

Castango, A. E. (2008). "I don't want to hear that!": Legitimating Whiteness through silence in schools. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly, 39*(3), 314–333. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2008.00024.x

Charbeneau, J. (2015). White faculty transforming Whiteness in the classroom through pedagogical practice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *18*(5), 655–674. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.831823

Charmaz, K., Thornberg, R., & Keane, E. (2017). Evolving grounded theory and social justice. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 211–443)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Chubbuck, S. M. (2004). Whiteness enacted, Whiteness disrupted: The complexity of personal congruence. *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(2), 301–333.

Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field (Part II). *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 109–121. doi:10.1177/0022487114558268

Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies, 38*(3), 263–274. doi:10.1207/s15326993es3803_6

Crowley, R. M., & Smith, W. (2015). Whiteness and social studies teacher education: Tensions in the pedagogical task. *Teaching Education*, *26*(2), 160–178. doi:10.1080/10476210.2014.996739

de Freitas, D. (2005). Pre-service teachers and the re-inscription of Whiteness: Disrupting dominant cultural codes through textual analysis. *Teaching Education, 15*(2), 151–164. doi:10.1080/10476210500122725

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone Press.

Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic. 2000. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, S. (Eds.) (1997). *Critical White studies: Looking behind the mirror.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2017). Part VI: Methods of collecting and analysing empirical materials. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 517–525)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

DiAngelo, R. J. (2010). Why can't we all just be individuals?: Countering the discourse of individualism in anti-racist education. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *6*(1). Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/ item/5fm4h8wm

DiAngelo, R. J. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *3*(3), 54–70.

Dixson, A. D. & Dingus, J. E. (2007). Tyranny of the majority: re-enfranchisement of African-American teacher educators teaching for democracy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(6), 639-654, doi: 10.1080/09518390701630775

Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo.* London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.

Dowling, F. (2017). "Rase" og etnisitet? Det kan ikke jeg si noe særlig om – her er det "Blenda-hvitt"! ["Race" and ethnicity? That, I cannot say anything in particular about – Here, all is "Snow White"!]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, *101*(3), 252–256. doi:10.18261/issn.1504-2987-2017-03-06

Dyer, R. (1993). *The matter of images: Essays on representation*. London: Routledge.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge

Døving, C. A. (2016). Dolezals rase – uten en dråpe blod. Om *rase* som folkelig og analytisk kategori [Dolezals race: Without one drop of blood. About *race* as a popular and analytical category]. *Sosiologisk Tidsskrift, 4*(24), 327–348.

Eberly, J. L., Rand, M. K., & O'Connor, T. (2007). Analyzing teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Using adult development theory. *Multicultural Education, 14*(4), 31–36.

Eide, E., & Simonsen, A. (2008). V*erden skapes hjemmefra* [The world is created at home]. Oslo: Unipub.

Eidsvik, E. (2012). Colonial discourse an ambivalence: Norwegian participation on the colonial arena in South Africa. In K. Loftsdóttir & L. Jensen (Eds.), *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic region.* (pp. 13-28). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ellisworth, E. (1997). Double binds of Whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Powell, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Off White* (pp. 259–269). New York, NY: Routledge.

Eriksen, T. H. (2009). Verden er mer enn bare etnisk [The world is more than ethnic]. In T. Giske (Ed.), *Mangfold eller enfold: 21 stemmer om kultur i vår tid* [Diversity or homogeneity: 21 voices on culture in our time] (p. 305). Oslo: Aschehoug.

Eriksen, T. H. (2011). A darker shade of pale: Cultural intimacy in an age of terrorism. *Anthropology Today*, *27*(5), 1–2. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8322.2011.00824.x

Eriksen, T. H., & Neumann, I. B. (2011). Fra Slektsgård til oljeplattform: Norsk identitet og Europa [From family farm to oil rig: Norwegian identity and Europe]. *Internasjonal Historie*, *69*(3), 413–436.

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Essed, P., & Trienekens, S. (2008). "Who wants to feel White?" Race, Dutch culture and contested identities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(1), 52–72. doi:10.1080/01419870701538885

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis*: *A critical study of language*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fairclough, N., Jessop, B., & Sayer, J. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth.* New York, NY: Grove Press.

Fasching-Varner, K.J. (2009). No! The team ain't alright! The institutional and individual problematics of race. *Social Identities. 15*(6). pp.811-289. doi: 10.1080/13504630903372520

Flintoff, A., Dowling, F., & Fitzgerald, H. (2015). Working through Whiteness, race and (anti) racism in physical education teacher education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 20*(5), 559–570. doi:10.1080/17408989.2014.962017

Forsey, M. (2012). Interviewing individuals. In S. Delamont (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 364–376). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Foucault, M (1977). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison.* London: Penguin books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–77, Michael Foucault* (C. Gordon, Ed.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1989). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of Whiteness*. London: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1970). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin Books.

Fylkesnes, M. K., Iversen, A. C., Bjørnes, R., & Nygren, L. (2015). Frykten for barnevernet: En underøkele av etnike minoritetsforeldres oppfatninger [Fearing the child protective services: A study of ethnic minority parents' perceptions]. *Norges Barnevern, 2*(92), 80–96.

Fylkesnes, S. (2011). *"The multicultural": Constructions in the curriculum of Norwegian primary schoolteacher education* (Master's thesis). Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College.

Galman, S., Pica-Smith, C., & Rosenberger, C. (2010). Aggressive and tender navigations: Teacher educators confront Whiteness in their practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 225–336. doi:10.1177/0022487109359776

Garmon, M. A. (2004). Changing pre-service teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(3), 201–213. doi:10.1177/0022487104263080

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Georgakopoulou, A. (2007). *Small stories, interaction and identities.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gillborn, D. (1995). *Racism and race in real schools.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gillborn, D. (1998). Racism, selection, poverty and parents: New Labour, old problems. *Journal of Education Policy, 13*(6), 717–735. doi:10.1080/0268093980130604

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of White supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(4), 485–505. doi:10.1080/02680930500132346

Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?* London: Routledge.

Gillborn, D. (2016). Softly, softly: Genetics, intelligence and the hidden racism of the new Geneism. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(4), 365–388. doi:10.1080/02680939.2016.1139189

Giroux, H. A. (1997a). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of Whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review, 27*(2), 285–320. doi:10.17763/haer.67.2.r4523gh4176677u8

Giroux, H. A. (1997b). White squall: Resistance and the pedagogy of Whiteness. *Cultural Studies, 11*(3), 367–389.

Glenn, W. J. (2012). Developing understandings of race: Pre-service teachers' counter narrative (re)constructions of people of color in young adult literature. *English Education, 4*(44), 326–353. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.hioa.no/stable/23238778

Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist culture: Philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Goldberg, D. T. (2006). Racial Europeanization. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29(2), 331-364. doi: 10.1080/01419870500465611.

Goldberg, D. T. (2009). The social formation of racist discourse. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *The anatomy of racism*. (pp. 295-318). Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.

Goldberg, D. T. (2015). *Are we postracial yet?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gorski, P. C. (2006). Complicity with conservatism:the de-politicizing of multicultural and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, (17) 2, pp. 163–177.* doi: 10.1080/14675980600693830

Gorski, P.C. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: a decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, (19)*6, 515-525. doi:10.1080/14675980802568319

Gough, D., & Thomas, J. (2013). Commonality and diversity in reviews. In D. Gough, S. Oliver, & J. Thomas (Eds.), An introduction to systematic reviews (pp. 1e16). London: SAGE.

Gough, D., Thomas, J., & Oliver, S. (2012a). Clarifying differences between review designs and methods. Systematic Reviews, 1(1), 28.

Gough, D., Thomas, J., & Oliver, S. (2012b). *An introduction to systematic reviews*. London: SAGE.

Goodlad, J. I. (1979). Curriculum inquiry: the study of curriculum practice. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gramsci, A. (2011). Hegemony. In I. Szeman & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 188–203). Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1998) *Turning on learning: Five approaches to multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender, and disability.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Grant, C., Elsbree, A. R., & Fondric, S. (2004). A decade of research on the changing terrain of multicultural education research. In J. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 184–207). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog.* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Guðjónsdóttir, G. (2014). "We blend in with the crowd but they don't." (In)visibility of Islandic migrants in Norway. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research, 4*(4), 176–183. doi:10.2478/njmr-2014-0026

Guðjónsdóttir, G., & Loftsdóttir, K. (2017). Being a desirable migrant: Perception and racialisation of Icelandic migrants in Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 43*(5), 791–808. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2016.1199268

Gullestad, M. (2002). *Det Norske Sett Med Nye Øyne: Kritisk Analyse av Norsk Innvandringsdebatt* [The Norwegian seen with new eyes: A critical analysis of the Norwegian immigration debate]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gullestad, M. (2004). Blind slaves to our prejudice: Debating "culture" and "race" in Norway. *Ethnos, 69*(2), 177–203.

Gullestad M. (2006) *Plausible prejudice: Everyday experiences and social images of nation, culture and race.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gullestad, M. (2010). Likhetens grenser [Similarity's limits]. In H. Vike, H. Lidén, & M. Lien (Eds.), *Likhetens Paradokser: Antropologiske Undersøkelser i det Moderne Norge* [The paradoxes of sameness: Anthropological interrogations in the modern Norway] (pp. 32–67). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gulson, K. N., & Webb, P. T. (2012). Education policy racialisations: Afrocentric schools, Islamic schools, and the new enunciations of equity. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 697–709. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.672655

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *Formations of modernity* (pp. 275–320). Oxford: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72–92). London: SAGE.

Hall, S. (2004). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.). *Discourse, theory and practice.* (pp. 72-81). London: Sage.

Han, K. T. & Leonard, J. (2017). Why Diversity Matters in Rural America: Women Faculty of Color Challenging Whiteness. Ur*ban Review, 49,* 112–139. doi:10.1007/s11256-016-0384-7

Harlap Y. & Riese, H. (2014). Hva skjer når vi ser farge innen utdanning? Mulighetene ved å teoretisere rase i skolen i et "fargeblindt" Norge [What happen when we see colour in education? The possibilities of theorising race in school in a "colour-blind" Norway. In K. Westrheim & A. Tolo (Eds.). *Kompetanse for mangfold* [Competency for diversity]. (pp. 190-216). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review, 106*(8), 1707–1791.

Harris, G. (2011). Teacher educators under surveillance at a religious university. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *17*(5), 545–558. doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.602208

Harry, B., & Klingner, J. (2006). *Why are so many minority students in special education? Understanding race and disability in schools.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Haviland, V. S. (2008). "Things get glossed over." Rearticulation the silencing power of Whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(40), 40–54. doi:10.1177/0022487107310751

Hayes, C., & Juárez, B. G. (2009). You showed your Whiteness: You don't get a "good" White people's medal. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22*(6), 729–744. doi:10.1080/09518390903333921

Hickling-Hudson, A. (2005). "White," "ethnic," and "Indigenous": Pre-service teacher reflects on ethnic identity in Australian teacher education. *Policy Futures in Education, 3*(4), 340–358. doi:102304/pfie.2005.3.4.340

Hill-Jackson, V. (2007). Wrestling Whiteness: Three Stages of Shifting Multicultural Perspectives among White Pre-service Teachers. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(2). 29-35.

Hoel, A. (2014). Mer enn norsk: Kulturell hybridisering og farskap blandt minoritetsetniske menn [More than just Norwegian: Cultural hybridization and fatherhood amongst ethnic minority men]. *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning, 3–4*(38), 219–234.

hooks, b. (2013). *Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Horton, J., & Scott, D. (2007). White students' voices in multicultural teacher education preparation. *Multicultural Education, 11*(4), 12–16.

Igantiev, N. (1997). *How the Irish became White.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Igantiev, N., & Garvey, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Race traitor.* London: Routledge.

Imsen, G., Blossing, U., & Mjoos, L. (2017). Reshaping the Nordic education in an area of efficiency. Changes in the comprehensive school project in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden since the millennium. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Studies, 61*(5), 568–583. doi:10.1080/00313831.2016.1172502

Indregard, S., Wergeland, I., & Wold, B. (2012). Svar på tiltale [Response to the charges]. In S. Indregard, I. Wergeland, & B. Wold (Eds.), *Motgift: Akademisk respons på den nye høyreekstremismen* [Antidote: Academic response to the new right-wing extremism]. (pp.13-16) Oslo: Flamme Forlag & Forlaget Manifest.

Iqbal, R., & Todi, P. (2015). The Nordic model: Existence, emergence and sustainability. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 30,* 336–351.

Iversen, L. L. (2012). Når religion blir identitet [When religion becomes identity]. *Kirke og Kultur,* 3, 258–270.

Jensen, E. B. (2005). *Skoleverket og de tre stammers møte* [The educational system and the tree tribe's meeting]. Tromsø: Eureka Forlag.

Juaréz, B. G. & Hayes, C. (2015). On Being Named a Black Supremacist and a Race Traitor: The Problem of White Racial Domination and Domestic Terrorism in U.S. Teacher Education. Urban Review, *47,* 317–340, doi: 10.1007/s11256-014-0294-5

Jørgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2010). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: SAGE.

Keskinen, S., Tuori, S., Irni, S., & Mulnari, S. (Eds.) (2016). *Complying with colonialism: Gender, race, and ethnicity in the Nordic region.* New York: Routledge.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism.* Buckingham and Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1998). Addressing the crisis of Whiteness. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, N. M. Rodrigues, & R. E. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign: Developing Whiteness in America* (pp. 9–44). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

King, J. E. (2004). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. In D. Gillborn & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *The Routledge Falmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 71–83). London: Routledge Falmer.

Klemsdal, L. (2009). Den nordiske modellen i tre deler [The Nordic model in three parts]. *Sosiologi i dag, 39*(2), 3–10.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Laclau E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Lander, V., & Santoro, N. (2017). Invisible and hypervisible academics: The experiences of Black and minority ethnic teacher educators. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *22*(8), 1008–1021. doi:10.1080/13562517.2017.1332029

Larsen, E. (2013). Likestillingslandets skygge: Utenlandske studenter og universittetenes (dis)integrerende rolle i Norge [The land of gender equality's shadow: Foreign students and the universities' (dis)integrative role]. *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning, 1*(37), 2–25.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociological Quarterly, 34,* 673-693. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1993.tb00112.x

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laughter, J. C. (2011). Rethinking assumptions of demographic privilege: Diversity among White pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 43–50.

Loftsdóttir, K. & Jensen, L. (Eds.) (2016). *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic region: Exaptionalism, migrant others and national identities.* New York: Routledeg.

le Roux, A. (2016). The teaching context preference of four White South African pre-service teachers: Considerations for teacher education. *South African Journal of Education, 36*(1), 1–11. doi:10.15700/saje.v36n1a1111

Lea, V. (2004). The Reflective Cultural Portfolio: Identifying Public Cultural Scripts in the Private Voices of White Student Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education.* 55, 116-127. doi: 10.1177/0022487103261842

Lea, V., & Griggs, T. (2005). Behind the mask and beneath the story: Enabling students-teachers to reflect critically on the socially-constructed nature of their "normal" practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *32*(1), 93–114. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478691

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of White folk: Critical pedagogy, Whiteness studies, and global discourse. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 29–50. Retrieved from https://doi.org/ 10.1080/13613320120117180

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of "White privilege". *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 137–152.

Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, Whiteness, and education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Leonardo, Z. (2013). *Race frameworks: a multidimensional theory of racism and education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Leonardo, Z. (2016). Tropics of Whiteness: Metaphor and the literary turn in White studies. *Whiteness and Education, 1*(1), 3–14. doi:10.1080/23793406.2016.1167111

Leonardo, Z. (2017). *Race education* [Video]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4m49aLmV-4g&feature=share

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2017). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 108–150). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Locke, K., Golden-Biddel, K., & Feldmann, M. S. (2008). Making doubt generative: Rethinking the role of doubt in the research process. *Organization Science, 19*(6), 907–918.

Lovdata. (2013). Lov om grunnskolen og den videregående opplæringa (opplæringslova) [Law concerning mandatory education and upper secondary education]. Lovdata. Retrieved from http://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61

MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Marx, S. (2004). Regarding Whiteness: Exploring and Intervening in the Effects of White Racism in Teacher Education, *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *37*(1), 31-43. doi: 10.1080/10665680490422089

Matias, C. E. (2016a). White skin, Black friend: A Fanonian application to theorize racial fetish in teacher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *48*(3), 221–236. doi:10.1080/00131857.2014.989952

Matias, C. E. (2016b). "Why do you make me hate myself?": Re-teaching Whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education. *Teaching Education*, *27*(2), 194–211. doi:10.1080/10476210.2015.1068749

Matias, C. E., & Grosland, T. J. (2016). Digital storytelling as racial justice: Digital hopes for deconstructing Whiteness in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(2), 152–164. doi:10.1177/0022487115624493

Matias, C.E. & Mackey, J. (2016) Breakin' Down Whiteness in Antiracist Teaching: Introducing Critical Whiteness Pedagogy. *Urban Review. 48*. 32-20. doi: 10.1007/s11256-015-0344-7

Matias, C. E., Montoya, R., & Nishi, N. W. M. (2016). Blocking CRT: How the emotionality of Whiteness blocks CRT in urban teacher education. *Educational Studies, 52*(1), 1–19. doi:10.1080/00131946.2015.1120205

Matias, C. E., Viesca, K. M., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Tandon, M., & Galind, R. (2014). "What is critical Whiteness doing in OUR nice field like critical race theory?" Applying CRT and CWS to understand the White imaginations of White teacher candidates. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 47*(3), 289–304. doi:10.1080/10665684.2014.933692

Matus, C., & Infante, M. (2011). Undoing diversity: Knowledge and neoliberal discourses in colleges of education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(3), 293–307. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.573248

Mausethagen, S. (2013). *Reshaping teacher professionalism: An analysis of how teachers construct and negotiate professionalism under increasing accountability* (Doctoral dissertation). Oslo: Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

Mausethagen, S., & Granlund, L. (2012). Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: Current tensions between education policy and teachers' union. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 815–833. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.672656

Mazzei, L. A. (2008). Silence speaks: Whiteness revealed in the absence of voice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(5), 1125–1136. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.009

McIntyre, S. (1997). *Making meaning of Whiteness: Exploring racial identity with White teachers.* New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

McVee, M. B. (2005). Revisiting the Black Jesus: Re-emplotting a narrative through multiple retellings. *Narrative Inquiry, 15*(1), 161–195.

McVee, M. B. (2014). The challenge of more light, the complexity of culture: Lessons learned in exploring the cultural positioning of literacy teachers. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1080/01596306.2012.739463

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1991). How research produces knowledge. In J. M. Peters & P. Jarvis (Eds.), *Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study* (pp. 42–65). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Michael-Luna, S., & Marri, A. R. (2011). Rethinking diversity in resegregated schools: Lessons from a case study of urban K-8 pre-service teachers. *Urban Education*, *46*(2), 178–201. doi:10.1177/0042085910378476

Michie, G. (2007). Seeing, hearing, and talking race: Lessons for White teachers from four teachers of color. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(1), 3–9.

Miller, E. T. (2017). Multiple pathways to Whiteness: White teachers' unsteady racial identities. *Early Years*, *37*(1), 17–33. doi:10.1080/09575146.2016.1223022

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 26*(3), 447–454. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.012

Ministry of Education and Research. (2009). *Læreren: rollen og utdanningen* [The teacher: The role and the education. Vol. 11. 2008–2009]. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-11-2008-2009-/id544920/

Ministry of Education and Research. (2010). *Nasjonle Retningslinjer for grunnskolelærerutdanningen, 1.-7. Trinn* [National guidelines for primary school teacher education, grades 1–7]. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kd/rundskriv/2010/retningslinjer_ grunnskolelaererutdanningen_1_7_trinn.pdf

Moi, T. (2012). Markedslogikk og kulturkritkk. Om Breivik og ubehaget i den postmoderne kulturen [Market logic and cultural critique. About Breivik and the discomfort in postmodern culture]. *Samtiden*. *3.* 20–30.

Morrison, T. (1993). *Dancing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Mouffe, C. (1993). *The return of the political*. London: Verso.

Mouffe, C. (2008). Critique as counter-hegemonic intervention. *Transversal Multilingual Webjournal* [Vienna: European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies]. Retrieved from http://eipcp.net/transversal/0808/mouffe/en/print

Mulinari, D. & Neergaard, A. (2005). "Black skull" consciousness: The new Swedish working class. *Race & Class, 46*(3), 55–72. doi: 10.1177/0306396805050018

Mulinari, D., Keskinen, S., Irni, S., & Tuori, S. (2016). Introduction: Postcolonialism and the Nordic models of welfare and gender. In S. Keskinen, S. Tuori, S. Irni, & D. Mulinari (Eds.), *Complying with colonialism: Gender, race, and ethnicity in the Nordic region* (pp. 1–16). New York, NY: Routledge.

Muller Myrdahl, E. (2014). Recuperating Whiteness in the injured nation: Norwegian identity in the response to 22 July. *Social Identities*, *20*(6), 486–500. doi:10.1080/13504630.2015.1004997

Myslinska, D. R. (2014a). Contemporary first-generation European Americans: The unbearable "Whiteness" of being. *Tulane Law Review, 88*, 559–625.

Myslinska, D. R. (2014b). Racist racism: Complicating Whiteness through the privilege and discrimination of Westerns in Japan. *Tulane Law Review, 83,* 1–55.

Mårtensson, U. (2014). Hate speech and dialogue in Norway: Muslims "speak back". *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 40*(2), 230–248. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.851473

Neumann, I. B. (2001). *Mening, materialitet, makt: en innføring in diskursanalyse* [Meaning, materiality, power: An introduction to discourse analysis]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* New York, NY: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2006). Foreword. In G. R. Howard (Ed.), *We can't teach what we do not know: White teachers, multiracial schools* (pp. xv–xvii). New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Orozco, R. A. (2011). "It is certainly strange": Attacks on ethnic studies and Whiteness as property. *Journal of*

Pais A. & Valero P. (2012). Researching research: mathematics education in the Political. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 80*(9), 9-24. doi: 10.1007/s10649-012-9399-5

Palmberg, M. (2016). The Nordic colonial mind. In S. Keskinen, S. Tuori, S. Irni, & D. Mulinari. (Eds.). *Complying with colonialism: Gender, race, and ethnicity in the Nordic region* (pp. 35-50). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pearce, S. (2012). Confronting dominant Whiteness in the primary classroom: Progressive student teachers' dilemmas and constraints. *Oxford Review of Education*, *4*(38), 455–472. doi:10.1080/03054985.2012.710546

Pennington, J. L. (2007). Silence in the classroom/whispers in the halls: Autoethnography as pedagogy in White pre-service teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(1), 93–113. doi:10.1080/13613320601100393

Pennington, J. L., Brock, C. H., & Ndura, E. (2012). Unraveling the threads of White teachers' conceptions of caring: Repositioning White privilege. *Urban Education, 47*(4), 743–775. doi:10.1177/0042085912441186

Peräkylä, A., & Ruusuvuori, J. (2017). Analysing talk and text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 669-690). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, (*12*)2, 197–215. doi:10.1080/13613320902995475

Picower, B. (2012). *Practice what you teach: Social justice education in the classroom and in the streets.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Pihl, J. (2002). Monumenter og mot-monumenter [Monument and counter-monuments]. *Nytt Norsk Tidskrift, (2)*19, 141–154.

Pihl, J. (2010). *Etnisk mangfold i skolen: det sakkyndige blikket* [Ethnic Diversity in the School: The Expert View. Vol. 2]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour.* London: SAGE.

Preston, J. (2008). Protect and survive: "Whiteness" and the middle-class family in civil defence pedagogies. *Journal of Education Policy, 23*(5), 469–482. doi:10.1080/02680930802054412

Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research.* London: SAGE.

Puchner, l., Szabo, Z., & Roseboro, D. L. (2012). The short-term effect of a race-related course on racial identity of White students. *Teaching in Higher Education, 4*(17), 399–410. doi:10.1080/13562517.2011.641003

Raible, J. & Irizarry, J. G. (2007). Transracialized selves and the emergence of post-white teacher identities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*. *10*(2). 177-198. doi: 10.1080/13613320701330718

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalising education policy*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.

Robinson, C. C., & Clardy, P. (2011). It ain't what you say, it's how you say it: Linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 18*(3), 101–110.

Rodriguez, N. M. (2000). Projects of Whiteness in critical pedagogy. In N. M. Rodriguez & L. E. Villaverde (Eds.), *Dismantling White privilege: Pedagogy, politics, and Whiteness* (p. 24). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Rodriguez, N. M., & Villaverde, L. E. (Eds.). (2000). *Dismantling White privilege: Pedagogy, politics, and Whiteness.* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Roediger, D. R. (1994). *Towards the abolition of Whiteness.* New York, NY: Verso.

Roediger, D. R. (2007). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Verso.

Rogers, R., & Christian, J. (2007). "What could I say?" A critical discourse analysis of the construction of race in children's literature. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(1), 21–46.

Rolfe, G. (2004). Deconstruction in a nutshell. *Nursing Philosophy*, *5*, pp. 274–276. doi: 10.1111/j.1466-769X.2004.00179.x

Rossholt, N. (2010). Gråtens mange ansiker [The multiple faces of crying]. *Nordic Studies in Education,* (30), 102–115.

Rugkåssa, M. (2012). *Likhetens dilemma: Om sivilisering og integrasjon i den velferdsambisiøse norske stat* [The Dilemma of Sameness: About Civilization and Integration in the Welfare Ambitious Norwegian State]. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Rysst, M. (2016) "I Think of Myself as Norwegian, Although I Feel that I Am from Another Country." Children Constructing Ethnic Identity in Diverse Cultural Contexts in Oslo, Norway. In M.L. Seeberg and E.M. Goździak (eds.), *Contested Childhoods:Growing up in Migrancy*. (pp.157-177). [IMISCOE Research Series]. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-44610-3_9

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Shedrow, S.J. (2017). Cross-Cultural Student Teaching: Examining the Meaning-Making of one White, Female, Middle-Class Preservice Teacher. *Journal of International Students, 7(2),* 270-290.

Scheurich, J. J. (1993). Toward a White Discourse on White Racism. *Educational Researcher* 22 (8): 5–10.

Scheurich, J. J. (2002). *Anti-racist scholarship: An advocacy.* New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Schulz, S., & Fane, J. (2015). A healthy dose of race? White students' and teachers' unintentional brushes with Whiteness. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(11), 137–154. doi:10.14221/ajte.2015v40n11.8

Schwandt, T.A. (1996). Farewell to criteriology. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2,* 58-72. doi:10.1177/107780049600200109

Seidmann, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sejersted, F. (2005). *Sosialdemokratiets tidsalder: Norge og Sverige i det 20. århundre* [The socio democratic age: Norway and Sweden in the 20th century]. Oslo: Pax Forlag.

Sirnes, T. (1999). Alt som er fast fordamper2? Normalitet og identitet i foranding [Everything solid evaporates? Normality and identity in transformation]. In S. Meyer & T. Sirnes (Eds.), *Normalitet og identitetsmakt i Norge* [Normality and identity power in Norway] (pp. 29–75). Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Sleeter, C. (1994). White racism. *Multicultural Education, 1*(4), 5–8.

Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural education as social activism.* New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2011). Becoming White: Reinterpreting a family story by putting race back into the picture. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *14*(4), 421–433. doi:10.1080/13613324.2010.547850

Smith, H. J. (2013). A critique of the teaching standards in England (1984–2012): Discourses of equality and maintaining the status quo. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(4), 427–448. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.742931

Smith, H. J. (2014). Emotional responses to documentary viewing and the potential for transformative teaching. *Teaching Education*, *25*(2), 217–238. doi:10.1080/10476210.2012.762351

Smith, H. J., & Lander, V. (2012). Collusion or collision: Effects of teacher ethnicity in the teaching of critical Whiteness. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(15), 331–351. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.585340

Smolcic, E., & Katunich, J. (2017). Teachers crossing borders: A review of the research into cultural immersion field experience for teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 62*, 49–57.

Solomona, R. P., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B.-J., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How White teacher candidates construct race, racism and "White privilege". *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(2), 147–169. doi:10.1080/13613320500110519

Statistics Norway. (2013). *Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre, 1. januar 2013* [Immigrants and Norwegian born with immigrant parents, 1 January 2013]. Retrieved from https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/statistikker/innvbef/aar/2013-04-25?fane=om

Svendsen, S.H. B. (2014). Learning racism in the absence of "race". *European Journal of Women's Studies, 21*(1), 9–24. doi: 10.1177/1350506813507717

Søreide, G. (2007). *Narrative construction of teacher identity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen). Retrieved from http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/2532Tajik, H. (Ed.) (2001). *Svart på hvitt. [Black on white.]* Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.

Tajik, H. (Ed.) (2001). *Svart på hvitt* [Black on white]. Oslo: Tiden Norsk Forlag.

Tajik, H. (2004). Når den andre er en av oss [When the other is one of us]. *Samtiden, 2*, 25–33.

Telhaug, A. O., Media, O. A. & Aasen, P. (2006). The Nordic Model in Education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. 50* (3), 245–283. doi: 10.1080/00313830600743274

Terwilliger, C. (2010). Mapping stories: Taking detours to challenge Whiteness. *Making Connections: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Cultural Diversity, 11*(2), 14–25. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.5555/maco.11.2.337r333043471148

Thomas, P. (2016). ''Papa am I a Negro?'' The vexed history of the racial epithet in Norwegian print media (1970–2014). *Race and Social Problems, 8*, 231–243. doi:10.1007/s12552-016-9179-4

Thompson, P. (2012). *Beginning the literature review: Taking notes*. Retrieved from https://patthomson.net/2012/03/03/doing-your-literature-review-taking-notes/

Thompson, P. (2017). *Using a literature review in your own "voice".* Retrieved from https://phdinahundredsteps.wordpress.com/tag/using-literature-in-your-thesis/

Tolgensbakk, I. (2014). *Partysvensker; go hard! En narratologisk studie av unge svenske arbeidsmigranters nærvær i Oslo* [Party Swedes; Go hard! A narratologic study of young work-migrant Swedes' presence in Oslo] (Doctoral dissertation). Oslo: University of Oslo.

Torfing, J. (1999). *New theories of discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Törrönen, J. (2000). The passionate text: The pending narrative as a macrostructure of persuasion. *Social Semiotics, 10*(1), 81–98.

Törrönen, J. (2003). The Finnish press' political position on alcohol between 1993 and 2000. *Addition, 89*(3), 281–290.

Ulucchi, K. (2012). Knowing we are White: Narrative as critical praxis. *Teaching Education, 23*(1), 89–107. doi:10.1080/10476210.2011.622747

Valestrand, H. (2011). Kartografier og geografier: Noen utfordringer for transnasjonal kjønnsforskning [Cartographies and geographies: Some challenges for transnational feminist research]. *Tidsskrift for kjønnsforskning, 1*(35), 18–39.

Van Dijk, T. (1992). Discourse and the denial of racism. *Discourse and Society, (3)*1, 87–118. doi:10.1177/0957926592003001005

Van Dijk, T. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115–140. doi:10.1080/13569310600687908

van Riemsdijk, M. (2010). Variegated privileges of Whiteness: Lived experiences of Polish nurses in Norway. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *11*(2), 117–137. doi:10.1080/14649360903514376

Vassenden, A., & Andersson, M. (2011). Whiteness, non-Whiteness and "faith information control": Religion among young people in Grønland, Oslo. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(4), 574–593. doi:10.1080/01419870.2010.511239

Vaugh, S. E. (2012). Institutional racist melancholia: A structural understanding of grief and power in schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, *82*(1), 52-77. doi:10.17763/haer.82.1.e3p454q1070131g4

Vedøy, G. E., & J. Møller. (2007). Successful School Leadership for Diversity? Examining Two Contrasting Examples of Working for Democracy in Norway. *ISEA. 35*(3). 58–66.

Vike, H. Lidén, H. & Lien, M. (Eds.) (2001). *Likhetens Paradokser: Antropologiske Undersøkelser i det Moderne Norge* [The paradoxes of sameness: Anthropological interrogations in the modern Norway]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Vuorela, U. (2016). Colonial complicity: The postcolonial in a Nordic context. In S. Keskinen, S. Tuori, S. Irni, & D. Mulinari (Eds.), *Complying with colonialism: Gender, race, and ethnicity in the Nordic region* (pp. 1–16). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wirtozek, N. (2011). *The origins of the "regime of goodness": Remapping the cultural history of Norway*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Wodak R. & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak, & C. Meyer (Eds.). *Method of critical discourse analysis.* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage publications.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (1999). Discourse and racism: European perspectives. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *28*, 175–199. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/223392

Zlatanovic, T., Havnes, A., & Mausethagen, S. (2016). A research review of nurse teachers' competencies. Advance online publication. *Vocations and Learning, 10*(2), 201-233. doi:10.1007/s12186-016-9169-0.

Appendices

The following eleven appendices include,
1. method description of the PhD thesis review's search process, results and final selection of studies
2. overview of the articles reviewed in the Norwegian context
3. overview of the articles reviewed in the international context
4. example of articles excluded and their reasons for exclusions
5. an example of textual analysis
6. confirmation letter for NSD (the Norwegian Data Protection Official for Research)
7. information letter with consent form
8. a rationale for the order in which the articles appear in the PhD thesis
9. overview of terms related to *cultural diversity* across all articles

Appendix 1: Description of review search process, results and final selection of studies

To find peer-reviewed articles on Whiteness in teacher education in the Norwegian context, the search term *whiteness* in combination with the terms *teacher education, teacher educators, student teachers* and *teacher education curriculum* were initially used in NORART. However, none of these searches produced results. Then, the same search terms were translated into the Norwegian language (e.g. *hvithet* combined with the terms *lærerutdanning, lærerutdannere, lærerstudenter, lærerutdanning* and *pensum/læreplaner*). However, these searches also produced no (n = 0) results. Therefore, in this database, the scope of the search was expanded by using the search terms *whiteness* and *Norway* and *hvithet* and *Norge*. However, these searches still yielded no results. Lastly, the search terms *whiteness* and *hvithet* were used, with the first yielding 25 hits (of which 2 were relevant) and the second yielding 5 hits (of which none were relevant). Due to the limited number of articles found and included in the review from NORART, searches were also performed in OsloMet's library's search motor Oria[42]. Here, the search terms *Whiteness* in combination with *Norway* yielded 1188 hits[43] (of which only 15 were relevant).

To find international peer-reviewed articles addressing Whiteness in teacher education, the exact same search terms as initially used in NORART (described above) were used (e.g. *whiteness* in combination with the terms *teacher education, teacher educators, student teachers* and *teacher education curriculum*) in Academic Search Premier and ERIC. These searches yielded a total of 14, 3, 10 and 5 results in Academic Search Premier (of which 13 were relevant), and 44, 20, 45 and 5 results in ERIC (of which 32 were relevant) for the searches performed in 2014. The exact same searches performed for 2018 yielded 4, 0, 0 and 0 results for Academic Search Premier (of which 3 were relevant), and 34, 17, 24 and 1 results in ERIC (of which 16 were relevant). Interestingly, none of the searches produced any relevant hits from 2018.

The selection of the studies was generally conducted in two stages. First, all titles and abstracts were read and checked against the *Inclusion and exclusion criteria* (Table 2). After excluding duplicate studies and evaluating the abstracts, 17 studies remained from the review in the Norwegian context and 74 articles remained from the international review context. Second, the full texts were retrieved for further examination of their relevance to this PhD thesis. From this, 7 studies were excluded from the Norwegian context and 12 were excluded from the international context. Finally, 10 studies from the Norwegian context and 62 from the international context were deemed to fit the inclusion criteria.

---

[42] Since Oria is an on-line library database covering all fields and all formats, multiple irrelevant hits necessarily occurred.

[43] Most of the articles excluded from the 1188 hits yielded from searches in Oria were studies focusing on the chemistry composition of chalk blocks, white-tailed eagles, humpback whales, white laboratory Norwegian-born and -bred rats, reindeers and white-collar crimes.

Appendix 2: Overview of articles reviewed in the Norwegian context

Author (Year)	Aim of study/Research question	Theoretical conception of Whiteness	Method	Claimed findings	Article's main argument	Location of study	Journal (language)
1. Berg (2008)	Addresses the translation problem in relation to studies of Whiteness, specifically processes of racialisation and methodological questions, discussing memory work as a possible way of drawing connections. Focuses on practices: "how to do" research on Whiteness. Looks for ways to handle empirical research on Whiteness within a frame of reference that takes the destabilisation of categories seriously, both theoretically and politically.	Whiteness as racialisation is a constant process of "doing race". In a predominantly White environment like a Nordic gender-research context (or other scientific contexts for that matter), race is remarkably inarticulate. Whiteness as an unmarked category ties in with privileged interpretations of scientific objectivity in particular ways.	The article's reflections and argumentations are based on a small research project that the author was involved in several years ago. We applied memory work (the writing down of specific episodes followed by analysis of the texts) in order to articulate Whiteness.	When trying to do or practice articulations of Whiteness, it was found to be agonising, complicated, and awkward. Uneasiness, guilt, and shame can be strongly expressed in memories targeting femininity, however, in the memory work focusing on race, this was much more complicated and painful [than the author experienced in the feminist work]. In one respect, silent avoidance may constitute an attempt to avoid the implicit power play in majoritising processes. The paradox is that this manoeuvre is the very reproduction of inequality. The wish to defend oneself was immanent in	There is scant literature concerned with methods that question how to articulate dominant or majority positions. Only dominant unmarked positions are allowed an act of avoidance – which is one dilemma for mainstream White feminism when dealing with racialising processes. Perhaps it is necessary to experience the silence of Whiteness as problematic in order to be able to articulate it. Memory work may provide an opportunity to explore and carve out positions or locations at the intersection of feminist studies and postcolonial studies from where it is possible to articulate Whiteness without the	Norway	*Nordic Journal of Women's Studies* (English)

| | | | | most analysing sessions. This self-defence was grounded in feeling incredibly stupid, imprudent, and daft in many of the memories. | accompanying futile guilt, passivity, and avoidance.

The articulation of Whiteness as a majority position implies not only a break with a dominant silence but also with "science as usual".

Even if we know what we "should" do, we are still left with the question of how to critically research Whiteness. | | |
| 2. Rossholt (2010) | Focuses on crying among the youngest children in preschool. | Studies of "Whiteness" show that "Whiteness" is linked to acting in a certain way as a form of cultural and symbolic capital and identity or a social norm.

A discursive approach gives the researcher an opportunity to analyse the constitution of social practices and cultural patterns.

Working with Foucault's material aspect of the subject and Deleuze's discussion about what a body may do, the article analyses the complexity | A discursive approach based on a critical ethnographic study, participating in observations of children one and two years of age and talking with the practitioners. | The social categories of gender and "Whiteness" are constructed through a binary approach where inclusionary and exclusionary practices are read in relation to a "sweet" [*blidt*] and a less "sweet" face in the analysis.

When practitioners talk about crying, smiling or clean faces they appear to be taking up particular dualistic verbal approaches. These can be read as taken-for-granted ways of thinking and talking, reflecting discourses of care | How preschool practitioners compose and enact care through a bodily logic that includes different tones and rhythms that are more complex than their talk about crying.

Research among the youngest children may make visible the as yet unknown (in our thoughts) analysing processes of materialisation. These processes melt the material and discursive together and create practices of care in a | Norway | *Nordic Journal of Education* (Norwegian) |

		and visualisation of crying.		intertwining age, gender and "Whiteness".	preschool context.		
3. van Riemsdijk (2010)	Examines the ambivalent and partial incorporation of Polish nurses into the Norwegian nation. Aims to contribute to understandings of variegated privileges of Whiteness and the differential incorporation of ethnic minority groups into a nation.	The study of conceptions of racialised and naturalized "White" identities and the privileges that these identities confer has become known as "Whiteness studies". In addition, Whiteness studies focus on the reproduction of structural privileges that include the ability of White people to disguise Whiteness itself as a location of power and privilege. The "invisibility" of Whiteness is a key part of what makes the operation of Whiteness discourses so powerful, permitting dominant Whites to deny their own position of privilege and power.	Semi-structured interviews and participant observation during 12 months of fieldwork research in Oslo and Bærum and 3 months in Warsaw, as well as an analysis of Norwegian migration policies, statistics and nurse recruitment documents.	The findings suggest that notions of variegated Whiteness can be a valuable tool to investigate differential inclusion into the nation, and that Europeanness and Norwegianness are constructed in complex, shifting forms in relation to changing notions of Whiteness. The partial inclusion of certain migrants more fully excludes migrants of colour who are not able to benefit from White privilege.	This article argues that Whiteness studies, whose history is based in the USA and Britain, needs to take a more thorough and specific account of the national and ethnic specificities on which its general claims have been based. By marking Whiteness as a racialised location, we can better investigate the racialised power positions of Whites.	Norway	*Social and Cultural Geography* (English)

4. Vassenden and Andersson (2011)	Examines how visible stigma or prestige symbols connect with invisible ones to different degrees and with various consequences across space. Explores the intersections of ethnicity, race and religion in everyday life, and contributes to the "third wave" of Whiteness studies.	Whiteness is articulated and lived by Whites as a residual category of social forms that elude the marks of colour or race. At the same time as being invisible – an "unmarkedness" referred to as "White transparency" – Whiteness is embedded in privilege. Giddens's notion of stigma is used to explain the intersection of Whiteness with religion.	The data consists of (1) individual interviews with 50 persons in the age band from 18 to 25 years, distributed among three samples (Christians, Muslims and the non-religious, who live and/or use congregations in Grønland); (2) 10 individual interviews with clerics and local city officials; (3) focus groups with Muslim and non-religious young people. Employs visual methods (e.g. photo elicitation).	An important observation is that Whiteness hides information about faith, or even signals "secular", whereas non-Whiteness signifies "religious" across the racial boundary.	"Faith information control" is closely attached to the status of faith as a stigma symbol, and further to the ethnic and racial marking of the interaction context.	Norway	*Ethnic and Racial Studies* (English)
5. Iversen (2012)	Present six possible explanations for why Christian pupils remain in the "closet", while other pupils freely display their religious identities.	The theory of Whiteness is understood as part of a larger interesting theme relevant for the social sciences. Increasingly more [researchers] want to look closer at the "powerful's" identity markers. There has become an increasing interest in	[Method unclearly described.] Personal (non-formalized) observation in schools.	Observations from the schools indicated that religious identity is "talkable" and public when it comes to Hindus, Sikhs and non-Christians. Whites, on the other hand, do not experience that people have already made assumptions about their religiousness early on during social	For minority pupils, religion becomes a "pseudo-ethnicity" that is not experienced as private. Non-Whites' religiosity is experienced as a public concern. Whiteness, in contrast, hides religion. White pupils have much more control over the information about their	Norway	*Kirke og Kultur* (Norwegian)

| | | masculinity, heteronormativity, for Norwegian studies – and also for Whiteness. | | meetings. They (Whites) say that it is important to have control over the situation.

The Muslim informants nodded in recognition and explained how their own "Muslimness" is not problematic because it is already "out there".

The White Christian informants contrarily talk about their different strategies for "outing" themselves in new relations. | own religiosity, a privilege that follows from the unmarked hegemony of Whiteness.

It is Whiteness that is hegemonic, not Christianity, and not, for instance, a possibly secular political correctness.

The expression of hegemony is the privilege of being unmarked, a privilege White Norwegians own, according to the theory of Whiteness. | | |
| 6. Tolgensbakk (2014) | To intently read stories about the Swedes and Norwegians. More correctly, stories about the Swedish in the Norwegian setting.

Interrogate how young Swede migrants in Oslo understand, construct and talk about their lives as migrants in Norway, and how Norwegians relate to these young migrants | Whiteness is a systemic privileged position in Norway, as in all other Western countries.

Whiteness leads to privileges in many arenas, first and foremost by being the norm against which difference/Otherness is measured.

Even though [the White] majority in Norway is a scarcely researched group, Marianne Gullestad has, among others, discussed | Open interviews with 21 young Swedes, 10 men and 11 women, about their life experiences. | However, most of the Swedes who were studied looked more or less like every other Scandinavian and would be hard to distinguish in an average Norwegian group, just like many other Europeans.

In this case, the young Swedes are perceived as so similar (White) [to Norwegians] that they are given an opportunity to be incorporated into Norwegian society without having to | The young Swedes' arrival seems to have challenged how both Swedes and Norwegians view the relation between the two nation states and the two peoples.

As migrants, the Swedes' Whiteness has been a challenge for the Norwegian self-image: Swedes have lately shifted between being a highly admired big brother, a competitor and an enemy. They are | Norge | PhD thesis, University of Oslo

(Norwegian) |

	through media and pop-cultural expressions.	how "'Norwegianness' and 'whiteness' is constructed (…) as taken for granted, unmarked, homogenous and normative, in contrast to immigrants' 'foreign' practices" (Gullestad, 2002, p. 164). Whiteness is often a visual quality where the phenotypic and other conditions are important aspects. *Visuality* is thereby important. It is the lack of Whiteness, understood as a feature in their phenotypes, that makes immigrants visible *as immigrants* in both its concrete and transformative meaning.		work/fight for it.	about to become something else. If you are lucky enough to be defined as White in Norway, whether in relation to your appearance, your family tree, or to something entirely different, you will usually have more access to the goods that are defined as part of "Us": as part of the Norwegian community.		
7. Guðjónsdóttir (2014)	Explores how relatively privileged migrants construct their position in the receiving society, and what role racialisation and migrant (in) visibility play in this regard.	Whiteness is an "invisible" position and the norm against which difference is measured. This only applies to "White" people as Whiteness has always been apparent to "non-White" people. Whiteness as racialisation thus signals a constant	Ethnographic fieldwork conducted in Norway – in Oslo and the surrounding area (the counties of Akershus, Buskerud and Østfold): participant observation and in-depth, semi-structured interviews once with 32 people who had	The participants construct their belonging through racialisation, emphasising their assumed visual, ancestral and cultural sameness with the majority population. As such, this article furthermore reveals how Whiteness, language and class intersect, resulting	The preferential treatment of Icelanders and narratives of sameness must be understood in relation to contemporary, intertwined racist and nationalistic discourses in Norway that exclude other migrants due to their assumed difference. Migrant (in)visibility and	Norway	*Nordic Journal of Migration Studies* (English)

		process of "doing race". Whiteness changes over time and space and is in no way a transhistorical essence. Whiteness is furthermore not a homogenous category; there are certain hierarchies within Whiteness at any given time and place. These hierarchies are determined by, for instance, class or national belonging.	moved from Iceland to Norway after the economic crisis in 2008. Both men and women of different ages, working in various occupations, living alone or with their families in Norway were interviewed.	in differing degrees of (in)visibility and privilege among the participants. Despite somewhat different positions, all the participants had the possibility of capitalising on their Icelandic nationality to receive favourable treatment.	belonging to Norwegian society need to be analysed in relation to the intersections of Whiteness, nationality, class and language use.		
8. Guðjónsdóttir and Loftsdóttir (2017)	Explores how Icelandic migrants in Norway make sense of their new position as economic migrants within a global economy characterised by a growing sense of precariousness, while past inequalities and racism continue to matter. Examines how these migrants are perceived in Norwegian media, and how social discourses of Icelandic migrants reflect larger	Postcolonial studies critically engage with the creation of Europe within racist and imperialistic historical processes, where Whiteness is one important feature of ongoing racialisation – the process of race becoming meaningful in a particular context and thus, where individuals learn to recognise their status within an unequal global system of discrimination. Racialisation intersects with class in the current neoliberal economy, where migrants' desirability and compatibility with a	Fieldwork in Norway in 2012 and 2013: 40 in-depth interviews were conducted with Icelanders living in Norway, consisting of 21 men and 19 women, who were all socially positioned as "White" and between the ages of 19 and 75. The participants migrated to Norway after the financial crash, mainly due to better work opportunities and	Icelanders are positioned as highly desirable compared to other migrant groups due to the intersection of perceived racial belonging, nationality and class. In some cases, "genes" become like a code word for "race", automatically demonstrating Icelanders' compatibility with Norwegian society and evoking the shared history of Nordic countries' engagement with eugenics at the beginning of the twentieth century.	Norwegians understand the issue of "belonging" in Norwegian society as depending on "race" and nationality, which also intersects with class. In the European context, "the immigrant" is frequently visualised as "non-White", non-Western and low-skilled. The assumption is that "Western" or "European" is a synonym for "White" whereas "non-White" European nationals are assumed to be "asylum seekers" or "illegal immigrants".	Norway	*Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (English)

	Norwegian debates on racism, desirability and cultural belonging.	particular nation state has also been strongly shaped by their class position.	they had different levels of education and worked in various occupational fields (e.g. as carpenters, nurses, engineers, kindergarten assistants and manual labourers).				
9. Muller Myrdal (2014)	Analyses media coverage immediately after the murders and immediately prior to Breivik's trial to show that the presumption that Whiteness is a prerequisite for being Norwegian was both interrupted and re-established during these periods.	The co-production of Norwegianness and Whiteness takes place centrally through constructions of "goodness". Whiteness in Norway does not depend on being co-produced with Norwegianness, but it is this co-production that lends it such tremendous structural power. In Norway, the invisibility of Whiteness is coupled with a general rejection of race as an analytical category. Thus, not only is Whiteness invisible, but the tools with which it might be brought to light and disassembled are rejected.	Review of the Norwegian media's (mainly newspapers) coverage of the July 22 massacre.	The presumption that Whiteness is a prerequisite for being Norwegian was both interrupted and re-established during these periods. In a discursive context in which "goodness" is central to being Norwegian, and in which Norwegian men of colour are nearly illegible as "good" or heroic, this elision has consequences beyond the non-recognition of their individual efforts: It leaves intact narratives in which goodness and heroism are aspects of Whiteness. The reproduction of Whiteness in response to the terror attacks can also	The early post-massacre focus on the "goodness" of individual Norwegians of colour seems to have predominantly served to highlight the extent to which this link was understood by many White Norwegians as surprising; there was no attendant interruption in the co-construction of goodness and Whiteness. The goal of a national community not based on Whiteness was fatally undermined by the refusal to face and challenge the ways in which national belonging is constructed in racial terms.	Norway	*Social Identities* (English)

			be seen in the focus on the perceived importance of "freedom of speech".				
10. Dowling (2017)	Focuses on teacher educator discourses on "race" and (anti-) racism in its everyday use. Applying a critical Whiteness perspective, the intention is to recognise the weaknesses in earlier educational research that traditionally have been researching the shortcomings of "the Other", or the relation between "Us" and "Them" rather than researching Whiteness as a system of privileges. What discourses of ethnicity and "race" are we applying? How do the pedagogues construct their own ethnic identities? To what extent are the discourses about	Whiteness is a set of silently and unmarked cultural practices. A critical Whiteness perspective is a theoretical perspective that recognises a lack in previous research of "race" and racism that to a too extensive extent have focused on the weaknesses of "the Other" rather than researching Whiteness as a system of privileges. The researcher's gaze is on the majority, and the goal is to illuminate how White humans are unavoidably "racialised" – their identities are created through power relations with other groups. As such, Whiteness is a marker that is like other markers (e.g. Asian, *Black*), but at the same time it is *different* to all others, because it is the dominant, normalized position and therefore has great significance for how	Six female participants, including the researcher herself, who had lengthy experience in teacher education (from 15–28 years) from various colleges and universities were interviewed with the intension of triggering certain memories in relation to race, multiculturalism, education, class (*oppvekstvilkår*), sports and teacher education. The researcher's own participation mirrored the recognition of her own participation in the (re)production of discourses on "race" both as a teacher educator and researcher.	As the analysis shows, the power to remain silent is quite prominent, and possible practical implications will involve a lot more than an awareness of one's own contribution to "race relations" in teacher education.	Despite the Norwegian educational system being characterised as an arena with increasing diversity, the majority of teachers are ethnically Norwegian. As a White (middle-class, female) teacher educator, it seems that the time has come to interrogate one's own and one's colleagues' participation in today's discourses.	Norway	*Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift* (Norsk)

	"race" and ethnicity in/excluding, and for whom?	other "racial categories" are defined. White people collect privileges from the racist social system, even though they, as individuals, may strongly disagree with the discrimination it promotes.					

Full references

Berg, A-J. (2008). Silence and articulation: Whiteness, racialization and feminist memory work. *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, 16*(4), 213–227. doi:10.1080/08038740802446492

Dowling, F. (2017). "Rase" og etnisitet? Det kan ikke jeg si noe særlig om – her er det "Blenda-hvitt"! ["Race" and ethnicity? That, I cannot say anything in particular about – Here, all is "Snow White"!]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, *101*(3), 252–256. doi:10.18261/issn.1504-2987-2017-03-06

Guðjónsdóttir, G. (2014). "We blend in with the crowd but they don't." (In)visibility of Islandic migrants in Norway. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research, 4*(4), 176–183. doi:10.2478/njmr-2014-0026

Guðjónsdóttir, G., & Loftsdóttir, K. (2017). Being a desirable migrant: Perception and racialisation of Icelandic migrants in Norway. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 43*(5), 791–808. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2016.1199268

Iversen, L. L. (2012). Når religion blir identitet [When religion becomes identity]. *Kirke og Kultur, 3*, 258–270.

Muller Myrdal, E. (2014). Recuperating Whiteness in the injured nation: Norwegian identity in the response to 22 July. *Social Identities*, *20*(6), 486–500. doi:10.1080/13504630.2015.1004997

Rossholt, N. (2009). Gråtens mange ansiker [The multiple faces of crying]. *Nordic Studies in Education, (30)*, 102–115.

Tolgensbakk, I. (2014). *Partysvensker; go hard! En narratologisk studie av unge svenske arbeidsmigranters nærvær i Oslo* [Party Swedes; Go hard! A narratologic study of young work-migrant Swedes' presence in Oslo] (Doctoral dissertation). Oslo: University of Oslo.

van Riemsdijk, M. (2010). Variegated privileges of Whiteness: Lived experiences of Polish nurses in Norway. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *11*(2), 117–137. doi:10.1080/14649360903514376

Vassenden, A., & Andersson, M. (2011). Whiteness, non-Whiteness and "faith information control": Religion among young people in Grønland, Oslo. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(4), 574–593. doi:10.1080/01419870.2010.511239

Appendix 3: Overview of articles reviewed in the international context

Author (Year), title	Aim of study	Theoretical conception of Whiteness	Method	Claimed findings	Article's main argument	Location of study	Journal
1. Aveling (2004) Being the descendant of colonialists: White identity in context	Explores the question of "being White" with a small group of young, well-educated Australian women. Contributes to the complexities, contradictions, limitations and possibilities of understanding how Whiteness is lived out in a particular time and place. Addresses implications for teacher education.	To study Whiteness is to turn the gaze from the racialised object to the racial subject. Whiteness is discursive practices that because of colonialism and neocolonialism, privilege and sustain the global dominance of White imperial subjects and Eurocentric worldviews. Whiteness understood as a set of locations that are historically, socially, politically and culturally produced.	Individual re-interviews with 12 highly educated women 15 years after their first interview. Initially these women were interviewed on the issue of gender; this time, the interview was concerned about the issue of race.	The women felt guilt, fear and alienation towards the discriminatory situation of the Aboriginal people in Australia. Being aware of White privilege also led to feelings of guilt, fear and helplessness. The women's awareness did not necessarily lead to them taking up anti-racist positionings. Rather, they felt trapped in their knowledge and left with no place to go.	The article raises questions of how we, as teacher educators, can help students to move beyond the position of "guilty liberals" and position ourselves to rearticulate Whiteness in anti-essentialist terms. Despite guilt, fear and alienation being a necessary first step in the process of deconstructing Whiteness and the privileged position, the challenge for educators is to provide students with strategies and resources which enable them to move beyond these feelings. (E.g. to demonstrate how it affects their	Australia	*Race Ethnicity and Education*

				interactions with racially diverse groups of people and attend to ways of speaking with, rather than for the Other.)			
2. Lea (2004) The reflective cultural portfolio: Identifying public cultural scripts in the private voices of White student teachers	To describe and evaluate one of the activity portfolios that the author uses in her teacher education classroom: The "cultural portfolio" to help her disproportionately White student teachers reflect on the public cultural scripts that shape their practices.	Whiteness: Our class-rooms become places in which we actively attempt to reproduce, usually less than consciously, ways of teaching and learning that work to the advantage of upper- and middle-class White students and those people of color who come to embody some part of cultural Whiteness for a variety of reasons. Cultural Whiteness is the educational and social water we swim in within the dominant institutions of the United States.	Action research: Analyses class activity referred to as the "cultural portfolio": introduction of cultural scripts that are rarely voiced in the lives of some student teachers through course dialogue, readings, videos and role-play.	White student teachers came to recognize how their private cognitive systems (their private voices) are shaped by public cultural scripts and what they say they think, feel and do translates into culturally responsive practice in the classroom. For several student teachers, the cultural portfolio journey is accompanied by severe culture shock. For others, the portfolio stimulated the motivation needed to reflect back on past culture shock. A minority of student teachers do not do well with suggestions that many people draw on from public cultural scripts, and leave	We need to find ways of addressing the powerful public scripts such as the racial harmony script that live within some of our student teachers and enable them to resist interrogating their Whiteness. Transforming our internal cultural landscape requires more than rhetoric. We need to transform the inequitable educational system; we need to recruit more teachers of color and more low-income teachers to the profession. We need to gain knowledge of the complexity of these	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

				having resisted feedback from colleagues, the literature pointing out possible connections between public cultural scripts (such as institutionalised Whiteness) and their private voices that drive their practice. They leave with an orthodox sense of themselves intact.	public spheres, these psychosocial webs in which we are all caught, and transform them and ourselves as reflections of them so that we can meet the needs of all of our children.		
3. Marx (2004) Regarding Whiteness: Exploring and Intervening in the effects of White racism in teacher education .	To examine the beliefs of nine English-only speaking preservice teachers who tutored English language learners of Mexican origin as part of a university field-service requirement.	Adopt a CWS perspective on how Whiteness is a situated, rather than a neutral, racial identity. Adopt the CRT perspective on how Whiteness is an imprecise and often shifting racial consortium, one that is influenced by time, space and relations of power and processes of struggle. A socially-constructed perspective on race. Racial inequality and racism are normal rather than aberrant qualities of American society.	Intervention study. In-depth interview, observation, recruiting nine women who saw themselves as White native monolingual speakers of English.	The good intentions of the participants were consistently undermined by the Whiteness and the racism that influenced their beliefs about and behaviours with the children. By continuing to problematize White racism and Whiteness and examine the researcher (her participants own connections to them), participants were able to move past their feelings of distress and began to show signs of empowerment. (E.g. they began to	Understanding, problematizing, subverting and otherwise dealing with White racism needs to be a conscious and *continuous* effort. Attention must also be placed on the cultural, racial and linguistic positionalities of teachers. That is, White teachers and teacher education students must be guided in an exploration of their own Whiteness. Attention to Whiteness and		

		Hence, no Whites can escape the grasp of Whiteness, no matter how much they would like to try to do so. Whites benefit from their Whiteness.		understand their own strengths and weaknesses, and many of them sought to mitigate the effects of their Whiteness and White racism.)	White racism is still omitted from most teacher education courses. Disregarding the effects of Whiteness and White racism is a disservice to everyone involved in education. Teacher educators and researchers have a responsibility to challenge their own limitations and interrogate how these affect their work with children.		
4. **Cross (2005)** New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression	Examines and theorizes about the occurrence of how new racism is operationalized in today's socio-political contexts and critiques field placements and knowledge taught about various groups and major teacher education reform efforts that particularly	Whiteness as an ideology locks teacher education into maintaining the same ole' oppression that objectifies, dehumanizes and marginalizes others while ignoring Whiteness, power, privilege and racism. White privilege is maintained through invisible, insidious operations of power that foster Whiteness and	Critical deconstructionist discourse analysis that builds on a case study about how teacher education students may actually learn racism through their program combined with a systematic analysis of teacher reform efforts analyzing practices for it.	Deconstructs how Whiteness and racism permeate both in an invisible manner and through systems of power in reformed teacher education programs that are entrusted to be grounded in liberalism and enlightenment.	Deconstruction is important in recognizing that many years of work may have been undertaken within an unintended Whiteness ideology. In the not so distant future, teacher educators will be called well-intentioned yet	USA	*Educational Studies*

	facilitate teaching racism.	racism. This power is no longer enacted primarily through physical violence but is mostly achieved through more symbolic power. Whiteness as New Racism is a system of power and domination that works best when invisible, through privileged knowledge, built into institutions, and applied to the social body (in contrast to Old Racism).			fraudulent because we reproduce racism, power and Whiteness through new forms of racism without acknowledging it, deconstructing it, or analyzing practices for it. We can be strongly anti-racist in our own minds but be promulgating racism in profound ways we do not understand. We should consider the exact opposite of what we currently do by developing the skills and knowledge to combat the root causes of racism, Whiteness and power rather than reaffirming them through either field placements or the knowledge taught.		

5. de Freitas (2005) Pre-service teachers and the re-inscription of Whiteness: Disrupting dominant cultural codes through textual analysis	To examine the transcription of hip-hop [: the artist Eminem] as a signifier, onto and through another signifier: the rural maritime context of Prince Edward Island, Canada.	*Whiteness* as a socially-constructed norm that centers White privilege at the cost of other cultures. Insidious Western racism marginalizes Otherness and difference against the dominant White identity. Whiteness is a sociohistorical form of consciousness that functions through social practices of assimilation and cultural homogenization.	Discourse analysis that assumes an unstable and recursive relation between text and context. Draws on cultural studies. Writing shifts registers from interpretive textual analysis, to autoethnographic narrative, to theoretical speculations, and to pre-service teacher responses.	Documents preservice teacher resistance to recognizing their implication in the circulation of that norm in the isolated communities of Prince Edward Island.	Argues that the hip-hop artist Eminem is an articulatory vehicle for the construction of the hegemonic norm of Whiteness, and documents pre-service teacher resistance to recognizing their implication in the circulation of that norm in the isolated communities of Prince Edward Island, Canada.	Canada	*Teaching Education*
6. Hickling-Hudson (2005) "White", "ethnic", and "Indigenous": Pre-service teacher reflects on ethnic identity in Australian teacher education	To help students analyse how their culture and socialisation into Whiteness influence their role as teachers.	The notion of "Whiteness" must be named and recognised as an overt and covert ideology in order to disband its normalising practices which operate through all Australian economic, political and social systems. Whiteness is shown to shape subjectivities as well as institutional and politician practices within the White centre.	Analysis of autobiographical and biographical texts.	In reflecting on their socialisation into Anglo-Australian, Indigenous and non-British migrants' cultures in their society, some recall being cultivated into a deep fear of Aborigines, and that they had a tokenistic understanding of ethnicity. Others talk of their confusion between the pulls of assimilation and into mainstream "Whiteness" and of	In grappling with negative legacies of neocolonialism and its race ideologies, teachers, as a first step, can analyse discourses of ethnicity and how these discourses contract "White", "ethnic" and Indigenous Australians. This groundwork is necessary for the further step of honouring the	Australia	*Policy Futures in Education*

		British dominance is still acting covertly in Australian society through the invisible and unnamed culture of "Whiteness", explained as the discourse of White supremacy.		maintaining a minority identity. An Anglo-centric education had left them with a problematic foundation with regards to becoming teachers who can overcome prejudice and discrimination in the classroom and the curriculum.	central role of Indigenous people in Australians' culture, recognising how interactive cultures restructure each other, contributing to initiatives for peace and reconciliation, and promoting the study of cultural diversity in the curriculum – all essential components of intercultural education.		
7. **Lea and Griggs (2005)** Behind the mask and beneath the story: Enabling students-teachers to reflect critically on the socially-constructed nature of their "normal" practice	To help student teachers become more aware of how they relate to their own students, and of the knowledge that they take for granted as normal. To help educators become aware of their own "hidden curriculum".	Cultural Whiteness is a collection of (usually less than conscious) norms, values and beliefs, or cultural scripts that function in specific contexts to reproduce the practices and identities that support White institutional privilege and advantage.	Evaluation of two assignments. Students making and wearing masks and a cultural portfolio. (Number of students not stated.)	Many of the students involved in these two experiences, as well as their instructors, gained a considerable amount of awareness of their own social and cultural privilege. They embraced more complex, post-formal ways of thinking that emphasized that knowledge is constructed.	We have the capacity to re-invent the schools in which we work and the society in which we live. We have the capacity to transform ourselves.	USA	*Teacher Education Quarterly*
8. **McVee (2005)** Revisiting the Black Jesus: Re-emplotting	To propose that close examination of story retellings, both orally and written, can reveal a	Whiteness might manifest as a "culture of niceness" and "White talk" and thereby avoid critique. That is,	Investigates how one White teacher educator re-tells one story six times in a teacher training course.	Reveals how the teacher educator, through changes in discursive patterns, re-	Studies of teacher narratives are needed that "map forward" by following the	USA	*Narrative Inquiry*

a narrative through multiple retellings	narrator's attempt to re-emplot a story in various ways.	saliences when confronted with issues of race and racism. These conversational moves reinforce dominant ideologies about racial minorities.		emplots one story and re-positions herself. She positions her students and their community through references that mask her own Whiteness by drawing attention to the Blackness of the Other.	teacher within teacher education settings and out into school contexts to examine how that enacts practices, positions and beliefs they have narrated in their coursework.		
9. **Solomona, Portelli, Daniel, and Campbell (2005)** The discourse of denial: How White teacher candidates construct race, racism and "White privilege"	To explore the notion and understandings of Whiteness and White privilege of students in teacher education and in Canadian society.	Whiteness and White privilege have become institutionalized and this text identifies the systemic factors that underscore its continued dominance. Whiteness is marked as invisible, colorless and as the inevitable norm.	A representative sample from 200 teacher candidates' (60 of colour) written responses to Peggy McIntosh's article, White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack.	Reveals several strategies that teacher candidates employed to avoid addressing Whiteness and its attendant privileges: ideological incongruence, liberalist notions of individualism and meritocracy, and the negation of White capital. Highlights the need for the continued naming of and a rearticulation of Whiteness.	A rearticulation of Whiteness should be clarified and its implications clearly noted for both White teacher candidates and candidates of color. Additional research needs to be conducted to identify the strategies that lead to a change in the understanding of the teacher candidates regarding notions of race, racism and Whiteness.	Canada	*Race Ethnicity and Education*
10. **Aveling (2006)** "Hacking at our very roots": Rearticulating White racial identity	Focuses on the challenges and possibilities of working with teacher education students – most of whom are White –	Whiteness as a social construct has its roots in colonialism worldwide but is enacted in ways that are culturally and historically specific.	Draw on students' comments and in this way, it is about the researcher's own learning experiences.	After a decade of re-evaluating the author's pedagogy, the anecdotal evidence as well as results from more formal evaluations would	"Teaching against the grain" is likely to continue to be unpopular with some students. Education that purports to have an	Australia	*Race, Ethnicity and Education*

within the context of teacher education	to critically deconstruct Whiteness as part of the larger project of anti-racism.	Whiteness is a historically produced category whose referents have been unstable and shifting throughout the story of Australia's colonisation. Discuss "Whiteness" in anti-essentialist terms rather than "the conventional left analysis of Whiteness as a space between guilt and denial".	Self-re-evaluation of researcher's own pedagogy through anecdotal study.	suggest that the researcher's strategies have become increasingly effective in assisting students to work through their resistances.	anti-racism focus must incorporate an experiential component despite the discomfort this may cause. The researcher's own teaching strategies have become increasingly effective in assisting students to work through their resistances		
11. Brown (2006) The place of race in teacher identity: Self-narratives and curricular intervention as a practice of freedom	To address the invisibility of Whiteness as privilege in White preservice teachers' identities to promote equality in classrooms. To examine the place of race in preservice teachers' narratives of self-constructions informed by personal and social history, the impact of a revised course on their racial identity and implications for	Commonsense hegemonic notions of "Whiteness" and "Blackness" embedded our racially coded self–other meanings – for example, hardworking–lazy, civilized–privileged, rational–emotional, normal–deficient, peaceful–violent, superior–inferior, oppressor–oppressed.	Analysis of 30 of the researcher's own students' self-narratives accompanied by questionnaires.	Preservice teachers acknowledging or disavowing their race and privileges and identities informed by historical experiences.	The inquiry highlights the importance of self-knowledge and historical inquiry in fostering problem-posing education and in the disruption of dominant societal racial meanings internalized by teachers.	USA	*Teacher Education and Practice*

	their projected work with youth.						
12. Carter et al. (2007) *"What do you mean by Whiteness?"*: A professor, four doctoral students, and a student affairs administrator explore Whiteness	Focuses on the reflections of four doctoral students (the authors of the article) from a Whiteness course, the tensions they faced as they moved through various defence modes and how they began to confront Whiteness in their own lives and collective experiences.	Watt's (2007) Privilege Identity Model (PIE) was integral in understanding the response and reactions students had as they addressed tensions and contradictions in their own lives. Watt asserts that meaningful and difficult dialogues are often blocked by resistant behaviors. The PIE model articulates eight defense mechanisms (e.g., denial, deflection, rationalization, intellectualization, principium, false envy, minimalization and benevolence) that people often engage in during difficult dialogues.	Four doctoral students (two White females, one African-American female, a White male), an African-American female assistant professor, and an African-American male student affairs administrator reflect on the difficult dialogues that took place during a seminar on Whiteness.	Whiteness creates tensions that can be overwhelming to some students and produce a variety of responses and behaviours. By examining and critiquing one's own experiences with Whiteness enables one to consciously address privilege and move "the conversation" forward.	Providing students with opportunities to reflect on their own experiences is an essential part of engaging in a difficult dialogue on Whiteness.	USA	*College Student Affairs Journal*
13. Dixson and Dingus (2007) Tyranny of the majority: Re-enfranchisement of	To examine the tensions related to multicultural pre-service teacher education for professors of colour.	Critical Race Theory, counterstories, Whiteness as property, tyranny of Whites, Black female professors, White teacher education, culture of dysconsciousness.	Draws on personal and professional experiences working with pre-service teachers in predominantly White institutions. Utilizes counterstories and CRT to provide a more	Teacher education environments relegate issues to simplistic reductionisms and thus power dynamics continue to work in the students' favour to the extent that they are able to leverage their	There is a need for students to have more meaningful experiences and interactions with difference especially as regards racial and	USA	*International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*

			focused racialized analysis of teacher preparation.	Whiteness and enlist the support of sympathetic White senior faculty and administrators who hold the same or similar biases about people of colour.	ethnic difference.		
African-American teacher educators teaching for democracy							
14. Hill-Jackson (2007) Wrestling Whiteness: Three stages of shifting multicultural perspectives among White pre-service teachers	To develop and test out a new theory that addresses equity pedagogy and is framed within Whiteness and consciousness studies. The second purpose is to have this theory serve as a reflective tool for educators to self-evaluate their pedagogical proclivities.	Whiteness has many definitions including: identity development; privilege; sameness; racial exclusion and control; property; and invisibility. But Whiteness has increasingly become a socio-political indicator for both conservatives and for the new critical scholarship on Whiteness. Emerging research on Whiteness is raising the pedagogical issue of how to enable White pre-service students to become culturally competent pedagogues, able to interact with and teach students from cultures different from their own.	Action research. An in-class teaching and sharing in multicultural education with nearly 120 participants where 94 completed pre- and post-anonymous surveys in narrative form. The analysis is framed within Whiteness and consciousness studies and consists of four phases or echelons: the *unconscious*, the *responsive stage*, the *critical consciousness* echelon, and *multicultural purgatory*.	By the end of our one-course mandate, 63 percent of students were in a wrestling phase, *multicultural purgatory*: They were vulnerable to reverting to the unconscious level.	So much of the research in multicultural education has been on the study of difference and those who occupy the borders or margins of society. Multicultural education must look at ways to assist this critical mass to embody healthier multicultural perspectives, which leads to critical forms of equity pedagogy.	USA	*Multicultural Perspectives*

| 15. Horton and Scott (2007)

White students' voices in multicultural teacher education preparation | To understand the process of identity formation among White students in a multicultural setting. To investigate the way in which White students sought to make meaning of their own Whiteness in the midst of a plethora of claims regarding the pervasiveness and immutability of racism in America. | Tatum (1999) suggests four models of Whiteness. The first is the actively racist White supremacist. The second consists of those who do not acknowledge Whiteness and choose to ignore the fact that Whiteness affords privilege. The third model is that of the "guilty White." A person in this category is aware of racism and feels shame and embarrassment because of their Whiteness. The last model is that of the "White ally," the actively anti-racist White.

Janet Helms (1990) offers six phases of White identity development. They are contact, disintegration, reintegration, pseudo independence, immersion/emersion and autonomy. Everyone does not pass through all of them, and many times people recycle through them depending on the context. Changing contexts and new events make people rethink | Observation and individual interviews of four students in class, personal reflective journals of classroom discussions, and an examination of students' curreré papers and personal reflective journals.

Interview with the lecturer. | Four pre-service teachers represented different stages or statuses of White identity development.

The examples of the four pre-service teachers in this article show that teachers represented different stages or statuses of White identity development. | A powerful rationale for focusing on issues of White identity development in multicultural-oriented teacher education programs is the reality that 80% of all students in such programs in the USA are White.

By helping White student teachers develop positive self-identities, teacher educators can provide an essential element in the development of new teachers in multicultural classrooms.

One purpose of multicultural education is to create an environment in which positive White identity formation is not only possible but also a likely occurrence. The challenge for teacher educators is | USA | *Multicultural Education* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

		their assumptions more deeply. Helms's models of identity have been reconceptualized by Tatum as "habits of mind," or formats for ways of thinking about one's own identity.			to make available the transforming power of multicultural education for everyone.		
16. Michie (2007) Seeing, hearing, and talking race: Lessons for White teachers from four teachers of color	To examine ways White teachers might work more effectively and respectfully with African-American and Latino students, particularly in urban communities.	Whiteness as refusing to acknowledge one's privilege.	A White teacher educator draws upon interviews with four teachers of colour.	The interviewees identify several steps White teachers can take to rethink and strengthen their practice, including listening to teachers of colour, examining personal privilege and "Whiteness," being honest about gaps in their knowledge and committing to learning more, clarifying one's purposes for teaching, and maintaining high expectations for students.	We have to start somewhere in thinking about cross-cultural teaching, and for many White teachers – again, myself included – listening to and learning from educators of color has proven to be a good place to begin.	USA	*Multicultural Perspectives*
17. Pennington (2007) Silence in the classroom/whispers in the halls:	How did our White identities affect how we viewed the children of colour in our classrooms? How could I encourage White PSTs to look at	CRT situates race as a factor in social relations that privileges Whiteness. "White racism is not primarily individual acts or beliefs; those are only	Examines the use of autoethnography as a teaching method to work with pre-service teachers in an elementary school setting.	The analysis demonstrates how the women enacted what the authors call "transracialized" selves: ways of being White that transcend predictable	The researcher claims to be able to deconstruct her own experiences within the context of her fellow student from her childhood and allows her	USA	*Race Ethnicity and Education*

| Autoethnography as pedagogy in White pre-service teacher education | their role and positioning critically?

 Deconstructs Whiteness through letting student teachers work with ethnographies and combining these with Critical Race Theory and Whiteness. | social effects. White racism is the Onto-Logical; it is built into the very nature of the social reality. It is Epistemo-Logical; it is built into the very nature of accepted and legitimated assumptions about how we come to know reality. It is *institutional*, *societal*, and *civilizational*. US institutions from the Government to the schools are White racist ones" (Scheurich, 2002, p. 3). | | performances of more typically racialized identities. | vulnerabilities and prejudices to show. White teacher educators outside of multicultural education do not commonly undertake the transparency of a studied examination of their own racial identity in the interpersonal and institutional milieus of schooling. Teacher educators interested in opening up a first-person dialogue to examine diversity in the classroom with their students beyond multicultural education courses should investigate taking an autoethnographic stance toward preservice teacher education. | | |
| **18. Raible and Irizarry (2007)**

 Transracialized selves and the emergence of post- | Documents White experiences with multiculturalism, race, and cultural differences.

 Contributes to | We agree that what we call post-Whiteness is not only a matter of choosing anti-racism over racism or even becoming a "traitor" to the White race. Rather | Draws on two previous studies by the authors, more precisely, interviews profiling two White European-American women. | The women enacted what we call "transracialized" selves, that is, ways of being White that transcend predictable performances of more | To prepare educators who will teach in increasingly complex, diverse classrooms. Since in the USA the | USA | *Race, Ethnicity and Education* |

| White teacher identities | teacher education through the re-theorization of White identities based on narrative analyses of vignettes (Seidman, 1998) created from interview transcripts. | we contend that, since all identities, even racial ones, are enacted discursively and in dialogic relationships within the various discourse communities in which we participate, for individual subjects to transform their racialized selves requires the active participation of people of other races. | | typically racialized identities. We link transracialized identities to the notion of post-White identity. | majority of current and future teachers (those currently enrolled in teacher preparation programs) are White, and almost half of all students enrolled in PK-12 public schools are students of color, there is a definite need to modify the preparation of teachers to facilitate border crossing, which in our view has become a necessary condition for post-White identity development.

Modifying teacher education necessarily includes significant immersion experiences in diverse communities.

Teacher education programs can simultaneously recruit more people of color as well as transracialized | | |

					Whites who already demonstrate a commitment to cultural connectedness and transforming their identities.		
19. Rogers and Christian (2007) "What could I say?": A critical discourse analysis of the construction of race in children's literature	Analyzes the construction of Whiteness in children's literature that intentionally brings Whiteness to the surface. Re-centers Whiteness in an attempt to racialize White people. Addresses what literary strategies and linguistic techniques the authors call on to present Whiteness and, subsequently, Blackness.	Often Whiteness is viewed as the presence or absence of the dimensions of racism. This view of Whiteness, however, completely ignores the many ways in which Whites benefit from unearned privilege at the expense of people of color. Rather than being endemic and inherent in social interactions and reactions, compounded by the infrastructure of social institutions and policies that uphold race, race is determined by the discourse of racial formation. The complex and dynamic interplay of a "Black–White" binary builds a constantly shifting, rarely permeable boundary that	Critical analysis of four books for a set of book club discussions with pre-service teachers that focused on a unit of inquiry into anti-racism. The books were from a range of genres that covered multiple points in time (contemporary America and historical America), that presented young children as racialized protagonists, and were written for children in the third and fourth grades.	The patterns the authors noticed in the children's books do not occur in isolation. They reflect larger societal themes of the privileging effect, colour-blind theories of race, a historicizing of racism, and ongoing White talk that does not engage directly with matters of race, racism, or anti-racism.	Points to the ways in which authors, educators, and publishers might think more carefully about the ways in which messages about race are communicated through discursive themes and syntactic patterns in the text. Such textual configurations can serve as the basis for critical literacy and critical language aware-ness in classrooms and communities. Indeed, attention to the ways in which authors construct, reproduce and resist these discourses is an important aspect of anti-racist	USA	*Race Ethnicity & Education*

		bestows upon Whites advantages and entitlements that often include a naïveté of such privileges and confer dominance over people of color. In other words, the absence of racist ideology and discourse hides Whiteness and, again, defines normal.			pedagogy.		
20. Adair (2008) White pre-service teachers and "de-privileged spaces"	To "de-privilege" Whiteness," through examining how Whiteness can become both a handicap and an opportunity instead of a privilege.	Whiteness as an identity (and a marker of power) is linked to its insistence on being the only version of right, good, and worthy, to the exclusion of other versions of being. The terms "White" and "Whiteness" are conceptualized as a socially-constructed version of reality that places White, middle-class values as normal or common sense.	Individual and group interviews, participant observations, videotaped class sessions, project presentations, and entrance applications of eight White pre-service teachers within a multicultural teacher training program.	When White students are placed in a de-privileged minoritised position in a multicultural teacher training class, they come to realize that their Whiteness (their arrogant perspectives on, for example, knowledge, social capital, and education) is not valid any more. They come to accept their de-privileged position in class and empathise with students that are minoritised in the larger society.	White pre-service teachers need to see the limitations of their Whiteness and also the value and importance of others' perspectives so they can learn to be successful in classrooms in many different cultural contexts. As teacher educators, we can help prepare White teachers to appreciate multiple landscapes and adapt to foreign cultural contexts to prevent their "escape." We can encourage them	USA	*Teacher Education Quarterly*

				(and ourselves) to "not see" more effectively.		
21. Castango (2008) "I don't want to hear that!": Legitimating Whiteness through silence in schools	Examines the ways in which silences around race contribute to the maintenance and legitimation of Whiteness and highlights patterns of racially coded language, teacher silence, silencing students' race talk, and the conflating of culture with race, equality with equity, and difference with deficit. Highlights the ways in which "normal" classroom occurrences contribute to and sustain Whiteness.	When I speak of Whiteness here, I mean to reference the ideological and institutional aspects of Whiteness. Importantly, Whiteness serves as a pervasive ideology justifying dominance of one group over others. The ideology of Whiteness also serves as a form of social amnesia that allows White people to forget or ignore how we are implicated in the maintenance of systems of privilege and oppression. As a system of ideologies and material effects (privilege and oppression), Whiteness is also a well-entrenched structure that is manifested in and gives shape to institutions. It has thus become a norm against which others are judged but also a powerful, if sometimes	Draws on ethnographic data from two demographically different schools: Observation of 24 teachers, 12 in each of the two schools. Formal and informal interviews with all teachers and the administrators at each school. Attending faculty meetings and other school-wide events. Interview with 11 district-level administrators. Attending district-level professional developments and board meetings. Reviewing pertinent policies, reports, and district publications. However, this article draws primarily on my	Through teacher silence and acts of silencing, students are learning rules about what can be acknowledged, publicly recognized, and discussed. Most of the silences and silencing the researcher observed were motivated by teachers' desires to keep everyone happy, not offend anyone, and protect students from getting upset. The colour-mute practices in the Zion School District serve an important purpose: namely, they feed the cycle in which meritocracy is justified, business-as-usual schooling is rationalized, and inequities are sustained.	Meritocracy and Whiteness are mutually reinforcing of one another. When meritocracy is assumed, our focus is directed away from systemic inequities and toward individual success and failure. Meritocracy allows us to see ourselves as innocent bystanders rather than as participants in a system that creates, maintains, and reproduces social injustice. Teachers' participation in this system clearly has a significant influence on our nation's youth.	USA	*Anthropology of Education Quarterly*

		unconscious, justification for the status quo. As a location of structural advantage, Whiteness serves as a discursive regime that enables real effects to take place. An institution of Whiteness was produced through the exclusion and denial of opportunity to people of color. Institutional leadership and seemingly race-neutral policies/practices work to insure White privilege.	classroom observations within the schools.				
22. Haviland (2008) "Things get glossed over": Rearticulation the silencing power of Whiteness in education	Investigates the ways that White teachers approach issues of race, racism, and White supremacy in White-dominated educational settings.	Critical studies of Whiteness recognize, analyze, and critique the power and privileges associated with Whiteness. From this literature, I have culled three characteristics of Whiteness generally agreed on by scholars: that Whiteness is powerful yet power-evasive, that Whiteness uses a wide variety of techniques to maintain its power, and that Whiteness is not monolithic.	Draws from data from a yearlong qualitative research study, using discourse analysis, critical studies of Whiteness, and feminist theory.	Details WED (White Educational Discourse) and revealed 15 rhetorical, behavioural, analytical, and interactional strategies that participants used to insulate themselves from implication in social inequality. The article demonstrates how participation in these strategies stymied attempts at transformative multicultural education	Attention to WED can help progressive White teachers and teacher educators understand that our participation in WED may be a barrier to White teachers and teacher educators moving toward transformative multicultural education and social-action multicultural education.	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

				and thus functioned to reproduce, rather than challenge, the status quo of educational and social inequality.	Simply recognizing the pernicious ways that White discourses often function in White-dominated educational settings is important; seeing the interactional consequences of White educational discourse can raise awareness of an undertheorized potential barrier to sustained and transformative White engagement with anti-racist pedagogies.		
23. Mazzei (2008) Silence speaks: Whiteness revealed in the absence of voice	To weave together the theoretical implications of Whiteness theory and a theorizing of silence on teacher education practices, research with her own students that explored these implications, and reflections on her own pedagogical practices and location as a White teacher educator	Whiteness must be situated in the global context (teacher education). Since Whiteness as a descriptor for Whites often goes unnamed, unnoticed, and unspoken, the silence or absence (that which is not spoken) of this racial identity continues to provide a framework for the analysis of the conversations I have with White teachers at	Research with the author's own students as well as reflections on her own pedagogical practices and location as a White teacher educator teaching about race and diversity.	Racially inhabited silences emerged in two teacher education courses comprised predominately of White pre-service teachers. Students speak between words and make assumptions about their entire class using the language of what the author refers to as "at-risk-ness". This means that White students are talking	It is my insistence, and I believe that chronicled by others in education (see for e.g. Cochran-Smith, 2000; Valli, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), that change in the arena of racial discourse comes by encouraging our students to brush up against their own Whiteness.	UK	*Teaching and Teacher Education*

	teaching about race and diversity.	both the preservice and in-service levels. These conversations are framed in the context of a qualitative exploration of how White teachers engage with the discourses of race and culture in their classrooms.		about race without noticing it themselves. Through this practise the students are silently voicing a norming presence of Whiteness. The author argues that the students risk losing their practise of normalising Whiteness if the silences of race and of Whiteness are noticed and articulated.	For this to happen we must attempt to develop pedagogical strategies that encourage the breaking of silences, both our own and those of our students. If White teachers continue to effectively deny or fail to see their Whiteness as raced then they will continue to see students of colour as "Other" and respond to them from that perception – i.e., they are raced, I am not.		
24. **Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, and Haviland (2009)** How emotion, race, and school context complicate cultural competence	Analyses one White beginning teacher's negotiations with cultural competence during a lesson in her student teaching semester then traces how she made sense of that lesson in the weeks and months that followed.	In a society that places such priority on racial identity, we are naïve if we attempt to ignore race, and yet many White beginning teachers want to do just that. Because they have lived monocultural lives, most White beginning teachers have little or no	Closely analyses one White beginning teacher's negotiations with cultural competence during a lesson in her student teaching semester, then traces how she made sense of that lesson in the weeks and months that followed.	Taking on cultural competence posed both cognitive and affective challenges. Emotional responses to racialized situations, inner conflicts over Whiteness, and the dynamics of the school context combined to mediate the	By normalizing the fraughtness involved in preparing beginning teachers to become culturally competent, we can begin a conversation that will help beginning teachers and teacher educators alike	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

| | | understanding of their own culture; notions of Whiteness are taken for granted.

The expansive literature from critical studies of Whiteness supports this view, showing that due to their race, Whites possess material, legal, and structural power that they often ignore or downgrade, even as they employ, often unconsciously, strategies to maintain Whiteness as normative, positive, and powerful. | The analysis draws on a subset of data within the larger corpus that includes 30 journal entries written by the beginning teacher while she was a student teacher; 10 videotaped classroom observations, with accompanying field notes, of her teaching; and 12 audiotaped interviews. | development of cultural competence. | embrace the challenges and complexity of culturally responsive teaching.

The article suggests that teacher educators should focus not only on the achievement of cultural competence but also on the struggle involved in enacting it. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **25. Bersh (2009)**

Deconstructing Whiteness: Uncovering prospective teachers' understandings of their culture: A Latina professor's perspective | Focuses on White prospective teachers' exploration of their cultural identities. | Whiteness, as the dominant discourse, becomes the cultural norm from which everything that is not White is defined.

The power and privilege embedded in the mainstream White discourse reifies and perpetuates its dominant quality. | A qualitative case study of 46 teacher education students' writing. | Deconstructing Whiteness became a starting point to reflect on issues about race and cross-cultural experiences for the researcher's own students and for the researcher herself, a Latina professor.

It raised their awareness of what it means to "be" White and their understanding of the role that race plays in defining individuals' cultures, | This deconstruction of the meanings of Whiteness was an important experience in guiding these prospective teachers' understanding of their cultural identities.

This experience just laid the foundation for a step in this direction, but it is a fundamental step in the process of | USA | *Multicultural Perspectives* |

				values, and beliefs, especially in regard to "the Other."	recreating American schools for a more equitable educational experience for all.		
26. Fasching-Varner (2009) No! The team ain't alright! The institutional and individual problematics of race	To make sense of race as it manifests in one teacher education program, in the Midwest in particular, and in teacher education programs more broadly. Providing an answer to Ladson-Billings's (2005) article.	Draw on Harris's (1995) concept of Whiteness as property – the notion that there is a certain absoluteness or inalienability to Whiteness that traditionally precludes something from having value as property, however people vested in the value of Whiteness experience a high sense of value. Whites capitalize on their Whiteness for purposes of enjoyment. One drop of White blood can never make one White, yet one drop of Black blood can strip one of Whiteness, decreasing one's value and consequently, the possession of Whiteness, often falsely understood at a phenotypical level. Whiteness excludes by never having to define	Analysis of a counterstory in order to move beyond the story itself and explore holes that implicate the teacher institution and the "author" as contributing to racism.	Racism manifests in pre-service teacher education; this behaviour has been complacent in institutional racism and as such it maintains White privilege.	White academics engage in discriminatory warfare in what is a systematic racist-oriented training regime. In preparing our future educators, mostly White middle-class women, we reinforce, reinscribe, and make acceptable practices that further widen the gap between White and Black students in K-12 settings. The very nature of teacher education, in the US context, maintains and breeds the very disparity that we often articulate a commitment to fight against, further adding to the educational debt	USA	*Social Identities*

		Whiteness itself, but by defining what it is not.			by which students of color have suffered.		
27. Hayes and Juárez (2009) You showed your Whiteness: You don't get a "good" White people's medal	To problematize the good White person's identity and subsequent reward that many expect because of some deed or some political stance they make. Deconstructs Whiteness through exposing counter-narratives of a Black professor's experience.	Whiteness serves as the normative standard against which Malcolm and others are measured and marked as the angry, unreasonable, and the unqualified Racial Other. Typically, the focus in analyzing Whiteness as a system of domination is on societal structures of racism or on the nature and consequences of individual White racial attitudes.	Counterstory of a Black professor's experience of Whiteness in the academic field.	First, in order to use CRT as a framework, Michelle needed to understand that racism is an endemic part of American society. Second, Michelle needed to understand that she cannot practice true colorblindness; in fact, colorblindness is not an appropriate ideal for social justice. Third, Michelle needed to understand that merit is problematic in the USA. It is not enough to say that anyone who works hard can achieve success. Next, Michelle needed to understand the role experiential knowledge plays in the discourses of people of color. Lastly, Michelle needed to understand the value of Whiteness to learn about and	For democratic education to be realized, the researchers argue that we must work together to abolish, rather than ignore, the Whiteness of teacher education.	USA	*International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*

				understand CRT.			
28. Picower (2009) The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies	To explore findings from a qualitative study that posed questions about the ways in which White pre-service teachers' life experiences influenced understandings of race and difference, and how they negotiated the challenges a critical multicultural education course offered those beliefs. How do White preservice teachers conceptualize race and difference, and what role do these conceptualizations play in maintaining existing racial hierarchies?	Tools of Whiteness facilitate in the job of maintaining and supporting hegemonic stories and dominant ideologies of race, which, in turn, uphold structures of White supremacy. In an attempt to preserve their hegemonic understandings, participants used these tools to deny, evade, subvert, or avoid the issues raised. I contend, however, that these tools are not simply a passive resistance to but much more of an active protection of their hegemonic stories and White supremacy.	Interviews, transcripts of class sessions and prior written assignments from eight White, female, pre-service teachers enrolled in a course on multicultural education during their last semester of a childhood teacher education program at a university located in New York City.	Through previous life experiences, the participants gained hegemonic understandings about race and difference. Participants responded to challenges to these understandings by relying on a set of "tools of Whiteness" designed to protect and maintain dominant and stereotypical understandings of race – tools that were emotional, ideological, and performative. This phenomenon is typically referred to as *resistance* in the literature on White teachers and multicultural education. The author contends, however, that these tools are not passive *resistance to* but rather an active *protection of* the incoming	Ongoing support for graduates who enter the teaching profession should become a built-in component of teacher education programs. As graduates enter the profession, they are bombarded by dominant messages from schools, teachers, and the media reinforcing the idea that urban children of color and their families do not care about education. Teacher education should play a role in supporting its graduates to navigate this experience with an explicit focus on resisting the tendency to return to hegemonic understandings under the pressure of first-year	USA	*Race, Ethnicity and Education*

				hegemonic stories and White supremacy. However, this requires analysis to better understand when and how these tools are strategically used.	teaching. By incorporating strategies that interrogate hegemonic understandings concerning race, teacher education programs can attempt to challenge them from multiple angles, repeatedly and continuously throughout their teacher preparation.		
29. Amos (2010) "They don't want to get it!": Interaction between minority and White pre-service teachers in a multicultural education class	To investigate what kind of interaction takes place between minority and White pre-service teachers in a multicultural education class, and how this interaction impacts minority pre-service teachers' participation in class.	Whiteness manifests through discourse, such as embodied actions and spoken interaction and by expressing, communicating, and sharing within the dominant White in-group. Whiteness manifested by various interactional styles is a discursively performative accomplishment by which Whites reproduce racism in society every day.	Observation of the researcher's own class where all members of the class's comments were noted together with individual in-depth interviews with four minority pre-service teachers' experience of the multicultural lessons.	Minority students in a multicultural education class experience domination by White peers through the acts of being overwhelmingly silenced. Even though the minority participants had lots to say about topics discussed in class, they lost hope when witnessing their White peers' naïveté, and were fearful of retaliation and ostracism. White students resist	The findings of this study do question whether or not I, as the instructor, was able to create a safe classroom space for the participants. Silencing cannot be avoided, yet good teaching can reduce or alleviate the process.	USA	*Multicultural Education*

				both the content as well as the methodology of an instructor's teaching in a multicultural education class.			
30. **Galman, Pica-Smith, and Rosenberger (2010)** Aggressive and tender navigations: Teacher educators confront Whiteness in their practice	To focus of teacher educators' beliefs and developing practice with anti-racist pedagogy.	The intersections of racial and gendered experience in White women's lives reveal that White women may be aware of the effects of patriarchy but may not acknowledge its effects or their complicity in White supremacy despite its relevance to many of their narratives. Conversations about race and racism in teacher education contexts often miss the mark because they fail to make clear not only the "fraughtness" of this grappling but also the concept of power, rushing instead down the blind but familiar alley of colorblindness and multiculturalism, both of which protect White racial knowledge by neutralizing the role of power and reframing race as a sanitized discourse of culture or	Self-study of teacher education practices combined with focus group research on three elementary-level teacher educators.	Beliefs and practices perpetuate and reinforce White racial knowledge in the following ways: (a) (we) teacher educators affirm White non-participation, and (b) silence talk, missing opportunities to address or interrupt racism in the teacher education context. It is hard for teacher educators to help students do the difficult work of interrogating race and power when they collectively have so much of their own work to do as White teacher educators.	We must aggressively interrogate our own practice and tenderly work with others to create alternative ideologies and transitional practices to enable a shift that makes race everyone's project. Building sustainable spaces for faculty to engage in authentic race work and dialogue. We should pursue additional institutional support to become not just skilled teacher educators but also skilled intergroup dialogue facilitators, increasing our	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

		difference.			instructional repertoire to interrupt racism and tenderly guide students through conflict without resorting to economies of niceness. Numerous studies suggest that successful anti-racist pedagogy addresses missteps by naming and becoming conscious of Whiteness and power.		
31. Terwilliger (2010) Mapping stories: Taking detours to challenge Whiteness	To inquire into racial identity construction of a group of White pre-service teachers in order to understand how teacher education programs can better prepare teachers to acknowledge how their personal identity influences classroom practices.	Structures of dominance reside in Whiteness. Examining the mainstream discourses with their embedded values can reveal how (White) teacher identity operated in the educational system as a colonizing force for maintaining the status quo. Whiteness as a discourse in inscribed in the lived experience of pre-service teachers and the	13 student teacher education majors were asked to read discourse and learning theory; guided discussions and written reflections of lectures and field notes on the lectures were undertaken. This was done before, in the middle of and after their practice work. As part of the conclusion of the work, students participated in an anonymous survey.	The data collected revealed participants' range of understanding where, through active student participation, the author suggests critical self-reflection provided a detour from "habits of mind" and created spaces for preservice teachers to acknowledge race as a pedagogical matter. The author suggests that educational programs can assist future educators in addressing diverse	Critical reflection serves as a detour from "habits of mind" and creates spaces for perceive teachers to acknowledge race as a pedagogical matter.	USA	*Making Connections*

		sedimentation of raced ideas over time makes self-critique difficult.		populations by closely examining how discourse is structured around power and knowledge.			
32. Harris (2011) Teacher educators under surveillance at a religious university	To examine how institutional norms are enforced through surveillance and self-discipline among teacher educators at a religious university. To investigate what can and what cannot be taught.	Whiteness structures institutions within the United States and serves as a set of presuppositions that underlie the functioning of the economic, political, legal, and other systems. Within the discourse of academia, discussing messy, controversial topics is considered inappropriate. Oppression is, after all, ugly and inelegant, it is hard to talk about sexism, racism, classism, homophobia, xenophobia, and ethnocentrism without getting messy. Whiteness provides cognitive and evaluative frameworks around the norm.	Focus group and personal interviews with eight teacher educators.	The data reveal the participant responses as highly structured by university norms about what they can and cannot say about particular topics. The results confirm the function of surveillance and norms in a university setting and illuminate the process in a religious context. Data also reveal how fear played a part in the process, as participants disciplined themselves to fit university norms and censored themselves when they began to exercise agency.	Teacher educators may deconstruct norms and speak and act in new ways; however, an emotional cost may be the result.	USA	*Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*

33. Laughter (2011) Rethinking assumptions of demographic privilege: Diversity among White pre-service teachers	To reveal ways in which demographic definitions are neither monolithic nor natural. To bring "White" voices of White pre-service teachers (WPTs) into dialogue and disrupt the evolving collection of characteristics undergirding the Whiteness of teacher education. Examines the demographic divide of the researcher's own context, to aim at providing methodological support or implications for other researchers.	Whiteness is an evolving, socially-constructed system of conscious/unconscious, intentional/accidental, explicit/implicit privilege associated with those who manifest certain characteristics labeled White, characteristics that evolve within a racialized society. Among the privileges of Whiteness are the privilege to exclude and the privilege to define, possess, and own property. I believe that by replacing the words "White" and "Whiteness" with other demographic indicators, I might describe any number of privileged demographics. For example, if examining a religious demographic, the words "Christian" and "Christian-ness" might replace "White" and "Whiteness" in the above definition. What is at play in this definition, and this study,	Longitudinal (one-year) study of a dialogue circle.	Evidence indicated a need to re-evaluate and diversify the ways in which each participant embodied and enacted Whiteness. For example, Rachel was conscious of oppressive systems and struggled with personal issues of race. Francis had broad experiences in a number of non-White communities. Both were willing to reach out to students of colour because the Whiteness of teacher education had often failed them as well. Teacher educators should not rely on assumptions lest they fail to know their student teachers as individuals and fail to prepare them adequately for diverse classrooms.	Many teacher educators engaged in the preparation of White preservice teachers for diverse classrooms may rely on generalized assumptions that will inevitably lead to failure. Instead, teacher educators might recognize each student teacher as diverse both within and across multiple communities.	USA	*Teaching and Teacher Education*

		is a system of demographic power from unearned but assumed privileges.					
34. Glenn (2012) Developing understandings of race: Preservice teachers' counter narrative (re)constructions of people of color in young adult literature	To reflect on how two counter-narrative young adult novels fostered for opportunities for preservice teachers to link their understandings of race with and beyond the text.	Counter-narrative, race, counterstory. Storytelling from the fictional character of color provides a powerful counter to the majoritarian stories that make White privilege appear natural. Stories constructed by the Other allow for broader and liminal perspectives that can reveal the way in which "dominant perspectives distort the realities of the other in an effort to maintain power relations that continue to disadvantage those who are locked out of the mainstream" (Ladson-Billings, 2000, pp. 262-262).	As part of their program, 14 students enrolled in a teacher preparation program in the north-eastern US meet six times to discuss the two counter youth narratives: *Mexican White Boy,* by Matt de la Péna (2008) and *After Tupac and D. Forster,* by Jacqueline Woodson (2008). Of the 14 participants, 1 identified as Black, 13 identified as White (1 male and 13 females), and all identified as monolingual English speakers.	Participants provided evidence of how the counter-narratives encouraged them to reconsider assumptions that society and they hold and perspectives relative to people of colour. The counter-narratives provided them with new ways in which to conceptualize social norms to reconsider how they see the seeming "Other" and, in some cases, recognise their own culpability in promoting existing stereotypes. It also illuminates the complexity of the development of understandings of racism.	Counter-narrative literature has the benefit of presenting stories that challenge the dominating narrative, thus exposing readers to alternative versions of what they think they know. It invites readers to more objectively experience a portrayal of the students with whom they might work. More opportunities need to be made available to think through [diversity-related] ideas that prospective teachers meet in school classrooms or university coursework. Preservice teachers need safe spaces with thoughtful and listening group	USA	*English Education*

						UK	*Oxford Review of Education*
				leaders who can help them consider how their racial and cultural identities are implicated in curriculum planning and instruction.			
35. Pearce (2012) Confronting dominant Whiteness in the primary classroom: Progressive student teachers' dilemmas and constraints	To explore the dilemmas and constraints faced by student teachers on their final teaching practice and to examine their different responses to the unexamined White norms and priorities in the material they are expected to teach.	Whiteness is an approach which seeks to deconstruct Whiteness as a historical and social category to reveal how it works to retain its elite status in part through its ability to seem invisible or neutral, at least to those with White skin. Recent studies find that students desire to resist the idea of Whiteness as a dominant discourse and minimize the issue of race inequity through appeals to individualism and meritocracy. The lack of attention to racism and cultural diversity in the National Curriculum can be seen as one indicator of the continuing dominance of Whiteness at government level, where the voices and experiences of minoritised groups are	Draws on data from an ongoing longitudinal study of nine progressive teachers in their early careers. This article draws on data from the second round of interviews, just after the participants' final teaching practice. It also makes use of one student's journal, written during the practice. Focusing on the curriculum, it examines what happened when some of the students challenged unexamined White norms in the material they were expected to teach.	The curriculum provided in all examples can be said to be both informed by and supportive of White cultural values and norms, to the exclusion of the experiences and perspectives of other cultural groups. It is important to acknowledge that all teachers can only draw on a limited range of experience when engaging with other cultures: we all struggle with difference. But when we, as White teachers, demonstrate a limited cultural repertoire, our position as members of the dominant ethnic group can act to insulate us from the consciousness of our restricted under-	There is ample evidence to suggest that in England, as elsewhere, the curriculum in primary schools is dominated by hegemonic notions of Whiteness, and that there is little understanding among many teachers of what a more inclusive curriculum might look like. I continue to argue that there is much for individual schools and teachers to do in understanding how their practices might uphold White norms and prevent other perspectives from becoming embedded in the		

		simply not seen as important enough to necessitate a redrafting of the curriculum (Gillborn, 2005). A "recognition that all speak from a particular place, out of a particular history, out of a particular experience, a particular culture, without being contained by that position" (Hall, 1992, p. 258).		standing. No evidence [from this study] suggests that, in blocking attempts to adapt the curriculum, the teachers concerned were consciously defending a White curriculum. It may be that they were simply rejecting a challenge from a junior colleague to the way things had always been taught. Nonetheless, these instances offer useful vignettes of how institutional racism really works.	curriculum. While there is cause for optimism about some new teachers' understanding of and commitment to race equality and ethnic diversity, more attention needs to be paid to how schools respond to teachers who offer a challenge to hegemonic norms and practices.		
36. **Pennington, Brock, and Ndura (2012)** Unravelling the threads of White teachers' conceptions of caring: Repositioning White privilege	To examine how two White elementary teachers came to understand how their White racial identities influenced their teaching of children of colour during a yearlong series of three courses.	Defines Whiteness as socially-constructed based on skin color. Highlights the examination of Whiteness as a form of White privilege that is a larger part of civilizational, societal, institutional, and individual racism expressed both overtly and covertly. A particular	Exposed the teacher to Helm's (1990) White identity model. Designed a teacher course that aligned with conceptions of critical pedagogy and social justice. Focused on repositioning the White teachers racially by using social semiotics.	First, the teachers' avoidance of addressing Whiteness is aligned with McIntyre's (1997) description of White talk. The two teachers came to understand their racial positioning and the role caring plays in racial interaction through the multimodal construction of the course.	The authors propose that teacher education attends to and problematizes the inherent stance of caring that White teachers bring to their classrooms in ways that open up dialogue and critique to foster Noddings and Valenzuela's (1984/2003) calls for authentic caring.	USA	*Urban Education*

		focus is put on White racism as unacknowledged White privilege, similar to color blindness (Ullucci & Battey, 2011). One particular aspect of White, unacknowledged privilege is the inherent avoidance, by Whites, of naming their Whiteness, especially within course settings. Bringing Whites to understand and name their White positioning in society requires an understanding of White identity.	Drew on critical ethnography focused on the documentation of oppression and empowerment, raising consciousness and reflective awareness. Data was collected through field notes, videotaping class meetings, and interacting with the teachers. The ethnographic study was followed up by reflective interviews with the two teachers after focusing on Whiteness and care.		Teachers need to reconceptualise their understanding of care so that it does not serve their own Whiteness but rather the needs of students of color.		
37. Puchner, Szabo, and Roseboro (2012) The short-term effect of a race-related course on racial identity of White students	To examine the short-term impact of taking a race-related course on White teacher education students' racial identity attitudes.	Explores Helms's model of White racial identity development, which contains six identity stages, later referred to as statuses (Helms, 1990; Helms & Carter, 1990). Helms's theory focuses on the White developmental need, as described by Helms (1990), to first renounce racism and then to develop a positive sense of Whiteness.	Compared a sample of 65 students (both preservice and in-service teachers) in the United States taking a race-related course to a comparison group of 58 students taking a non-race-related course.	Findings indicated that the course had a positive effect on student understanding of racial issues.	Follow-up work to determine whether changes in beliefs are actually accompanied by changes in educational practices would be an important part of future study, as would work linking specific teacher education experiences to changes in teacher beliefs and practices	USA	*Teaching in Higher Education*

		Because Whites are dominant in US society, they are socialized to believe they are entitled to privilege. To retain their privilege, they tend to distort reality and feel aggression toward threats to the current situation (Helms, 1995). Thus, healthy development for Whites, according to Helms's theory, is to overcome the sense of entitlement.			(Zeichner, 2005), and work that goes beyond examination of White teachers. Linking changes in beliefs to changes in practice requires longitudinal work that we hope to undertake in the future.		
38. Smith and Lander (2012) Collusion or collision: Effects of teacher ethnicity in the teaching of critical Whiteness	To expose and explain the very different reactions of White student teachers to a critical Whiteness approach given that one of the lecturers is Black and the other White.	Whiteness is [an] active participant in systems of domination. The analysis is based on critical Whiteness research to reveal aspects of "White talk" (McIntyre, 1997) embedded within their discourse: a discourse of Whiteness.	Two lecturers' teaching of critical Whiteness studies at opposite ends of England to overwhelmingly White student cohorts. One, a Black teacher maintained detailed diaries of her teaching experiences over the previous nine years, including examples of students' work and course reviews. The other, a White teacher teaching diversity and equality on a postgraduate initial teacher education course,	Through our personal and professional conversations we have come to realise that student responses to the approach we both adopt in teaching educational equality appear radically different. Reveals that student reactions are underpinned by racialized assumptions of teacher ability and motives, leading to collusion in Whiteness for the White teacher and, for the Black teacher, a collision	We are not just socialized into an understanding of "who teaches," however, we also have expectations (in terms of racial ascription) surrounding who is a "good teacher." The White teacher learned that: Students' minds would be closed to the ideas of Whiteness if her body was not White.	UK	*Race Ethnicity and Education*

			focusing on critical Whiteness studies, interviewed 24 out of a possible 76 students.	between her teaching and student perceptions of her role and values.	The Black teacher has learned that her brown face "means something here, probably more than ever imagined" (Truitt et al., 2009, p. 70) and that she cannot teach about Whiteness alone, but with a White colleague. Few of her White colleagues understand the symbolic violence she faces, or the privileges with which they are endowed and which they enact (albeit often unwittingly) as teacher educators. Both have learned that White student teachers are most receptive to understanding educational inequities through a critique of Whiteness when taught by a White teacher educator.		

| 39. Ullucci (2012)

Knowing we are White: Narrative as critical praxis | To highlight how teacher educators can use narrative, particularly autobiographies, to help understand the racial and cultural consciousness of White teachers. | Whiteness, like all racial identities, is a social construct.

Kincheloe and Steinberg (1998) argue that in its most basic interpretation, Whiteness is "involved with issues of power and power differences between White and non-White people. Whiteness cannot be separated from hegemony … Whiteness holds material/economic implications" (p. 4).

Whiteness is "a system and ideology of dominance and superiority that marginalizes and oppresses people of color ensuring privilege for White people" (McIntyre, 2002, p. 3).

McLaren and Munoz (2000) describe Whiteness as having "an unprecedented degree of authority and power to its membership and its ethnocentric cultural, social and ideological expression, while at the same time repositioning | Document analysis of 11 race- and culture-focused autobiographies addressing the questions:

How do you define yourself racially? Culturally?

When did you first "discover" your own race?

What experiences have shaped your racial identity?

In which ways has your ethnicity/race benefitted you? Caused you difficulties? | The author's greatest concern with the autobiographies is the lack of focus on race.

Students mainly focus on their cultural identity, even though they are supposed to answer questions of race.

Students are not fully exploring how Whiteness functions in society, thus obscuring how Blackness/Brown-ness also functions. | Narrative construction provides a method for highlighting how White teachers understand their identities and how Whiteness functions in society.

I have also learned many (needed) lessons myself. Name. Reflect. Act. | USA | *Teaching Education* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

152

		the 'other' as deviant" (p. 32).					
40. Smith (2013) A critique of the teaching standards in England (1984–2012): Discourses of equality and maintaining the status quo	To present a critical analysis of the state-prescribed teaching standards from 1984 to 2012 in order to reveal discourses of equality imbued within.	"[D]iscourses are intimately related to the distribution of social power and hierarchical structure in society, which is why they are always and everywhere ideological" (Gee, 1996, cited in Rogers, 2004, p. 6). "Whiteness cannot be separated from hegemony" because Whiteness too holds material and economic implications. Whiteness here is understood to represent "particular social and historical formations that are reproduced through specific discursive and material processes and circuits of desire and power" (McLaren, 1998, p. 66).	A critical discourse analysis and critical race theory are employed to explore and explain how the discourses of equality are shaped by the prevailing political ideology of the state.	Up to 2007, the analyses revealed the gradual emergence of two seemingly incompatible discourses: recognition of the difference within notions of appropriacy of curriculum input vs. the assertion of a homogenised knowledge valid for all. It is argued that because this tension remained unexamined in the documents, damaging assumptions of deficit were obscured, thereby effecting a failure to critique the hegemonic norms against which such a deficit was assumed, with the ultimate effect of maintaining the status quo of inequitable outcomes. The standards of 2012 also operate to maintain the status quo but do so far less discretely. Here,	Whether the knowledge and understanding required to educate teachers in the "social and political contexts of the curriculum, of pedagogy, of educational purposes, of the structures of schooling and education, and the effects these have on reproducing and widening racialised, gendered, social class-based inequalities" (Hill, 2007, p. 214) is possible within the standards' agenda of a new managerialist, marketised vision of education, is highly doubtful. It is essential that students are critically reflexive and reflect not only on their immediate	UK	*Journal of Education Policy*

| | | | | homogeneity appears overtly approved through an overarching assimilationist agenda. Deficit is now more openly articulated as attached to those who need to assimilate. | situational practice but question "the taken-for-granted assumptions which underpin practice" (Winter, 2000, p. 155).

Such critique requires tools such as Critical Race Theory (CRT) and critical discourse analysis as utilised herein, and crucially, as part of CRT, an understanding of Whiteness through a study of White supremacy. | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **41. Brown (2014)**

Teaching in color: A critical race theory in education analysis of the literature on preservice teachers of color and teacher education in the US | Takes seriously the call for recruiting and retaining more preservice teachers of color by critically considering some of the pressing challenges they might encounter in teacher preparation programs.

Reviews the existent literature on preservice | Draws from Frankenberg (1993) and recognizes Whiteness as operating across a "set of linked dimensions" in which: Whiteness as hegemony is evident in the knowledge, values, experiences and ways of being valorized in society and in educational settings, including (but not limited to) schools and teacher education | Searches in the Web of Knowledge and Education Full Text databases using the terms "preservice teachers of color" and "teacher candidates of color" to locate relevant literature. | The literature presents the challenges these teacher candidates encounter when navigating their preservice teacher training programs.

These challenges include encountering programs mired in a normalized, White culture that fails to align with, include or support the experiential knowledge teachers of | Recognizing that teacher training does not occur in a race-neutral context but to acknowledge race and critically address it teachers of color are to truly operate in a space of equity within teacher education.

Teachers of color must be recognized as both individuals and members of | USA | *Race Ethnicity and Education* |

	teachers of color and teacher education in the USA.	programs. In the specific case of the USA, the sociocultural factor of race has played a primary role in organizing and maintaining inequitable societal relationships. It is necessary, then, to place race at the center of social analysis. The dominant, (dis)embodied and normalized culture of Whiteness, White privilege and White hegemony pervades contemporary teacher education, and presents a formidable challenge to the goal of preparing teachers (of color) to teach in a manner that is relevant, critical and humanizing while also socially and individually transformative.		color bring with them while also neglecting to provide the knowledge and experiences needed to challenge and adequately prepare teachers of color to become effective teachers of social justice. Another shortcoming highlighted in the literature is the fact that teachers of color are often discussed as possessing a similar critical stance in their reason for becoming teachers in the first place.	historic groups that likely possess knowledge and experiences that are different from but complementary to those found in the dominant society. Programs must take care not to essentialize preservice teachers of color but recognize that all teachers – regardless of their background or race – require appropriate and relevant teacher training if they are to acquire the skills, knowledge and dispositions needed to become teachers committed to relevant, responsive and socially just teaching.		
42. **Matias, Viesca, Garrison-Wade, Tandon, and Galind (2014)**	Employs CRT to (a) substantiate the Black imagination as a historical reality and, thus, (b) use the Black imagination to	The Black imagination can encompass other people of color's experiences, albeit with differentiation, because it acknowledges that Blackness, just as its	Interviewees with 16 students, 15 identifying as White.	Findings describe how the White imagination operates inside the minds of White teacher candidates, namely through their (a) emotional	Since the White teacher candidates did not acknowledge the construction of the White imagination to everyday acts of	USA	*Equity & Excellence in Education*

"What is critical Whiteness doing in OUR nice field like critical race theory?": Applying CRT and CWS to understand the White imaginations of White teacher candidates	contrast how the White imagination responds, reacts, conceptualizes, and blinds itself to realities of race and racism.	ontological opposite, Whiteness, is ever-present in how individuals experience racialization (Iijima, 1997; Perea, 1998). If Blackness is a social construction that embraces Black culture, language, experiences, identities, and epistemologies, then Whiteness is a social construction that embraces White culture, ideology, racialization, expressions, and experiences, epistemology, emotions, and behaviors. Unlike Blackness, Whiteness is normalized because White supremacy elevates Whites and Whiteness to the apex of the racial hierarchy (Allen, 2001).		disinvestment, (b) lack of critical understanding of race, (c) resurgence of White guilt, and (d) recycling of hegemonic Whiteness, all of which negatively impact their role in anti-racist teaching in urban schools.	Whiteness, racism was upheld. For the future, we will include both CWS and CRT readings so that White teacher candidates can identify and understand how the existence of the White imagination impacts their understanding of race dynamics, a process that influences their relationship with urban students of color.		
43. Smith (2014) Emotional responses to documentary viewing and the potential for transformative	Examines the relationship between specific documentaries and White student teachers' emotional responses to their viewing as part of a	Whiteness operates to sustain differential power relations; however, it is also crucial to recognise that Whiteness involves "a refusal to acknowledge how White people are implicated in	Specific documentaries and White student teachers' emotional responses to their viewing as part of a postgraduate teacher education course on	The analysis of students' responses to particular documentaries has revealed a range of emotions from shock, surprise and anger to fear, frustration and	Certain documentaries have the pedagogic potential to transform student thinking via the evocation of particular emotions	UK	*Teaching Edcuaiton*

| teaching | postgraduate teacher education course on educational equality.

Analyses emotional responses from a critical Whiteness perspective to reveal emotion as also potentially obstructive to student transformation.

Shares the pedagogic decisions taken to capitalise on those emotional responses conducive to transformed student understandings and to stymie those which act as investments in Whiteness to impede student development. | certain social relations of privilege and relations of domination and subordination" (McLaren, 1998, p. 66). | educational equality.

Each workshop lasts for one full day, and the cohort is split into three groups of approximately 27 students. The groups rotate around workshops and hence I teach critical White studies three times each year to three different groups. | resentment and finally to passion and a determination to act.

More importantly, however, the analysis in this small-scale study strongly suggests that those teacher educators employing documentaries to transform student thinking in unsettling White hegemonic practices, attitudes and cognitions must always read beyond the face value of students' emotional responses. | which act to disturb White hegemonic practices, attitudes and cognitions; a conceptual lens is vital for understanding the relationship between documentaries and emotional responses in order that transformed thinking is enabled.

A conceptual lens is therefore critical to reveal how Whiteness works through evoked emotions to justify and reinforce White interests.

The study suggests that documentaries of the investigative journalism genre, employing particular conventions such as hidden cameras or fly-on-the-wall recordings; interviews with participants and invited "experts"; and the | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

					involvement of trusted journalists, are less likely to be perceived as ideologically-driven "educational films". They may, therefore, be particularly conducive to transformative teaching. However, here too one needs to be vigilant.		
44. Charbeneau (2015) White faculty transforming Whiteness in the classroom through pedagogical practice	Presents a conceptual framework of pedagogical practices reported by White faculty that serve to challenge the hegemony of Whiteness in the university classroom.	Whiteness includes not only a micro-level personal racial identity but a social location and pattern of interactions in the context of macro-level political–economic structures, and cultural representations and norms. It is a social construction and a lived reality, a subjective experience and a set of objective power structures and relationships that organize and influence institutions and individuals.	Interviews conducted with a sample of 18 White faculty members (tenured and tenure tracked). These participants were elected on the basis of their local reputations as outstanding instructors and as especially thoughtful practitioners of teaching with or about diversity, even if the professor and/or students are all White.	Thee teacher educators expressed their racial awareness by practice that acknowledged the presence of Whiteness and articulations of how Whiteness impacts on social interactions and structures and by understanding plurality and recognizing that there is a racial hierarchy in our society that positions Whites above other racial/ ethnic groups. They also worked in ways to reveal patterns of White hegemony and one's location in a system of White privilege by	One way Whiteness is manifest in higher education is via the assumption that faculty are unbiased conveyors of knowledge, unaffected or influenced by their own or their students' social identities or the larger structure of race. Even if they do recognize the impact of these practices, they may not know how, and may not make the effort to find out how, to do things	USA	*Race Ethnicity & Education*

| | | | | recognizing that the dominant narrative in our society is based on the perspective of the White racial group and by White students acknowledging their social location within this system of White privilege.

They challenged White supremacy (power and privilege) by creating diverse alliances and by acting to bring individuals and groups of varied racial/ethnic identities together to form relationships that transcend the normative racial structure.

And they worked to alter structures/cultures by innovating to challenge patterns of White supremacy by trying to transform structures, practices and cultural norms that directly or indirectly perpetuate the social racial hierarchy and resulting inequalities/ injustices. | differently.

There are several reasons why transformative approaches are imperative and at the same time difficult to implement.

You have to embrace conflict and not be scared of it, not be scared of emotion. | | |

45. **Crowley and Smith (2015)** Whiteness and social studies teacher education: Tensions in the pedagogical task	Analyzes the experiences of a cohort of predominantly White pre-service social studies teachers discussing race and Whiteness in relation to education and attempts to trouble the assumption that the pedagogical practices in teacher education adequately create an environment in which White teachers can thoroughly engage in the problematics of race, racism, and Whiteness.	Whiteness, as a hegemonic system of racial reasoning, and White people, as a heterogeneous group of participants in race relations. While Whiteness bestows advantages upon all those racially identified as White, not all White people participate in or benefit from race relations in the same way (Gillborn, 2010). CWS views race as a social construct and discusses Whiteness as a shifting ideological deployment, rather than a fixed racial category (Frankenberg, 1993). Whiteness is not viewed as merely a phenotypical distinction, but rather, as a set of power relations (Mills, 1997) or a racial world view (Leonardo, 2002). Whiteness derives much of its power from its normalizing function, serving as the "unmarked marker of others" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 198) or "the unnamed, universal moral referent"	Instrumental, collective case study (Stake, 1995) that included a participant group consisting of a cohort of 27 pre-service social studies teachers at a large, public university in the southwestern United States.	The pre-service teachers resisted identifying White privilege as a form of structural racism, instead preferring individualized understandings of racism. The participants also utilized their personal biographies to accept or reject aspects of race privilege. The authors highlighted three tensions for teacher educators to consider when engaging pre-service teachers in discussions about race privilege, including recognizing the unfamiliar nature of structural thinking, appreciating the limitations of personal experience, and acknowledging the challenges of structural considerations within individual classrooms. If White pre-service teachers are able to understand their personal experiences through this lens, they will be much more	Teacher educators must have an appreciation for the structural dimensions of Whiteness that imbue their students' responses, and they must be willing to reflect on how their pedagogical approaches serve to limit the ways in which White teachers might engage with these issues.	USA	*Teaching Education*

		(Giroux, 1997, p. 286). Whiteness acts as a model of cultural and social behavior by which others are judged. Through these processes of normalization, Whiteness discourse creates a "structured blindness" (Mills, 1997), in which Whites often fail to recognize their participation in maintaining a racial hierarchy.		capable of the critical reflection and social analysis that allows for them to unthink and to escape Whiteness (McLaren, 1998) through the choices they make in their daily lives.			
46. **Flintoff, Dowling, and Fitzgerald (2015)** Working through Whiteness, race and (anti) racism in physical education teacher education	Examines the operation of Whiteness within physical education teacher educators (PETEs) through a critical reflection on the three co-authors' careers and experiences working for social justice.	As McKinney (2005) argues, this is how Whiteness works: The privilege and luxury of Whiteness involves "the option [for White people] to confront race or to avoid it" (p. 73). In this paper, we explore how it is that, although we have each come to position ourselves under the umbrella of "critical" scholars in PE/TE, we have been able to maintain considerable contradictions and silences in our engagement with social justice agendas (see	A collective biography work – a process in which we reflected upon, wrote about and shared our embodied experiences and memories about race, racism and Whiteness as educators working for social justice.	The narratives reveal the ways in which Whiteness operates within PETE through processes of naturalisation, ex-denomination and universalisation. We have been educated, and now work within, teacher education contexts where professional discourse about race at best focuses on understanding the racialised Other, and at worse, is invisible. By drawing on a "racialised Other" deficit discourse in our	Reflecting critically on our biographies and careers has been the first step in recognising how Whiteness works in order that we can begin to work to disrupt it. White teacher educators must critically examine their own role within these processes if they are to expect student teachers to engage seriously in doing the same.	UK	*Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*

		Dowling, Fitzgerald, & Flintoff, 2014), and specifically around race and racism. Whiteness works to silence or downplay discussion about racism – for both racialised and White participants, and particularly when the researchers are White. Whiteness works through being invisible to most Whites. We reproduce "White privilege pedagogy" (Levine-Rasky 2000) through taking White experiences and White knowledge as universal, by continuing to define Others' experiences of race rather than our own, and through avoiding the naming of Whiteness (see Flintoff & Webb, 2012).		pedagogy, and by ignoring race in own research on inequalities in PETE, we have failed to disrupt universalised discourses of "White-as-norm" or addressed our own privileged racialised positioning.			
47. Juarés and Hayes (2015) On being named a Black supremacist and a race traitor: The	Concerned with the preparation of future teachers and the continued Whiteness of teacher education.	Whiteness is the dominating perspective that confers tangible and economically valuable benefits, and it is jealously guarded as a	Counterstorytelling.	Pre-service teacher education programs consistently articulate commitments to fairness, equity and cultural diversity.	Pointedly, the concepts and experiences of racial aggression we present in this article are not new.	USA	*Urban Review*

problem of White racial domination and domestic terrorism in U.S. teacher education	Presents a composite story to highlight and analyze how race and racism influence the preparation of future teachers in ways that typically sustain rather than challenge the Whiteness of education despite widespread self-reports of successful multicultural teacher education. Uses an examination of the intersections of White racial domination and the daily business of teacher preparation as a learning tool for pushing forward endeavors to prepare all teachers to successfully teach all students.	valued possession. The article is mainly on CRT but theorises Whiteness as a form of domestic terrorism, or more precisely, as a form of academic lynching. Lynching was a form of punishment that often was a public spectacle with the entire community watching and actively participating. This lynching in the academy also happens publically. Academic lynching oftentimes circles around Whites' attempt to determine what kind of Blackness is acceptable to them, how that Blackness should be expressed, and how one gets disqualified or excluded from Whiteness through one's Blackness: tame versions of "Blackness ONLY allowed!" reminiscent of Jim Crow segregation.		However, what we observe with the two stories of Malcolm and Gloria is quite the opposite. When these two faculty members begin to critique programmatic structures, questioning other colleagues, and pushing White students to begin critiquing the system from which they benefit as Whites, the attacks leading to academic lynching begin.	We have simply gathered under one umbrella, the umbrella of domestic terrorism, the terrorizing experiences that are and have been commonplace for faculty members who challenge Whiteness in predominantly White institutions. "Why aren't teachers being prepared to teach for diversity, equity, and global interconnectedness?" (Merryfield, 2000). We already know the answer: because White supremacy will use domestic terrorism in the form of academic lynching and any other measure to ensure the future of the existing racial hierarchy.		

| 48. Schultz and Fane (2015)

A healthy dose of race? White students' and teachers' unintentional brushes with Whiteness | Reports on efforts by three Australian academics to develop students' sociocultural awareness (in particular, their racial literacy) during a time of mounting pressure on teacher educators to narrow and standardise their approaches.

Of key concern is the development of a critical disposition in students – a disposition geared toward teaching for social equity. | Whiteness reproduces White race privilege.

Racism rarely nowadays manifests in overt acts, but is elided beneath inclusive rhetoric that conflates openly oppressive discourses with those relating to multiculturalism, diversity or human rights (Green, Sonn, & Matsebula, 2007, p. 392).

In Australia, Hage (2002) has described this as "Benevolent Whiteness", or the everyday reproduction of White cultural and political power in ways that simultaneously naturalise racial hierarchy.

Race remains an organising principle of domination.

Three standpoints exist:

1) Conservative standpoint: While overt references to race have fallen out of favour with an "inclusive" White | Three data-collection methods, including the analysis of two student assessment tasks (an essay and reflective journal); semi-structured post-topic student interviews, and; teacher academic journals that included observational notes. 31 students in total participated. | In the analysis of student work, a conservative position was evidenced as a manoeuvre expressed most commonly as "victim blaming".

An equal number of students expressed "complicit" sentiments in their writing that, despite being less overt, also fed into the epistemological foundations of "race" by deferring to an essential sameness.

Another key Whiteness strategy to emerge from the student writing involved the use of counter-narratives – "what abouts" – to affirm unintentionally racist beliefs that lead to deviation from the critical content of a discussion and rely instead on other's non-reflexive "beliefs" about Other people, used, for example, as a basis for conceptualising Aboriginal Indigenous | We are asking students to engage with radically different views than those instilled through the pedagogic work of silence surrounding "Whiteness" (in mainstream schools and society); our critical focus needs to target these racial silences.

This is necessary to challenge widely held beliefs and ideas in ways that empower students to start to engage meaningfully in a cultural politics of race, no matter what their teaching area. It would be remiss of us, however, to make such claims without acknowledging the political environment presently influencing our work as educators. | Australia | *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* |

| | | Australian mainstream, we conceptualise a conservative position as one that is evident when patently racialised beliefs are clearly enunciated, or existing close to the surface of White people's dialogue.

2) Complicit (colour blind) standpoint: This position overlaps with the last and is evident when White subjects avoid speaking "race", while relying upon naturalised White standards as yardsticks for normalcy.

3) Subordinate standpoint: This position advances a comparatively inclusive viewpoint and may be evident when White subjects acknowledge difference or dare to speak "race", while adopting a benevolent position that fails to subvert the grounds of

White hegemony. | | health. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 49. Amos (2016)

Voices of teacher candidates of color on White race evasion: "I worried about my safety!" | Investigates the negative impacts minority teacher candidates receive from White teacher candidates in a required multicultural education class. | Whiteness as a culture of colour-blindness and niceness through which White power is evasive.

Whiteness implants in the minds of Whites messages about their superiority and the inferiority of people of color and becomes an integral component of their personalities.

The invisibility and normality of Whiteness is strengthened by embracing colorblindness (Harris, 1993; Sue, 2011).

Colorblindness – the mode of thinking about race organized around an effort to not "see," or at any rate not to acknowledge, race differences – allows Whites to "both ignore the benefits of Whiteness and dismiss the experiences of people of color" (McIntyre, 1997, p. 126).

It creates actions of equality, based on the assumption that "if | Four female teacher candidates of color participated in semi-structured interviews. | Four teacher candidates of color had difficulty positioning themselves among the overwhelming silencing power of Whiteness in the class.

The White students were tactful at evading power and race and attending the existing hierarchical power relations through the discourses of colorblindness and by preying on the minority instructor.

Their understanding of diversity was also shallow.

The teacher candidates of color were afraid that they might be labeled as the ones who spoke up against the White students and were fearful of the possibility of retaliation and ostracism from their White peers. | It seems that the teacher education program's structure allowed the White candidates to impose strong negative peer pressure on the teacher candidates of color. | USA | *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* |

		everyone is treated the same, then outcomes will be similar for all groups" (Donnelly, Cook, van Ausdale, & Foley, 2005, p. 8). White race and power evasiveness reduces racism to specific individuals and intentional acts.					
50. Bisonnette (2016) The trouble with niceness: How a preference for pleasantry sabotages culturally responsive teacher preparation	Postulates the ways in which teacher education programs' preference for niceness functions as an iteration of Whiteness that obstructs attempts to actualize culturally responsive teacher preparation, tending specifically to the complicity of audit culture, pre-service teachers, teacher educators, and curricula and instruction. Disrupts and ultimately dismantles the	Whiteness is a social construction designed intentionally and purposefully to realize hegemonic purposes (Frankenberg, 1993). Whiteness allows for a systemic advantage of a particular group over another, which, in turn, creates privileges and marginalization doled out to people based on the conferred dominance/non-dominance of the groups to which they belong (Brodkin, 2012). Because Whiteness often functions as the majoritarian, mainstream story, the construct has been normalized;	Explore four entities: audit culture, pre-service teachers, teacher educators, and curricula and instruction.	Among teacher education programs, there is little agreement in how to conceptualize, and "do" social justice teacher preparation. Many PSTs demonstrate a disdain for multicultural courses, voicing their belief that multicultural education should be reserved for students belonging to historically marginalized populations (Rios & Stanton, 2011). Some teacher educators who actively adopt and model culturally responsive teaching	To disrupt the inequities that students belonging to historically marginalized populations continue to face, all of the usual suspects (audit culture, PSTs, teacher educators, and curricula and instruction) must combine forces and thus fortify their efforts to reject a culture of niceness that thwarts culturally responsive teaching. Such a collective transformation means a cessation	USA	*Journal of Language and Literacy Education*

	culture of niceness.	seemingly neutralized. Niceness allows White students to control their social environments and defend their privilege. Alemán (2009) cautioned, "Liberal ideology and Whiteness privileges niceness, civility, and commonalities which only serves to maintain the status quo, covers up institutionalized racism, and silences the communities" (p. 291).		practices for their PSTs face a backlash from their administrations. The final barrier to culturally responsive teacher preparation lies in the delivery of curricula and instruction: The superficial presentation of multicultural content using a "holidays and heroes" approach or multicultural courses presented as "ghettoized issues of diversity" (Ladson-Billings, 2006, p.42), all of which inadequately prepare PSTs for the needs of their most underserved students.	of the half-hearted pandering around culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education and requires instead a revitalized, legitimate commitment to social justice-oriented teacher preparation.		
51. le Roux (2016) The teaching context preference of four White South African pre-service teachers: Considerations for teacher education	Explores the preference of four White SA pre-service teachers to work with Black learners.	Whiteness can be considered a property interest, and Harris (1995) investigates how the relationship between the concepts of race and property plays a critical role in establishing and maintaining racial and economic subordination. The mindset of Whiteness emerged from	Interviews with four preserve teachers.	A rhetoric that emerged from the data is the participants' claim that they were not part of apartheid. Within the South African context, this refers to the transmission of knowledge of a traumatised past, by parents who "upheld,	As an investment in Whiteness remains an investment in the most privileged racial identification in South Africa, the use of stock stories in a teacher education programme will indeed place the focus on Whiteness.	South Africa	*South African Journal of Education*

		the historical link between slavery and the privileges of Whites in their subordination of Blacks as objects of property who were exploited for their labour. In this way, Whiteness became a form of property associated with the rights of disposition, the rights to use and enjoy, and the absolute right to exclude (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; also Harris, 1995; Vaught & Castagno, 2008). To be identified as White implies possessing the property of "being White", where to have a White identity as a vested interest means having an identity constituted by the legitimation of expectations of power and control.		supported and benefited from White domination" (Jansen, 2008, p. 4), to their post-apartheid children All four participants are aware of existing inequalities in SA schools and they perceive themselves as agents of change, however, their disassociation from the legacy of apartheid leaves their understanding of such inequalities devoid of a critical awareness of White complicity in White privilege, and subsequently endorses the maintenance of White innocence in racism. Whilst unexamined Whiteness and the subsequent comfort of White innocence feed into four seemingly well-meaning White pre-service teachers' positioning themselves as the agents that will bring about change, it also underscores the notion that White	However, the aim of doing so is not to essentialise Whiteness, but to provide White pre-service teachers with a context in which to interrogate and critique the way in which race, racism and racial imbalances of power operate in South African society. In addition to the analysis of stock stories, teacher education must also provide the space for Black pre-service students to share concealed stories, i.e. those stories about race and racism that remain either invisible or merely glimpsed at in stock stories (Bell et al., 2008). The counter-balancing of stock stories with concealed stories is imperative, as the		

				people often view their world in ways that favour their positions within it (Solomona et al., 2005). In this regard, Marx (2004) indicates that although White teachers can indeed be successful teachers for learners who are culturally, linguistically and racially different from themselves, they can still be racist.	focus on Whiteness through the analysis of stock stories might unwittingly re-center Whiteness as a marker of privilege.		
52. Matias (2016a) White skin, Black friend: A Fanonian application to theorize racial fetish in teacher education	Offers emotional ways one can self-actualize the racialization process.	As Fanon argues, "not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man" (p. 110), ergo, Whites can only be White in juxtaposition to Blacks. Although discursive analysis unveils the impact of Whiteness enacted in speech and/or behavior, psychoanalysis	Theoretical article.	Many of my teacher candidates have explained that their desire to become an urban-focused teacher hinges on their privilege of Whiteness, and thus they feel the "need to give back." Yet nearly all cannot articulate why: What makes them feel compelled or guilty	White teacher candidates seek to fill an emptiness, for Whiteness exacts a loss of humanity, ergo one logically seeks atonement and redemption through "giving back" to those from whom humanity was taken.	USA	*Educational Philosophy and Theory*

| | | investigates the underlying context which renders such speech and behaviors.

A psychosocial state of Whiteness exists when White teacher candidates believe they have "authentic" relationships with urban students of color that are, at times, problematic. Suffice it to say that Whiteness is a pre-existing psychosocial condition which makes those who subscribe to it feel humanistically empty.

Thenceforth, by emotionally attaching to people of color – and specifically Blacks as the symbol of racialized pigmentocracy – Whites feel they have successfully avoided Whiteness, which erroneously presumes they are no longer humanistically empty. | | enough to give back?

What racialized processes have they undergone that lead them to believe they are apt to teach urban students of color? And, most importantly, how will this impact urban students of color? | White teacher candidates in the urban-focus program believe they will be fulfilled by teaching K-12 students of color and by acquiring these students as their "Black friends," a friendship that at once solidifies the colonizer/colonized (teacher/student) relationship, while perpetuating their safety in Whiteness by not fully confronting it.

Interestingly, these White teacher candidates resist making "Black friends" of their professors of color, a practice I've encountered first-hand with my White colleagues as well (see Matias, 2013b).

The White student- or college professor-to-Black professor | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

					relationship morphs into the servant/served paradigm: Now the professor of color, one with higher status in the relationship, becomes a threat to Whiteness, White narcissism, and the student's White colorblindness (see Duncan, 2002; Thompson, 2003).		
53. Matias (2016b) "Why do you make me hate myself?": Re-teaching Whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education	A reflective and theoretical paper employs critical race theory and critical Whiteness studies to deconstruct Whiteness, abuse, and love in teacher education. Examines how denying race during White childhood via a color-blind ideology leaves lasting emotional scars, impressions that perpetuate the institutional silencing of race in	Acknowledges White supremacy as an overarching system of White Western racial domination, which manifests globally (Allen, 2001). I do not question whether or not racism is occurring in any specific situation, context, or location, or if any individual White person is or isn't engaged in racism. Nor am I concerned that by generalizing about racism and Whiteness, I may be creating binaries.	Interdisciplinary and emotion-based theoretical approach to understanding Whiteness.	In teaching at a US urban-focused teacher preparation program, my White teacher candidates professed a readiness to teach urban students of color though most had had no previous interactions with people of color; this is akin to saying one is ready to work with children despite never having interacted with them! According to my students' responses, educators of color are "odd" and the absence of educators of color	Inclusion of socially just philosophies in the curriculum is indeed essential, yet it can mask the recycling of normalized, oppressive Whiteness. Asserts that until teacher education programs make confronting and exploring Whiteness a priority, they cannot truly love their urban students of color as complete beings and so deny	USA	*Teaching Education*

				has "no impact." Yet, interestingly, they still claim to know what urban education "is all about." Finally, they applied race neutrality to their own Whiteness, as if White racialization has no effect on their own character development.	humanity full and just consideration. Thus, the anti-racist project is to identify how (but not if) racism is manifesting – morphing and adapting – in any given context, both locally and globally.		
54. Matias and Grosland (2016) Digital storytelling as racial justice: Digital hopes for deconstructing Whiteness in teacher education	Critically reflects and examines the utilization of digital storytelling by teacher educators of color to pedagogically deconstruct Whiteness in a predominately White, urban-focused teacher education course. Deconstructs four academic years of digital stories produced in a mandatory diversity course in an urban teacher education program and	First, *Whiteness* does not equate to *White people*, albeit Whiteness tends to operate more readily among White people due to the nature of White supremacy (Allen, 2001; Gillborn, 2006; Leonardo, 2009). Whiteness is a "social construction that embraces White culture, ideology, racialization, expressions and experiences, epistemologies, emotions and behaviors" (Matias, Viesca, Garrison-Wade, Tandon, & Galindo, 2014, p. 290). White supremacy is defined as the institutionalized	The approximately 150 digital stories viewed in this study come from 4 years of teaching the specified course. The focus of our analysis is on the image selections, the graphic designs, music, and message that stems from the culmination of all these digital story elements. We chose these three cases because they were reflective of the major themes of most of the 150 stories.	By "refusing to share in the burden of race," we mean that teacher candidates saw race as a problem of the Other and not of all, including themselves. However, the digital storytelling process allowed the teacher candidates to first identify them and consequently disrupt them.	Digital storytelling is a racially just way of having White teacher candidates self-reflect on their own Whiteness in a multitude of ways, by (a) ending emotional distancing, (b) debunking colorblindness, (c) engaging emotions, and (d) sharing the burden of race.	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

	illustrates how digital storytelling itself promotes a critical self-revelation that confronts Whiteness in White teacher candidates.	process that benefits Whites at the expense of people of color (described more below). Second, the use of the term *White supremacy* refers to the overarching institutional and systemic processes of White superiorization, particularly in education (Lewis & Manno, 2011). Finally, terms like *Whites* and *people of color* are used generally to illustrate the overarching impact of White supremacy on both groups. We acknowledge that there are different degrees of experiences within these racial categories; however, with respect to larger racial analyses, we use these terms to highlight larger group racial dynamics.					
55. Matias and Mackey (2016) Breakin' down Whiteness in antiracist teaching:	Reflects on strategies used in a U.S. urban teacher education course specifically designed for preservice teachers,	Critical Whiteness studies continue to have a profound impact in the field of race studies and education (Allen, 2001; Gillborn, 2006;	Via a critical self-reflective approach to our own teaching process, this section describes some of the pedagogical strategies we implemented, the	Preservice teachers appreciated and say the relevance of the activities presented in a course as part of their education.	Teachers who experience an emotional-based curriculum and pedagogy focused on deconstructing their own	USA	*Urban Review*

| Introducing critical Whiteness pedagogy | many of whom are middle-class White females who have rarely experienced relationships with people of color yet hope to teach in U.S. urban schools rich with students of color. | Leonardo, 2009).

From the original works of DuBois (2005) to Baldwin (1963), Black scholars have been interrogating the operations and prevalence of Whiteness in American society for some time.

Fanon (1967) argues that Whiteness leads the White man to believe he is the "predestined master of the world" (p. 128), a process that corrupts the "soul of the White man" (p. 129).

hooks (1994) claims that naturalizing Whiteness and Otherizing people of color leads Whites to believe that "there is no representation of Whiteness as terror or terrorizing" (p. 45), a blatant falsity considering history.

If, as Ignatiev and Garvey (1996) argue, "treason to Whiteness is loyalty to humanity" (p. 10), then loyalty to Whiteness pulls one's | rationale with respect to critical Whiteness studies, and teacher candidates' responses to each pedagogical strategy.

We organized the course into three emotional phases:1) Understanding social complexities: getting emotionally

invested;   2) Sharing the burden: expectations, strategies, and moving beyond

basic;   3) Visions of humanity: demonstrations of a

loving education.

This course focused on the multimodality of race, as is represented through various texts: books, surveys, commercials etc. The sessions always ended with critical co-reflection together with their lecturer. | The pedagogical applications expanded the learning of critical Whiteness studies by our predominantly White middle-class teacher candidates and represent an essential process in breaking down the overwhelming presence of Whiteness in teacher education (Sleeter, 2001). | emotionality move beyond discomfort, guilt, sadness, defensiveness, and anger. Without doing so, they can easily revert to Whiteness and thus reinforce the racist educational system. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

		soul away from humanity. Therefore, critical Whiteness studies uses a transdisciplinary approach to investigate the phenomenon of Whiteness, how it is manifested, exerted, defined, recycled, transmitted, and maintained, and how it ultimately impacts the state of race relations. Whiteness need not be only indicative of White folks since people of color can inhabit Whiteness ideology – albeit for different reasons; yet, Whiteness is indeed most prevalent in Whites themselves.					
56. **Matias, Montoya, and Nishi (2016)** Blocking CRT: How the emotionality of Whiteness blocks CRT in urban teacher	Employs CRT's methodology of counterstorytelling to interrogate how Whiteness manifests itself in emotional ways, like fetishism and sentimentalization, and how such	When interviewing our potential teacher candidates, mainstreamed teacher educators and master teachers – most of whom are White women – they select mirror images of themselves; mainly other White female teacher	Theoretical article. Counterstorytelling the realities of what is really going on in a teacher education program publicly advocated as one that addresses urban	Although publicly committed to social justice and equity, this urban teacher education program is able to deflect topics of race by presuming that they can be supplanted with topics of gender	Teacher educators themselves should likewise be placed under the microscope, precisely because the overwhelming presence of Whiteness within teacher education	USA	*Educational Studies*

| education | emotions are the root of resistance toward CRT in teacher education. | candidates.

Teacher candidates of color who have experienced and benefited from performing Whiteness often choose to adopt this ideology and thus cover many aspects of their heritage, culture, and race (see Yoshino, 2002). Such a "covering" or "passing" (Yoshino, 2002) of their heritage or race is often rewarded in teacher education programs, similar to the false sense of rewards in wearing a White mask (Fanon, 1967).

Administrators, claiming concern with critical race courses taught by two of the authors, "solved the problem" by proposing to plant a White mainstreamed doctoral student in the course to police content:

When studying critically diverse topics such as race, administrators chose to cater to the unfettered emotional | education. | and class. | has gone unchallenged for too long.

Not until we build our intellectual and emotional arsenal of race and the responses to teaching race can we better approach the inclusion of CRT in teacher education that fully penetrates the core of teacher education with the potency of racial justice. | | |

| | | angst incurred by White teacher candidates by reprimanding the professors for teaching these theories (see Cottom, 2013).

When courses directly address race or Whiteness in teacher education are put as an "elective" course, it is not often taken by

teacher candidates;

When critical race faculty members are never included in the main conceptual and institutional decisions of teacher education often labeled as elective educational foundation courses, as this is viewed as not pertinent to the mainstay of teacher

education;

When administration weeds out critical race teacher educators by suggesting that they may not be a good fit for teacher education or when administration attempts to redirect a potential candidate's | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

		interest in the program by suggesting that this is probably not the best place to suit their expertise; When teacher education master's programs get streamlined to lessen credit load, often diversity and foundational courses on race get cut out; When teacher education programs use faculty and/or students of color or critical race faculty only when it is opportune for them to portray themselves as multicultural; and When students of color groups are not institutionally supported claiming that having such a group is discriminating against Whites.					
57. Han and Leonard (2016) Why diversity	Examines White privilege and institutional racism. Challenges	Discusses CRT, Whiteness as property and privilege, White fatigue and counter-	Counterstorytelling methodology.	Racial and/or ethnicity identity emerged in the foregoing counterstories.	University leaders need to establish policies and practices to support (recruit, retain, and	USA	*Urban Review*

matters in rural America: Women faculty of color challenging Whiteness	Whiteness and institutional racism with the hopes of: (1) promoting social justice teaching in order to globally prepare (pre- and in- service) teachers and educational leaders to motivate and empower ALL students to learn; (2) dismantling racism to promote better wellbeing for women faculty of color; and (3) moving educational communities at large closer toward equitable education, which is a fundamental civil right.	narratives: Whiteness and its dominating effects are clear in historical times and in the present time. Learning critically and more deeply about institutional racism, Whiteness, and White privilege are unpopular and avoided topics in most institutional spaces, including higher education. Ignoring these issues and limiting dialogue in higher education and teacher preparation programs create a false sense of security that racism does not exist and establishes a default setting where some people believe we live in a colorblind society (Carr & Lund, 2009; Evans & Leonard, 2013; Han et al., 2015; Leonard, 2008; Leonard & Dantley, 2005). The hidden agenda behind Whiteness as hegemony and normalcy continues to be the social		Our narratives show that we experienced low evaluations when we tied course content to social justice pedagogy. Evidence obtained from journal writing, oral statements, face-to-face interactions, and written comments on course evaluations suggest that teacher/teacher candidates are not only uncomfortable about discussing race and inequality but would prefer to just learn the content, which implies they would rather just teach the content without concern for who their students are. Academia (both in urban and rural contexts) operates on the premise of this interest convergence primarily ensuring White interest and privilege.	promote) faculty/leaders of color, not just mainstream academics. Working toward equity and justice, we strive to form alliances between Whites and Others. Work alongside courageous and humanist White allies and those in leadership to support diversity in all teacher education programs, especially at predominantly White institutions. Skewed power relations between Whites and Others reinforce and maintain Whiteness, White fatigue, and White privilege.		

| | | order, in part, by refusing to acknowledge and talk about Whiteness and White privilege (Leong, 2013; Scheurich, 2002).

Consequently, by ignoring Whiteness, White privilege, and White fatigue (disengagement in learning about racism) and by not considering systematic, structural, and institutional impacts, but simply avoiding individual racist names and acts, policies and practices enacted in teacher education programs, maintains systems of entitlement and contributes to racial illiteracy (i.e., lack of knowledge about race, racial identity, and contributions of Others from diverse backgrounds) (Carr & Lund, 2009; DiAngelo, 2012; Lea, 2009).

Scholars recommend that education is the key to understanding White fatigue, Whiteness, and White privilege. White | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

		students, teachers/faculty, and administrators should become aware of the individual and structural benefits of Whiteness. Delving deeply into the complexities of (institutional) racism allows for a more critical examination of White supremacy, which is embedded in structural, cultural, and systematic power and racial and social relations that impinge on diverse Others (Blum, 2008; Carr & Lund, 2009).					
58. Barnes (2017) Practicing what we preach in teacher education: A critical Whiteness studies analysis of experiential education	Problematizes the reasons for and methods through which the author incorporates an opportunity for experiential learning via a Community Inquiry Project into my own teaching. Closely analyzes the specific documents and tasks used to introduce pre-	Whiteness is a system of political, social, legal, and cultural advantage (Roediger, 2002) that is maintained by the conscious and sometimes unconscious denial of its existence (Banning, 1999; Fine et al., 1997). The power of Whiteness is maintained through various techniques, including a discourse of color-blindness (Frankenberg, 2001), evading critique (Gomez, Allen, & Clinton, 2004),	Teacher as researcher, on own course.	The project limited the pre-service teachers' characterizations of community, understandings of sociocultural approaches to learning, relationships to the community, and perceptions of the role of community in teaching.	Teacher educators share their reflective practices with their students and learn about the diverse experiences of the pre-service teachers themselves to better prepare them to inquire into and draw on knowledge of communities as they work with diverse populations of students.	USA	*Studying Teacher Education*

	service teachers to the project.	and a lack of self-refection and interrogation into the ways that one is implicated in systems of racial domination (Haviland, 2008).					
59. Miller (2017) Multiple pathways to Whiteness: White teachers' unsteady racial identities	Demonstrates the intersectionality of teacher identity, and in particular the impact of social class, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and religion on the processes whereby White students acquire a successful White teacher identity.	Generally theorizes Whiteness as White identity. When identity factors such as class, sexuality and language were not congruent with Whiteness, students experienced racial awareness much more abruptly as they learned to make deliberate moves into Whiteness.	An analysis of 60 critical memoirs.	Students described a feeling of gratitude for Whiteness and connected Whiteness with resources. Students learned early on to comply with the school rules and norms for White girls. Because they were White and middle class, they were accepted into schools warmly and teachers had high expectations for them. Some students explicitly described being placed in a position of racial privilege by their assimilation in school, and described this privilege through confessional stories, or stories that read like an admission of something of which	We need far more critical and complex racial theorizing of White female teachers who will teach our nation's youngest children.	USA	*Early Years*

				they are now ashamed.			
60. Lander and Santoro (2017) Invisible and hypervisible academics: The experiences of Black and minority ethnic teacher educators	Investigates the experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) teacher educators in England and Australia working within the predominantly White space of the academy.	Whiteness, a social, political and cultural construct, underpins the existence and operation of everyday racism and microaggressions (as well as other forms of racism). White is a racialised and advantaged identity that has developed over time through colonisation and the subjugation of the racialised "Other" (Bonnett, 2000; Dyer, 1997). Whiteness privileges those who are White and it maintains the interests of White groups (Picower, 2009) Frankenberg (2009) asserts that Whiteness is an advantaged standpoint from which "Others" are observed. Not only has it come to occupy and represent a	In-depth qualitative interview data from 27 Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) academics from education faculties and schools of education in Australian and English universities.	Participants in both national contexts felt marginalised, and encountered subtle everyday racism manifested as microaggressions that contributed to the academics' simultaneous construction as hypervisible and invisible, and as outsiders to the academy. Vulnerability, insecurity and precariousness were generated through the participants' positioning as space invaders within the university and this was borne from surveillance by students and managers.	Despite long-standing Equal Opportunity policies, tenacious racism in the academy must be disrupted through structured career support and mentoring for BME staff and wider staff development on implicit bias and everyday racism.	UK and Australia	*Teaching in Higher Education*

		position of privilege and power, it silently and invisibly constitutes the "norm". Marx (2006) insists the racial performance associated with Whiteness leads to inequity, which, in turn, results in the reproduction of power that accompanies the assertion of Whiteness as a racial discourse. The power and privilege associated with Whiteness sustains a paradoxical position where contradictions are accepted. For example, the rhetoric of colour blindness is used, on the one hand, to negate the ethnic identity of the Other, and at other times, it is used to spotlight the ethnic "Other" by making him or her hypervisible in an attempt to "normalise" Whiteness. Furthermore, a "colourblind" stance that fails to acknowledge					

		how colour does shape lived experience can also mean the effects of racism go unacknowledged. Frankenberg (1993) notes that Whiteness is a "color evasive" and "power evasive" (p. 143) position that enables White people to seek to avoid discussions about their White privilege and power.					
61. Shedrow (2017) Cross-cultural student teaching: Examining the meaning-making of one White, female, middle-class preservice teacher	To better understand how one White, female preservice teacher made meaning of her experiences during a cross-cultural experiential learning (CCEL) student teaching placement abroad.	Drawing on Frankenberg's (1997), three pillars Whiteness: First, Whiteness is a location of structural advantage, of race privilege. Second it is a "standpoint," a place from which White people look at ourselves, at others, and at society. Third, "Whiteness" refers to a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed (p. 1). Thus, Whiteness theory provides a lens to understand individuals' construction of their culture and personal	One university supervisor's stories of students in a cross-cultural learning experience in a small village in Uganda were gathered using several narrative inquiry approaches, including observations of her teaching, document collection, informal conversations, formal interviews, and the writing of field notes following interactions with her.	Cultural competency does not directly equate to recognizing Whiteness and the privileges associated with it. Before traveling to Uganda, Nora was not completely aware of the privileges she enjoyed, the socially accepted ideologies, or the cultural practices of Whiteness; it can be argued that she was more cognizant of these than the typical White, middle-class female in their early twenties.	Adequately preparing our predominantly White and middle-class teaching force to teach the diverse PK-12 student populations in 21st-century classrooms (NCES, n.d.) through CCEL alone is not enough: We must also earnestly consider how to facilitate these potentially transformative learning opportunities before, during, and after students travel abroad so that all	USA	*Journal of International Students*

		position within their community and the society at large.		Her stay abroad prompted her to reflect on teaching diverse students and how, she felt, the school in the United States that she would finish her student teaching in did not honor student diversity. This realization on Nora's part allowed her to embrace her Whiteness and understand how the privileges afforded to her, as well as the ideologies and cultural practices of Whiteness, can alienate her students.	preservice teachers participating in such experiences are able come away with meaningful learning that translates into real classroom change.		

Full references

Adair, J. (2008). White pre-service teachers and "de-privileged spaces". *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(4), 189–206. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23479181

Amos, Y. T. (2010). "They don't want to get it!" Interaction between minority and White pre-service teachers in a multicultural education class. *Multicultural Education, 17*(4), 31–37.

Amos, Y. T. (2016). Voices of teacher candidates of color on White race evasion: "I worried about my safety!" *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(8), 1002–1015. doi:10.1080/09518398.2016.1174900

Aveling, N. (2004). Being the decedent of colonialists: White identity in context. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 7*(1), 57–71. doi:10.1080/1361332042000187306

Aveling, N. (2006). "Hacking at our very roots": Rearticulating White racial identity within the context of teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 9*(3), 261–274. doi:10.1080/13613320600807576

Barnes, M. E. (2017). Practicing what we preach in teacher education: A critical Whiteness studies analysis of experiential education. *Studying Teacher Education*, *13*(3), 294–311. doi:10.1080/17425964.2017.1365701

Bersh, L. C. (2009). Deconstructing Whiteness: Uncovering prospective teachers' understandings of their culture: A Latina professor's perspective. *Multicultural*

Perspectives, 11(2), 107–112. doi:10.1080/15210960903028792

Bissonnette, J. D. (2016). The trouble with niceness: How a preference for pleasantry sabotages culturally responsive teacher preparation. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, *12*(2), 9–32.

Brown, E. R. (2006). The place of race in teacher identity: Self-narratives and curricular intervention as a practice of freedom. *Teacher Education and Practice, 19*(2), 257–279.

Brown, K. D. (2014). Teaching in color: A critical race theory in education analysis of the literature on pre-service teachers of color and teacher education in the US. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *17*(3), 326–345. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.832921

Buehler, J., Gere, A. R., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). Normalizing the fraughtness: How emotion, race, and school context complicate cultural competence. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(4), 408–418. doi:10.1177/0022487109339905

Carter, S. P., Honeyford, M., McKaskle, D., Guthrie, F., Mahoney, S., & Carter, G. D. (2007). "What do you mean by Whiteness?": A professor, four doctoral students, and a student affairs administrator explore Whiteness. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *26*(2), 152–159.

Castango, A. E. (2008). "I don't want to hear that!": Legitimating Whiteness through silence in schools. *Anthropology of Education Quarterly, 39*(3), 314–333. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1492.2008.00024.x

Charbeneau, J. (2015). White faculty transforming Whiteness in the classroom through pedagogical practice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *18*(5), 655–674. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.831823

Cross, B. E. (2005). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies, 38*(3), 263–274. doi:10.1207/s15326993es3803_6

Crowley, R. M., & Smith, W. (2015). Whiteness and social studies teacher education: Tensions in the pedagogical task. *Teaching Education*, *26*(2), 160–178. doi:10.1080/10476210.2014.996739

de Freitas, D. (2005). Pre-service teachers and the re-inscription of Whiteness: Disrupting dominant cultural codes through textual analysis. *Teaching Education, 15*(2), 151–164. doi:10.1080/10476210500122725

Dixson, A. D., & Dingus, J. E. (2007). Tyranny of the majority: Re-enfranchisement of African-American teacher educators teaching for democracy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20*(6), 639–654. doi:10.1080/09518390701630775

Fasching-Varner, K. J. (2009). No! The team ain't alright! The institutional and individual problematics of race. *Social Identities, 15*(6), 811–829. doi:10.1080/13504630903372520

Flintoff, A., Dowling, F., & Fitzgerald, H. (2015). Working through Whiteness, race and (anti) racism in physical education teacher education. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 20*(5), 559–570. doi:10.1080/17408989.2014.962017

Galman, S., Pica-Smith, C., & Rosenberger, C. (2010). Aggressive and tender navigations: Teacher educators confront Whiteness in their practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 225–336. doi:10.1177/0022487109359776

Glenn, W. J. (2012). Developing understandings of race: Pre-service teachers' counter narrative (re)constructions of people of color in young adult literature. *English Education, 4*(44), 326–353. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.hioa.no/stable/23238778

Han, K. T., & Leonard, J. (2016). Why diversity matters in rural America: Women faculty of color challenging Whiteness. *Urban Review,49,* 112–139. doi:10.1007/s11256-016-0384-7

Harris, G. (2011). Teacher educators under surveillance at a religious university. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *17*(5), 545–558.

doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.602208

Haviland, V. S. (2008). "Things get glossed over." Rearticulation the silencing power of Whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(40), 40–54. doi:10.1177/0022487107310751

Hayes, C., & Juárez, B. G. (2009). You showed your Whiteness: You don't get a "good" White people's medal. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22*(6), 729–744. doi:10.1080/09518390903333921

Hickling-Hudson, A. (2005). "White," "ethnic," and "Indigenous": Pre-service teacher reflects on ethnic identity in Australian teacher education. *Policy Futures in Education, 3*(4), 340–358. doi:102304/pfie.2005.3.4.340

Hill-Jackson, V. (2007). Wrestling Whiteness: Three stages of shifting multicultural perspectives among White pre-service teachers. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(2), 29–35.

Horton, J., & Scott, D. (2007). White students' voices in multicultural teacher education preparation. *Multicultural Education, 11*(4), 12–16.

Juarés, B. G., & Hayes, C. (2015). On being named a Black supremacist and a race traitor: The problem of White racial domination and domestic terrorism in U.S. teacher education. *Urban Review, 47*(3), 317–340. doi:10.1007/s11256-014-0294-5

Lander, V., & Santoro, N. (2017). Invisible and hypervisible academics: The experiences of Black and minority ethnic teacher educators. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *22*(8), 1008–1021. doi:10.1080/13562517.2017.1332029

Laughter, J. C. (2011). Rethinking assumptions of demographic privilege: Diversity among White pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 43–50. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.07.001

le Roux, A. (2016). The teaching context preference of four White South African pre-service teachers: Considerations for teacher education. *South African Journal of Education, 36*(1), 1–11. doi:10.15700/saje.v36n1a1111

Lea, V. (2004). The reflective cultural portfolio: Identifying public cultural scripts in the private voices of White student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*, 116–127. doi:10.1177/0022487103261842

Lea, V., & Griggs, T. (2005). Behind the mask and beneath the story: Enabling students-teachers to reflect critically on the socially-constructed nature of their "normal" practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *32*(1), 93–114. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478691

Marx, S. (2004). Regarding Whiteness: Exploring and intervening in the effects of White racism in teacher education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *37*(1), 31–43. doi:10.1080/10665680490422089

Matias, C. E. (2016a). White skin, Black friend: A Fanonian application to theorize racial fetish in teacher education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *48*(3), 221–236. doi:10.1080/00131857.2014.989952

Matias, C. E. (2016b). "Why do you make me hate myself?": Re-teaching Whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education. *Teaching Education*, *27*(2), 194–211. doi:10.1080/10476210.2015.1068749

Matias, C. E., & Grosland, T. J. (2016). Digital storytelling as racial justice: Digital hopes for deconstructing Whiteness in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(2), 152–164. doi:10.1177/0022487115624493

Matias, C. E., Montoya, R., & Nishi, N. W. M. (2017). Blocking CRT: How the emotionality of Whiteness blocks CRT in urban teacher education. *Educational Studies, 52*(1), 1–19. doi:10.1080/00131946.2015.1120205

Matias, C. E., Viesca, K. M., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Tandon, M., & Galind, R. (2014). "What is critical Whiteness doing in OUR nice field like critical race theory?" Applying CRT and CWS   to understand the White imaginations   of White teacher candidates. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 47*(3), 289–304.

doi:10.1080/10665684.2014.933692

Matias, C. E., & Mackey, J. (2016). Breakin' down Whiteness in antiracist teaching: Introducing critical Whiteness pedagogy. *Urban Review*, *48*, 32–20. doi:10.1007/s11256-015-0344-7

Mazzei, L. A. (2008). Silence speaks: Whiteness revealed in the absence of voice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(5), 1125–1136. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.009

McVee, M. B. (2005). Revisiting the Black Jesus: Re-emplotting a narrative through multiple retellings. *Narrative Inquiry, 15*(1), 161–195.

Michie, G. (2007). Seeing, hearing, and talking race: Lessons for White teachers from four teachers of color. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(1), 3–9.

Miller, E. T. (2017). Multiple pathways to Whiteness: White teachers' unsteady racial identities. *Early Years*, *37*(1), 17–33. doi:10.1080/09575146.2016.1223022

Pearce, S. (2012). Confronting dominant Whiteness in the primary classroom: Progressive student teachers' dilemmas and constraints. *Oxford Review of Education*, *4*(38), 455–472. doi:10.1080/03054985.2012.710546

Pennington, J. L. (2007). Silence in the classroom/whispers in the halls: Autoethnography as pedagogy in White pre-service teacher education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(1), 93–113. doi:10.1080/13613320601100393

Pennington, J. L., Brock, C. H., & Ndura, E. (2012). Unraveling the threads of White teachers' conceptions of caring: Repositioning White privilege. *Urban Education, 47*(4), 743–775. doi:10.1177/0042085912441186

Picower, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, (*12*)2, 197–215. doi:10.1080/13613320902995475

Puchner, l., Szabo, Z., & Roseboro, D. L. (2012). The short-term effect of a race-related course on racial identity of White students. *Teaching in Higher Education, 4*(17), 399–410. doi:10.1080/13562517.2011.641003

Raible, J., & Irizarry, J. G. (2007). Transracialized selves and the emergence of post-White teacher identities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(2), 177–198. doi:10.1080/13613320701330718

Rogers, R., & Christian, J. (2007). "What could I say?" A critical discourse analysis of the construction of race in children's literature. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(1), 21–46. doi:10.1080/13613320601100351

Shedrow, S.J. (2017). Cross-Cultural Student Teaching: Examining the Meaning-Making of one White, Female, Middle-Class Preservice Teacher. *Journal of International Students, 7(2),* 270-290.

Schulz, S., & Fane, J. (2015). A healthy dose of race? White students' and teachers' unintentional brushes with Whiteness. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(11), 137–154. doi:10.14221/ajte.2015v40n11.8

Smith, H. J. (2013). A critique of the teaching standards in England (1984–2012): Discourses of equality and maintaining the status quo. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(4), 427–448. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.742931

Smith, H. J. (2014). Emotional responses to documentary viewing and the potential for transformative teaching. *Teaching Education*, *25*(2), 217–238. doi:10.1080/10476210.2012.762351

Smith, H. J., & Lander, V. (2012). Collusion or collision: Effects of teacher ethnicity in the teaching of critical Whiteness. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *3*(15), 331–351. doi:10.1080/13613324.2011.585340

Solomona, R. P., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B.-J., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: How White teacher candidates construct race, racism and "White privilege". *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(2), 147–169. doi:10.1080/13613320500110519

Terwilliger, C. (2010). Mapping stories: Taking detours to challenge Whiteness. *Making Connections: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Cultural Diversity, 11*(2), 14–25. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.5555/maco.11.2.337r333043471148

Ullucci, K. (2012). Knowing we are White: Narrative as critical praxis. *Teaching Education, 23*(1), 89–107. doi:10.1080/10476210.2011.622747

Appendix 4: Example of articles excluded and the reasons for their exclusion

Articles excluded	Reason for exclusion
Gosselin, C. (2011	Article does not theorise the Whiteness concept
Golombeck & Jordan (2005)	Article does not theorise the Whiteness concept
Bruna, K.R. (2007)	Article presents a figure for discussion intended to contribute to critical reflection
Weilbacher (2012)	An article responding to Hayex and Huares' (2012) article.
Pearce (2014)	Discuss racism as institutionalised. However, do not use the conception of Whiteness to guide the article.
de los Ríos & Manning (2015)	Does not theorise Whiteness.
Enriquez-Gibson & Gibson (2015)	Talk about Whiteness throughout but does not theorise it
Flintoff, A. (2015).	Talk about Whiteness throughout but does not theorise it
Sleeter (2017)	Talk about Whiteness throughout but does not theorise it
Cross (2017)	Does not theorise Whiteness
Sleeter (2011)	Theorise Whiteness through family history, but does not really relate it teacher education
Annamma (2015)	Examines dispositions of teachers in juvenile justice surrounding young women of color with disabilities
George (2006)	Presents a pedagogical game, but I not related to teacher edcuaiton

Full references:

Annamma, S. A (2015). Whiteness as Property: Innocence and Ability in Teacher Education. *Urban Review.* 47. pp. 293–316. doi: 10.1007/s11256-014-0293-6

Bruna, K. R. (2007). Finding new words: how I use critical literacy in my multicultural teacher education classroom. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy. 33*(1). 115-118.

doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02607470601098377

Cross, S.B. (2017). Whiteness in the academy: using vignettes to move beyond safe silences. *Teaching in Higher Education*. *22*(7). 879-887. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2017.1340266

de los Ríos, C. & Souto-Manning, M. (2015), Teacher Educators as Cultural Workers: Problematizing Teacher Education Pedagogies. Studying Teacher Education, 2015   Vol. 11, No. 3, 272–293, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17425964.2015.1065806

Enriquez-Gibson, J. & Gibson, I. (2015). (Un)becoming tourist-teachers: Unveiling white racial identity in cross-cultural teaching programmes. International Journal of Pedagogies and learning. *10*(2). 107–120. doi: 10.1080/22040552.2015.1113845

Flintoff, A. (2015). Playing the 'Race' card? Black and minority ethnic students' experiences of physical education teacher education, Sport, Education and Society, 20:2, 190-211, DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2012.745397

George, R.F. (2006). The Race Card: An interactive tool for teacher multicultural education. *Multicultural Perspectives. 8*(3). 51–55.

Gosselin, C. (2011). Reflecting on Meaning: Crafting Visual Metaphors on Whiteness. *Multicultural Perspectives*. *13*(1). 27–35. doi: 10.1080/15210960.2011.548188

Golombeck, P. & Jordan, S. R. (2005). Becoming Black "Lambs" Not "Parrots": A poststructuralist orientation to intelligibility and identity. *TESOL Quaterly. 39*(3). 513-533.

Pearce, S. (2014). Dealing with racist incidents: what do beginning teachers learn from schools? *Race Ethnicity and Education. 17*(3). 388-406. doi: 10.1080/13613324.2013.832936

Sleeter, C.E. (2011). Becoming white: reinterpreting a family story by putting race back into the picture. *Race Ethnicity and Education*. 14(4). 421-433. doi: 10.1080/13613324.2010.547850

Sleeter, C. (2017). Critical Race Theory and the Whiteness of Teacher Education. *Urban Education. 52*(2). 155-169. doi: 10.1177/0042085916668957

Weilbacher, G. (2012). Standardization and Whiteness: One and the Same? *Democracy and Education (2)*2. 1-6.

Appendix 5: Example of textual analysis

In the following, an example of how the analysis was approached through the three-step reading strategy is provided. The three analysed excerpts are extracted from three different individual interview transcripts of teacher educators' responses to the interview's third part, where the informants were asked to compare *cultural diversity* and *the multicultural* – terms repeatedly featured in Norwegian national primary school teacher education policy and curriculum documents (analysed in Article 2).

In the first reading, in this analysis, *cultural diversity* and its related terms are detected (1st reading):

1st reading

Cultural diversity:
- cultural diversity is more positive
- diversity is more positive
- it is good with diversity
- cultural diversity has something Norwegian
- cultural diversity is much more positive

The multicultural:
- the multicultural is kind of more negatively loaded
- the multicultural
- you think of persons that have another culture than the Norwegian
- I automatically think that it has something to do with people from different cultures

Then, how these terms are described is highlighted (2nd reading):

2nd reading

…**cultural diversity** it is kind of **more positive**. I think it is more…**diversity**, yes, kind of **diversity**. **Diversity** is more **positive**. I think **diversity is**, kind of, it is **good** with **diversity**, but perhaps the **multicultural** is kind of a **more negatively loaded** term. While **cultural diversity** is kind of, it has **something Norwegian**. That is, perhaps, one [term] lies much, in a way, much closer to **ethnic culture**. With the **multicultural**, you think of **persons** that have another culture than the Norwegian.   (*Teacher Educator, Institution A*)

Mhm, **the multicultural**, yes, I think **cultural diversity** is much **more positive** without being able to say what it is. It might be that some terms contain other things.
                    (*Teacher Educator, Institution B*)

The multicultural. Then I automatically think that it has something to do with **people from different cultures**.   (*Teacher Educator, Institution B*)

Lastly, the patterns detected across the excerpts are synthesised (3rd reading):

3rd reading

…**cultural diversity** it is kind of **more positive**. I think it is more…diversity, yes, kind of diversity. **Diversity is more positive**. I think diversity is, kind of, **it is good with diversity,** but perhaps **the multicultural is** kind of a **more negatively loaded** term. While **cultural diversity** is kind of, it **has something Norwegian**. That is, perhaps, one [term] lies much, in a way, much closer to ethnic culture. With **the multicultural**, you think of **persons that have another culture than the Norwegian**.   (*Teacher Educator, Institution A*)

194

> Mhm, **the multicultural**, yes, I think **cultural diversity is** much **more positive** without being able to say what it is. It might be that some terms contain other things.
>
> *(Teacher Educator, Institution B)*

> **The multicultural**. Then I automatically think that it has something to do with **people from different cultures.**
> *(Teacher Educator, Institution B)*

As exemplified in the excerpts above, one of the patterns detected was how *cultural diversity*, particularly when used interchangeably with the term *diversity*, referred to something positive and Norwegian, whilst *the multicultural* was described as having more negative connotations, as persons that have other cultures, or as something that has to do with people from different cultures. This pattern is interesting to this thesis because when the interviewees were asked to compare the terms *cultural diversity* and *the multicultural*, they were represented as two different things (e.g. *cultural diversity* is represented as something Norwegian and *the multicultural* is represented as something non-Norwegian), yet the general feature of the rest of the transcribed interview material showed that these terms were generally used interchangeably. Moreover, this pattern, when related to CWS perspectives, points to how these terms, when used interchangeably, are generally almost always used with reference to a racialised Other. As such, the patterned usage and meaning making of *cultural diversity*, whether used interchangeably with *the multicultural* or not implies discursive practices of Otherness and exclusion – of Whiteness. Interestingly, and as will be discussed in the Discussion chapter, this was a dominating feature across all three knowledge-promoting domains of this PhD thesis's inquiry.

Appendix 6: Confirmation letter form NSD

Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS
NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICES

Sandra Fylkesnes
Institutt for internasjonale studier og tolkeutdanning Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus
Postboks 4, St. Olavs plass
0130 OSLO

Harald Hårfagres gate 29
N-5007 Bergen
Norway
Tel: +47-55 58 21 17
Fax: +47-55 58 96 50
nsd@nsd.uib.no
www.nsd.uib.no
Org.nr. 985 321 884

Vår dato: 11.12.2013   Vår ref: 36282 / 2 / IB   Deres dato: Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 12.11.2013. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

36282	*Cultural diversity in Norwegian teacher education - tensions between policy, research and practice*
Behandlingsansvarlig	*Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus, ved institusjonens øverste leder*
Daglig ansvarlig	*Sandra Fylkesnes*

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/meldeplikt/skjema.html. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 31.12.2019, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Vigdis Namtvedt Kvalheim

Inga Brautaset

Kontaktperson: Inga Brautaset tlf: 55 58 26 35
Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering

Dokumentet er elektronisk produsert og godkjent ved NSDs rutiner for elektronisk godkjenning.

Avdelingskontorer / District Offices:
OSLO: NSD. Universitetet i Oslo, Postboks 1055 Blindern, 0316 Oslo. Tel: +47-22 85 52 11. nsd@uio.no
TRONDHEIM: NSD. Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, 7491 Trondheim. Tel: +47-73 59 19 07. kyrre.svarva@svt.ntnu.no
TROMSØ: NSD. SVF, Universitetet i Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø. Tel: +47-77 64 43 36. nsdmaa@sv.uit.no

Appendix 7: Information letter with consent form

Information letter for teacher educators

Cultural diversity in Norwegian teacher education
- tensions between policy, research and practice

Hi,

My name is Sandra Fylkesnes and I am a PhD student at Oslo and Akershus University College, Faculty of Teacher Education and International Studies. Related to my PhD study, I would like to gain insight into whether there are differences in how policy documents, research, and teacher educators' understand of cultural diversity. My main focus area is on the primary school teacher education's specialisation for the grades 1-7 and on the *Pedagogy and pupil knowledge* [*Pedagogikk og elevkunnskap*] course.

I would like you to participate in the study because I believe that you can contribute with useful information regarding how teacher educators work with themes related to cultural diversity in their teaching. I would like to interview you about themes related to the *Pedagogy and pupil knowledge* course and that are related to cultural diversity. Your identity will remain anonymous and I will not ask you about personal information.

I will record the interview and the audio-files will be kept confidential. This means that it is only me that will have access to the sound files.

The audio files will be transcribed. This material will constitute the foundation for the data that will be used in an article or several articles that are planned to be published in international journals. the Project is set to be completed by the end of January 2016.

Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any point and without having to argue for the reasons why. Should you withdraw, all information that you have provided will be deleted.

The project has been approved by the Norwegian Data Protection Official for Research (NSD).

To confirm your participation, please see the next page.

Very best regards,

Sandra Fylkesnes

If you have any further questions about the study, please contact me on my mobile phone: **90 99 57 59** or on the following e-mail: **Sandra.Fylkesnes@hioa.no**.

Confirmation of participation in the study

I have received and read the information on the previous page and I am willing to participate

----
(Teacher educator's signature and date)

☐ *I have read the information on the previous page and I confirm my participation in an interview*

☐ *I agree that the information I provide may be saved and used for research purposes after this study is completed*

Appendix 8: Rationale for order of articles in PhD thesis

The four articles that are part of this PhD thesis are organised with inspiration from Goodlad's (1979, p. 60) five hierarchical curriculum domains and can be understood as representing the first three domains. For example, Article 1, the literature review, relates to the *Ideological Curricula.* Article 2, the policy and curriculum document analysis, relates to the *Formal Curricula*, and Articles 3 and 4, the teacher educator interview transcript analysis, relate to *The Perceived Curricula.* Even though Goodlad's domains are flexible and some articles might be interpreted as belonging to more than one domain, the main point is that this thesis understands the research on teacher education to ideally inform teacher education policy and curriculum documents, and teacher education policy and the curriculum (including teacher education research) to ideally inform teacher educators. The fourth article is placed last because I am not the main author of it, and because it is related to another theoretical conceptual framework than the other articles of this thesis are.

What is defined as Article 1 in this thesis is presented first based on the idea of how research on teacher education is ideally supposed to inform policy and the curriculum (at least in the Norwegian context). What is defined as Article 2 is presented second based on the ideas of how policy and curriculum documents are ideally supposed to inform teacher educators' practice. Articles 3 and 4 are thus presented as those placed "lowest" in the "curricular hierarchy". However, Article 3 is presented prior to Article 4, as this article shares the same sets of theoretical perspectives (CWS) as Articles 1 and 2.

Appendix 9: Overview of terms related to *cultural diversity* across the articles

Article 1	Article 2	Article 3	Article 4 (nouns, adjectives)
Terms used that appear to be similar across the discursive domains and the analysis in the articles			
multicultural	multicultural	multicultural	multicultural
linguistic	multilinguistic	multilingualism, bilingualism	linguistic, bi- and multilingual,
immigrants	immigrant		immigrant
behaviour		behavioural challenges	challenges, behavioural
difference			differences/ different
socioeconomic, *poor, class*			socioeconomic
ethnic/ethnicity			ethnicity
other			others/other
	minority *linguistic minority*	minority	minorities/minority
		integration	integration
		inclusion	inclusion inclusive
		another nationality, *form another country*	nationalities, *new national, the foreign/ foreign, non-Western, skin colour*
		resource	resources, *competence*
	diversity, cultural and linguistic diversity		*plurality*
religion			*Islam*
race/racial			*racism*
critical thinking		*dialogue*	
ability/disability		*special education*	*difficulties, dyscalculia, dyslexic children's development*
Terms used that appear to be different across the discursive domains and the analysis in the articles			
social justice, practices, sexual orientation			*pizza*, experience, *music*, *dance*, barriers, *values*, pupils, parents, children, crises, prejudices, depression, violence, belonging, majority, *discrimination*, *pupil groups*, persons, cultural, mono-cultural, emotional stigmatising, low, adapted, Norwegian, less, individual, learning

Index

describe;18; 25; 50; 53; 54; 63; 117; 145; 152; 155

desirable;vi; 9; 19; 20; 65; 74; 75; 78; 79; 86; 87; 96; 112; 115

desire;27; 86; 147; 153; 170

deter;84; 85

detriment;v; 62; 77

deviant;14; 39; 40; 69; 152

deviation;14; 164

dichotomy;66; 78

difference;v; 12; 14; 21; 26; 29; 30; 35; 39; 41; 42; 54; 62; 68; 70; 71; 72; 75; 78; 79; 80; 110; 111; 121; 125; 126; 133; 140; 142; 147; 153; 164; 200

different;vi; 7; 11; 12; 13; 18; 28; 34; 35; 38; 41; 44; 45; 48; 50; 51; 52; 55; 56; 59; 62; 66; 67; 68; 69; 71; 76; 78; 79; 80; 81; 82; 84; 88; 107; 109; 110; 111; 112; 114; 126; 127; 132; 133; 147; 150; 154; 156; 164; 168; 173; 174; 194; 195; 200

difficult;27; 30; 42; 125; 142; 143; 158

direct;7; 26; 70; 85; 89

discourse;v; vi; vii; 5; 6; 9; 19; 23; 24; 25; 27; 29; 30; 31; 33; 34; 35; 36; 37; 38; 39; 40; 42; 43; 45; 47; 48; 52; 54; 55; 57; 63; 64; 66; 70; 74; 77; 78; 80; 82; 83; 88; 89; 93; 94; 95; 96; 97; 98; 100; 101; 102; 103; 119; 121; 123; 129; 131; 134; 135; 137; 141; 142; 143; 144; 147; 150; 153; 160; 161; 182; 184; 190

discover;45; 152

discriminate;72

discrimination;vi; 12; 26; 30; 41; 64; 66; 68; 72; 75; 84; 85; 100; 112; 114; 121; 200

discursive;i; v; vi; vii; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 13; 15; 27; 31; 33; 34; 35; 36; 37; 38; 39; 40; 41; 42; 43; 46; 47; 48; 49; 50; 51; 52; 53; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 60; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 72; 73; 74; 75; 76; 77; 78; 79; 80; 81; 82; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88; 89; 107; 113; 116; 122; 131; 133; 153; 170; 195; 200

discursive knowledge-promoting domains;v; 6; 50; 88

dispositions;v; viii; 5; 36; 46; 49; 53; 63; 77; 83; 86; 87; 95; 100; 154; 192

diversity;v; vi; 6; 7; 8; 9; 26; 33; 34; 42; 56; 60; 62; 63; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70;

71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 76; 77; 79; 80; 82; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88; 95; 96; 97; 99; 100; 114; 128; 135; 146; 147; 150; 158; 162; 164; 166; 167; 173; 176; 179; 186; 188; 194; 195; 197; 200

domains;6; 7; 32; 33; 35; 36; 37; 48; 50; 51; 54; 56; 60; 62; 67; 68; 69; 73; 76; 78; 79; 80; 82; 83; 88; 195; 199; 200

dominance;12; 25; 26; 27; 31; 42; 43; 45; 48; 81; 86; 89; 116; 121; 123; 131; 133; 143; 147; 152; 167

site of;43

dominant;5; 22; 25; 27; 30; 37; 42; 62; 77; 94; 101; 106; 108; 114; 117; 121; 122; 124; 137; 140; 141; 146; 147; 149; 154; 158; 188; 190

domination;12; 22; 31; 40; 41; 44; 49; 63; 64; 69; 87; 119; 139; 141; 150; 156; 162; 164; 168; 172; 182; 189

double;vi; 4; 9; 11; 42; 51; 59; 65; 74; 75; 86

doubly;26

doubt;58; 99

doxic;5; 12; 14; 15; 38; 64; 80; 83; 86

dysconscious;v; vi; vii; 5; 38; 42; 43; 62; 63; 78; 84; 87

dysconsciously;45; 57; 85; 87; 88

Educational Law;11; 75

effect;v; 5; 36; 39; 40; 43; 45; 67; 77; 82; 84; 86; 101; 131; 149; 153; 172; 190

effects;13; 26; 28; 46; 73; 118; 128; 133; 142; 153; 179; 184; 189

egalitarianism;vi; 6; 14; 75; 83

element;34; 127

embedded;25; 26; 37; 41; 47; 49; 57; 87; 109; 124; 137; 143; 147; 150; 179

embodiment;18; 21

empirical;vi; vii; 6; 8; 16; 48; 50; 53; 54; 56; 60; 65; 80; 82; 87; 94; 106

enact;36; 44; 86; 101; 107; 140; 150; 190

endeavour;44; 87

enemy;39; 40; 74; 110

entitled;9; 25; 78; 149

epistemic violence;39; 77; 87

epistemological;26; 30; 31; 33; 47; 48; 50; 73; 83; 164

equality;11; 12; 14; 38; 64; 75; 84; 85; 98; 102; 124; 133; 147; 150; 153; 156; 166; 190

essentialized;13

spoken;27; 28; 69; 78; 135; 141

status quo;5; 26; 28; 30; 43; 64; 75; 85; 102; 133; 134; 143; 153; 167; 190

stereotypes;13; 20; 146

strategies;vii; 16; 26; 30; 31; 38; 48; 57; 87; 109; 116; 123; 131; 134; 135; 136; 140; 174

structural;vii; 13; 26; 27; 34; 43; 103; 108; 113; 133; 136; 160; 179; 186

structuralism;33

structure;34; 47; 133; 153; 158; 166

struggle;34; 35; 37; 118; 136; 147

student teachers;vi; 23; 24; 29; 34; 36; 37; 61; 63; 64; 65; 75; 78; 82; 86; 87; 88; 101; 105; 117; 122; 127; 128; 145; 147; 150; 156; 161; 189; 190

sub-groups;78

subjects;vii; 36; 37; 38; 67; 116; 129; 164

subjugation;22; 42; 64; 184

subordination;12; 28; 156; 168

subtle;v; vi; vii; 6; 18; 40; 41; 47; 52; 54; 63; 64; 65; 69; 71; 72; 75; 76; 79; 81; 82; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 89; 184

subtler;vi; 65; 73; 86; 88

subtly;vi; vii; 9; 13; 31; 38; 42; 65; 79; 82; 86; 87

success;11; 133; 139

superior;vi; 6; 12; 14; 39; 43; 63; 77; 78; 79; 124

superiority;v; 28; 30; 39; 62; 80; 152; 166

superpower;12

supremacy;v; vi; vii; 5; 6; 7; 8; 15; 27; 30; 40; 41; 42; 43; 46; 47; 48; 52; 60; 62; 63; 64; 69; 77; 78; 79; 80; 81; 82; 84; 88; 89; 92; 96; 98; 121; 134; 140; 142; 153; 155; 158; 162; 172; 173; 179

Swedish;20; 100; 110

symptoms;13

taboo;6; 13; 19; 69; 70; 71; 73; 83; 94

take a back seat;45

talking;13; 21; 69; 100; 107; 128; 135; 190

teacher education;i; v; vi; vii; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 15; 16; 17; 18; 23; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29; 31; 32; 33; 34; 35; 36; 42; 46; 48; 49; 50; 51; 52; 56; 57; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 67; 68; 75; 76; 78; 79; 80; 81; 82; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88; 89; 92; 93; 94; 95; 97; 98; 99; 100; 101; 105; 114; 116; 117; 118; 119; 121; 122; 123; 125; 127; 128; 129; 135; 137; 138; 139; 140; 142; 143; 145; 148; 149; 150; 154; 156; 160; 161; 162; 166; 167; 168; 170; 172; 173; 174; 176; 179; 182; 187; 188; 189; 190; 192; 193; 194; 197; 199

teacher education programme;87

teacher educator;v; 4; 6; 7; 8; 9; 54; 65; 68; 72; 74; 75; 78; 114; 122; 128; 135; 150; 199

teacher educators;vi; 8; 9; 23; 29; 34; 36; 37; 48; 49; 50; 54; 60; 64; 65; 66; 78; 80; 81; 82; 85; 86; 87; 88; 94; 98; 105; 116; 119; 125; 127; 128; 132; 134; 136; 142; 144; 145; 150; 152; 156; 158; 160; 161; 164; 167; 173; 176; 184; 188; 189; 194; 197; 199

teachers;v; 5; 24; 28; 29; 34; 46; 53; 61; 64; 66; 73; 74; 77; 83; 87; 88; 92; 93; 94; 95; 96; 98; 99; 100; 101; 102; 103; 114; 117; 118; 121; 122; 124; 125; 126; 127; 128; 129; 131; 132; 133; 134; 135; 136; 137; 140; 141; 143; 145; 146; 147; 148; 149; 152; 153; 154; 160; 162; 164; 167; 168; 174; 176; 179; 182; 183; 186; 187; 188; 189; 190; 192; 193

term;i; v; vi; viii; 4; 5; 6; 7; 11; 13; 14; 18; 20; 34; 38; 39; 40; 45; 47; 49; 53; 54; 55; 62; 63; 65; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 76; 77; 79; 82; 84; 86; 87; 101; 105; 149; 173; 190; 194; 195

territory;14

textual;vii; 29; 33; 50; 54; 55; 57; 58; 60; 88; 94; 104; 121; 131; 188; 194

the craft;53; 98

Them;13; 70; 114

theoretical;vi; vii; 5; 6; 9; 11; 15; 17; 18; 19; 22; 24; 29; 31; 33; 34; 39; 45; 47; 48; 50; 52; 53; 54; 55; 56; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 65; 67; 71; 73; 74; 78; 80; 82; 83; 85; 86; 87; 88; 114; 121; 135; 172; 199

theoretical lens;55

theorise;vi; 13; 17; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 33; 34; 35; 37; 44; 66; 69; 82; 192

thesis;v; vii; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 11; 13; 15; 16; 17; 18; 21; 23; 31; 33; 34; 35; 36; 37; 38; 39; 40; 41; 42; 43; 44; 45; 46; 47; 48; 50; 52; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 59; 60; 62; 63; 65; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 74; 75; 76; 77; 79; 80; 81; 82; 83; 84; 85;

Article 1

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71,* 24–33. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.005

Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*

Sandra Fylkesnes

Department of International Studies and Interpreting, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Postboks 4, St. Olavs plass, 0130 Oslo, Norway

H I G H L I G H T S

- Teacher education researchers do not explicitly define the term *cultural diversity.*
- Teacher education researchers use the term *cultural diversity* in relation other undefined terms.
- Teacher education researchers use *cultural diversity* extensively in binary oppositions.
- Teacher education researchers are actors who produce a discursive ideology of White supremacy.
- Discourses of teacher education research may effect racial justice.

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A C T

The term "cultural diversity" is extensively used in recent teacher education research, but its meaning appears to vary and therefore needs to be made visible. This article reviews the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity. The analysis reveals three main patterns across the 67 studies reviewed: Cultural diversity is (1) undefined, (2) related to a set of other undefined terms and (3) used in binary oppositional discourses that produce a racialized Other. Drawing on critical Whiteness studies and critical discourse analysis, I argue that despite attempting to promote social justice, researchers are actors who produce a discursive ideology of White supremacy.

Contents

E-mail address: Sandra.Fylkesnes@hioa.no.

1. Introduction

This article reviews the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* across 67 international research studies on teacher education published in the period 2004—2014. The term cultural diversity is extensively used in recent educational research, especially in research focusing on multicultural education. There already exists an extensive amount of research on multicultural teacher education, particularly in the USA (e.g. Castro, 2010; Trent, Kea, & Oh, 2008), but work in this area outside the USA is only just beginning to gain traction. Even though established researchers in this research area describe cultural diversity by referring to various other terms (e.g. Artiles, Palmer, & Trent, 2004; Banks, 2012, 2014; May & Sleeter, 2010), the meaning of cultural diversity appears to vary. Reviews of teacher education studies reveal that the lack of conceptual clarity is persistent across teacher education research (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Grant, Elsbree, & Fondric, 2004; Smolcic & Katunich, 2017). In their critique of teacher education research, Cochran-Smith et al. (2015) claim that this lack of conceptual clarity is a well-known issue. In a review of intercultural competency in teacher education, Smolcic and Katunich (2017) argue that such lack of conceptual clarity reflects a lack of culturally relevant theoretical and conceptual knowledge. Despite some researchers taking an interest in the analyses of discourses and particularly how terms manifest themselves in teacher education institutions (e.g. Matus & Infante, 2011), multicultural teacher education researchers generally do not focus on the constructed—and potentially contested—meaning of central terms such as cultural diversity.

If the establishment of meaning "takes place through language" (Leonardo, 2002, p. 4), conceptualisations of terms in discourses, constituted by knowledge-producing institutions, work through educational curricula and practice (Afdal & Nerland, 2014, p. 284), and teachers' dispositions are fundamentally about meaning making related to feelings that affect pedagogical behaviour (e.g. Eberly, Rand, & O'Connor, 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011). The varied use and meaning making of cultural diversity in research on teacher education then needs to be made visible because its conceptualisation affects the dispositions of researchers, teacher educators and student teachers in ways that in turn effect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010). Therefore, I argue that to investigate the use and meaning making of cultural diversity in educational research is important because, despite research on cultural diversity in teacher education appears to promote social justice, it in fact subtly produces discourses that centre Whiteness as normal through ways that the term cultural diversity almost always denotes an inferior and racialized Other. As long as Whiteness is an engrained and unexamined area in the discourses produced for teacher education, the extensive focus on cultural diversity has implications for teacher education when it comes to promoting social justice.

The aim of this article is twofold. Firstly, it aims to clarify how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* by making visible what meaning is given to this term in the reviewed articles. Secondly, it aims to discuss possible implications for researchers in the field of teacher education as well as teacher educators. The two questions guiding this review are:

1. How is cultural diversity used and made meaning of in teacher education research?
2. What are the possible implications of the use and meaning of cultural diversity for researchers in the field of teacher education as well as teacher educators in relation to social justice?

The article's main theoretical framework draws on critical Whiteness studies (CWS), wherein Whiteness is understood as an ideology of White supremacy that works through discourses. Methodologically, the article is inspired by the data-gathering strategies of systematic reviews (e.g. Gough, Thomas, & Oliver, 2012a, 2012b) and an analytical approach based on critical discourse analytical theory (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). These theoretical and methodological approaches are important because they allow the researcher to focus not only on the object of the discourse (Foucault, 1989; Goldberg, 2006) (i.e. the use and meaning making of cultural diversity) but also on the patterns of discursive positionality within a targeted area of research. In this manner, the article aims to map—and thus make visible—the discursive object constructed in the use and meaning making of cultural diversity. Simultaneously, it aims to deconstruct and uncover the subtly promoted positionality of the researchers within a delimited research area and within a delimited timeframe.

In the next section, I outline the article's theoretical perspectives. I then describe the rationale and criteria for the selection of the studies, provide a general overview of the selected studies and explain the strategy for analysis. Following, I address the article's first guiding question by presenting this review's analysis. Next, I discuss this review's analysis against the second guiding question and in light of the concept of Whiteness. Last, some concluding remarks are made.

2. Theoretical perspectives: Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy

Both critical researchers of Whiteness and critical discourse analysts aim to challenge the existing social *status quo*, for example, by questioning the power/knowledge (cf. Foucault, 1980) produced within institutions, with a wider goal of bringing about greater social justice (Taylor, 2009). However, whilst critical discourse analysts generally focus on detecting and deconstructing the workings of any dominant group's hegemonic discursive meaning making, critical researchers of Whiteness are mainly concerned with detecting and deconstructing the workings of Whiteness in different societal contexts. In this article, I review written texts and focus on detecting and deconstructing the workings of Whiteness through the discursive use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* in teacher education research studies.

Theoretical perspectives in both CWS and critical discourse analysis recognise the inextricable relationship between the Foucauldian concepts of *power* and *knowledge*. In the concept *power/knowledge*, power is always a function of knowledge and knowledge is always an exercise of power. According to Foucault (1980), power/knowledge "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (Foucault, 1980, p. 39). As an embedded part of discourses, power/

knowledge thus penetrates through educational institutions and produces ideologically bound political actors (Althusser, 1970; MacLure, 2003) (e.g. researchers, teacher educators and student teachers). These ideological political actors produce power/knowledge discourses that "make true" (Hall, 2001, p. 76) and determine what is accepted as "true" (Torfing, 1999). According to Foucault (1980), each society has its own "regime" or "general politics of truth" (p. 31). However, important concerning discourses is that, because they are embedded in regimes and general politics of truth, they frame "what can be said and thought but also … who can speak, when, where and with what authority" (Foucault, 1989, p. 49). Therefore, the "truthfulness" of discourses is related to the "status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true" (Foucault, 1980, p. 31).

CWS holds, in line with critical race theory, the fundamental point that racism is an ordinary, normal and omnipresent part of "larger systemic, structural conventions and customs that uphold and sustain oppressive group relations" (Taylor, 2009, p. 4). Moreover, CWS hold that these conventions are rooted in *Whiteness*. The concept of Whiteness may be understood as a legacy of global White colonialism (Taylor, 2009); a racial worldview (Leonardo, 2002); a White European identity constantly in the making (Goldberg, 2006); a global racial discourse (Leonardo, 2002) and/or an ideology of White European supremacy (Gillborn, 2005). In this article, Whiteness is understood as a discursive ideology of White supremacy. Importantly, "White supremacy" as an embedded part of the discursive ideology does not allude to explicit racism but to

…a political, economic, and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement … [that] are wide spread, and [how] relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily re-enacted across a broad array of institutional and social settings (Ansley, 1992, p. 592).

Whiteness can thus be understood as a socially constructed (Frankenberg, 1993; Mathias & Grosland, 2016) organising principle (Chubbuck, 2004) linked to institutionalised power/knowledge that (mainly but not only) privilege White people (Chubbuck, 2004; Gillborn, 2005; Roediger, 2007). However, as Leonardo (2004) and others have stated, the critical study of Whiteness should not only be concerned with privilege but also with detecting and deconstructing the "structures and actions that mask domination that makes possible, and sustains, White racial hegemony" (Gillborn, 2008, p. 35). Importantly, White racial domination, the discursive power/knowledge processes that sustain the hegemonic ideology of White supremacy, resides (to the "surprise" of most liberal Whites) in "the domain of average, tolerant people, lovers of diversity, and believers in justice" (Leonardo, 2004, p. 143). This, because Whiteness, as a discursive ideology of White supremacy, does nothing to disrupt these good people's "business-as-usual" behaviour (Delgado & Stefanic, 1997, p. xvi) that re-enacts and sustains their institutionalised social privilege and hegemony. As I will discuss later, the discursive ideology of White supremacy inheres in precisely those places that racist ideologies are believed to be extirpated. The review I undertake in this article nonetheless points at the persistence of a discursive ideology of Whiteness in studies that generally claim to promote social justice.

Critical researchers of Whiteness argue that Whites' ability to sustain their racial hegemonic position is due to the "invisibility" of Whiteness or its ability to remain unseen (Dyer, 1997; hooks, 1997) and unmarked (Frankenberg, 1993, 1997). Dyer (1997) argues that Whiteness "resides in invisible properties" (p. 45). Therefore, if researchers start, as Vaugh (2012) suggests, to understand

Whiteness as a property of meaning making, then we might come to understand how Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy works through power/knowledge-producing institutions in their exclusive right to define both "truth" and social order. Leonardo (2002) suggests that Whiteness works like "late capital", "with scopes, not scales" (p. 41), and that researchers therefore need to pay attention not merely to how Whiteness excludes Others (Leonardo, 2004) but to how Whites and others invest in it. One way of interrogating how Whites and others invest in Whiteness could be to pay closer attention to how Whiteness works in discourses and to how researchers invest in language. For example, researchers may perform "*micro* analyses" (Riviere, 2008, p. 264, italicised in original) that unveil how Whiteness works through researchers' use of covert language (e.g. the term cultural diversity) that implicitly produces references to the racialized Other (Urrieta, 2006).

Understanding Whiteness as a productive power/knowledge ideology of White supremacy that works through discourses involves understanding researchers and other members of the knowledge-producing community as political actors (cf. Althusser, 1970) who consciously or unconsciously (Ansley, 1992) work to maintain their own racial group's social, economic and hegemonic position through various discursive practices. Analysing how Whiteness works as a discursive ideology of White supremacy therefore involves paying attention to the discursive practices as centring around power/knowledge to name, define and thus to dominate the social world (e.g. Essed, 1991; Frankenberg, 1993; Said, 2003), mainly through definitions of the racialized Other (cf. Said, 2003). *Othering*, a term inspired by Said (2003), entails attention being drawn away from the active naming "racialless" subject to the passively constructed racialized discursive object (Foucault, 1989; Goldberg, 2009). The main implication of the discursive practices of Othering is that it leaves Whiteness appearing to be both invisible and neutral, particularly to those embedded within it (Dyer, 1997, 2013; Frankenberg, 1993; Gillborn, 2005). "Seeing" Whiteness as invisible implies dysconscious forms of racism (King, 2004, p. 73). According to King (2004), dysconscious racism is a kind of "impaired" consciousness, an uncritical way of thinking about race and racism that allows for a racism that "tacitly accepts dominant White norms and privileges" (p. 73) through, for example, certain use and meaning making of terms. Therefore, as Frankenberg (1993) advocates, researchers must start to name Whiteness because by doing so they "assign *everyone* a place in the relations of racism" (p. 6, original emphasis). McVee (2014) argues that because there are "linguistic cues deeply embedded within our discourse that draw attention to race" (p. 5), language cannot therefore be seen as a neutral vehicle for communication but rather as a conveyer of a racialized understanding of the world that ultimately both constructs and represents the positions we as researchers take up. In this article, the positions researchers take up are revealed through the analysis of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity.

The analysis of the use and meaning making of cultural diversity in the reviewed articles draws on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001, pp. 106—114, 127—130) theorisation of discursive formation, that is, how conceptualisations of terms are negotiated and constructed. As in CWS, Laclau and Mouffe (2001) draw on the Foucauldian conceptualisation of power/knowledge, in addition to Gramsci's (2011) conceptualisation of *hegemony*. Embracing the Saussurean post-structural idea of the relationship between the signifier and the signified, Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that in the process of discursive formation there exists a continuous political power/knowledge struggle between discursive terms in a fight for the hegemonic meaning making of central discursive terms. Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that the ability of terms to influence central

discursive terms' meaning making is dependent on the use, frequency, proximity and manner of other terms to which they are related (see pp. 106–114, 127–130). In this article, I regard Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation of the discursive formation as my epistemological foundation that provides me with tools (as explained in the Methods section) for analysing and understanding the constellations of terms by tracking their relationships. Such an approach implies that the meanings given to the term *cultural diversity* can be found not only in explicit definitions of it but also by tracking and mapping the very terms to which it is directly and/or indirectly related.

Discourse in this article refers to a "system of representation" (cf. Hall, 1992, p. 287) that provides a particular kind of knowledge about a topic. Particularly when concerned with representation of the racialized Other, this system of representation is a legacy of the racist imperial and colonial practices of categorisation (Goldberg, 2009). Categorisation practices always implies hierarchy, are always constructed in configuration with power/knowledge, and always places the race of the classifiers at the hierarchical apex (cf. Dyer, 1997). A basic categorisation principle in Western discourses is the use of binary oppositions (MacLure, 2003). Binary oppositions may be understood as dichotomous, unfair pairs of terms (e.g. white/black, good/bad, cultural/natural) that are always established around a superior term that is always related to a lesser and deviant Other (MacLure, 2003, p. 10). However, when sets of superior terms cluster together and are related to sets of deviant terms through the same dichotomous logic as binary oppositional terms, they form what in this article I refer to as *binary oppositional discourses*—two relational but dichotomous systems of representation. Like binary oppositional terms, binary oppositional discourses produce a hierarchy of meanings that invest and construct certain terms with particular identities (p. 9) whilst simultaneously marking the boundaries of what *cultural diversity* is not. As a product of researchers' dysconscious investment in terms, binary oppositional discourses provide conceptual frameworks for individuals (cf. Frankenberg, 1993). In other words, binary oppositional discourses make it "possible to construct the topic in a certain way" whilst limiting "other possible ways in which the topic can be constructed" (Hall, 1992, p. 291). Critical researchers of Whiteness argue that Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy does not only systematically form the objects of which it speaks (cf. Foucault, 1989). It also performs a kind of "epistemic violence" (Frankenberg, 1993; MacLure, 2003) by investing in certain terms at the expense of others that provide "conceptual frameworks for individuals" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 265). These frameworks work in Foucauldian power/knowledge ways in that they shape individuals' daily practices and social relationships (Eberly et al., 2007; Frankenberg, 1993). Given that power/knowledge affect individuals' actions and attitudes, discourses, learning processes and everyday lives (cf. Foucault, 1980), to detect and deconstruct a discursive ideology of White supremacy is important because it can give insight into how the constellation of terms might ultimately affect racial justice.

Combining the theoretical perspectives of CWS with critical discourse analysis theory when analysing the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* is important and relevant because both these perspectives turn researchers' focus to what I understand Allen (2004) is advocating, that is, to deconstruct *the pedagogy of the oppressor*. Focusing the research gaze on the pedagogy of the oppressor is "to look head-on at a site of dominance" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 6) and thus an important counterstrategy of how Whiteness historically has controlled the gaze of its subordinated Other (e.g. slaves) (hooks, 2013) whilst blinding itself (Dyer, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993) to its own doings. Moreover, focusing the research gaze on the pedagogy of the oppressor turns

what is generally regarded as a subject into a researched object and thus encourages the researcher to *look behind the mirror* (cf. Delgado & Stefanic, 1997) regarding what is claimed to be represented. For this article, this means that the analysis of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity in the 67 critically reviewed articles is not only illustrative of how cultural diversity is represented; it is just as much a detection of the discursive production of the political actors of research. In other words, this article is also an analysis of the researchers' positionality—their collective political power and ability to define "truth" and social order by investing in the term cultural diversity.

3. Method

Literature reviews generally synthesise previous research within the field of interest (Creswell, 2014) to establish the state of the art within that field. However, literature reviews may vary in both scope and aim (Neuman, 2014), as well as in terms of the issues being addressed (Gough et al., 2012a). This review is inspired by the literature on systematic configurative reviews (Gough & Thomas, 2013; Gough et al., 2012a). Conducting a systematic configurative review means approaching the review "using systematic and explicit, accountable methods" (Gough, Thomas, & Oliver, 2012b, p. 5) and organising or configuring the data from the studies to answer the article's research question. In this article, I have used systematic database searches and organised the data in a table (Appendix A) to get an overview of the corpus of the studies reviewed. However, it is important to stress that I have drawn on critical discourse analytical-inspired strategies for my analysis of the written text. The review presented in this article is not concerned with the selected studies' findings or methods. It instead performs a deconstructive discourse analysis of the use and meaning making of a term within the text. In line with the aims of "traditional" reviews, this review aims to stimulate broader discussions on general discursive patterns across the reviewed studies rather than to stimulate debates about individual studies (Gough et al., 2012b). Additionally, the review aims to point to possible implications following on from the patterns identified. It is important to stress that where the article provides examples from individual studies, the examples illustrate a generalised pattern detected across the analysed studies.

3.1. Database searches and the selection of studies

The studies reviewed in this article were found by searching two databases (Academic Search Premier and ERIC) in January and February of 2015. To target studies addressing the term *cultural diversity* in teacher education research, the search term *cultural diversity* was initially combined with the terms *teacher education, teacher educators, student teachers* and *teacher education curriculum*. These combinations of search terms produced 971 results. More precisely, 257, 46, 265 and 62 results, respectively were obtained using Academic Search Premier, and 156, 37, 117 and 31 results, respectively, were obtained using ERIC. The selection of the studies was conducted in two stages. First, all titles and abstracts were read and checked against the selection criteria (Table 1). After excluding duplicate studies and evaluating the abstracts, 132 studies remained. Second, for the studies to be considered relevant to the article's first research question, the full texts were retrieved for further examination. A further 65 studies were excluded from the review, whilst 67 articles were deemed to fit the criteria. The full texts of these relevant studies were read and thoroughly analysed using a three-step reading strategy (Table 2).

Table 1
Selection criteria (table inspired by Zlatanovic, Havnes, & Mausethagen, 2016).

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Rationale
Peer-reviewed studies	Editorials, letters, duplicate texts	Ensure scientific quality and decrease the risk of inappropriate conclusions
English language	Other languages	Published for an international audience
Empirical and theoretical/conceptual studies	Purely descriptions of teaching materials, class sessions and lectures	Contribution to the field of research
Focus on teacher education	Other focus (e.g. music teacher education, special teacher education)	Relevance to the article's guiding questions
Focus on studies published in the period 2004–2014	Studies before 2004	Relevance to the current context and requirements for research on teacher education

Table 2
The three-step reading strategy.

	Aim	Strategy for analysis	Empirical research questions
First reading	Get an overview of terms and content related to cultural diversity	Word search Choice of words	What terms are prominently and frequently used in relation to cultural diversity in the reviewed studies?
Second reading	Identify how cultural diversity is used through representations of closely related terms	Representations Comparison	How are cultural diversity and other related terms described in the studies? What similarities and differences in the use of cultural diversity exist?
Third reading	Synthesise and discuss the use of cultural diversity across the selected studies	Synthesis	How is cultural diversity generally used in studies on teacher education?

3.2. General overview of the studies

The included studies and their use of cultural diversity were summarised in an appendix (see Appendix A) to provide detailed information and an overview of the studies' theoretical frameworks, aims and other main terms used in relation to the use of cultural diversity. Most studies (n = 64) were conducted in a context considered "Western" (from the context of the USA (n = 43) and Canada (n = 2), the UK (n = 3), Finland (n = 3), Germany (n = 1), the Netherlands (n = 1), Denmark (n = 1), Australia (n = 9) and New Zealand (n = 1)). Even though three studies originated from areas that were not geographically considered "Western" (one study was conducted in Israel, one in Singapore and one in Chile), two came from countries that are members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (Chile and Israel). One study was conducted in a context that is considered unique because it represents a so-called industrialised country surrounded by "developing countries" (Singapore). Most studies were qualitative; however, six studies applied a quantitative approach and two were literature review studies. Fifty-two studies clearly located their studies within a defined theoretical/conceptual framework, mainly multicultural theory, critical multicultural theory and critical Whiteness theory, as indicated in Appendix A. Twelve studies reviewed literature relevant to their study's field, and three studies did not draw on theory but used measurements instruments to test a hypothesis. All the studies reviewed were regarded as attempts to promote social justice. Of these, almost two thirds (n = 39) explicitly promoted and used the term social justice, whilst almost one third (n = 28) did not use the term social justice but nonetheless argued for the importance of the need to better prepare teachers for cultural diversity.

3.3. Analytical approach

The initial textual approach in the analysis of the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* draws on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation of how terms' meaning(s) are negotiated and constructed (as noted earlier). I view this theory as an epistemological foundation that provides me with tools that enable a mapping of the relationships between terms, implicit definitions and thereby possible meaning making of cultural diversity. As such, this theory was operationalised (see Fylkesnes, 2011, pp. 55–59) and "translated" into a *three-step reading strategy* (see Table 2; inspired by Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012; Søreide, 2007).

The first step of the analysis laid out and provided an overview of other terms used in relation to cultural diversity (Table 2). The main analytical approach was employed through word searches and focused on terms that appeared prominently and frequently in relation to cultural diversity. During the first reading, excerpts were selected for a deeper analysis of how teacher education researchers described cultural diversity and its related terms. The second reading focused on these excerpts and on how cultural diversity and the related terms were described. Similarities and differences among researchers' use of the terms were detected and noted. The third step of the analysis built on the previous two and synthesised the main patterns identified through the usage of cultural diversity across the research.

4. Analysis

Keeping in mind that the 67 studies reviewed were all understood as attempts to promote social justice, the textual analysis of the use and meaning making of cultural diversity in these studies revealed the following patterns: Cultural diversity is (1) generally not defined in the research studies but is (2) related to a set of other undefined terms. (3) Cultural diversity is mainly used as a part of two main binary oppositional discourses that generally produced cultural diversity as a racialized *Other* in contrast to the *student teacher(s)* and the *student(s)*. In the following, I present an analysis of these three main patterns and demonstrate how these patterns give meaning to cultural diversity.

4.1. Indeterminate definitions of cultural diversity

Of the 67 studies analysed, only two claim to explicitly define cultural diversity (Holm & Londen, 2010, p. 107; Michael-Luna &

Marri, 2011, p. 180). However, despite claiming to define the term, these studies nonetheless relate cultural diversity to a set of terms (e.g. class, gender, race, language, religion and ethnicity **and** ethnicity, race, language, gender, sexual orientation, ability/disability and religion). Meaning that, in their studies, Holm and Londen's (2010) and Michael-Luna and Marri's (2011) do not locate, situate or discuss the meaning ascribed to cultural diversity within their respective studies. As such, their claimed definitions of cultural diversity are understood as indeterminate. A challenge with not properly situating or discussing the meaning ascribed to central terms used in articles might be that, as I argue is the case with the terms *ethnicity* and *race* in the next section, it affects the preciseness in the use of terms and their denotations.

4.2. Related to a set of other undefined terms

As noted above, the remaining 65 studies did not attempt to explicitly define cultural diversity. Rather, they give meaning to cultural diversity by referring to various other terms. Therefore, all these other terms may be interpreted as central discursive elements competing in a political power struggle over the hegemonic meaning making of cultural diversity (cf. Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). Some of these other terms have more influence on the meaning making of cultural diversity than others. This influence depends on the extent to which they dominate the other terms when used in relation to cultural diversity. In particular, the frequency, proximity and manner of a term's use in relation to cultural diversity may affect its ability to influence meaning making.

Throughout the analysis, it became clear that the term *multicultural* in all its variations (see Table 5, Appendix B) has the most extensive influence on the meaning making of cultural diversity. This pattern emerged through how cultural diversity was related to the term *multicultural* in 34 studies, used interchangeably, superordinately and subordinately to cultural diversity, and through how the term sometimes replaced cultural diversity's discursive position. This replacement occurred whenever researchers used cultural diversity interchangeably with multicultural (see Table 5, Appendix B). One example of the interchangeable use of these terms can be found in Brown's (2004) study where she uses the terms *cultural diversity* and *multicultural* interchangeably, primarily when the terms are related to the term *course/courses*. However, throughout her study, cultural diversity and multicultural were related to various undefined and indistinguishable terms. This means that in Brown's (2004) study, not only the difference in meaning between the terms *multicultural course* and *cultural diversity courses* appeared ambiguous. This was also the case for the terms *multicultural perceptions* and *multicultural thinking*; *cultural diversity awareness*, *cultural diversity sensitivity* and *cultural diversity attitudes*; *multicultural tenets* and *cultural diversity awareness factors* and *multicultural pedagogy, multicultural teaching* and *cultural diversity behaviour*.

The analysis also showed that the terms *race/racial*, *difference*, *class*, *linguistic*, *ethnic/ethnicity*, *gender*, *critical thinking* and *practices*, *socioeconomic*, *other*, *immigrants*, *social justice*, *behaviour*, English language learners (ELLs), *religion*, *poor*, *sexual orientation* and *ability/disability* were also closely related to cultural diversity. Of these terms, *race* and *ethnicity* were found to have the most influence on the meaning making of cultural diversity based on how they were used interchangeably and sometimes also in subordination to cultural diversity (see Table 6, Appendix B). Additionally, the terms *difference* and *class* were found to have more influence on the meaning making of cultural diversity than the terms *poor*, *sexual orientation* and *ability/disability,* based on their frequency and their relationships to cultural diversity (Table 7, Appendix B). One example of the interchangeable use of *race* and *ethnicity* can be

found in Gay's (2013) study, particularly when the terms are used as part of phases that describe *diversity, students, groups (of people), difference,* a *post-racial society* and *perspectives.* This means, for example, that even though Gay (2013) once distinguished the terms by relating *ethnic* to *heritage* and *race* to *background,* the difference in the meaning between the terms disappeared when they also appeared in phrases that merged the two terms, for example, in phrases that describe students as coming "from diverse ethnic, racial and cultural backgrounds" (p. 67). Thus, the terms race and ethnicity appeared in Gay's (2013) study to be ambiguous, just as the terms cultural diversity and multicultural appeared to be ambiguous in Brown's (2004) study.

When *race* and *ethnicity* were used in subordination to cultural diversity, the terms were, for example, described as one of several "perspectives of cultural diversity" (McVee, 2014, p. 1), "sources of cultural identity" (Valentín, 2006, p. 197) and as components in critical multicultural education that potentially could reduce "the achievement gap between students" (Holm & Londen, 2010, p. 117).

So far in this analysis, I have found that the term cultural diversity is implicitly defined by how researchers use it in relation to other terms. Yet, the meaning of the term remains variable and therefore ambiguous. One reason for this lack of clarity may be that researchers use cultural diversity in relation to other undefined terms. Nonetheless, I have found that the meaning making of cultural diversity is heavily influenced by the term multicultural (and all its related terms) and that it could sometimes be understood as connoting the same meaning(s) as *multicultural*. I have also found that the use of cultural diversity in reference to *race/racial* was sometimes simultaneously a reference to *ethnic/ethnicity*, and through their interchangeable nature, these terms have exerted meaning making power over cultural diversity. Even though the meaning making of cultural diversity is also influenced by *difference*, *class*, *linguistic*, *critical thinking*, *practices*, *socioeconomic*, *other*, *immigrants*, *poor*, *social justice*, *behaviour* and *religion* (see Table 5, Appendix B), their influence is weaker. Therefore, the meaning of cultural diversity appears to be quite ambiguous and open in that it relates to a set of other terms. Nonetheless, its use in relation to a *specific* set of terms indicates the following: (1) there are limits to the universe of terms that cultural diversity is used in relation to and (2) there must be terms that cultural diversity is not used in relation to. These two indications highlight the importance of the third finding of this review, namely that researchers use cultural diversity with its related set of terms extensively in binary oppositional discourses.

4.3. Used as part of two binary oppositional discourses

The analysis of the studies also revealed that more than two thirds of them place cultural diversity and all its related terms in a discourse that in total was understood as oppositional to the discourses in *student teacher(s)* and *student(s)* (see Table 8, Appendix B; Table 3).

4.3.1. Binary oppositional discourses of cultural diversity and student teacher(s)

The studies that used cultural diversity in explicit binary

Table 3
Number of studies using cultural diversity as part of binary oppositional discourses.

Cultural diversity in binary oppositional discourses with	
student teacher(s) and student(s)	47
student teacher(s)	32
student(s)	10

oppositional discourses with *student teacher* related it mainly to the terms *student of color, race, other, ethnicity, difference/different* and *minority* (see Table 9, Appendix B). More specifically, when the binary oppositional discourses are related to *race*, cultural diversity and race are described using a set of terms that are dichotomous to the set of terms used to describe student teacher(s) (see Table 10, Appendix B). Similarly, when the binary oppositional discourses are related to *ethnicity*, the two terms are not described but are related to a set of terms that are dichotomous to the terms used to describe *student teacher(s)* (see Table 11, Appendix B). Examples of how the binary oppositional discourses are related to the term *other* were found in three studies (Burnett & McArdle, 2011; Castro, 2010; Pope & Wilder, 2005). For example, in Pope and Wilder's (2005) study, the binary oppositional discourse was found through, on the one hand, how cultural diversity is related to the term to *diverse others* (see Table 7, Appendix B) and described as "persons from another ethnic background or social class" (Pope & Wilder, 2005, p. 323) and "individuals who are *predominantly* of another race" (Pope & Wilder, 2005, p. 326, italicised in original). On the other hand, *student teachers*, the participants in Pope and Wilder's (2005) sample, are described as "primarily Caucasian females" (p. 324). Similarly, and quite explicitly, in Castro's (2010) study, *cultural diversity* is used in a binary oppositional discourse that, on the one hand, relate *cultural diversity* to *others* and *culturally different,* whilst, on the other hand relate *student teachers* to *White pre-service teachers* (p. 201). (See Table 4).

In Burnett and McArdle's (2011) study, cultural diversity is related to the term *migrant Other* and is used in explicit binary opposition to *ordinary Australian* throughout. This explicit binary oppositional discourse is revealed by how Burnett and McArdle show how binary oppositions are used in Australian policy discourses as an opposition between *the un-integrated Islamic Other* and *the essence of the Western nation state* and between *Australian ethnicity* and *the Other*. Burnett and McArdle argue that these binary oppositions are uniquely Australian articulations of race and ethnicity, articulations they refer to as *Whiteness*. They define Whiteness as the "logic that links White racial identity with high civilized standards of living" (Hage, 2003, p. 54, cited in; Burnett & McArdle, 2011, p. 46) and as a logic of the binary opposition *colonial society and identity* (p. 46) to an *uncivilized other* (Hage, 2003, p. 52, cited in; Burnett & McArdle, 2011, p. 45). Moreover, they also argue that *ordinary Australians* and *the Other, familiarity* and *difference*, are "identified reference points of Australian identity and 'the Other'" (Burnett & McArdle, 2011, p. 52). Even though Burnett and McArdle (2011) highlight the binary oppositional use in Australian policy discourses, they do not attempt to either deconstruct or critique the binary oppositions present in the discourse they claim to detect. Rather, they uncritically remain within the same binary oppositional discourse, thus leading to a continuation of discourses that promote ideas and definitions of cultural diversity as racially Other. This investment in terms therefore exemplifies one way that the imperial and colonial legacy persists in discursive logics. The binary opposition discourse of *cultural diversity* and *student teacher* is reinforced in the discussion of their article, in which they reflect upon future teacher education courses (see Burnett & McArdle, 2011, p. 53).

4.3.2. Binary oppositional discourses of cultural diversity and student(s)

When cultural diversity is used as a part of explicit binary oppositional discourse with *student(s),* cultural diversity is directly related or contrasted to student(s). In this binary oppositional discourse, students are, similar to the binary oppositional discourse of cultural diversity and student teacher(s), described by terms that act as dichotomous to the terms that describe the term *students* when **not** used in relation to cultural diversity (see Table 12, Appendix B).

To sum up, in this analysis, I have found that cultural diversity is not only implicitly defined by being related to a set of other undefined terms, as mentioned earlier. It is also given meaning through how the set of other undefined terms cluster together and form two binary oppositional discourses with *student teacher(s)* and *student(s)* and these terms' related terms. The production of these binary oppositional discourses implies that as researchers give meaning to cultural diversity they simultaneously "mark" the boundaries of what cultural diversity is not. Cultural diversity is *not* student teacher, student or any of their related terms (Table 12, Appendix B).

5. Discussion

This review has demonstrated how cultural diversity is used and given meaning in 67 research studies in teacher education published in the period 2004—2014. By drawing on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation of the discursive formation, this review has shown that cultural diversity, despite not being defined, gets its meaning by being related to a set of other undefined terms. Therefore, there seems to persist, as researchers have already pointed out (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Grant et al., 2004; Smolcic & Katunich, 2017) a lack of conceptual clarity. From a discursive analytical perspective, this undefined and ambiguous nature of cultural diversity is, per se, positive because it leaves open the possibility of a political struggle between terms' meaning making that makes a disruption of the hegemonic discursive *status quo* possible (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). However, leaving terms undefined and open to various meanings has implications for both the research community and for other consumers of research (e.g. readers of the studies) because it might impede effective and precise communication. This argument is not one that advocates the need for researchers to start defining cultural diversity in a strict manner. However, it points to the importance of the advancement of clear and concise communication within research for both

Table 4
Terms used in the binary oppositional discourses of cultural diversity and student teacher(s), cultural diversity and student(s).

Cultural diversity	Student teacher(s)
multicultural, race/racial, difference, class, linguistic, ethnic/ethnicity, critical thinking, practices, socioeconomic, other, immigrants, social justice, behaviour, religion, poor, sexual orientation, ability/disability	pre-service teachers, prospective teachers, monocultural, homogenous, White counterparts, White mainstream counterparts, predominantly white, middle-class, monolingual, European American, hegemonic mainstream, privileged, normal

Cultural diversity	Student(s)
multicultural, race/racial, difference, class, linguistic, ethnic/ethnicity, critical thinking, practices, socioeconomic, other, immigrants, social justice, behaviour, religion, poor, sexual orientation, ability/disability	native English speaking, middle to high income, relatively homogenous socioeconomic status, relatively homogenous ethnic background, higher socioeconomic status, predominantly White, dominant majority, mainstream, mono-ethnic, school population, White

research peers and consumers. It also addresses the importance of researchers starting to locate, situate and discuss cultural diversity in each specific ubiquitous study.

From a discourse analytical perspective (e.g. Laclau & Mouffe, 2001), the finding of how cultural diversity, despite not being explicitly defined, got its meaning by being related to a set of terms actually counters the undefined and ambiguous nature of cultural diversity. This is because it fixes the potential meaning of cultural diversity only to the universe of these terms. Cultural diversity is *student of color, race, other, ethnicity, difference/different and minority.* Moreover, the finding of how cultural diversity and its related terms were extensively used in binary oppositional discourses with *student teacher(s)* and *student(s)* and all their related terms marks the boundaries of what cultural diversity is not. It is not student teacher(s), student(s) or any of their related terms. As such, these dichotomous discourses revealed how cultural diversity has assumed an identity (Gillborn, 2005) as racialized Other (MacLure, 2003). This is one way that Whiteness works through researchers' discursive practices of division and exclusion produced by their initial dysconscious choices and investments in terms. In this review, the "evidence" of *Whiteness* is found in the extensive practice of *Othering* (Said, 2003).

If we accept that the concept of Whiteness, like the Foucauldian concept of power/knowledge, is productive—that it "makes true" (Hall, 2001, p. 76) and is accepted as "true" (Torfing, 1999)—then the usage of cultural diversity in binary oppositional discourses "makes" cultural diversity "true" as a racialized Other to student teachers and students. Importantly, in this review, with regards to how cultural diversity with all its related terms is made true as a racialized Other to student teacher(s) and student(s), it is by its assumed an identity representing difference and inferiority. Contrary, *student teacher(s)* and *student(s)* and their related terms are assumed an identity representing superiority. This is because the set of terms that are part of the binary oppositional discourse on one hand connotes detriment and on the other connotes privilege. hooks (2013) argues that binary oppositional discourses lie at the core of dominator thinking because it teaches people that there is always the oppressed and the oppressor, a victim and a victimizer (p. 30). Based on this logic, it can be argued that the way that cultural diversity is used and given meaning in teacher education research generally promotes a discursive ideology of White supremacy. This ideology is promoted through descriptions of student teacher(s) and student(s) (e.g. *monolingual, European American, hegemonic mainstream, privileged, normal* **and** *relatively homogenous ethnic background, higher socioeconomic status, predominantly White, dominant majority, mainstream*). Furthermore, this discursive ideology, even though implicit and dysconscious (King, 2004), performs "epistemic violence" by way of providing certain conceptual frameworks (Frankenberg, 1993) or discourses through which cultural diversity may be understood.

Based on this study's analysis, there are reasons to ask why so many researchers give meaning to the term cultural diversity as racialized Others and why no one treats it as an abstract term on a higher conceptual and theoretical level. Cochran-Smith et al. (2015) argue that the reasons for researchers' *Othering* of cultural diversity is based on their assumptions that student teachers are culturally different from the diverse students they are supposed to be qualified to teach. In line with Cochran-Smith et al. (2015)'s argument, it seems as if the researchers of this article's reviewed studies dysconsciously (King, 2004) "allow" a practice of *Othering* to dominate their discourses. Goldberg (2009) argues that racist discourse is dominated by "definitions" of *Otherness* (Goldberg, 2009). Such practice may be interpreted as one of "dysconscious racism" or a form of subtle everyday racism (Essed, 1991) that manifests in language through cues (McVee, 2014) or, as this article has shown,

though the use and meaning making of covert terms (Urietta, 2006) such as cultural diversity.

From both a discourse theoretical (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) and a CWS perspective (e.g. Leonardo, 2002), research is always understood as a political activity (Blair, 2004) in which researchers are regarded as central political actors. It implies the authorisation of power conditioned on a subjugation to the rules and conduct set by an elitist, hegemonic (White and male), knowledge-producing community (Blair, 2004) to name, define and thus dominate the social world (e.g. Essed, 1991; Frankenberg, 1993; Said, 2003). Language as such is not only understood as a tool for communication but also as productive. It creates, constitutes and forms the "objects" (cf. Foucault, 1989) being researched and simultaneously constructs and represents the (dis)positions that researchers adopt (McVee, 2014). As such, the choice of one term over another invests the researcher with moral and political allegiances (MacLure, 2003, p. 9) and thereby possible allegiance to Whiteness. In this study, researchers' possible moral and political allegiances to Whiteness manifest through the extent to which they discursively produce *cultural diversity* as a racialized Other.

Despite the studies reviewed for this article being understood as attempts to promote social justice, the extensive practice of *Othering* cultural diversity revealed through this article's critical discourse analysis facilitates an understanding of researchers as political actors who produce a discursive ideology of White supremacy. As Said (2003) and others have exemplified, the implication of *Othering* for teacher education research is that it draws attention away from the unnamed and thus leaves it assumingly neutral (Dyer, 1997, 2013; Frankenberg, 1993; Gillborn, 2005). In line with Frankenberg's (1993) argument on the importance of assigning everyone a place in the social relations of racism, through this review I have named the assumingly neutral actors of Whiteness. However, these actors are not only the researchers themselves but are members of the hegemonic knowledge-producing community. Therefore, all members involved in hegemonic knowledge production can be understood as "accountable" for participating in the production of the *Other*. Thus, the importance of questioning positionality promoted in this article extends beyond this review's interrogation of researchers' language used to include researchers' academic peers (Taylor, 2009) and other research consumers.

In this review, when teacher education researchers are named and made visible as political actors who produce a discursive ideology of White supremacy, it has implications for teacher education research in relation to the exiting ways such research currently appears to promote social justice. Scheurich (1991) suggests that researchers and other political actors in education need to start recognizing that *everyone* is racially positioned, that there is no exception (not even for anti-racists, lovers of diversity and believers in justice) and that this positionality impacts the ways researchers act on the world. One way of starting to understand one's positionality could be to turn the research focus to the *pedagogy of the oppressor* (inwards, towards oneself), that is, from the racialized object to the racialized subject (cf. Morrison, 1991; cited in Aveling, 2004, p. 57) throughout the research process. For example, employing exercises that ensure central terns are used consistently according to their ubiquity of study could be one way to practice reflexivity. Critical self-reflexivity focusing on language use can function as an important counterstrategy for resisting dysconscious allegiances to Whiteness. Such practice can make researcher positionality explicit and thus reveal how Whiteness manifests through the use and meaning making of terms. In other words, such racial reflexivity could allow the researchers to "look behind the mirror" (cf. Delgado & Stefanic, 1997) of the discursive power/knowledge "truth" of their own institutionally framed knowledge that their research claims to produce.

Researchers argue that over time, the discourse of the academy comes to seem natural and commonplace to the students (e.g. Bangeni & Kapp, 2007). If, given that the "truthfulness" of discourses is related to the status of those who produce it (Foucault, 1980), then this implies that the discourse produced in the academy holds considerable "truth-persuasive" power. As such, discourses do more than form objects (Foucault, 1989, p. 49). In line with Foucault, I suggest that the binary opposional discourses of *cultural diversity*, *student teacher(s)* and *student(s)* produced in the research reviewed in this article, particularly because they are framed under a conventional umbrella of institutionally produced power/knowledge produced by an elitist, hegemonic community, "install" (mainly implicitly) patterned ideas of cultural diversity as a racialized Other "into students' heads". In other words, as consumers of research discourses, student teachers are likely to take up the underlying discursive ideology of White supremacy like that detected through this review. This is one way that discourse works through institutions, educational curricula and practice. If dispositions affect pedagogical behaviour (e.g. Eberly et al., 2007; Garmon, 2004; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that ultimately effect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010), then there are good reasons to ask what dispositions of cultural diversity as a racialized Other might do. I suggest that when student teachers enter the classroom, their dispositions may manifest though a "dysconscious" pedagogy of subtle racism, detectable only though micronuances in modes of speaking to and about what they believe to be its manifested "phenomenon" (e.g. the racialized Other). Consequently, a pedagogy of White superiority impedes racial justice by further reconstituting an imbalance of power in the social relations of racism and by feeding into the privilege assumed to belong to those already positioned at the socially categorised hierarchical racial apex. As such, a pedagogy of White supremacy sustains the racial *status quo*. Therefore, the implications of this study for teacher education could be to provide student teachers with critical tools for deconstruction (Mathias & Grosland, 2016) that enable them to question and disrupt the institutionalised produced power/knowledge and the ways this implicitly centres and sustains a discursive ideology of White supremacy. Generally, teacher education could start providing student teachers with critical knowledge about the realities of history that counter what Leonardo (2002) refers to as a "pedagogy of amnesia" (p. 34) in ways that reveal the power and domination of Whites embedded within it (Frankenberg, 1993). Critical historical and theoretical knowledge about how a discursive ideology of White supremacy works is important for student teachers to "see" how Whiteness is expressed dysconsciously (King, 2004) through, for example, the use and meaning making of covert terms. hooks (2013) argues that such knowledge is important because it allows individuals to emotionally distance themselves. By emotionally distancing themselves, student teachers may better cope with the common feelings of guilt, fear, anger and alienation they get when confronted with their Whiteness and may learn how to take a stance against it (Aveling, 2004). More specific implications for teacher education with respect to how student teachers could learn to take a stand against the discursive ideology of White supremacy could be to provide student teachers with discourse analytical tools that allow them to challenge the omnipresent domination of binary oppositional discourses in Western discourses. Student teachers could, for example, start performing deconstructive "micro analyses" like the one I have provided in this study (cf. Section 3.3 *Analytical Approach*). Such analyses are crucial because they can function as critical tools that teach student teachers how power/knowledge is produced through assumingly natural and commonplace discourses of educational institutions, discourses that enable central actors in education to remain "unaware" of how the workings of Whiteness inform their personal beliefs and thereby their pedagogical practices (Riviere, 2008).

6. Concluding remarks

In this review article, I have demonstrated how teacher education researchers use and give meaning to the term *cultural diversity* and I have claimed that this usage indicates researchers' positionality. Throughout, I have applied the lenses of CWS and critical discourse analysis. I have argued that the 67 studies' discursive production, despite attempting to promote social justice, facilitates understanding of how research functions as constitutive of a discursive politics that re-centres Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy. As such, this review contributes to the research on the workings of Whiteness in teacher education based on racial justice, particularly with respect to the ways that researchers invest in central discursive terms, such as *cultural diversity*.

An investigation of researchers' positionality through their use and meaning making of cultural diversity sheds light on the importance of the discourses of knowledge produced within institutions and beyond by pointing at the possible ideas of cultural diversity that these might "install" in their readers. Based on this review, I believe that there are reasons not only to ask why so many researchers practice such discursive *Othering* in the extensive ways I have found that they do but also why researchers seem to have the need to objectify this term when they just as well could treat it as an abstract term placed on a higher conceptual and theoretical level. An exploration of these questions, however, is beyond the scope of this article. Nevertheless, the investigation of researchers' positionality through their use of cultural diversity has also led me to question what role and responsibility the research community has concerning knowledge production and dissemination.

Based on this article's analysis, I suggest that not only researchers themselves but also other members of the research community should more actively engage in the production of discourses that counter the discursive ideology of White supremacy. One way to achieve this could be for researchers to start to more explicitly define and discuss cultural diversity according to its specific context of reference and to use their definition(s) accordingly and consistently throughout their produced textual material. Another way could be for researchers to engage critically in reflections on why they have chosen certain terms in relation to others, on whether their writings construct racist binary oppositional discourses and on what possible implicit "truths" their total textual corpus produces and promotes.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.005.

References

Afdal, H. W., & Nerland, M. (2014). Does teacher education matter? An analysis of relations to knowledge among Norwegian and Finnish novice teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 58*(3), 281—299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2012.726274.

Allen, R. (2004). Whiteness and critical pedagogy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 121—136.

Althusser, L. (1970). Ideology and ideological state apparatus (notes towards an investigation), 2011. In I. Szeman, & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory, an anthology* (pp. 204—222). West Sussex: Whiley-Blackwell.

Ansley, F.,L. (1992). White supremacy (and what we should do about it). In R. Delgado, & S. Stefanic (Eds.), *Critical white studies. Looking behind the mirror* (pp. 592—595). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Artiles, A. J., Palmer, J. D., & Trent, S. C. (2004). Culturally diverse students in special education: Legacies and prospects. In J. A. Banks, & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.),

Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 716—735). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Aveling, N. (2004). Being the decedent of colonialists: White identity in context. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 1*(7), 57—71.

Bangeni, B., & Kapp, R. (2007). Shifting language attitudes in linguistically diverse learning environment in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 4*(28), 253—269. https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd495.0.

Banks, J. A. (2012). *Encyclopaedia of diversity in education*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Banks, J. A. (2014). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Blair, M. (2004). The myth of neutrality in educational research. In G. Ladson-Billings, & D. Gillborn (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 243—251). New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Brown, E. L. (2004). The relationship of self-concepts to changes in cultural diversity awareness: Implications for urban teacher educators. *The Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 36*(2), 119—145.

Burnett, B., & McArdle, F. (2011). Multiculturalism, education for sustainable development (ESD) and the shifting discursive landscape of social inclusion. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(1), 43—56. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.537070.

Castro, A. J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39*(3), 198—210.

Chubbuck, S. M. (2004). Whiteness enacted, whiteness disrupted: The complexity of personal congruence. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 301—333.

Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part II. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 109—121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114558268.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, S. (Eds.). (1997). *Critical white studies. Looking behind the mirror*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.

Dyer, R. (2013). *White: Essays on race and culture*. London: Routledge.

Eberly, J. L., Rand, M. K., & O'Connor, T. (2007). Analyzing teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Using adult development theory. *Multicultural Education, 14*(4), 31—36.

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Foucault, M. (1980). In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-77, Michael Foucault*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1989). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. London: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1997). Introduction: Local whitenesses, localizing whiteness. In R. Frankenberg (Ed.), *Displacing whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism*. London: Duke University Press.

Fylkesnes, S. (2011). *"The Multicultural": Constructions in the curriculum of Norwegian primary schoolteacher education*. Master thesis. Oslo and Akershus University College. Retrieved from http://oda.hioa.no/en/the-multicultural-constructions-in-the-curriculum-of-norwegian-primary-schoolteacher-education.

Garmon, M. A. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(3), 201—213. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487104263080.

Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry, 43*(1), 48—70. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12002.

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(4), 485.

Gillborn, D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?* London: Routledge.

Goldberg, D. T. (2006). Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29*(2), 331—364. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870500465611.

Goldberg, D. T. (2009). The social formation of racist discourse. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *The anatomy of racism* (pp. 295—318). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gough, D., & Thomas, J. (2013). Commonality and diversity in reviews. In D. Gough, S. Oliver, & J. Thomas (Eds.), *An introduction to systematic reviews* (pp. 1—16). London: SAGE.

Gough, D., Thomas, J., & Oliver, S. (2012a). Clarifying differences between review designs and methods. *Systematic Reviews, 1*(1), 28.

Gough, D., Thomas, J., & Oliver, S. (2012b). *An introduction to systematic reviews*. London: SAGE.

Gramsci, A. (2011). Hegemony. In I. Szeman, & T. Kaposy (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 188—203). Singapore: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grant, C., Elsbree, A. R., & Fondric, S. (2004). A decade of research on the changing terrain of multicultural education research. In J. Banks, & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 184—207). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hage, G. (2003). *Against paranoid nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society*. London: The Merlin Press.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall, & B. Gieben

(Eds.), *Formations of modernity* (pp. 275—320). Oxford: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72—92). London: SAGE.

Holm, G., & Londen, M. (2010). The discourse on multicultural education in Finland: Education for whom? *Intercultural Education, 21*(2), 107—120. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675981003696222.

hooks, b. (1997). Representing whiteness in the black imagination. In R. Frankenberg (Ed.), *Displacing whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism*. London: Duke University Press.

hooks, b. (2013). *Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.

King, J. E. (2004). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. In D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 71—83). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and global discourse. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 29—50. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320120117180.

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The Color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 137—152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00057.x.

MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Mathias, C. E., & Grosland, T. J. (2016). Digital storytelling as racial justice: Digital hopes for deconstructing whiteness in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(2), 152—164.

Matus, C., & Infante, M. (2011). Undoing diversity: Knowledge and neoliberal discourses in colleges of education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(3), 293—307. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.573248.

Mausethagen, S., & Granlund, L. (2012). Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: Current tensions between education policy and teachers' union. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 815—833. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2012.672656.

May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (2010). Introduction. In S. May, & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (pp. 1—16). New York, NY: Routledge.

McVee, M. B. (2014). The challenge of more light, the complexity of culture: Lessons learned in exploring the cultural positioning of literacy teachers. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*(1), 1—15.

Michael-Luna, S., & Marri, A. R. (2011). Rethinking diversity in resegregated schools: Lessons from a case study of urban K—8 preservice teachers. *Urban Education, 46*(2), 178—201.

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 447—454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.012.

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson.

Pope, J., & Wilder, J. (2005). Now that I'm out in the field: Student teaching and valuing diversity. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(4), 322—328.

Rivière, D. (2008). Whiteness in/and education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 11*(4), 355—368. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320802478838.

Robinson, C. C., & Clardy, P. (2011). It ain't what you say, it's how you say it: Linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 18*(3), 101—110.

Roediger, D. R. (2007). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. New York: Verso.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Scheurich, J. J. (1991). Toward a white discourse on white racism. *Educational Researcher, 8*(22), 5—10.

Smolcic, E., & Katunich, J. (2017). Teachers crossing borders: A review of the research into cultural immersion field experience for teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 62*, 49—57.

Søreide, G. (2007). *Narrative construction of teacher identity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen). Retrieved from http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/2532.

Taylor, E. (2009). The foundations of critical race theory in education: An Introduction. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *The foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 1—13). New York, NY: Routledge.

Torfing, J. (1999). *New theories of discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Trent, S. C., Kea, C. D., & Oh, K. (2008). Preparing preservice educators for cultural diversity: How far have we come? *Exceptional Children, 74*(3), 328—350.

Urrieta, L., Jr. (2006). Community identity discourse and the heritage academy: Colorblind educational policy and white supremacy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(4), 455—476. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390600773197.

Valentín, S. (2006). Addressing diversity in teacher education programs. *Education, 2*(127), 196—202.

Vaugh, S. E. (2012). Institutional racist melancholia: A structural understanding of grief and power in schooling. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(1), 52—77.

Zlatanovic, T., Havnes, A., & Mausethagen, S. (2016). A research review of nurse teachers' competencies. Advance online publication. *Vocations and Learning, 10*(2), 201—233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-016-9169-0.

Author (Year)	Theoretical framework Method, if quantitative or mixed methods, or review	Aim of study	Terms related to *cultural diversity*	Main use of *cultural diversity*.	Location of study	Journal
1. Asimeng-Boahene & Klein (2004)	Multicultural education theory and Vygotsky's theory of socio-cultural learning	To examine why educators should be concerned with cultural diversity in US classrooms.	• Demography • Stereotyping • Socio-economic class • Different learning styles • Achievement/cognitive processes • Multicultural society • Diverging values, customs and traditions • Minority thought and values	Interchangeably with the term *the multicultural society* throughout the study. In a binary opposition to *the mainstream*, found through how *the multicultural society* is described as "all learners with different multicultural experiences" that "may be just as equally legitimate and valid as the mainstream" (p. 47).		*Multicultural Education*
2. Brown (2004a)	Review of relevant multicultural studies and studies on self-concepts, and Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory theory Quantitative study	To investigate the relationship between the self-concepts and cultural diversity awareness of 100 European-American pre-service teachers through a test–retest to ascertain if changes in cultural diversity awareness occurred during a standalone multicultural course.	• Cultural diversity awareness • Multicultural • Continuous modification of one's belief system	Within the term *cultural diversity awareness*. Interchangeably with *multicultural*, found in the claim that students' *cultural diversity awareness* may be tested through a multicultural course, and in how "cultural diversity awareness is defined as one's personal belief toward multicultural attitudes and behaviours are used as dependent variables because the study assumes that personal beliefs and perceptions are, in part, predicated on self-concepts" (p. 129). The term *cultural diversity/multicultural* is used in a binary opposition with *student teachers* found in the argument that European-American pre-service teachers are not initially *culturally diverse/multicultural* (p. 136).	USA	*The Urban Review*

3.	Brown (2004b)	Multicultural education/cultural diversity awareness education (Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory) Quantitative study	To investigate the relationship between instructional methodology and changes in resistance to cultural diversity sensitivity among Caucasian teacher education students in a required junior-level cultural diversity course.	• Cultural diversity awareness • Development in students • Teaching instrument • 5 items • Multicultural • Multicultural • Other than	The term *cultural diversity awareness* is used. Interchangeably and with *multicultural*. In a binary opposition with *student teachers* found in how *cultural diversity* refer to cultures other than the Caucasian or White [teacher education students'] cultures (pp. 335, 337).	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*
4.	Garmon (2004)	Review of research on implications of student teachers' attitudes towards and beliefs about different racial/cultural groups	To determine whether there are specific factors that may be associated with the development of greater multicultural awareness and sensitivity in pre-service teachers.	• Racial/cultural backgrounds • Different • Racial diversity	Interchangeably with *racial diversity* (throughout the study, pp. 201–203, 205, 208.). In a binary opposition with *pre-service teachers* found in how *cultural diversity* is described as "students from racial/cultural backgrounds different than their [pre-service teachers'] own" (p. 201).	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*
5.	McCall (2004)	Critical literacy theory and critical multicultural theory	To explain how poetry may be used in order to increase teacher students' understanding of cultural diversity.	• Reading poetry • Affirmation • Fostering equal opportunities • Challenging social stratification • Racial • Economic • Gender • Injustice • Race	Used interchangeably with *multicultural*, found in the claim: "I emphasize Sleeter and Grants' (1999) conception of a multicultural, social reconstructionist approach to social studies. That orientation affirms cultural diversity" (p. 172).	USA	*Social Studies*
6.	Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005)	Experiential multicultural education Quantitative study	To help prepare pre-service teachers to communicate effectively with diverse students, parents and colleagues when they assume positions in public schools.	• Multicultural context • Multicultural issues • Cultural similarities and differences • Encounter in school • Multicultural competence and skills • Culturally different • Diversity students	Used in subordination to *multicultural issues*, describes what novice teachers will encounter in school (p. 199). In a binary opposition to *pre-service teachers*, found for example, through how it is described as other(s) (pp. 199–200), as about working and interacting "with those who are culturally different from themselves" (p. 199), and as *multicultural competence and skills* that pre-service teachers need in order to "explore their cultural heritages, their experiences with	USA	*Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*

					prejudice, and their roles as educators of culturally diverse students" (p. 202).		
7.	Guyton & Wesche (2005)	Multicultural education	To develop a scale, the Multicultural Efficacy Scale (MES), for measuring some of the complexities and progressions of evolving conceptions of multicultural education.	• Exceptional population • Diverse economic, racial and cultural backgrounds • Represents	Interchangeably with *culturally diverse* (p. 21). In a binary opposition with *faculty*: "a teacher education faculty that represents cultural diversity" (p 21).	USA	*Multicultural Perspectives*
8.	Hyland & Noffke (2005)	Social justice framework	To describe a portion of a long-term, action-research project investigating the teaching of an elementary social studies methods course for pre-service teachers.	• Teaching for social justice • Historically marginalised groups • Found within a homeless shelter	Within the term *social and cultural diversity* (p. 369). In a binary opposition with *student teachers* [pre-service teachers], found through *cultural diversity* implicitly referring to *historically marginalised groups* (throughout the study).	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*
9.	Jokikokko (2005)	Critical multiculturalism /critical pedagogy	To describe newly graduated teachers' conceptions of diversity as they perceive them in their work in various educational contexts and to illustrate teachers' conceptions of intercultural competence needed in their work during their first years in the teaching profession.	• Replaced by the term *difference* • Differences • Group differences • Unequal educational opportunities and outcomes	Once, and interchangeably, with *difference* (p. 73). *Difference* is found to replace the term *cultural diversity* (throughout the study).	Finland	*Intercultural Education*
10.	Ladson-Billings (2005)	Critical whiteness theory (?)	To suggest that the real problems facing teacher education are the disconnections between and among the students, families	• Culturally diverse • Students of colour • Student population	The term *culturally diverse* (p. 230) is used. Interchangeably with *students of colour* (throughout the study).	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

				In a binary opposition, *teacher educators and teachers* are described as *White* (pp. 230–232).		
11.	Locke (2005)	Review of critical multicultural literature	To examine the perspectives of pre-service teachers enrolled in a multicultural education course at a large predominately White Midwestern university.	• Values • Attitudes • Perspectives of multicultural teacher education	Subordinated to *multicultural teacher education*, found through how *cultural diversity* is implicitly described as part of *multicultural teacher education* (pp. 21–22).	USA	*Multicultural Perspectives*
12.	Pope & Wilder (2005)	Multicultural theory	To assess pre-service teachers' perceptions and attitudes regarding issues of cultural diversity, once the student has moved from the traditional college classroom.	• Issues • Diverse others are persons form another ethnic background • Persons from another social class background • Minority population • Another ethnic background • Diverse classrooms	In a binary opposition with *pre-service teachers*, found, for example, through how *pre-service teachers* are described as *Caucasian females* (p. 324) who "[have] little or no experience working with minority populations" (p. 322), and *cultural diversity* is related to *minority populations* and described as "persons from another ethnic background or social class" who are found in "the increasingly diverse classrooms" (p. 323).	USA	*Journal of Instructional Psychology*
13.	Ambe (2006)	Multicultural curricular transformation	To examine the rationale for a multicultural curricular transformation in teacher education programs.	• Culturally, linguistically and racially diverse • Multiculturalism • Students of other cultural backgrounds	*Culturally, linguistically and racially diverse* (p. 691) is used. *Diversity* and *multiculturalism* are used interchangeably. The author claims that these two terms are related (p. 691). *Diversity* is used in subordination to *multiculturalism* found in the claim that *multiculturalism* encompasses much more than *diversity* (p. 691). In a binary opposition with *pre-service teachers* found through how *multicultural* is described as dealing with people of different backgrounds (p. 691).	USA	*Teaching and Teacher Education*

4

14.	Athanases & Martin (2006)	Review literature in order to argue the importance of "teaching for equity" Quantitative study	To illuminate survey results of whether students feel well prepared to advocate for equity in classrooms and school, by drawing on a 5-year program-wide investigation of ways pre-service teachers learn to teach for diversity.	• Diversity issues • Knowledge that informs practice • Lower income (class) • English language learners (ELLs) • Very poor • A third African American, Latino (mostly Mexican American) and Asian of varied ethnicity • Few numbers of White students • A few native Spanish speakers • Native languages: Vietnamese, Hmong, Lao and Russian/Ukrainian • Students living in housing projects • Children of migrant farm workers	Interchangeably with *ELLs*. In an implicitly binary opposition to *student teachers* (pp. 628, 630, 634); this is found in how *cultural diversity* is related to various terms that *cultural diversity* is not related to (see previous column).	USA	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
15.	Baltodano (2006)	Critical multicultural theory/social justice theory	Critique of the shortcomings of multiculturalism as an effective strategy for accomplishing social equality through education, and introduction of critical whiteness theoretical perspective (applies a counter-hegemonic strategy).	• People of colour • Other marginalised groups • Multicultural • Multicultural education • Student of colour • Policy of coloured bodies • Children of colour • Educators of colour • Instructors of colour • Scholars of colour • Faculty of colour • The Other	Used twice (pp. 124, 127), however generally replaced by the term *multicultural* and *multicultural education* (throughout the study). In a binary opposition with *student teachers* described as *White counterparts* (p. 123) of *White mainstream counterparts* (p. 127), *mainstream cultural in the US* (p. 127) and *Whiteness* (p. 127).	USA	*Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*
16.	Barnes (2006)	Cultural responsive teaching	The purpose of this study is, according to the authors, to scaffold multiple structured courses and field experiences so that pre-service teachers, in a reading methods class, could have a more integrative, connected learning experience in their teacher education program whilst working with a	• Multicultural children • Culturally Other • Teaching strategies • Multicultural competency • Multicultural students • What teachers need to know • Culturally and linguistically diverse student populations	Within the term *Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory*. In a binary opposition to *student teachers*, found in the argument of how student teachers need multicultural skills (gained through the Cultural Diversity Awareness Inventory) in order to more effectively support their *multicultural students* to learn, regardless of their background (p. 86), and how student teachers, through such competency, will be enabled to teach *culturally and linguistically diverse student populations* in a culturally responsive way (pp. 85, 86, 93).	USA	*The Negro Educational Review*

			culturally and linguistically diverse student population.			
17.	Hope-Rowe (2006)	Critical discourse analysis and critical multiculturalism	To examine various discourses around cultural diversity that are available to student teachers on the teacher education course and how their discursive practices are mediated and reconstructed in the specific university context.	• Multiculturalism difference • Multicultural • Immigration • Racism • Race • Multicultural education	Interchangeably with *multiculturalism* (p. 48) (used throughout study). Used in subordination to *multicultural education* found through how *cultural diversity* is explained as something that one is exposed to through *multicultural education*. In a binary opposition with *student teachers*, found in how *student teachers* are described as monocultural (p. 44), and homogenous, whilst their students are described as *culturally diverse* (throughout).	Australia	*Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*
18.	Milner (2006)	A self-developed typology from several theoretical, conceptual and empirical assumptions combined with critical multiculturalism and critical whiteness studies	To describe and discuss several essential interactions or experiences that had an influence on pre-service teachers' learning and understanding about urban education and diversity and to introduce a developmental typology that was used to analyse pre-service teachers' learning and understanding as a result of a course designed to help pre-service teachers develop the knowledge, skills, dispositions and attitudes necessary to teach in highly diverse and urban school contexts.	• Cultural and racial diversity • Student population • Increasingly diverse • Student and learners • Student of colour • English language learners • Poor • Students of colour	As part of the term *cultural and racial diversity*. In two binary oppositions: One in a binary opposition to *student teachers*, found through how *white, monolingual, middle-class and female* (p. 344) student teachers are described as faced with challenges of teaching the *cultural and racial* and *increasingly diverse student population* (p. 344). The other in a binary opposition with *students* found, for example, through the statement: "We also know that students whose basic needs are met – most often higher SES students – are better able to concentrate on learning and on managing their behaviors" (p. 346).	USA	*Urban Education*

19.	Rogers, Marshall, & Tyson (2006)	Bakhtin's (1986) term *dialogue*	To focus on the "dialogic narratives" (Bakhtin, 1981, 1986) of selected pre-service teachers within an innovative teacher education program in the Midwestern USA that included community-based internships.	• Social inequities • Social justice • Specific courses on multicultural education • Social injustice stories • Language and literacy practices • Diverse settings • Language and literacy practices • Diverse settings	Subordinated to the term *multicultural education* evident in how it is described as "specific courses on multicultural education" (p. 205).	USA	*Reading Research Quarterly*
20.	Valentin (2006)	Review of the literature on diversity in teacher education	To present a holistic approach to examining diversity in education programs; describes an initiative by a college of education to infuse diversity throughout all education courses and programs.	• Culture • Diversity • Students • Cultural identity Race/ethnicity • Social class/socio-economic status • Sex/gender • Geographical region/ area • Sexuality/sexual orientation • Language • Ability/disability/exceptionality/health • Influencing teaching a learning	The term *diversity* is used throughout the study. In a binary opposition with *student teachers,* found, for example, in questioning "whether pre-service teachers are being prepared to meet the needs of their diverse student population" (p. 196) and through how *students* are related to "differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation and geographical area" (p. 197).	USA	*Education*
21.	Cicchelli & Su-Je (2007)	Not heavily emphasised Some arguments from critical multiculturalism Quantitative study	To provide data on students' multicultural awareness and diversity sensitivity.	• Central tenet of multicultural education • To become knowledgeable about • To promote social justice • Blacks, Hispanics and Asians	Subordinated to *multicultural education*, found in how *cultural diversity* is described as a central tenet of *multicultural education*. In an implicit binary opposition with *student teachers*, found, for example, in the claim that "[s]chools in New York City are continually pressed to meet the demands of an ever-increasing multicultural population" (p. 370), and through the terms to which *cultural diversity* are related to, but *student teachers* are not.	USA	*Education and Urban Society*

22.	Eberly, Rand, & O'Connor (2007)	Adult developmental theory of Robert Kegan (1998)	To analyse the foundation and address questions of teachers' dispositions – their values, beliefs, commitments and passions – that they bring to issues of racial and cultural diversity in order to say something about the role it plays in the educational reform movement.	• Racial • Multicultural issues • Macro-system relationship conditions; micro-system interpersonal relationships • A system organized of relationships • Macro level • Racist/sexist/classist structures • Supporting interpersonal relationships • Micro level	*Racial and cultural diversity* is used.	USA	*Multicultural Education*
23.	Gill & Chalmers (2007)	Critical multiculturalism	To document a two-year journey developing and implementing a teacher education programme that required pre-service teachers and teachers, administrators and students in six cooperating schools to address issues of diversity, multi-transculturalisms, inclusion, anti-racism/antioppression and social justice.	• Fact-of-life multicultural nation • Culturally diverse nation • Multicultural schools • Testimonial state of society • Diverse multicultural population	Interchangeably with the term *multicultural*, found, for example, through the statement: "Cultural diversity is a fact of life in Canada. We are the most multicultural nation in the world and the Lower Mainland of British Columbia is one of the most culturally diverse areas in our nation" (p. 552).	Canada	*International Journal of Inclusive Education*
24.	Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007)	Black and cultural specific pedagogy	To address safe ways to prepare pre-service teachers, specifically White teachers, but not limited to that ethnicity, who will teach in schools with an increasingly culturally diverse student population,	• Multicultural • Student population • Multicultural/diversity courses • People of colour • Ethnicity/race	Interchangeably with the term *multicultural*. In a binary opposition with *student teachers*, found in how, for example, this article's purpose is to address safe ways to prepare pre-service teachers for a culturally diverse student population and in how *cultural diversity* refers to *student population*, meaning particularly *people of colour* (p. 8) as opposed to *student teachers* described as White (p. 8).	USA	*Multicultural Education*

			particularly people of colour.		*Ethnic* and *race* are used interchangeably when related to *cultural diversity*, however, *ethnic* is used only when referring to white teachers (p. 8).		
25.	Scott & Mumford (2007)	Cultural awareness theory	To discuss why and how the SFE [social foundation of education] can increase the cultural competencies of teachers and provide some recommendations on what is missing in the literature on SFE and cultural diversity training and discuss how teacher education programs need to increase the number of SFE cultural diversity courses.	• Better than multicultural education if combined with SFE • Self-criticality in relation to race, ethnicity and cultural diversity • Critical thinking • Critical consciousness specific to racial, ethnic and cultural diversity • Intersection of SFE • Complicates (together with SFE) multicultural education	Interchangeably with *social foundation education* (SFE) (pp. 54–55). Subordinated SFE. This is found in how *cultural diversity* is described as part of what students will gain critical consciousness about through the SFE.	USA	*Multicultural Perspectives*
26.	Tavares (2007)	Critical multicultural theory and critical diversity theory	To explore the way identity and difference, as developed in the educational practices of multicultural teacher education and cultural diversity, proceed in directions that leave several fundamental assumptions unexplored.	• Multicultural education • Identity • Difference	Interchangeably with *multicultural [teacher] education* (p. 7).	USA	*College Quarterly*
27.	Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly (2007)	Review of research on cultural diversity	To seek to influence both, through on-site coursework and a long-term field placement at a culturally diverse urban elementary school.	• Community • Urban elementary school • Classroom • Groups of students • Multicultural readiness • Experience	Interchangeably with *multicultural* (p. 657). Moreover, *cultural diversity* is used in a binary opposition to *student teacher,* for example, in how *student teachers* are described as *naïve, white, suburban females* (p. 655) and in how they are assumed to have little experience with *cultural diversity* (p. 653).	USA	*Teaching and Teacher Education*

				• Settings			
28.	DePalma (2008)	Critical multiculturalism and Bakhtin's notion of truth through dialogue	To discuss the promise and challenge of fostering critical pedagogical dialogue in settings with children from racial and ethnic backgrounds different from student teachers' own, focusing particularly on the complex difficulties faced by ethnic and racial minority students who find themselves present in very small numbers.	• Children from racial and ethnic backgrounds • Ethnic and racial minority students • Issues of race and racism • Dialogue • Minority parents	*Cultural diversity education* is used interchangeably with *multicultural education*. In binary opposition with *student teachers*, found in how *cultural diversity* refers either to children from racial and ethnic backgrounds different from white middle-class teachers or from other ethnic and racial minority students (p. 768) and through how it is closely related to issues of race and racism within institutions (p. 769), and *student teachers* are implicitly referred to as "people [for] whom race and ethnicity have never mattered" (p. 768).	USA	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
29.	Haas (2008)	Four different versions of multiculturalism (policy)	Based on an analysis of the concept of citizenship, as introduced into Danish teacher education in 2007 through the compulsory subject called "Christianity studies, life enlightenment, and citizenship" in which citizenship education, according to the author, seems to be exclusively about responding to cultural diversity and articulated as part of a national state-driven strategy for	• Foreigners • Migrants • Ethnic minorities • Othering • Multiculturalism	In a binary opposition with *Danish*, found in the terms that *cultural diversity* is related, but *Danish* is not.	Denmark	*London Review of Education*

				the socio-cultural integration of foreigners, migrants and ethnic minorities, the author addresses the following question: What does integration mean, and integration into what?			
30.	Haddix (2008)	Critical pedagogy with a focus on issues of language, identity and power and critical whiteness theory	To examine the cultural and linguistic identity work of two white, monolingual pre-service teachers initiated by their participation in a sociolinguistics course.	• Linguistic and cultural diversity • Identity • Difference • Mismatch • Affiliation • In schools, today • Inclusion	Within the term *linguistic and cultural diversity* and replaced by *linguistic difference*, *linguistic identity*, *linguistic mismatch* and *linguistic affiliation* (pp. 256257, 259, 268).	USA	*Language and Education*
31.	Kyles & Olafson (2008)	Review of the literature on teachers' beliefs and expectations and student achievements	To explore the impact of developing structured learning opportunities that required pre-service teachers to inquire into their own beliefs about diversity whilst they were enrolled in their second practicum experience in an urban and culturally diverse practicum site at an elementary school.	• Personal belief and experience • Contact with cultural diversity will increase experience with cultural diversity	Interchangeably with *multicultural*. In a binary opposition with *student teachers* described as *monocultural* and *White, middle class* (p. 502).	USA	*Urban Education*
32.	Leeman (2008)	Review of the Dutch population, immigration- and education-policy context	To show how the Netherlands has partly accommodated itself to greater cultural diversity through compulsory reforms.	• Clothing styles • Religious-based rules on food and fasting • Emotional sensitivity • Political standpoints • Cultural and religious diversity • Juxtaposition with ethnicity • Religious diversity	Once, within the term *cultural and religious diversity*. *Diversity* is mainly used.	The Netherlands	*European Educational Research Journal*

			To show the double standards applied to Christian and Islamic schools in the media and public debate. To describe teachers' and teacher educators' daily dilemmas with regards to diversity and commonality in contemporary classrooms.	• Ethnic diversity		
33.	Thomas & Kearney (2008)	Review of the literature on teacher understandings of cultural diversity in Australia	To report the outcomes of a survey to investigate the level of cultural understanding and confidence for teachers working in culturally diverse classrooms.	• Children with culturally different background classrooms • Cultural groups • Backgrounds • Otherness • Academic achievement • Communities • Challenges	In a binary opposition with *student teachers*, found, for example, through how *cultural diversity* refers to children with culturally different backgrounds than the *student teachers* (p. 106) or through how schools are described as "culturally, socially, and linguistically diverse (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000)" and how "pre-service teachers are characteristically white, middle class, and monolingual" (p. 105).	Australia	*Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*
34.	Trent, Kea, & Oh (2008)	Multicultural theory Review study	To review research on the incorporation of multicultural education in pre-service general and special education teacher preparation programs from 1997 to 2006.	• Culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) learners • From economically disadvantaged backgrounds • Multicultural education • Cultural and racial awareness and insight • Critical reflection • Cultural and linguistic diversity • Schools	Interchangeably with the term *multicultural education*, found, for example, when comparing the study's title "Preparing Pre-service Educators for Cultural Diversity: How Far Have We Come?" with the study's research aim, and through how the findings are presented as findings of cultural *diversity*. In a binary opposition to *student teachers* found in how schools are described as "becoming more racially, ethnically, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse", and the *teacher population* is described as "becoming more White, female, and middle class" (p. 329).	USA	*Exceptional Children*
35.	Montgomery & McGlynn (2009)	Multicultural theory	To reflect upon student teachers' conceptions of inter-community relations and the preparation they receive to address issues of	• New • Eastern European immigrants • Old • Christian Protestants as well as Indian, Chinese and African communities • Opportunity for dialogue	In two implicit binary oppositions. One with *student teachers*, whereby *student teachers* implicitly refers to *Christian Protestants* and *cultural diversity* is labelled *new* and is described as immigrants coming from Eastern Europe (p. 397).	UK	*Teaching and Teacher Education*

			diversity and mutual understanding.	The other, with *student teachers* still implicitly referred to as *Christian Protestants*, where *cultural diversity* is labelled *old* and described as *traditional religious-cultural differences* (p. 397) as well as Indian, Chinese and African communities.		
36.	Santoro (2009)	Critical whiteness theory	To draw on data from a small-scale qualitative study conducted in Australia that explores how pre-service teachers engaged with students from culturally diverse backgrounds during practicums and how they understood their own ethnic identities.	• Backgrounds • Contexts • Immigration of people • From many cultural groups • Not a new concept in schools • Within their student population • Student groups • Knowledge of self • Knowledge of others • Student cohort • Ethnic others	In two binary oppositions, one of *cultural diversity* and *student teacher*, and the other of *cultural diversity* and *students*: The first is found in the title, which contains a binary opposition of *self* and *others*, in which *self*, or *ethnic self* (p. 33) refers to *student teachers* who are assumed to belong to the *dominant ethnic majority* (p. 41) and *others*, or *ethnic others,* which refers to *culturally diverse students* (p. 33) (see also bottom of p. 34 and top of p. 35). The second binary opposition is found in how *students* are described as two different groups, one as *culturally diverse students* (p. 33) and the other as *students from the dominant cultural majority* (p. 36).	Australia	*Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*
37.	Virta (2009)	Intercultural theory	To examine prospective history teachers' thinking about ethnic and cultural diversity and their experiences of learning to teach about history in multicultural classrooms.	• Linguistic diversity • Ethnic • Changes • The multicultural classroom • Other than the ethnicity confirmed in the national historical narratives • Unique in different societies • On a theoretical level • Logical inferences understandable on a theoretical level	Within the term *cultural and linguistic diversity* and *ethnic or cultural diversity*. In a binary opposition with *students*, where *cultural diversity* refers explicitly to those who experience that it is not their history that is being taught (p. 286), and *students* refers implicitly to those experiencing that their history – the *ethnocentric characterized national narrative* – is being taught (p. 286).	Finland	*Intercultural Education*
38.	Yan, Arthur, & Lund (2009)	Three theoretical constructs: (a) social inclusion; (b) intercultural competence; and (c) representations of diversity	To examine the intercultural competence of pre-service teachers and ways to prepare them for responding to the needs of diverse student populations.	• Inclusive practices • Intercultural competency • Children and youth of immigrant origin • Particularly racialised minorities • Other marginalised students • Issues • Conflicts • Phenomenon • Children from diverse backgrounds	Interchangeably with *diversity*. In an implicit binary opposition with *student teachers* through how *student teachers* are described as having "little knowledge about how to work effectively with students from different cultural backgrounds" (p. 565), and *cultural diversity* is described as "children and youth of immigrant origin, particularly racialised minorities and other marginalised students" (p. 565). Also, found through how learning about *cultural*	Canada	*Intercultural Education*

			• Other	*diversity* is implicitly in the heading about "Learning about the other" (p. 573).		
39.	Assaf & McMunn Dooley (2010)	Draw on Bakhtin's theories of ideological becoming Critical discourse analysis (CDA)	To explore the complexities of learning to teach culturally and linguistically diverse students in a graduate-level multicultural literacy course for beginning teachers.	• Multicultural • Cultural and linguistic diversity • Students with economically disadvantaged backgrounds • The lower economical class • Racism • Discrimination • White privilege • Linguistic diversity • Bilingual education • Educational policy • Multicultural education • Challenge dominant perspectives about culture and equity in education • Understand literacy and language as cultural practices • Critically explore social and racial inequities • Culturally conscious ways to teach literacy • The cultural lives of others	Subordinated the term *multicultural* through how it refers to one of many themes that are part of a multicultural literacy course (p. 160). In a binary opposition with *student teachers*, found in how *student teachers* are described as *White, middle-class women* (p. 159).	USA	*The Teacher Educator*
40.	Castro (2010)	Critical multiculturalism Review study	To draw insights that inform education researchers interested in interrogating and unpacking views about diversity expressed by today's millennial college students.	• Multicultural education • Social justice • Acceptance • Civic participation • Social justice issues • Appreciation • Beliefs • Perspectives on economics and culture • The Other	Interchangeably with *multicultural education* and *social justice*, found in how the study claims to investigate "views on cultural diversity" in the article's title, but actually investigates "pre-service teachers' views on social justice" as well as *multicultural education*. In a binary opposition with *student teachers* found in how *cultural diversity* refers to students' demography (economic and culturally) and is described as other than the dominant American teachers, described as having *middle-class, Anglo-American backgrounds* (p. 198).	USA	*Educational Researcher*
41.	Gay (2010)	Cuban's (1988) theory of second order and critical multicultural education	To promote a discussion that focuses on an aspect of teacher education for diversity that is frequently	• Racial, ethnic and cultural differences • Teaching behaviours • Self-criticality • Certain manifestations	In two binary oppositions with *student teachers*. In the first, *cultural diversity* is related to *students and prospective teachers of colour* who are described as being more competent in *cultural diversity* (p. 145),	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

			mentioned, but not developed in sufficient detail: pre-service teachers' and teacher educators' attitudes and beliefs about racial, cultural and ethnic differences.	• Natural to members of other communities, ethnic groups and communities • Racial inequality • Deep structures • The underlying value assumptions of all dimensions of teacher education and classroom practice • Teaching behaviour • A responsibility • What teacher educators and teachers need to know and understand	and *student teachers* are described as *White teachers and students*. In the second, *student teachers* are described as *White teachers* and *cultural diversity* as *ethnically and culturally diverse students* (p. 147).		
42.	Holm & Londen (2010)	Critical multicultural education	To examine the multicultural education discourse in Finland by analysing the national and municipal curricula for the comprehensive school, educational policy documents and teacher education curricula.	• Increased immigration • Immigrants • Consequence of immigration • Class • Gender • Race • Language • Religion • Ethnicity • Multicultural education • Minority • Issues • Student population • Beyond immigration-related diversity	In two binary oppositions: One between *[student] teachers* described as *ethnic Finns,* and *students*, described as immigrants who have rapidly increased the school populations' ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity and as a "new group of culturally diverse students" (p. 107). The other with *cultural diversity* and *students*, found in the claims that "Finland is experiencing increased immigration and therefore increased cultural diversity in its schools" (p. 107), and that "Multicultural education is considered as being aimed at the majority population as well as immigrant and other minorities" (p. 107).	Finland	*Intercultural Education*
43.	Hyland & Heuschkel (2010)	Review of the literature on teacher education for diversity and social justice	To describe the use of an institutional inquiry assignment for pre-service teachers at a large state university in the USA to foster critical understanding of institutional oppression.	• Course • Issues • Oppression • Institutional oppression • Ideologically and practically oriented to privilege certain groups and marginalise others • Teaching for social justice • Recognising institutional oppression	In a binary opposition to *student teachers,* found through how "pre-service teachers, who are overwhelmingly White, middle-class women" are described as "often blind to ways that schools oppress students from marginalized racial, class, religious, language, ability, and sexual preference groups; they are also blind to ways that society and other public institutions serve to marginalize such groups" (p. 823).	USA	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
44.	Mills & Ballantyne (2010)	Builds on Garmon's (2004) argument of three dispositions of multicultural	Explores Australian pre-service teachers' beliefs about and attitudes towards diversity.	• Diversity • Standalone courses • Linguistic • In Australian society	Subordinated to *diversity* and occurs in the term *linguistic and cultural diversity.* Used interchangeably with *linguistic diversity.*	Australia	*Teaching and Teacher Education*

	awareness and sensitivity		• In school	In a binary opposition to *student teachers,* found through how *cultural diversity* is related to *students* and described as *linguistic and cultural diversity*, and *student teachers* are described as members of the Anglo-Australian middle class (p. 447), and also in the statement that "[T]here are significant discrepancies between the backgrounds of teachers and pre-service teachers and the increasingly diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic experiences of school students" (p. 447).		
45.	Milner IV (2010)	Critical whiteness studies and critical multicultural theory	To elucidate several concepts that are important for inclusion in any teacher education curriculum regarding diversity studies. What are some relevant conceptions regarding issues of diversity that every teacher education program should consider including in its curriculum?	• Students • Fall outside the dominant mainstream • Race • Ethnicity • Socio-economic status • Gender • Geography	Used within the term *cultural diverse students*. In two binary oppositions: One with *teachers*, found in the statement that "[T]he conceptual repertoires of diversity I share in this article, then, take the basic demographics of White teachers and culturally diverse student as sites for consideration throughout while also considering the needs among teachers of color" (p. 120). The other, with *students.* found in how *culturally diverse students* are described as "those students who fall outside the dominant mainstream in terms of their race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, and/or geography" (p. 129).	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*
46.	Premier & Miller (2010)	A review of Australian (Victorian) teacher education and a review of the role of pre-service teacher education	To what extent do teacher training courses in Victoria prepare pre-service teachers to cater for the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) students? To report findings from a qualitative study on pre-service preparation for teaching CALD students in mainstream secondary schools.	• Evident • New arrivals • War-torn countries • Sudan • Afghanistan • Iraq • Cultural difference • ESL students • Multicultural student groups • Conflation of cultural diversity and multicultural	Interchangeably with *multicultural*. In a binary opposition with *student teacher*, found in the argument that if student teachers are positive to *ESL students*, and if they are exposed to *cultural diversity*, they will most likely be more appreciative towards *multicultural student groups* (p. 38).	Australia	*Australian Journal of Teacher Education*

			To investigate ways in which CALD student needs are addressed on secondary teaching courses in Victoria.				
47.	Unruh & McCord (2010)	The Five Factor Model of Personality: A hypothesis that teachers' beliefs about diversity reflect, in part, their basic dispositional traits (which may then be influenced by a culturally sensitive curriculum) Quantitative study	To explore the relationships between basic personality traits, using the FFM [The Five Factor Model of Personality], and beliefs about diversity in a sample of pre-service teachers.	• Ethnicity • Socio-cultural • Increasing • Students • Racially • Staff and faculty	The term *ethnic and socio-cultural diversity* is used.	USA	*Individual Differences Research*
48.	Alviar-Martin & Ho (2011)	Transformative multicultural education	To examine six Singaporean teachers' experiences of diversity and understanding of multicultural education in order to illuminate the influence of national policies and narratives on teachers' perceptions and practice.	• Social equality • Members of minorities • Social justice • Multiculturalism • Different socio-political milieu • Ethnicity • Gender • Religion • Transnationalism	Replaced by *diversity*, interchangeably with *social equality*, and subordinated to *multiculturalism*. In a binary opposition [not very clear] with *teachers,* found through how students are described as having *needs* if they are *children from a widening cultural spectrum* and *from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds* (p. 128).	Singapore	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
49.	Burnett & McArdle (2011)	Critical multiculturalism	To examine a component of Australia's relationship with the migrant Other via the window of	• A tenet of UNESCO's discourse on Education for Sustainable Development • Racial equality • The immigrant (Australian) • Other	Subordinated to *diversity* together with the terms *multicultural* and *social justice*. In a binary opposition to *student teachers,* found in how *cultural diversity* refers to *the Other*; and described as the immigrant Australian Other, are those	Australia	*Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*

		contemporary multicultural policy.	• Migrant Other	groups that are not part of the Australian identity, the white ruling group of British descent (p. 45).		
50.	Hachfeld et al. (2011)	The Teacher Cultural Beliefs Scale (TCBS), informed by social psychological research on intergroup contact Quantitative study	To describe a newly developed Teacher Cultural Beliefs Scale (TCBS) that assesses multicultural and egalitarian beliefs about diversity, both of which reflect favourable attitudes towards immigrant students, but differ with regards to how cultural diversity is believed to be best accommodated in schools.	• Immigrant students • Be accommodated in schools • Dealing with increasing • In the classroom • Global migration • Valuable resource • Be preserved • Pluralism	In an implicit binary opposition with *[student] teachers,* found, for example, in the argument that "[C]onsequently, very little is known about [student] teachers' beliefs about cultural diversity or about how those beliefs affect immigrant students. Most research in this domain has focused on the effects of prejudices and discrimination on immigrant students' achievement" (p. 987).	Germany	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
51.	Harris & Clarke (2011)	Critical multiculturalism/ critical race theory	To explore the issues that secondary history teachers on an initial teacher education (ITE) programme in England encounter in attempting to incorporate more cultural and ethnic diversity into the history curriculum.	• Teaching history • Stances towards • Diversity • In the curriculum • Teaching • At home • At work • The value of • Explore • Aspects • Attitudes • Position • Towards	Within the term *cultural and ethnic diversity* Interchangeably with both *ethnic* and *diversity*.	UK	*Cambridge Journal of Education*
52.	Jacobs, Assaf, & Lee (2011)	Critical multiculturalism and culturally responsive pedagogy	To examine a professional development book club of teacher educators exploring their beliefs about language diversity and how to prepare future teachers for culturally	• Linguistic and cultural diversity • Tensions within pedagogy development • Students' internal conflict • Schools	Within the term *linguistic and cultural diversity*. In a binary opposition with *teacher educators,* found in how *cultural diversity* is referred to as *culturally and linguistically diverse students* (p. 499).	USA	*Professional Development in Education*

				and linguistically diverse schools.			
53.	Matus & Infante (2011)	Discourse analysis (deconstruction)	To trouble the uses of discourses of *diversity* in colleges of education in Chile.	• Not identifiable commonalities • Not a problem that should be solved • Not about being part of humanity as a whole • Not the common humanitarian heritage • Not intercultural competence • Not about essentialisation • Not the naturalisation of social inequality	Deconstructed, problematized and countered, the way it is used by the OECD and in the context of teacher education in Chile.	Chile	*Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*
54.	Michael-Luna & Marri (2011)	Multicultural democracy theory	To use the research question "How do urban teacher candidates (TCs) understand socio-economic, racial, and cultural diversity in resegregated urban educational contexts" and examine the perceptions of pre-service K-8 teachers in an urban education program.	• Social class • Race • Ethnicity • Language • Gender • Sexual orientation • Ability/disability • Religion	Subordinated to the terms *multicultural democracy* and *socio-economic diversity*. In a binary opposition with *students,* found in how some *students* are described as *middle-class, English-speaking, and White European Americans* (p. 180) whilst other *students* are described as *students of colour, those low on the socio-economic scale, or who were not native speakers of English* (p. 180).	USA	*Urban Education*
55.	Robinson & Clardy (2011)	Critical race theory	To explore the following phenomena: how linguistic and cultural diversity is regarded in teacher education programs, as well as teacher candidates'	• Linguistically diverse • Minority • Students	Interchangeably with *linguistic and cultural diversity*. In a binary opposition with *student teacher*, found through how *student teachers* refer to *White teacher candidates*, and the term *cultural diversity* refers to *minority* (p. 106), as well as in how the term *minority*	USA	*Journal of Cultural Diversity*

			and current K-12 teachers' dispositions towards students who do not share their cultural backgrounds or language (including those who vary in their dialects).		is described as having "backgrounds other than their [teacher candidates] own student population" (p. 106).		
56.	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012)	Culturally responsive teaching Quantitative study	To investigate a course at a large research university in the South-eastern United States designed to influence the attitudes of pre-service teachers about how they might work with low-income and/or ethnic minority families.	• Lack understanding of • Immigrant • Low income • Ethnic minority families • Economy, class • Lower class • Other traditions • Other beliefs	Interchangeably with *economically and/or culturally diverse*, and this term is again used interchangeably with *low-income families*. In two binary oppositions: One with *pre-service teachers* described as part of the dominant middle-class culture (p. 806); *cultural diversity* refers to something other or different from *pre-service teachers* throughout the study. In the second binary opposition, *dominant culture* is used, found through how *cultural diversity*, related to *culturally diverse families* (pp. 805, 806, 807), is described as valuing interdependence and conformity to external standards (p. 806). *Cultural diversity* is also related to *other traditions* and *other beliefs* than those that form part of the school curriculum (p. 822), and *economically and culturally diverse communities* and the people who live within them are described as having *a traditional mind set* (p. 828).	USA	*Urban Education*
57.	Lake & Rittschof (2012)	Multicultural theory (American) Quantitative study	To discuss an action-research approach and classroom application strategies stemming from a survey of 88 pre-service teacher candidates on their attitudes towards homosexuality, race, social class and women's equality, following a university course on diversity.	• Attitudes towards • Diversity • Diversity issues • Diversity courses • Greater understanding of many types of student diversity • Implications for cultural and other differences • Within educational settings	Twice, once in the title, and once in the text. *Diversity* is generally used.	USA	*Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*

58.	Pearce (2012)	Critical whiteness theory	To explore the dilemmas and constraints faced by four student teachers on their final teaching practice and to examine in some detail what happens at an individual and institutional level when progressive student teachers mount a challenge to the status quo, the focus in this article is on the stories of the three students who spoke out against the taken-for-granted dominance of whiteness in the curriculum.	- Racism - Minoritised backgrounds - Minoritised groups - Diversity issues - Issues of diversity	Once, and it occurs within the term *racism and cultural diversity* (p. 459).	UK	*Oxford Review of Education*
59.	Reid & Sriprakash (2012)	Critical multiculturalism	To re-vision the ethos that has been part of the genealogy of multicultural education. In the context of teacher education, the authors ask: Where to now? To reflect on their design and delivery of a new undergraduate unit offered by the School of Education, University of Western Sydney.	- Socio-cultural diversity - Contemporary contexts - Multicultural issues - Indigenous issues - Educational policy - National policy - Policies - Rights - Migration - Social welfare	Within the term *socio-cultural diversity*. *Diversity* is generally used.	Australia	*Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*
60.	Rodriguez & Polat (2012)	Claim to bridge a theoretical framework of diversity and citizenship, however refers to	To address two research questions: How do pre-service teachers construct difference between themselves and	- Difference - Reflect upon their experiences - Influence their imagined (mis)conceptions - ELs	In a binary opposition with *student teachers*, found, for example, in how the authors in this study are interested in how *prospective teachers* construct *difference*, and in investigating "how pre-service teachers' views and the ways in which they reflect upon their experiences influence their imagined	USA	*Linguistics and Education*

	researchers (who refer to researchers) of critical multicultural theories, critical race and critical whiteness theory	others? How do they express a sense of belonging and community membership (or construct citizenship) in representing themselves as prospective teachers of ELs?	• Learners • Participant • In classroom communities	(mis)conceptions of ELs as learners and participants in classroom communities" (p. 362).		
61. Gay (2013)	Culturally responsive teaching	To discuss and examine some of the major issues and attributes of culturally responsive teaching.	• Teaching to and through • Restructuring teacher attitudes and beliefs about • Matter of beliefs • Manifested in instructional actions • Racial • Cultural • Ethnic • Promoting • Resistance • Differences • Heritages • Backgrounds • Beliefs through action • Humanistic • Realistic • Normative • Transformative • Endeavour	Within the term *ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity* (throughout).	USA	*Curriculum Inquiry*
62. Kumar & Hamer (2013)	Achievement goal theory and multicultural education Quantitative study	To draw on insights from achievement goal theory and multicultural education to examine the interrelated nature of pre-service teachers' biases and beliefs regarding culturally diverse students and the kind of instructional practices they are likely to pursue.	• Multicultural education • Valuing cultural diversity • Respecting cultural diversity • Visible • Behavioural • Rejecting prejudice • Rejecting the enactment of discrimination • Critical examination • Attitudes • Instructional practices	Subordinated to *multicultural education* (pp. 146/147). In a binary opposition with *student teachers*, found through the statements: "Demographers predict that by 2035, half the school-age population will be students of color…. In contrast, the majority of the teachers will still be White, monolingual, middle-class women" (p. 162). "Many White teachers experience some ambivalence toward minority and immigrant students (Hollins & Torres-Guzman, 2005; Sleeter, 2001) and doubt their efficacy in teaching students whose cultural backgrounds differ from their own" (p. 162).	USA	*Journal of Teacher Education*

| 63. | Turner (2013) | Review of the literature on how to engage pre-service teachers' reflections on their own classroom | To explore how reflective practice may be facilitated among pre-service teachers preparing to teach in culturally diverse classrooms. | Reflective practices Classrooms Student teachers Coming from a different region or country Among our own students Inquiry-based learning Promotes reflective practices Different cultural backgrounds | Refers "not only to the students but also to the teacher; for example, a teacher is exposed to cultural diversity when teaching students in a different region or country" (p. 80).

Cultural diversity is also used to critique the frequent binary opposition of teachers and students. This is found in the argument that "[I]t has been noted that, in the USA, pre-service teachers are predominantly white (Liu & Milman, 2010), but there may be spaces, such as in language education, where pre-service teachers come from different cultural backgrounds" (p. 80). | Australia | *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice* |
| 64. | McVee (2014) | Critical whiteness theory | To consider perspectives on cultural diversity and research in the context of the current politicised educational environment within the United States and articulate three practices that teacher educators and researchers can attend to in order to maintain complex explorations of culture with pre-service and in-service teachers. | Perspectives on Complexity in explorations of culture Fostering a discursive view of culture Attending to both one's own and to students' knowledge Acknowledge and develop empathic stances in teaching and research Invite complexity into instruction and research Looking at one own's subjectivities and histories, positions Become complacent about one's own knowledge and role in perpetuating inequities A project of teacher research and the role of the teacher researcher Creating a learning community that sustains dialogue and moves beyond a superficial, ritualised conversation Learning from research your successful and unsuccessful pedagogical practices Move beyond the comfort zone in order to challenge students Thinking about position, discourse and culture Reflecting upon one's own position within society Address taboos such as race | Only once as an overriding theme in the article's discussion.

Refers mainly to academic activities that educators teaching *cultural diversity* are supposed to undertake. | USA | *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* |

23

65.	Paul-Binyamin & Reingold (2014)	Multicultural theories	To examine the multicultural policies advocated and the actual practices in two teacher education colleges in Israel.	• Multiculturalism • Cultures of underprivileged groups • Students from diverse cultural backgrounds • Separate or shared public spaces • Cultural identity	Subordinated to the term *multiculturalism* (p. 49).	Israel	*Teaching and Teacher Education*
66.	Santoro (2014)	Critical whiteness theory	To draw on the findings of a qualitative study that aimed to investigate pre-service teachers' perceptions of the value of an international experience to their development as teachers.	• Better understandings of • Difference • Ethnically and racially diverse learners • Diverse communities • Linguistic and diverse communities • Others	In a binary opposition with *student teachers,* found, for example, through how *student teachers* are urged to "have the skills and pedagogical strategies to address the needs of students whose cultural beliefs, values and practices are different from the dominant cultural majority" (p. 429), and through how *student teachers'* "interaction with culturally diverse Others is one way to extend pre-service teachers understandings of difference and diversity" (p. 430).	Australia	*Race Ethnicity and Education*
67.	Smith (2014)	A phenomenological approach, based mainly on the writings of Heidegger, Gadamer and Merleau-Ponty	To report on one aspect of a New Zealand Christian institution's self-reflection on its attitudes and practices in relation to cultural diversity.	• Attitudes • Practices • Awareness of • Unity in diversity • Multiracial coalition • Embracing • Sense of safety • Overcoming the hegemonic status quo • Racial diversity • Foundation for curriculum making • Curriculum decision making • Re-education • Multiracial diversity	As a conceptual tool to argue the case for how a Christian University can "walk as Jesus walked" (p. 279), by overcoming *the hegemonic status quo* (p. 276) and by developing *cultural confluence* (p. 279).	New Zealand	*Christian Higher Education*

References

Alviar-Martin, T., & Ho, L.-C. (2011). "So, where do they fit in?" Teachers' perspectives of multi-cultural education and diversity in Singapore. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 27*(1), 127–135. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.07.009

Amatea, E. S., Cholewa, B., & Mixon, K. A. (2012). Influencing preservice teachers' attitudes about working with low-income and/or ethnic minority families. *Urban Education, 47*(4), 801–834. doi:10.1177/0042085912436846

Ambe, E. B. (2006). Fostering multicultural appreciation in pre-service teachers through multicultural curricular transformation. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 22*(6), 690–699. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.005

Arizaga, M. P., Bauman, S., Waldo, M., & Castellanos, L. P. (2005). Multicultural sensitivity and interpersonal skills training for preservice teachers. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development, 44*(2), 198–208.

Asimeng-Boahene, L., & Klein, A. M. (2004). Is the diversity issue a non-issue in mainstream academia? *Multicultural Education, 12*(1), 47–52.

Assaf, L. C., & McMunn Dooley, C. (2010). Investigating ideological clarity in teacher education. *Teacher Educator, 45*(3), 153–178.

Athanases, S. Z., & Martin, K. J. (2006). Learning to advocate for educational equity in a teacher credential program. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 22*(6), 627–646. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.008

Baltodano, M. P. (2006). The accreditation of schools of education and the appropriation of diversity. *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies, 6*(1), 123–142. doi:10.1177/1532708605282819

Barnes, C. J. (2006). Preparing preservice teachers to teach in a culturally responsive way. *Negro Educational Review, 57*(1/2), 85–100.

Brown, E. L. (2004a). The relationship of self-concepts to changes in cultural diversity awareness: Implications for urban teacher educators. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 36*(2), 119–145.

Brown, E. L. (2004b). What precipitates change in cultural diversity awareness during a multicultural course: The message or method? *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(4), 325–340. doi:10.1177/0022487104266746

Burnett, B., & McArdle, F. (2011). Multiculturalism, education for sustainable development (ESD) and the shifting discursive landscape of social inclusion. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(1), 43–56. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.537070

Castro, A. J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39*(3), 198–210.

Cicchelli, T., & Su-Je, C. (2007). Teacher multicultural attitudes. *Education & Urban Society, 39*(3), 370–381.

DePalma, R. (2008). "The voice of every Black person?": Bringing authentic minority voices into the multicultural dialogue. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 24*(3), 767–778. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2007.08.002

Eberly, J. L., Rand, M. K., & O'Connor, T. (2007). Analyzing teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Using adult development theory. *Multicultural Education, 14*(4), 31–36.

Garmon, M. A. (2004). Changing preservice teachers' attitudes/beliefs about diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(3), 201–213. doi:10.1177/0022487104263080

Gay, G. (2010). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 143–152.

Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry, 43*(1), 48–70. doi:10.1111/curi.12002

Gill, H., & Chalmers, G. (2007). Documenting diversity: An early portrait of a collaborative teacher education initiative. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 11*(5–6), 551–570. doi:10.1080/13603110600600986

Guyton, E. M., & Wesche, M. V. (2005). The Multicultural Efficacy Scale: Development, item selection, and reliability. *Multicultural Perspectives, 7*(4), 21–29. doi:10.1207/s15327892mcp0704_4

Haas, C. (2008). Citizenship education in Denmark: Reinventing the nation and/or conducting multiculturalism(s)? *London Review of Education, 6*(1), 59–69. doi:10.1080/14748460801889902

Hachfeld, A., Hahn, A., Schroeder, S., Anders, Y., Stanat, P., & Kunter, M. (2011). Assessing teachers' multicultural and egalitarian beliefs: The Teacher Cultural Beliefs Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 27*(6), 986–996.

Haddix, M. (2008). Beyond sociolinguistics: Towards a critical approach to cultural and linguistic diversity in teacher education. *Language & Education: An International Journal, 22*(5), 254–270. doi:10.2167/le772.0

Harris, R., & Clarke, G. (2011). Embracing diversity in the history curriculum: A study of the challenges facing trainee teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 41*(2), 159–175. doi:10.1080/0305764X.2011.572863

Hollins, E. R., & Torres-Guzman, M. A. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: A report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 477-548).

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Holm, G., & Londen, M. (2010). The discourse on multicultural education in Finland: Education for whom? *Intercultural Education, 21*(2), 107–120. doi:10.1080/14675981003696222

Hope-Rowe, G. (2006). Student teachers and cultural diversity in an australian regional university. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 6*(1), 42–54.

Hyland, N. E., & Heuschkel, K. (2010). Fostering understanding of institutional oppression among U.S. pre-service teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 26*(4), 821–829. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.019

Hyland, N. E., & Noffke, S. E. (2005). Understanding diversity through soical and community inquiry: An action-research study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(4), 367–381. doi:10.1177/0022487105279568

Jacobs, J., Assaf, L. C., & Lee, K. S. (2011). Professional development for teacher educators: Conflicts between critical reflection and instructional-based strategies. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(4), 499–512. doi:10.1080/19415257.2010.533587

Jokikokko, K. (2005). Interculturally trained Finnish teachers' conceptions of diversity and intercultural competence. *Intercultural Education, 16*(1), 69–83. doi:10.1080/14636310500061898

Kumar, R., & Hamer, L. (2013). Preservice teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward student diversity and proposed instructional practices: A sequential design study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 64*(2), 162–177. doi:10.1177/0022487112466899

Kyles, C. R., & Olafson, L. (2008). Uncovering preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity through reflective writing. *Urban Education, 43*(5), 500–518.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2005). Is the team all right? *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 229–234. doi:10.1177/0022487105275917

Lake, R., & Rittschof, K. (2012). Looking deeper than the gradebook: Assessing cultural diversity attitudes among undergraduates. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12*(3), 142–164.

Leeman, Y. (2008). Education and diversity in the Netherlands. *European Educational Research Journal, 7*(1), 50–59.

Liu, L., & Milman, N. (2010). Preparing teacher candidates to teach diverse student populations through reflective practice. Reflective Practice, 11(5), 619–630.

Locke, S. (2005). Institutional social and cultural influences on the multicultural perspectives of preservice teachers. *Multicultural Perspectives, 7*(2), 20–28. doi:10.1207/s15327892mcp0702_4

Marbley, A. F., Bonner, F. A., II, McKisick, S., Henfield, M. S., & Watts, L. M. (2007). Interfacing culture specific pedagogy with counseling: A proposed diversity training model for preparing preservice teachers for diverse learners. *Multicultural Education, 14*(3), 8–16.

Matus, C., & Infante, M. (2011). Undoing diversity: Knowledge and neoliberal discourses in colleges of education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 32*(3), 293–307. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.573248

McCall, A. L. (2004). Using poetry in social studies classes to teach about cultural diversity and social justice. *Social Studies, 95*(4), 172.

McVee, M. B. (2014). The challenge of more light, the complexity of culture: Lessons learned in exploring the cultural positioning of literacy teachers. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*(1), 1–15.

Michael-Luna, S., & Marri, A. R. (2011). Rethinking diversity in resegregated schools: Lessons from a case study of urban K-8 preservice teachers. *Urban Education, 46*(2), 178–201.

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 26*(3), 447–454. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.012

Milner, H. R. (2006). Preservice teachers' learning about cultural and racial diversity: Implications for urban education. *Urban Education, 41*(4), 343–375. doi:10.1177/0042085906289709

Milner IV, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1/2), 118–131. doi:10.1177/0022487109347670

Montgomery, A., & McGlynn, C. (2009). New peace, new teachers: Student teachers' perspectives of diversity and community relations in Northern Ireland. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 25*(3), 391–399. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.11.002

Paul-Binyamin, I., & Reingold, R. (2014). Multiculturalism in teacher education institutes: The relationship between formulated official policies and grassroots initiatives. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 42*, 47–57. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2014.04.008

Pearce, S. (2012). Confronting dominant whiteness in the primary classroom: Progressive student teachers' dilemmas and constraints. *Oxford Review of Education, 38*(4), 455–472. doi:10.1080/03054985.2012.710546

Pope, J., & Wilder, J. (2005). Now that I'm out in the field: Student teaching and valuing diversity. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(4), 322–328.

Premier, J. A., & Miller, J. (2010). Preparing pre-service teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(2), 35–48.

Reid, C., & Sriprakash, A. (2012). The possibility of cosmopolitan learning: Reflecting on future directions for diversity teacher education in Australia. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(1), 15–29. doi:10.1080/1359866X.2011.643762

Robinson, C. C., & Clardy, P. (2011). It ain't what you say, it's how you say it: Linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 18*(3), 101–110.

Rodriguez, T. L., & Polat, N. (2012). Politicizing difference: Interpreting citizenship as a dimension of diversity in pre-service teachers' narratives. *Linguistics & Education, 23*(4), 361–372. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2012.08.001

Rogers, T., Marshall, E., & Tyson, C. A. (2006). Dialogic narratives of literacy, teaching, and schooling: Preparing literacy teachers for diverse settings. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(2), 202–224. doi:10.1598/RRQ.41.2.3

Santoro, N. (2009). Teaching in culturally diverse contexts: What knowledge about "self" and "others" do teachers need? *Journal of Education for Teaching, 35*(1), 33–45. doi:10.1080/02607470802587111

Santoro, N. (2014). "If I'm going to teach about the world, I need to know the world": Developing Australian pre-service teachers' intercultural competence through international trips. *Race, Ethnicity & Education, 17*(3), 429–444. doi:10.1080/13613324.2013.832938

Scott, K., & Mumford, V. (2007). Critical thoughts: Reexamining teacher training, cultural awareness, and school reform. *Multicultural Perspectives, 9*(4), 54–58.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *52*, 94-123.

Sleeter, C. E., and C. A. Grant. 1999. *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. 3rd ed. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Smith, A. (2014). Cultural confluence: Challenges for a christian college desiring to work cross-culturally. *Christian Higher Education, 13*(4), 266–280. doi:10.1080/15363759.2014.924767

Tavares, H. M. (2007). Making diversity desirable: Scientism and the fetishizing of difference. *College Quarterly, 10*(4), 1–9.

Thomas, S., & Kearney, J. (2008). Teachers working in culturally diverse classrooms: Implications for the development of professional standards and for teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(2), 105–120.

Trent, S. C., Kea, C. D., & Oh, K. (2008). Preparing preservice educators for cultural diversity: How far have we come? *Exceptional Children, 74*(3), 328–350.

Turner, M. (2013). Beyond the "good teacher": Guiding pre-service teacher reflections on culturally diverse students. *Teachers & Teaching, 19*(1), 78–92. doi:10.1080/13540602.2013.744200

Unruh, L. E., & McCord, D. M. (2010). Personality traits and beliefs about diversity in pre-service teachers [Cover story]. *Individual Differences Research, 8*(1), 1–7.

Valentín, S. (2006). Addressing diversity in teacher education programs. *Education, 127*(2), 196–202.

Virta, A. (2009). Learning to teach history in culturally diverse classrooms. *Intercultural Education, 20*(4), 285–297.

Wiggins, R. A., Follo, E. J., & Eberly, M. B. (2007). The impact of a field immersion program on pre-service teachers' attitudes toward teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 23*(5), 653–663.

Yan, G., Arthur, N., & Lund, D. (2009). Intercultural inquiry with pre-service teachers. *Intercultural Education, 20*(6), 565–577. doi:10.1080/1467598090344861

Table 5: The Usage of Cultural Diversity in Relation to the Term Multicultural

Interchangeably with	
multicultural	Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Brown (2004a, 2004b); Castro (2010); Garmon (2004); Gill & Chalmers (2007); Kyles & Olafson (2008); Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007); McCall (2004); Premier & Miller (2010); Trent, Kea, & Oh (2008); Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly (2007)
Subordinated	
multicultural	Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Assaf & McMunn Dooley (2010); Paul-Binyamin & Reingold (2014)
In relation to	
multicultural education	Castro (2010); Cicchelli & Su-Je (2007); DePalma (2008); Garmon (2004); Holm & Londen (2010); Hope-Rowe (2006); Kumar & Hamer (2013); Rogers, Marshall, & Tyson (2006); Scott & Mumford (2007); Tavares (2007); Trent, Kea, & Oh (2008)
multicultural teacher education	Locke (2005)
multicultural educational issues	Holm & Londen (2010)
multicultural democracy	Michael-Luna & Marri (2011)
multicultural society	Asimeng-Boahene & Klein (2004)
multicultural population	Gill & Chalmers (2007)
multicultural children	Barnes (2006)
multicultural readiness	Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly (2007)
multicultural issues	Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005)
multiculturalism	Alviar-Martin & Ho (2011); Ambe (2006); Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Haas (2008); Hope-Rowe (2006)

Table 6: The Usage of Cultural Diversity in Relation to the Interchangeably Used Terms Race and Ethnicity

In relation to the interchangeable terms	
race and *ethnicity*	Gay (2010, 2013); Guyton & Wesche (2005); Michael-Luna & Marri (2011)
Subordinate to the interchangeable terms	
race and *ethnicity*	Holm & Londen (2010); McVee (2014); Valentín (2006)

Table 7: The Usage of Cultural Diversity in Relation to Various Other Terms

In relation to	
race/racial	Ambe (2006); Eberly, Rand, & O'Connor (2007); Garmon (2004); Gay (2010, 2013); Guyton & Wesche (2005); Holm & Londen (2010); McVee (2014); Michael-Luna & Marri (2011); Milner (2006); Scott & Mumford (2007); Smith (2014); Valentín (2006)
difference	Gay (2010, 2013); Lake & Rittschof (2012); Rodriguez & Polat (2012); Santoro (2014); Tavares (2007); Turner (2013); Virta (2009)
class	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012); Assaf & McMunn Dooley (2010); Eberly, Rand, & O'Connor, (2007); Guyton & Wesche (2005); Holm & Londen (2010); Paul-Binyamin & Reingold (2014); Valentín (2006)

linguistic	Assaf & McMunn Dooley (2010); Haddix (2008); Mills & Ballantyne (2010); Robinson & Clardy (2011); Rodriguez & Polat (2012); Santoro, (2014); Virta (2009)
ethnic/ethnicity	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012); Gay (2013); Leeman (2008); Pope & Wilder (2005); Scott & Mumford (2007); Unruh & McCord (2010); Virta (2009)
gender	Holm & Londen (2010); McCall (2004); Michael-Luna & Marri (2011); Milner IV (2010); Valentín (2006)
critical thinking	Gay (2010); Kumar & Hamer (2013); McVee (2014); Scott & Mumford (2007)
practices	Kumar & Hamer (2013); McVee (2014); Rogers, Marshall, & Tyson (2006); Turner (2013)
socio-economic	Michael-Luna & Marri (2011); Milner IV (2010)
other	Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Lake & Rittschof (2012)
immigrants	Holm & Londen (2010); Montgomery & McGlynn (2009)
social justice	Hyland & Heuschkel (2010); McCall (2004)
behaviour	Gay (2010); Kumar & Hamer (2013)
English language learners (ELLs)	Athanases & Martin (2006)
religion	Holm & Londen (2010)
Poor	Milner (2006)
sexual orientation	Michael-Luna & Marri (2011)
ability/disability	Michael-Luna & Marri (2011)

Table 8: The Usage of Cultural Diversity as Part of Two Binary Oppositional Discourses with Student Teacher(s) and Student(s)

Binary oppositional discourses with	
teacher student(s) and *student(s)*	Alviar-Martin & Ho (2011); Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012); Ambe (2006); Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Asimeng-Boahene & Klein (2004); Assaf & McMunn Dooley (2010); Athanases & Martin (2006); Baltodano (2006); Barnes (2006); Brown (2004a, 2004b); Burnett & McArdle (2011); Castro (2010); Cicchelli & Su-Je (2007); DePalma (2008); Garmon (2004); Gay (2010); Haas (2008); Hachfeld et al. (2011); Harris & Clarke (2011); Holm & Londen (2010); Hope-Rowe (2006); Hyland & Heuschkel (2010); Hyland & Noffke (2005); Jokikokko (2005); Kumar & Hamer (2013); Kyles & Olafson (2008); Ladson-Billings (2005); Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007); Michael-Luna & Marri (2011); Mills & Ballantyne (2010); Milner (2006); Milner IV (2010); Montgomery & McGlynn (2009); Pope & Wilder (2005); Premier & Miller (2010); Robinson & Clardy (2011); Rodriguez & Polat (2012); Santoro (2009, 2014); Thomas & Kearney (2008); Trent, Kea, & Oh (2008); Unruh & McCord (2010); Valentín (2006); Virta (2009); Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly (2007); Yan, Arthur, & Lund (2009)

Table 9: The Usage of Cultural Diversity as Part of Two Binary Oppositional Discourses with Student Teacher(s)

In studies where *cultural diversity* is related to	
student of color	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012); Baltodano (2006); Brown (2004b); Burnett & McArdle (2011); Gay (2010); Hope-Rowe (2006); Hyland & Noffke (2005); Kumar & Hamer (2013); Kyles & Olafson (2008); Ladson-Billings (2005); Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007); Mills & Ballantyne (2010); Milner (2006); Milner IV (2010); Montgomery & McGlynn (2009); Robinson & Clardy (2011); Santoro (2009)
other	Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Brown (2004a); Burnett & McArdle (2011); Castro (2010); Pope & Wilder (2005); Santoro (2009, 2014); Thomas & Kearney (2008)
race	Gay (2010); Hope-Rowe (2006); Hyland & Heuschkel (2010); Mills & Ballantyne (2010); Milner (2006); Santoro (2014); Unruh & McCord (2010); Yan, Arthur, & Lund (2009)
ethnicity	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012); Gay (2010); Harris & Clarke (2011); Holm & Londen (2010); Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007); Mills & Ballantyne (2010)
difference/different	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012); Arizaga, Bauman, Waldo, & Castellanos (2005); Brown (2004a; b); Hope-Rowe (2006); Jokikokko (2005); Santoro (2014)
minority	Asimeng-Boahene & Klein (2004); Kumar & Hamer (2013); Pope & Wilder (2005); Robinson & Clardy (2011); Yan, Arthur, & Lund (2009)

Table 10: The Usage of Cultural Diversity Related to Race and as Part of a Binary Oppositional Discourse with Student Teacher(s)

***Cultural diversity* described as**	
issues associated with multiculturalism, immigration and racism *non-mainstream groups* *the 'other' dimension and* *children with diverse cultural and linguistic resources*	Hope-Rowe (2006, pp. 50, 52)
[s]tudents living in racially isolated neighbourhoods	Unruh & McCord (2010, p. 4)
***Cultural diversity* related to**	
people of color	Milner (2006, p. 359); Unruh & McCord (2010, p. 4)
multicultural settings	Hope-Rowe (2006, p. 52)
diversity, gender, culture, others	Milner (2006, pp. 347–349, 353–355, 359)
racially, ethnically, diverse students	Santoro (2014, pp. 429, 441)
***Student teacher(s)* described as**	
pre-service teachers	Hope-Rowe (2006, p. 45)
prospective teachers	Milner (2006, p. 343)

monocultural, homogenous	Hope-Rowe (2003, p. 44, throughout)
monocultural, White, middle class	Kyles & Olafson (2008, p. 502)
naïve, white, suburban females	Wiggins, Follo, & Eberly (2007, p. 655)
White counterparts, White mainstream counterparts	Baltodano (2006, pp. 123, 127)
characteristically white, middle class, and monolingual	Trent, Kea, & Oh (2008, p. 329)
white, monolingual, middle-class, and female	Milner (2006, p. 344)
predominantly white middle-class, monolingual	Hope-Rowe (2006, p. 45)
European American, with little or no experience with cultural diversity	Milner (2006, pp. 344, 347)
having attitudes and beliefs about diversity	Unruh & McCord (2010 pp. 1, 3, 4)
and lacking experience with people who are different, and as part of the hegemonic mainstream	Santoro (2014, pp. 429, 441)
Student teacher(s) related to	
whiteness	Baltodano (2006, p. 127); Santoro (2014, p. 441)
accrued privilege, normal	Santoro (2014, p. 441)

Table 11: The Usage of Cultural Diversity Related to Ethnicity and as Part of a Binary Oppositional Discourse with Student Teacher(s)

Cultural diversity related to	
student population, people of color	Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007, p. 8)
new group	Holm & Londen (2010, p. 107)
pupil population, minority ethnic students	Harris & Clarke (2011, p. 161)
ethnic minority, low-income, families, caregivers, students	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012, pp. 802–803)
others, ethnic others	Santoro (2009, p. 33)
Student teacher(s) described as	
Finns who are not sufficiently educated to teach this new group of culturally diverse students	Holm and Londen (2010, p. 107)
from mono-ethnic backgrounds	Harris & Clarke (2011, p. 162)
Student teacher(s) related to	
pre-service teachers	Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007)
teachers	Holm & Londen (2010)
trainees	Harris & Clarke (2011)

White, middle-class	Amatea, Cholewa, & Mixon (2012, pp. 182–183); Harris & Clarke (2011, p. 162); Marbley, Bonner, McKisick, Henfield, & Watts (2007, pp. 10–11)

Table 12: The Usage of Cultural Diversity as an Explicit Part of a Binary Oppositional Discourse with Student(s)

Cultural diversity described as	
students of color, not native speakers of English	Michael-Luna & Marri (2011, p. 180)
urban and rural communities	Milner (2006, p. 345)
generally lower income, culturally and linguistically diverse (primarily Latino, African American, American Indian and some Southeast Asian) students	Athanases & Martin (2006, p. 628)
those students who fall outside the dominant mainstream in terms of their race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender and/or geography	Milner IV (2010, p. 129)
having "needs ... different from and/or similar to the needs of students from the dominant cultural majority"	Santoro (2014, p. 441)
African American females and African American males that diversify a class	Robinson & Clardy (2011, p. 103)
Cultural diversity related to	
culturally diverse	Santoro (2009, pp. 33, 36, 41–43)
ethnic minority groups	Santoro (2009, pp. 34, 38)
minority cultures	Santoro (2009, p. 40),
minority ethnic population	Harris & Clarke (2011, p. 165)
lower income	Athanases & Martin (2006, p. 628)
ELLs	Athanases & Martin (2006, p. 631)
very poor	Athanases & Martin (2006, p. 631)
socio-economic status	Milner (2006, p. 345)
ethnic background	Milner (2006, p. 345)
urban and rural communities	Milner (2006, p. 345)
other(s), ethnic others	Santoro (2009, p. 33)
increased immigration, immigrants and other minorities	Holm & Londen (2010, p. 107)
not their history that is being taught	Virta (2009, p. 286)
Student(s) described as	
native English speaking, middle to high income	Athanases & Martin (2006, p. 628)

relatively homogenous in terms of socio-economic status (SES) and ethnic background	Milner (2006, p. 345)
in the rural and suburban areas	Harris & Clarke (2011, p. 165)
suburban schools, higher in SES, and predominantly White	Milner (2006, p. 345)
Student(s) related to	
peer, dominant majority, mainstream	Santoro (2009, pp. 34, 38)
mono-ethnic, school population	Harris & Clarke (2011, p. 165)
White	Athanases & Martin (2006, p. 628); Robinson & Clardy (2011, p. 103)

Article 2

Fylkesnes, S. (2018). Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy.* Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/02680939.2018.1482503

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum

Sandra Fylkesnes

Department of International Studies and Interpreting, Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

ABSTRACT

This article adds to new ways of understanding the institutionalisation of Whiteness as subtle workings of race and racism within education policy. It presents a critical discourse analysis of how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of the term 'cultural diversity' in six Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents. These documents are positioned as promoters of social justice. This article, however, aims to contest this position. Framed under the theoretical perspectives of critical Whiteness studies, discourse analysis and Goldberg's theorisation of racialised discourse, the findings indicate that Whiteness is embedded in the usage of the term 'cultural diversity', manifested in discursive patterns of (1) three hierarchically arranged pupil group categories, (2) descriptions that place the pupil group categories as either superior Norwegian or as inferior non-Norwegian, and (3) the role of student teachers as 'political actors of assimilation'. I argue that despite these educational documents being explicitly positioned as promoters of social justice, they are nonetheless both a product and producers of racialised discourses of Othering and exclusion – a result of the Norwegian 'imagined sameness' ideal and a socially accepted 'pedagogy of amnesia' that blinds itself to the current workings of the imperial and colonial legacy of race and racism.

Introduction

In recent decades, Norway and other European countries have witnessed a steep rise in immigration from the *Global South*.[1] Internationally and nationally, such demographic changes are met with policies advocating teacher education that better prepares teachers for cultural diversity (Ministry of Education and Research 2009; OECD 2010) in relation to social justice (Van Driel, Darmody, and Kerzil 2016). These perspectives are supported by multicultural teacher education research (e.g. Gay 2010; Mills and Ballantyne 2010; Sleeter

2001). In both education policy documents and teacher education research, the term *cultural diversity* is frequently used, yet without content consistency. Despite both policy and researchers promoting the importance for student teachers to be better prepared for cultural diversity in relation to social justice, current research on teacher education has pointed to how one consequence of not defining and discussing central discursive terms such as cultural diversity results in dysconscious (King 2004) productions of a discursive ideology of White supremacy because of how the term *cultural diversity* almost always refers to the inferior racialised Other (e.g. Fylkesnes 2018). Whilst previous literature on the institutionalisation of Whiteness generally points to how race is intimately connected to both power and domination and is tacitly embedded in education policy discourses (e.g. Brown and De Lissovoy 2011; Gillborn 2005, 2008, 2016; Orozco 2011; Preston 2008; Smith 2013), this article presents a study that unveils how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of one particular term: *cultural diversity*. Taking on a *policy chain* (cf. Arneback and Quennerstedt 2016) – a set of six policy and curriculum documents –, the analysis interrogates how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* in Norwegian national teacher education policy discourses. Herein, the term *cultural diversity* is placed as central, however, its meaning is never made explicit. To interrogate the workings of Whiteness in the Norwegian context is interesting for international research on teacher education policy because of how representations of the Norwegian self-image mirror the very core workings of Whiteness: On the surface, Norwegian Whiteness explicitly and intendedly presents a facade of peace, solidarity and egalitarianism. However, below this polished surface, minimal subtle and dysconscious forms of racisms are omnipresent, maintained by the orthodox yet doxic ideology of White supremacy.

Therefore, the aim of this article is to make visible and deconstruct how Whiteness, as an institutionalised discursive ideology of White supremacy, is embedded in subtle discursive patterns of power and domination within teacher education policy discourses, and to point to some possible implications of such policy discourses in terms of both future teacher education and teacher education policy in Norway and elsewhere. The following question guides this article: How does Whiteness work through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* in the six Norwegian policy and curriculum documents? This article's main theoretical perspectives draw on critical Whiteness studies (CWS) and Goldberg's (1993, 2009) theorisation on racialised discourses, and on an analytical approach based on Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation on discursive formation – how discourses form. Thus, it is important to note that, in this article, to *interrogate the use and meaning making of the term 'cultural diversity'* is not a concern with the term per se, but with *semiotics*–the totality of the discursive meaning making formation. The term *cultural diversity* functions as a *synecdoche*, meaning that it represents a central analytical entry point that leads to the totality of the discursive formation. This epistemological perspective is a central feature of Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation of the discursive formation: how *new* discursive macro *objects* (e.g. discursive categories) may emerge from the initial discursive analysis of micro *objects* (e.g. the interrogation of one term and its relations to other terms) (cf. Foucault 1989; Goldberg 2006). In this article, to *interrogate the use and meaning making of the term 'cultural diversity'* represents the process through which inextricably related, discursively produced racialised patterns emerge (e.g. manifested in discursive representations and categorisations), as these patterns work to uphold the ideology of White supremacy.

In the next section, the article presents the concept of Whiteness and discusses its relation to education policy and the Norwegian context. Then, the policy chain, the documents,

their authority and their function are outlined, before the conceptual tools for the analysis are outlined and the analytical strategy is explained. This is followed by the analysis of how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*. Finally, the findings are discussed, followed by suggestions for teacher education policy and teacher education with regards to the implications the findings may have for racial justice.

The concept of Whiteness, education policy and the Norwegian context

A central tenet of CWS is the importance of recognising the colonial and imperial legacy of race and racism (Leonardo 2002). Hence, within this research tradition, Whiteness is understood as a post-colonial and imperialistic social construct (Frankenberg 1993; Matias and Grosland 2016; Matias et al. 2014), a White European identity in-the-making (Goldberg 2006), an ideology of White supremacy (Ansley 1992; Leonardo 2004), or a racial discourse (Leonardo 2004) that works at the intersection of national, contemporary, political and economic interests. Whiteness as such, when related to education policy, may work through the ways in which certain national imageries and ideas of *ideal citizens* are discursively represented in curriculum-related documents that intend to foster socially loyal and economically beneficial subjects. However, what these same well-intended representations often also produce are racialised discursive patterns that categorise an assumed *us* against assumed *Others*.[2] Within CWS, *race,* a legacy of the modern project of categorisation, is understood as a concept embedded in Whiteness that describes the foundation of the socially constructed phenomenon upon which people are grouped and given status according to a hierarchy. Importantly, in CWS, the superior White race is positioned at the hierarchical apex (Dyer 1997; Gullestad 2004). *Racism* – central to the concept of Whiteness and defined as discrimination based on racial membership – is, within CWS, understood as normal, minimal, omnipresent, systemic, *ordinary* and commonplace. Thus, it is institutionalised (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Dyer 1997) and works through multifaceted and deeply embedded taken-for-granted aspects of power relations (e.g. Frankenberg 1993; Gillborn 2005; Leonardo 2002) that allow for 'business as usual' forms of racism (Delgado and Stefancic 2000; xvi). This omnipresent and everyday form of racism may be understood as an ideologically motivated *dysconscious racism* (King 2004) manifested in discursive practices of White supremacy (Gillborn 2005) that works to sustain the existing racial hierarchy. In this article, *dysconscious racism* refers to a kind of *impaired* consciousness, an uncritical way of thinking about race and racism that allows for a racism that 'tacitly accepts dominant White norms and privileges' (King 2004, 73) through, for example, certain usage and meaning makings of terms. Importantly, dysconscious racism is *invisible* to its actors until the moment they are explicitly confronted with it.

Critical researchers of Whiteness argue that Whiteness gains and sustains its power and domination (Gillborn 2005; Leonardo 2002) by its ability to remain invisible, unseen (Dyer 1997; hooks 1997) and unmarked (1997; Frankenberg 1993) through dominating practices that excessively focus on naming, defining and representing the Other (Said 2003). As such, the workings of Whiteness produce a set of *invisible* norms and standards against which everything is measured and compared (Dyer 1997; Frankenberg 1993). For the field of education policy, this implies that if Whiteness remains an engrained and unexamined area in the political discourses produced for teacher education, subtle forms of race and racism will continue to 'slip in through the back door' (Gullestad 2004, 177) with serious implications for teacher education when it comes to promoting social and racial justice.

Harris (1993) describes Whiteness as a form of *property* that privileges its holders. In understanding Whiteness as property, critical researchers of Whiteness also suggest that Whiteness resides in more invisible *entities* (Dyer 1997). For example, Whiteness as property might refer to abstract entitlements such as *rights*, and cultural and linguistic resources and competencies. Building further on the idea of Whiteness as abstract property, Vaught (2012) proposes that Whiteness may be understood as meaning making property, found in the discursive ideology of White supremacy produced within educational institutions in their exclusive right to name, define and represent *truth* and social order. Leonardo (2002) suggests that Whiteness as an abstraction works like 'late capital', 'with scopes, not scales' (41), and that it is sustained by ideologically embedded political actors, what can be described as Althusserian (2003) soldiers of discourses (Leonardo 2005), through their everyday discursive dysconscious racist practices. These practices work in ways that sustain ideas of White supremacy (Leonardo 2002). For Leonardo (2004), critically studying Whiteness not only concerns dismantling (White) privilege, but moreover, it demands detecting and deconstructing the political actors and the ways in which they work to sustain their hegemonic orthodoxy. Therefore, when interrogating the workings of Whiteness in education policy discourses, one must not only ask the *classical* question regarding whom the education (in its wide sense: including education policy and the curriculum) benefits and privileges (e.g. Apple 2014), but one must also ask who the political actors promoting and producing these discourses are and pay close attention to how those actors invest in such discourses.

International contributions studying the institutionalisation of Whiteness quite extensively discuss how race, intimately connected to both power and domination, is tacitly embedded in education policy discourses (e.g. Brown and De Lissovoy 2011, Gillborn 1998, 2005; 2008; 2016; Orozco 2011; Preston 2008; Smith 2013) in ways that maintain the existing inequalities in educational opportunities (Gillborn 1998, 2005; Smith 2013). These studies have found that Whiteness, as ideas of White supremacy (Gillborn 2005) and superiority (Preston 2008), works through taken-for-granted discursive routines that pass by unnoticed and unremarked upon in the political mainstream (Gillborn 2005). Specifically, they have shown how Whiteness has been found in discourses implicitly defining ability (Gillborn 1998), in discourses that promote particular normative understandings of *humanity* that favour White survival (Preston 2008), in discourses that normalise the curriculum as *White property* (Orozco 2011), in discourses that promote colour-blind ideas of racial inexplicitness (Gillborn 2016) and in discourses that market racial diversity as a competitive advantage for upper- and middle-class White families (Turner 2017). Critical researchers on the workings of Whiteness in education policy discourses argue that because Whiteness works through subtle discursive patterns embedded in explicit and well-intended educational political initiatives, there has been a failure to critique the hegemonic norms (Smith 2013) that privilege White interests (Gillborn 2005), White property (Orozco 2011) and White survival (Preston 2008). Moreover, these subtle patterns have allowed for a new educational discourse trend that promotes eugenic discourses as new, exciting and promising (Gillborn 2016).

In the Norwegian as well as in the wider Nordic context, the concept of Whiteness has traditionally not been used when analysing socially constructed and systematic racial injustices.[3] Moreover, the concept of *race* is generally deemed taboo (Dowling 2017; Muller Myrdahl 2014)[4] and the understandings of racism generally refer to explicit actions of hate. However, recently, the concept of Whiteness seems to have gained further interest and acceptance (e.g. Loftsdóttir and Jensen 2012; Van Riemsdijk 2010), also within the field of

education (see Atabong 2016; Dowling 2017; Mikander 2016). To interrogate the workings of Whiteness in a Norwegian teacher educational policy context is of particular interest because of how the Norwegian international self-image is presented as one of promoting peace, solidarity and egalitarianism (Gullestad 2002), and as part of both *Nordic Exceptionalism* and the *Nordic Model*. The description of Norway as part of *Nordic Exceptionalism* involves ideas of how the country is portrayed as being historically detached from both imperialism and colonialism (Loftsdóttir and Jensen 2012) and how such a historical 'pedagogy of amnesia' (Leonardo 2002, 34) – a deliberate remembering and forgetting of events – has further promoted and established a Norwegian identity based on ideas of Norwegians as victims of colonialism and war, as anti-racist peace-promoters and as solidarity-focused (Gullestad 2004). The description of how Norway is part of the *Nordic Model* involves ideas of Norwegian society being built on social democratic principles that led to the establishment of a well-developed and functioning welfare state with free comprehensive education and equal access to higher education for all (e.g. Antikainen 2006; Telhaug, Mediås, and Aasen 2006), regardless of, for example, social background, gender, ethnicity or geographical location (Vedøy and Møller 2007). Within this same imagery, Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents are positioned as promoters of social justice through their judicial commitment to both democracy and equality; through, for example, promises of eradicating all forms of discrimination (Lovdata 2013). However, this article contests these documents' promoted positionality by arguing that, despite the fact that Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents are positioned as promoters of social justice, they are nonetheless both the products and producers of racialised discourses of Othering and exclusion. The article also asserts that this inherent tension is grounded in a 'pedagogy of amnesia' (Leonardo 2002, 34) that refuses to recognise the legacy of imperialism and colonialism, *race* as a socially constructed concept, and racism as omnipresent, normal and ordinary.

In this article, the concept of Whiteness works well to describe how the omnipresent *invisibility* of everyday dysconcious racism (Essed 1991; King 2004) manifests in the Norwegian context. Whiteness, being a legacy of imperialism and colonialism, is an inherently permeated feature of the national psyche, covered by the colour-blind nationalistic ideal of *imagined sameness*[5] (Gullestad 2002) – a Norwegian concept that refers to likeness, similarity, fitting together, or to sharing the same set of ideas (Gullestad 2006). The imagined sameness ideal can be understood as a national ideology based on racial principles of White Norwegian superiority, accompanied (in line with the workings of Whiteness ealsewhere) by unearned privileges. The ideal or ideology of this imagined sameness also implies that difference or even deviation is seen as a threat to its workings (Rugkåssa 2012, 39):

> Both historically and currently, groups that do not live up to the ideal social norms are defined as abnormal or deviant, and not as alternative. Difference is in many cases considered as a threat to the [Norwegian] ideal of '[imagined] sameness'. In Norway, the discussion regarding the relationship between normality and deviation is [simultaneously] also a discussion about sameness and difference (Sirnes 1999; Vike, Lidén, and Lien 2001) … Identification with the nation has to a great extent translated into accepted ways of living life. Deviation is considered as something that must be removed or treated (Sirnes 1999). (Translated from Norwegian by author)

Despite the historical amnesia of Nordic Exceptionalism that promotes ideas of Norway as historically detached from both imperialism and colonialism, Norway has always had

its Other – its history of dominance and violence against its minority populations is no different to that of other Western countries –; however, it has always managed to assimilate the Other by *any means necessary*. Importantly, Norwegian educational institutions have played a central role in this regard (Pihl 2010). However, as the Other's presence is now also visible in the form of bodies of colour, it is no longer possible to completely assimilate it into the colour-blind ideal of *imagined sameness*. Hence, the imagined sameness ideal has its limitations. As such, the presence of the Other becomes a threat, not necessarily to people's access to and consumption of resources, but a threat to the imagined imagery of the Norwegian self-image. This, I argue, is because it is not merely about Whiteness, but the explicit forms of racism that come to the surface in class struggles over resources. Whiteness appears when the socially dominant race's ideology – the overall metaphor by which it lives (Leonardo 2016) – is at stake. To use a metaphor, Whiteness appears not only when the emperor is stripped of his clothes but, more importantly, when he is given the mirror that reveals his nakedness to himself. To people of colour, Whiteness is highly visible and not something new. However, as critical researchers of Whiteness often argue, White people are often blinded to its workings, but people of colour might assist them in revealing its workings. In other words, the presence of the Other, in the form of a non-assimilative body of colour on Norwegian territory, pressures White people to disrupt the *pedagogy of amnesia* (and its accompanied *imagined sameness ideology*) that helps to maintain the 'idyllic' Norwegian self-image as one of a peace-promoting, solidarity-loving and egalitarian people and as an exception to the imperial and colonial legacy. In the presence of the un-assimilative Other, the ideal Norwegian self-image as part of Nordic Exceptionalism and the Nordic Model – as a supreme, *flawless* White European *Herrenvolk* – is threatened.

Norwegian Whiteness, like other contexts in which Whiteness works, gains and sustains its power and domination (Gillborn 2005; Leonardo 2002) by its ability to remain invisible. Therefore, explicit forms of racist domination are not considered as proper means to support its *innocent* self-image. Notably, because Norwegian education policy and curriculum documents are explicitly positioned as promoters of social justice, the workings of Whiteness in these policy-produced discourses will likely focus on dominating this *new* non-assimilative Other through subtle, yet excessive, discursive practices of naming and representation that *assign* this Other to its 'rightful place' as a subjugated Other (Said 2003). This context also explains why Norwegian society welcome immigrants of colour because it is only in this way that the national self-image and Norwegian ideal of *imagined sameness* can both thrive and survive: We are nice people.

The policy chain: six Norwegian national policy and curriculum reform documents

Critical researchers on educational policy argue that because education is framed within normative public policy that expresses ends and means, and that authorises certain sets of values (Rizvi and Lingard 2010) that affect people's behaviour (Gulson and Webb 2012), power works through it (Brown and De Lissovoy 2011). Educational policy may be defined as ongoing institutional inertias, as converging processes and practices, but it may also be defined as texts (Ball 1994; Rizvi and Lingard 2010), for example, policy and curriculum reform documents. This article's analysis of the institutionalisation of Whiteness focuses on the following six policy and curriculum documents: one White Paper, *The Teacher:*

The Role and The Education (2008–2009) (Ministry of Education and Research 2009); one national primary school teacher education curriculum document, *National Guidelines for Primary School Teacher Education, Grades 1–7* (Ministry of Education and Research 2010); two primary school teacher education programme plans[6] and; two subject-specific plans. In line with critical researchers on education policy, the status of the empirical documents analysed in this article is perceived as consisting of normative value-laden documents of power that through their discourses on *cultural diversity* potentially affect teachers' (and other consumers') dispositions and hence, their pedagogical behaviour (Eberly, Rand, and O'Connor 2007; Garmon 2004; Robinson and Clardy 2011) in ways that may affect social justice (Mills and Ballantyne 2010). The documents are relevant because they constitute a *policy chain* (cf. Arneback and Quennerstedt 2016), representing different policy levels that are linked through how they are all part of the Norwegian teacher education reform of 2010. The documents are also related through their intertextuality (Fairclough 2015) in that they refer to, quote and sometimes copy one another. As such, this set of documents is interpreted as a central testimonial of a *new* discourse (Neumann 2001) on Norwegian primary school teacher education (Table 1).

Even though the White Paper (Ministry of Education and Research 2009) is not bound to legislation, it is relevant to analyse it because it exemplifies the dominating discourses of its time (cf. Mausethagen and Granlund 2012), provides a foundation for future legislation and serves as a reference point for government discourses (Neumann 2001). The two program plans and the two subject-specific plans have been retrieved from two Norwegian teacher education institutions (Institution A and Institution B) where Institution A has a *multicultural* profile. The two subject-specific plans from the mandatory 60-credit *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course were chosen because this course is the largest mandatory course in teacher education in Norway and because it is mandated to provide student teachers with an identity as teachers. Moreover, the course is mandated to ensure that critical thinking is a central component of teacher education (Ministry of Education and Research 2010, 8, 24).

Racialised discourses: methodology

In line with critical researchers on Whiteness and critical educational policy researchers, central to critical discourse theory is the concern regarding how naming and defining objects involves power and domination, and the way in which a term is used and thereby filled with meaning in certain contexts ultimately may have implications for how people can and do act upon it. As Dyer (1993, cited in Gillborn 1995, 18) argues, 'How we are seen determines in part how we are treated; how we treat others is based on how we see them', and importantly, 'such seeing comes from representation'. The workings of Whiteness in everyday dysconscious practices, for example, may *define* boundaries for inclusion and exclusion by considering who the members and non-members are of the dominant social group (Goldberg 1993, 2009). A common aim of both CWS and critical discourse analysis is the detection and deconstruction of social dominance through the analysis of the workings of power, dominance and hegemony. However, whilst scholars of CWS are concerned with deconstructing the social dominance of the White group, discourse analysts are concerned with deconstructing any group's social dominance, mainly through the critical analysis of discursive practices.

Table 1. The policy chain: authority and function of the six analysed documents.

Policy level	Document(s)	Authority and function
National	(1) White Paper 11 (2008–2009), *The Teacher: Their Role and Their Education*	• Written by policy-makers in the Ministry of Education. • A policy document to be implemented. • Not legally binding; however, it gives recommendations and promotes an overall and integrated future policy. • Provides a foundation for future legislation. • Prospects the Norwegian primary school teacher education reform of 2010, outlines the expectations for the teacher's role, teacher education and the curriculum. • Reflects discursive and social trends and ideas.
National	(2) *The National Guidelines for Primary School Teacher Education, Grades 1–7*	• Written by a committee which comprised of political actors mainly from educational institutions appointed by the Norwegian government. • A nationally binding curriculum document that indicates what constitutes high-quality primary school teacher education in Norway. • Builds upon White Paper 11. • Constitutes the foundation upon which the institution's programme plans are based.
Institutional	(3 & 4) *The Programme Plans for Primary School Teacher Education, Grades 1–7*	• Written by teacher educators at their specific institution. • Sets the general aims and areas of focus for the institution's teacher education. • Builds upon the national curriculum document. • Constitutes the foundation upon which the institution's subject-specific plans are based.
	(5 & 6) *The Subject-Specific Plans for Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge*	• Written by teacher educators working within the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge subject. • Builds upon the institution's programme plan. • States the aims and objectives for the specific subject at a specific institution and includes a general reading list.

In this article, the analysis of the ways in which Whiteness works through the discursive usage and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* draws mainly on the four interrelated analytical concepts from Goldberg's (1993, 2009) theorisation on a racialised[7] discourse: *representations* and *metaphors,* and *categorisation* and *hierarchy*. In line with critical researchers of Whiteness (e.g. Dyer 1997; Frankenberg 1993; hooks 1997; Leonardo 2002), central to Goldberg's (1993, 2009) theorisation on the racialised discourse is how 'racism is generally considered to be discrimination against others in virtue of their putatively, different racial membership' (2009, 295) and how it is manifested in the linguistic domination of *the Other* (e.g. Said 2003) by practices of naming, defining and categorising (Goldberg 2009) – or in other words, in discursive practices of *Othering*.

In line with Dyer (1993), Goldberg argues that *representations*, not truth, have the central impact within the fields of racialised discourses. Representations are informed by beliefs that presuppose values and norms (Goldberg 1993). They are discursive elements that are named, described, analysed and judged through racist expressions such as metaphors. Goldberg (2009) stresses that the unity of a racialised discourse is a 'product of' and 'product by' controlling metaphors (Goldberg 2009, 299). Perceived through the theoretical lenses of CWS, the metaphors of a racialised discourse need not only be concerned with degrading (racialised) groups of people, but also with metaphors or tropes of *White supremacy* (Gillborn 2008; Leonardo 2016).

Categorisation refers to the practice of classification inherited from the modern project of the seventeenth century. According to Goldberg (1993, 2009), the practice of categorisation is racial domination established in respect of a series of similarities and differences to other individuals or groups, generally based on the value of purity. Goldberg (2009) argues that exclusion based on definitions of difference is the most basic feature of a racialised discourse because this practice establishes the mark of entitlement and restriction, endowment and appropriation, and dominance and subjugation. As such, racial categorisation implies a racial hierarchy and, along with it, behavioural expectations (Goldberg 1993), whether interpreted culturally, linguistically (e.g. accent) or bodily (e.g. skin colour) (Goldberg 2009). Given that the racial hierarchy is promoted by a complex configuration of power relations and representations whereby the race of the classifiers is always placed at the hierarchical apex (cf. Dyer 1997), racial classification carries the moral implication that higher beings are considered to be of greater worth than lower ones are (Goldberg 2009).

The analytical concepts – *representations* and *metaphors*, and *categorisation* and *hierarchy* – provide tools that enable the detection of subtle points of racialised *objects* that, according to Goldberg (2006), otherwise would easily be overlooked. For example, they may reveal how discourses, whilst explicitly claiming to be anti-racist, may simultaneously incorporate subtle racialised patterns. As a methodological example, this article offers the field of CWS discursive tools and analytical strategies for understanding the subtle, minimal workings of the institutionalisation of Whiteness that manifests though *hidden* discursive patterns, related to the use and meaning making of apparently *innocent* and positive terms such as cultural diversity.

Analytical strategy: method

A three-step reading strategy (adapted from Mausethagen and Granlund 2012; Søreide 2007) was applied for the analysis of how Whiteness works through the discursive usage and

Table 2. A three-step reading strategy.

	Aim	Strategy for analysis	Empirical research questions
1st Reading	Obtain overview of terms related to *cultural diversity*	Word search Track and map terms and their relations	What terms are prominent and frequently used in relation to *cultural diversity*?
2nd Reading	Identify how *cultural diversity* is used and given meaning through representations of it as well as its related terms	Representations Metaphors Categorisation	How is *cultural diversity* and its related terms described? How is *cultural diversity* and its related terms categorised?
3rd Reading	Synthesise and discuss the representation and categorisation of *cultural diversity*	Synthesis Discursive patterns	What overall discursive patterns emerge?

meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*. The epistemological starting point for the analysis of how *cultural diversity* is used and made meaning of is founded on a central point made by Laclau and Mouffe's (2001) theorisation on how discourses form. Embracing the Saussurean post-structural idea of the relationship between the signifier and the signified, Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that in the process of discursive formation there exists a continuous political power/knowledge struggle between discursive terms in a fight for the hegemonic meaning making of central discursive terms dependent on the use, frequency, proximity and manner of other terms to which they are related (see 106–114, 127–130). For this study, this means that the meaning given to the term *cultural diversity* could be found not only through explicit definitions of the term, but also through mapping the very terms used in direct or indirect relation to it – its meaning is *formed* by a constellation of terms that again is embedded and formed by the totality of the discursive formation.

Even though the three-step reading strategy presented in the table below might appear schematically rigid, it is important to stress that whilst analysing the text, I moved back and forth between the analytical steps (Table 2).

In the first reading, the term *cultural diversity* served as the starting point for obtaining an overview of terms related to it within the documents. Here, a *word search* was applied as the main analytical strategy for identifying and mapping terms appearing prominently and frequently in relation to it. From this first reading, excerpts were drawn for a deeper analysis of the usage of the term *cultural diversity* and its related terms. The second reading then focused on these excerpts and on how the term *cultural diversity* and its related terms were used specifically in relational modes of *representations* and descriptions through, for example, the use of metaphors and ways of *categorising*. The third reading was based on the previous two readings and aimed to synthesise and to detect overall discursive patterns that emerged from the detected representations and categorisations.

Patterns of racialised discourses in the policy chain

Interestingly, the three-step reading strategy highlighted how the documents generally featured discursive inconsistencies and vagueness, found through how the central terms were not discussed, were left undefined, and were used interchangeably and/or in conflation with one another, or with other central discursive terms. For example, it highlighted how the term *cultural diversity* was not explicitly elaborated on or defined according to its ubiquity, but

was rather related to, or used interchangeably with a set of other undefined terms, mainly the term *multicultural,* but also *multilinguistic, immigrant, cultural and linguistic diversity, linguistic minority, minority* and *diversity.*[8] Nonetheless, what is central to this article is how the terms, their descriptions and their representations indicated that Whiteness was an embedded part of the meaning making constellation. More precisely, Whiteness was found to be related to the usage and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*, manifested in three discursive patterns of representation that highlighted: (1) three hierarchically arranged pupil group categories; (2) descriptions that placed these pupil group categories as either superior Norwegian or as inferior non-Norwegian, and; (3) the role of student teacher as a *political actors of assimilation.* Understanding the teacher student role as a political actor of assimilation, in this article, is an idea I have developed from the Althusserian theory of how there in ideological discourse are 'no civilians, only soldiers, that is, ideological subjects'. (Althusser 2003, 55; cited in Leonardo 2005, 409). Important to stress is that in this article's analysis, I am *not* concerned with actual student teachers (nor actual pupils) in actual classrooms. I am concerned with discursive representations. Discursive representations are central to discourse analysis because they, in line with policy, affect 'real' behavior. As such, discursive representations can *themselves* be understood as potential political actors of assimilation. As I will discuss later, the ideal student teacher role discursively conjured by these policy and curriculum documents appears to be a political actor pursuing, *dysconsciously,* an ideal of assimilation.

In the following, I first begin by presenting an analysis of the discursive taxonomy of the three pupil group categories: *the Norwegian*, *the Sami* and *the multicultural.* Second, I provide an analysis of how this taxonomy organised the pupil group categories into a racialised hierarchy, mainly based on representations of them as either superior and Norwegian or as inferior and non-Norwegian. Third, I argue about the discursive representations of the student teacher role's centrality in relation to the discursive representations of the racialised hierarchical taxonomy of the three main pupil group categories and suggest that the discursive represented role may be understood as promoting ideas of it as a *political actor of assimilation.*

Racial taxonomy of the three pupil group categories

> *The Norwegian pupil group category:* In the policy and curriculum documents, the Norwegian pupil group was categorised as distinctively different from the *multicultural pupil,* found both through how these pupil groups were explicitly related to the term *background* and by more implicitly being contrasted to the *multicultural school.* To have positive role models with a multicultural background is important. Multicultural teachers have experience that is valuable both for pupils with a multicultural background and for pupils with a Norwegian background. (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 32)[9]

> The multicultural school is about all pupils, also the majority Norwegian [pupils], and the school is an important arena for cultural dialogue and understanding and for the fundamental democratic elements. (Institution A's programme plan)

In the first quote above, the different categorisation of the Norwegian and the multicultural pupil groups was found in the focus placed on how these pupil groups (including the multicultural teachers) are assumed to have different backgrounds. In the second quote, the different categorisation of the Norwegian and the multicultural pupil groups is found in

the phrase: *The multicultural school is about all pupils, also the majority Norwegian* [*pupils*]. Despite this phrase perhaps being read as an attempt to discursively *place the majority Norwegian* as part of the *multicultural school*, it may in fact more subtly communicate the opposite message, because a discursive distinction is established between the Norwegian majority as a category in its own right. This categorisation reflects a subtle representation of the Norwegian pupil group as not *originally* part of the multicultural school. As such, the different categorisation of the Norwegian pupil majority and the multicultural pupil has a similar pattern to a racialised discourse in that it *defines* the boundaries for inclusion and exclusion based on who is considered as a member and non-member of the dominant social group (Goldberg 1993, 2009). Despite the use of the term *multicultural* pupil, implying the existence of heterogeneity in Norwegian society, what is not yet evident (at this point in the analysis) is how the categorisation of the multicultural pupil group is established as the Other (Said 2003) through racialised patterns that *define* the boundaries for entitlements and restrictions, dominance and subjugation (Goldberg 1993, 2009). This, I will discuss later.

The Sami pupil group category: In the documents, the Sami pupil group was categorised as both part of *something* considered Norwegian as well as a linguistic minority. When the Sami group was categorised as part of what is considered Norwegian, it was represented with emphasis on its rights, how it has special status as an indigenous people and a special position within Norwegian society (as part of the [Norwegian] common cultural heritage). These descriptions of the Sami pupil were always related to a description of how the student teachers were expected to support it. When it was represented as a linguistic minority – a category found to be *Other* than Norwegian – it was related to two discursive modifications.

> *Sami conditions and Sami pupils' rights:* Elementary school teacher education shall qualify the [teacher] students for maintaining the education of the Sami conditions, Sami children's rights and the Sami people as a recognised indigenous people. Sami culture and social life is an important part of the [Norwegian] common cultural heritage. Education for Sami pupils has a special position within Norwegian elementary education. Student teachers must therefore gain knowledge about the Sami content in the national guidelines for elementary education and about Sami pupils' rights. (Ministry of Education and Research 2010, 9)

> Awareness about the cultural variation in terms of upbringing will be crucial when meeting with Sami and other linguistic minority pupils, whereby one should consider both what is special and what is common for all children in Norway. (Ministry of Education and Research 2010, 16)

In the first quote above, the categorisation of the Sami pupil group as part of the Norwegian common cultural heritage is discursively supported by the emphasis being placed on the importance of its *rights*, and by descriptions of how the student teacher must gain knowledge about this pupil group (in the curriculum documents) and its rights. Moreover, this statement is also supported by the statement concerning elementary school teacher education qualifying student teachers to maintain the education of Sami conditions, Sami children's rights and the Sami people as a recognised indigenous people. This is one example of how representations of the student teacher role as a *political actor of assimilation* starts to emerge as central to the pupil group categorisation. This, I discuss later.

In the second quote, the categorisation of the Sami pupil group as a linguistic minority might be interpreted as contradictory to the first categorisation. However, two discursive moderations co-occur with it. In the first, the Sami is related to the term *cultural variation*. This modification is interpreted as such because the term *cultural variation* co-occurs only with the Sami pupil, meaning that with the term *linguistic minority,* the term *cultural*

difference generally co-occurs throughout the documents. In the second discursive moderation, the Sami is related to descriptions of it as *common for all children in Norway*. The two discursive moderations are interesting because they can be interpreted as toning down the initial categorisation of the Sami pupil as a *linguistic minority* – as Other (Said 2003) to the Norwegian. The Sami pupil group as doubly categorised, as part of the Norwegian category and as a linguistic minority, may be interpreted as discursively positioned in limbo: it is part of what is considered Norwegian, yet is not entirely coterminous with being Norwegian (the dominant social group) (Goldberg 1993, 2009). What is starting to emerge in the analysis of the Sami pupil category that will become even more prominent in the analysis of the multicultural pupil category, as discussed above, is how Whiteness produces its own indivisibility by creating and extensively focusing on categories of Otherness.

The multicultural pupil group category: As already pointed out, the multicultural pupil group category was categorised as Other to the Norwegian pupil group category in the policy and curriculum documents. Moreover, it was also generally represented as part of two contrasting sub-categories: either as a contributor to school resources, or as a user of school resources. These representations of this pupil category are highly problematic when seen in relation to the representations of the Norwegian and the Sami pupil groups. This is because representations of it might allude to expectations of the multicultural pupil group as only being either positive (because of its usefulness as a resource) or negative (because it uses resources), and never as both (a resource and a resource user) – like other individual pupils in school.

When the multicultural pupil group category was represented as a contributor to the school's resources, the resources were described by the terms *multicultural resources and multilingualism, cultural and linguistic diversity* and *cultural and linguistic diversity competency*, and it was generally related to descriptions of the student teacher's role in relation to these resources.

> The international understanding may be strengthened when consciously making use of the multicultural resources and the multilingualism that now already exists in all learning environments in Norway. (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 26)

> In the 1–7 [teacher] education, the student teachers shall acquire research-based insights into cultural and linguistic diversity amongst the pupils in the school. In this way, they will be able to build further on the cultural and linguistic competency within the pupil group. (Institution A's programme plan)

In the above quotes, the student teacher is both encouraged to make use of, obliged (*the student teachers shall*) to acquire research-based insights into, and build further on the multicultural pupils' (multi-)cultural and (multi-)linguistic resources and competencies. This is another example of how representations of the student teacher role as a *political actor of assimilation* starts to emerge as central to the pupil group categorisation. The categorisation of the multicultural pupil group, represented as a resource contributor and related to the student teacher role, may be interpreted as resembling a racialised discourse in that it involves a *definition* of the boundaries for inclusion and exclusion, entitlements and restrictions. Despite the claim that the multicultural pupil group category already exists in Norwegian society (in the form of multicultural resources and multilingualism) – a claim that also might be understood as a confession of the non-existence of the Norwegian *imagined sameness* (Gullestad 2002) – it is nonetheless also considered as a non-member of the dominant social group, as exemplified above. Moreover, the multicultural pupil group's (multi-)cultural and

(multi-)linguistic resources and competencies and this pupil group category's enjoyment of these, which, from a CWS perspective may be referred to as its property (Harris 1993), appear to be restricted by the student teacher's described role as a utiliser of these (presumably for the *good* of the class). Through the perspective of a racialised discourse, the boundaries of the multicultural pupil group's inclusion thus also seem to be based on the student teacher's ability to dominate (: use) and distribute its entitlements. In line with historical patterns of Whiteness and property, the discursive pattern here invokes ideas of how property is made White (e.g. Harris 1993; Orozco 2011). Subjugated by the student teacher, the multicultural pupil, represented through descriptions of this pupil group category's property – the (multi-) cultural and (multi-)linguistic resources and competency – is reduced to a *tool* that is useful for other (merely White and majority Norwegian) pupils' learning (e.g. their international understanding). Focusing on the role of the student teacher, his/her role might be interpreted as an anti-Robin Hood story: the student teacher is expected to take *property* from an already marginalised group and provide this to those already represented as *privileged*. The multicultural pupil group category, represented as a resource contributor, despite initially being assumed to *own* its own resources and competencies, is assumed to not actually be entitled to its own *property* (cf. Harris 1993; Orozco 2011). As such, this pupil group category is discriminated against by an active student teacher, when compared to the Norwegian and Sami pupil group categories.

In the documents, the representations of the multicultural pupil group category as a user of the school's resources were described by the terms *multicultural, immigrant, linguistic minority*, *pupil diversity* and *minority,* terms that were occasionally used interchangeably and in conflation with one another, something that discursively created the illusion that these *entities* referred to the same discursive *object.* Moreover, descriptions and representations of this pupil category were found in multiple places throughout the policy and curriculum documents. A main pattern to emerge regarding the way in which this category was represented was found in subtle discursive hints or cues (McVee 2014) of Othering and exclusion, by ways of representing it that hinted at this pupil group category's visibly different bodily features, its assumed non-belonging in school and its assumed cognitive inferiority. When the multicultural group category was represented via hints towards its visibly different bodily features, this was done through the use of a metaphor.

> (WP 11) Multicultural Norway is mirrored in the school. Since 1980, the immigrant population has more than trebled. The diversity amongst pupils and parents has increased. Diversity, combined with the principles of equality and adjusted education, demands great degrees of flexibility and adjustment. (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 42)

The metaphorical claim that multicultural Norway can be *mirrored in the school* elicits ideas of this pupil group category as having a different appearance to the Norwegian pupil category, for example, a different skin colour or clothes that are considered visibly different. However, when this metaphor is coupled with the claim that *the immigrant population has trebled* since the 1980s and how the *diversity amongst the pupils and parents has increased*, these representations allude to the children of immigrants. The multicultural pupil is represented as someone who is not *originally* Norwegian. Thus, these representations of the multicultural pupil group category as *mirrored in the school* and as *children of immigrants* can be described as discursive objectifications (Essed 1991). Essed (1991) defines objectification as a racialised categorisation based upon the notion of *someone* looking different, and as such, implies that this Other (Said 2003) does not *naturally* belong (Essed 1991). Moreover,

in the quote, the coupling of these descriptions and representations with descriptions of how this pupil group category demands flexibility and adjustment hints at various sets of other representations of this pupil category in the analysed documents that elicit ideas of how this pupil group category is assumed to be cognitively inferior, and therefore assumed to belong in *special education*.[10] For example, the resource user was described as representing 'challenges for the work in school' (Ministry of Education and Research 2010, 16) and for the student teacher's 'particular work areas' (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 8). It was described as having 'special learning challenges' (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 21) and assumed to be in need of concretisation and visualisation in order to optimise its learning and to create good learning frameworks for this particular group (Institution A's programme plan). Interestingly, what is common for these above-listed claims and assumptions is that they are not elaborated on.[11] Thus, the statements leave it up to the reader to do the analysis. However, what these representations might do (Foucault 1989) is to create ideas of the linguistic minority pupil group category as deprived and in need of extra facilitation, thus using a larger portion of the school's resources than other pupil group categories do. The discursive representation of the multicultural pupil group category in relation to special education may furthermore also be interpreted as resembling a pattern of institutionalised racism that is already too familiar to critical researchers of education; namely, how pupils of colour and minoritised pupils are persistently overrepresented in special education (e.g. Baratan 2008; Pihl 2010). From the CWS and racialised discourse perspectives, these representations involve definitions of the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion based on how the resource user is represented as a non-member of the dominant social group and by its exclusion and submersion into *special education*.

The pupil group categories as superior and Norwegian or inferior and Non-Norwegian

Looking more closely at the overall patterns of the representations of the three pupil categories, as presented in the preceding examples, two further overriding discursive patterns emerged. These patterns consisted of sets of terms that either connoted highly conceptual abstracts that motivated ideas of advanced cognitive skills (e.g. *knowledge, understanding, dialogue, democracy*), or of lower level conceptual abstract terms that motivated ideas of tangible concrete objects or concrete practices (e.g. *difference, [something] mirrored, challenges, practice, visualisation* and *learning frames*). Perhaps not surprisingly, whereas the terms motivating advanced cognitive skills were related to the Norwegian and the Sami pupil group categories, the terms motivating tangible concrete objects or concrete practices were related to the multicultural pupil group category (Table 3). As such, these two overriding discursive patterns could be interpreted as racialised discourses that, on the one hand, represent ideas of a cognitive superior and civilized *us* and, on the other hand, a cognitive, inferior and uncivilized subordinate *Other* (Said 2003). Moreover, what these contrasting representations of the pupil group categories might do (Foucault 1989) is not only support the previously mentioned ideas of the multicultural pupil group represented as a resource user and a non-member of the dominant social group, but also justify the ideas of its exclusion and submersion into *special education*. As such, this might be one of the ways in which Whiteness discursively works to constitute the status quo of unequal educational outcomes (Smith 2013).

Table 3. Terms alluding to whether pupils may be considered Norwegian or Non-Norwegian.

Binary oppositions	Norwegian		Non-Norwegian
Pupil category	The Norwegian pupil	The Sami pupil	The multicultural pupil
Related Descriptors	• knowledge and understanding • dialogue • democracy • individual	• knowledge and understanding • dialogue • democracy • linguistic minority • rights • cultural variation • upbringing • special and common for all children in Norway	• cultural difference • mirrored in school • background • made use of • challenges • special learning challenges • practice • practical aesthetical forms of learning • visualisation • good learning frames

Generally, the findings of how Whiteness worked through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* by categorising three pupil groups and developing a taxonomy can be argued to be organised in a racial hierarchy based on the following four contrasting discursive representations: (1) Whilst the Norwegian pupil group was categorised as a member of the dominating social group, the Sami and the multicultural pupil groups were categorised as non-members of the dominant social group. (2) Whilst the Norwegian and the Sami groups were represented through patterns of terms invoking cognitive superiority, the multicultural pupils were represented through patterns of terms invoking cognitive inferiority and concrete practices. (3) Whilst the Norwegian pupil group and the Sami pupil group categories were represented without their bodily features being alluded to, the multicultural pupil group was represented through a metaphor pointing at its bodily features (e.g. the group's skin colour or clothing that was deemed to be different). As such, the Norwegian and the Sami pupil categories may be interpreted as *invisibly present*, in contrast to the multicultural pupil category. (4) Whilst the Norwegian pupil group was assumed to possess rights and other privileges (e.g. of individuality) and the Sami pupil group was represented as possessing rights, the multicultural pupil group either possessed multilingual competency and resources, or was a user of the school's resources. However, the multicultural pupil's attributes were, contrary to the Norwegian and Sami pupils' attributes, assumed to be handed over to the student teacher and used by him or her for the benefit of the school (Table 4).

In brief, Whiteness worked through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity* by producing and promoting a racialised hierarchical taxonomy of three pupil group categories based on ideas of them being: (1) more or less Norwegian; (2) cognitively able or challenged; (3) invisible, yet present as abstractions, or visibly present as bodies; and as (4) entitled or restricted in relation to the ownership, use and enjoyment of *property* (cf. Harris 1993).

As noted in the analysis, the discursive representation of the pupil group categories, particularly the representation of the multicultural pupil group category, oftentimes co-occurred with descriptions and representations of the student teacher role in the policy and curriculum documents. In the next section, I further discuss the centrality of the discursive representations of the student teacher role and suggest it may be interpreted as one of a *political actor of assimilation*.

The student teacher role: a political actor of assimilation

As noted, discursive representations of the student teacher's role as a *political actor of assimilation* initially emerged through discursive patterns of representations present in almost all the above-quoted examples. These representations were related to discursive representations of the Sami pupil group category (e.g. as a maintainer of the education of the Sami conditions, their rights and their recognition as an indigenous people) and the multicultural pupil group category (e.g. through the anti-Robin Hood story and its implicit involvement in the exclusion and submersion of the resource user into *special education*). What is important to stress is that, here, the term *actor* refers to the *discursive representations* of the student teacher role category and not to actual student teachers. Additionally, the concept of *assimilation* does not only refer to the process by which a person, thing or entity *acquires* the sociological and psychological characteristics of a group but also to the

Table 4. Representations of the three main pupil categories.

Pupil categories/representations	The Norwegian pupil	The Sami pupil	The multicultural pupil	
			As a resource contributor	As a resource user
Norwegian, Non-Norwegian	Norwegian	Part of what is considered Norwegian – *the cultural heritage*	*Not part of what is considered Norwegian*	*Not part of what is considered Norwegian*
Cognitive descriptors	Related to abstract terms	Related to abstract terms	Related to terms referring to concrete objects/practices and to special education	Related to terms referring to concrete objects/practices, learning challenges and special education
Visible, Invisible	'invisible' but present	'Invisible' and visible (when categorised as part of the linguistic minority)	Visibly present in school and society	Visibly present in school and society
Properties/Possessions	Possesses rights	Possesses rights (*Human Rights*) and has a special social status	Has (multi-) cultural and linguistic resources and competency that ought to be made use of by the teacher/student teacher for the benefit of the school	A user of the school's resources

acquisition of something through the ideological workings of Whiteness and, hence, into the discursive and racial positions that align with the ideology of White supremacy. In the Norwegian context, discursive assimilation is not necessarily about *acquiring* the ideal of *imagined sameness* (because, as already noted, this ideal has its limitations), but about the processes of *acquiring* that allows the nationalistic and colour-blind imagined sameness ideology to thrive and survive as it works to ensure the hegemonic status quo of the White Norwegian racial group. As such, assimilation, in the way this term is used as an analytical concept in this article, refers to a form of assimilative discursive racial stratification (e.g. manifested in hierarchical representations of pupil group categories).

In the policy and curriculum documents, the discursive representations of the student teacher role as *a political actor of assimilation* analysed in this article did not emerge through isolated passages, but through the ways it was related to the discursive representations of the pupil group categories: *cultural difference*, having a *clear value-foundation* and *Norwegianness*. When the discursive representations of the student teacher role were related to *cultural difference*, there were existing assumptions of how this difference was expected to be transformed and assimilated by the student teacher into something more acceptable in a White Norwegian context.

> [Student] teachers must have knowledge about and understanding of the multicultural society. This involves attention to cultural differences, and skills to handle these as a positive resource. (Ministry of Education and Research 2010, 9)

> In the 1–7 [teacher] education, it is a goal that the student [teachers] shall be able to reflect academically on cultural differences and [should be able to] facilitate constructive cultural meetings in the classroom. (Institution A's programme plan)

In the examples given above, *cultural difference* is represented through assumptions of this difference being undesirable and that, therefore, must be transformed and assimilated into something more desirable, such as *positive resources* or *constructive cultural meetings in the classroom*. Even in the student teachers' practical role, the two examples are quite different regarding the assimilation of *cultural difference* –in the first example, the role is presented as more hands-on, defined as one who pays *attention to* and has the *skills to handle these* cultural differences (a description that might elicit ideas of these differences being difficult or problematic) and, in the second example, as one who *facilitates* – the desired outcome appears to be aimed at the same result: to transform and assimilate the undesired difference into something regarded as more desirable, or perhaps less threatening, to the Norwegian imagined sameness context. Although both examples initially describe how the *student teachers must have knowledge about and understanding of the multicultural society* and how they *shall be able to reflect academically on cultural differences*, descriptions that might invoke ideas of critical thinking–also a central component that the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course is mandated to ensure in teacher education (Ministry of Education and Research 2010 8, 24) – other discursive representations of the student teacher role unfortunately overshadow this interpretation. The student teacher role presented above is indicative of how the student teacher role is discursively represented with the expectance of acting uncritically. Moreover, the discursive representation of how the student teacher role is seen as one that eradicates difference, transforming and assimilating it into *positive resources* and *constructive cultural meetings in the classroom* that are, in line with previous representations, presumably also expected to be utilised for the benefit of the school–can be read as echoing discursive patterns that represent the student teacher role as a central actor

in an anti-Robin Hood story. Furthermore, when considering, as I have noted earlier in this article, that *cultural difference* was found to co-occur with descriptions of the linguistic minority–a pupil group category generally represented as Other (Said 2003)– then, for the student teacher to observe cultural differences implies an observation of the Other (e.g. visibly different bodily features, the children of immigrants or other pupils who are possibly part of the multicultural Norway that is claimed to be 'mirrored in the school' [Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 42]). If it is the case that *cultural differences* refer to the Other, then a paradox emerges: The discursive representation of the student teacher as a *political actor of assimilation* becomes one of exclusion or, perhaps more precisely, one of assimilative racial stratification, because assimilation into the Norwegian imagined sameness ideal is an impossibility for those pupils who are simply not able to *Whitewash* completely. As such, the representation of the student teacher role in relation to cultural difference, when this difference refers to the minoritised Other of colour, exemplifies the limitations of the Norwegian ideal of *imagined sameness* (Gullestad 2002). In sum, the discursively represented student teacher's role as a political actor of assimilation, in relation to *cultural difference*, appears to encourage racial stratification through processes of Othering and exclusion.

Further encouragements of the discursive representations of the student teacher's role as being a *political actor of assimilation* of difference were encouraged through statements in the documents that promote ideas of how the student teachers should have a clear value-foundation.

> … the education must take its starting point in the foundational ways of thinking and the values that gather us as a society. A clear value-foundation and a wide cultural understanding is foundational for an inclusive social community and for a learning community in [which] diversity and difference is respected. The value-foundation is further concretised in the curriculum. (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 10)

> *Ethics.* The teacher must act in line with the value-foundation that is constituted in the school's mandate and concretised in the curriculum. In the education, the teacher must contribute to develop the pupils' understanding for and ability to act in compliance with this value-foundation. (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 15)

In the first excerpt quoted above, a *clear value-foundation* is represented as something fundamentally *good*, with respect to both *diversity* and *difference*, found in statements of how this clear value-foundation and wide cultural understanding are *foundational for an inclusive social community and for a learning community in [which] diversity and difference is respected,* and in how such a *clear value-foundation gathers us as a [Norwegian] society.* However, like many other statements in the documents, what it means for the student teacher to have a clear value-foundation other than the implication of certain *foundational ways of thinking* and *values that unite us as a society* (Ministry of Education and Research 2009; 11) is not explained. Although the phrases *wide cultural understanding, inclusive social community* and *diversity and difference is respected* sound positive and promising, the overall detected meaning makings found in these documents nonetheless challenge such phrasings. Interestingly, in both quoted examples, explicit references are made to the educational curriculum for a better understanding of what the *clear values-foundation* entails. Such descriptions are found mainly in the Norwegian national Core Curriculum (Ministry of Education and Research 2017). However, this document has been criticised for its nationalistic and excluding discourse (e.g. Breidlied 2015). Drawing on discourses that have nationalistic and exclusionary characters, the policy and curriculum documents'

representation of the student teacher role regarding representations of *diversity*, *difference* and having a clear *value-foundation* may thus be read as further encouragement of representations of the ideal student teacher role as being one of a political actor of assimilation, particularly with respect to ideas of assimilation as a matter of racial stratification that, in turn, work to sustain an overall ideology of White Norwegian supremacy and the imagined sameness ideology. As such, the discursive representations of the student teacher as a political actor of assimilation of racial stratification, highlighted here, indirectly and subtly work to justify and support representations of the student teacher's role as one that dominates and subjugates the multicultural resource user Other into special education.

In the policy and curriculum documents, the ideology of White Norwegian supremacy moreover subtly presents itself through how the language of these documents assumes a White *Norwegian* reader and a White *Norwegian* student teacher and, thus, how the documents normalise this usage in such a way as to produce its invisibility. This claim is based not only on the fact that these documents are written solely by White Norwegian knowledge-promoting actors of teacher education (see Table 1) but also on these discursive representations of *Norwegianness*.

> It [the school] shall transfer knowledge and skills, culture and values from one family generation [*slektsledd*] to another. (Ministry of Education and Research 2009, 9)

This statement, regarding how *knowledge and skills, culture and values shall* be transferred through *family* generations is relevant to the understanding of the patterns of representation of the student teacher's role as a *political actor of assimilation* because it infers ideas of what being Norwegian *looks like* (Gullestad 2002): This statement suggests that it is something one is born with (one is White) and that *being Norwegian* is something that simply cannot be achieved (the skin colour one is born with cannot be changed). The discursive representations of *Norwegianness* in the policy and curriculum documents are interesting when seen in relation to the representation of the student teacher role as an assimilator regarding descriptions of *cultural difference*, because they yet again confirm the teacher education role being a concern with the paradox of Othering and exclusion of the Other of colour from the White Norwegian *imagined sameness* ideal that, nonetheless, supports processes of 'inclusion' based on processes of racial stratification.

When re-examining and comparing the overall analysis in this article, the discursive representations of the student teacher role as a political actor of assimilation, where assimilation is understood as racial stratification, involves – among other issues – not only supporting the Sami pupil group category's special social position and rights but also property exploitation, Othering and exclusion and subjugation of the multicultural pupil group category into special education. In the next section, I argue the possible implications of the institutionalisation of Whiteness teacher education policy in relation to racial justice in Norway and elsewhere.

Racialised discourses and their implications for teacher education policy

This article has deconstructed and made visible how Whiteness works through the use and meaning making of the term *cultural diversity*. Functioning as a synecdoche, the analysis of *cultural diversity* and its inextricably related constellation of terms has shown that Norwegian policy and curriculum documents contain discursive racialised patterns produced by ways of representing both pupil group categories and the student teacher role. Taken together,

I have described how these racialised discursive patterns promote ideas of assimilation as racial stratification by the way in which the patterns work to support the overall ideology of White supremacy. In this final part of the article, I link the discursive representations of the pupil group categories and the discursive representations of the student teacher role with implications for three central areas of teacher education policy with respect to racial justice: (1) classroom practice, (2) national ideology, and (3) future policy implementation.

The first central area of implications (classroom practice) concerns how the patterns of racialised discourse found in this article's analysis are highly problematic when seen in relation to classroom practice. Whilst the analysed policy and curriculum documents are explicitly positioned as promoters of social justice, through the methods that the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course promises to ensure critical thinking as a central component of Norwegian teacher education (Ministry of Education and Research 2010; 8, 24), the law-binding mandate promotes democracy, equality, a scientific way of thinking and the deterrence of all forms of discrimination (Lovdata 2013). The mandate also supports the portrayal of the Norwegian self-image as one of peace-promotion, solidarity, and egalitarian (Gullestad 2002) people who are part of Nordic Exceptionalism and the Nordic Model; however, the analysis of the policy and curriculum documents in this article, contrary to their stated positions, shows that these documents implicitly and discursively produce and promote ideas of racial hierarchy, un-critical actions, autocracy, social inequality and racism. These findings are troubling because, as we have learned from previous studies, policy discourses authorise values that affect people's dispositions and pedagogical behaviour in ways that may affect social justice (e.g. Eberly, Rand, and O'Connor 2007; Garmon 2004; Gulson and Webb 2012; Mills and Ballantyne 2010; Robinson and Clardy 2011; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). Therefore, in line with previous research that points to how conceptualisations of terms in discourses constituted by knowledge-producing institutions work through educational curricula and practice (Afdal and Nerland 2014), the discourse of the policy and curriculum documents may affect everyday school practices (Arneback and Quennerstedt 2016) in terms of how educators' discursive pedagogy may *dysconsciously* reflect patterns of representation and categorisation similar to the racialised patterns produced in the policy and curriculum documents. For example, teachers may address whom they assume to be Norwegian pupils through a language affirming their cognitive superiority (e.g. using terms such as *knowledge, understanding, dialogue,* and *democracy*) in contrast to how they might address whom they assume are the multicultural pupils (using a language that affirms their cognitive inferiority). Given that these teachers adopt discursive patterns similar to those produced in the policy and curriculum documents, and understand their role as being one similar to that of a *political actor of assimilation*, they may at best understand their role as one affirming the Sami pupil group's role of being placed in limbo (having both a special position and rights, and being a linguistic minority) and perform anti-Robin Hood acts in relation to the assumed multicultural-resourced pupil's property. However, at worst, teachers may subjugate the assumed multicultural resource user pupil into a position in special education. Nonetheless, the result will be the re-production of a racial, hierarchical taxonomy in which the pupils are schooled as first-, second- and third-class citizens. In line with previous research, this article exemplifies not only how the ideology of Whiteness, manifested as subtle racialised patterns of White supremacy, in policy discourses might be *enacted* (Braun, Maguire, and Ball 2010), but also how these subtle discursive patterns might preserve the unequal racial status quo of unequal educational outcomes (Smith 2013).

The second central area of implication (national ideology) concerns the inherent tension in how the policy and curriculum documents, on the one hand, are explicitly presented as promoting social justice, yet how, on the other hand, they subtly become both the products and producers of a racialised discourse of representation and categorisation, hierarchy, Othering and exclusion–a result of the Norwegian *imagined sameness* ideal that is grounded in a socially accepted 'pedagogy of amnesia' (Leonardo 2002, 34) – *frees* these documents from the important responsibility of recognising the historical legacy of imperialism and colonialism. This freedom occurs because the documents' explicit positionality presents a polished facade that glosses over the subtle and 'invisible' patterns in which the racialised discourses are formed and produced. I argue the following: The descriptions of Norway as part of Nordic Exceptionalism and the Nordic Model, the refusal of *race* as an analytical concept and the understanding of racism as explicit actions of hate can be understood as re-producing a historical pedagogical amnesia that *blinds* Norwegians to the idea of Whiteness working as a social construct at the intersection between Norway's national past and its contemporary political and economic interests. This amnesic behaviour silences the workings of Whiteness and, in turn, leads to an understanding of contemporary Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents as anti-racist promoters of social justice. In line with Gillborn's (2005) understanding of White supremacy in the British education policy context, this article suggests that White supremacy and the way it works through Norwegian teacher education policy and curriculum documents' discourses is normalised as taken for granted, and political discursive routines are made invisible because they only manifest through subtle discursive micro level meaning making patterns. Importantly, these micro level patterns discursively support the ideological workings of White supremacy–in the Norwegian context, the ideal Norwegian self-image, the pedagogy of amnesia and the colour-blind nationalistic ideal of *imagined sameness*–at the political macro level.

Given that teacher education policy discourses are enacted by central knowledge-promoting actors, the third central area of implications (future policy implementation) concerns what future teachers need to know and what they *actually* need to do to promote social justice. Following international critical researchers of Whiteness, two aspects are highlighted as central for future teachers' knowledge and competency about the promotion of racial justice.

First, teachers need knowledge about the realities of history that counter the existing 'pedagogy of amnesia' (Leonardo 2002, 34) so that they can come to understand how this amnesia actually works to sustain the doxic Norwegian (including the wider Nordic) self-image. One place to start, in the Nordic context, could be to understand that the imagery of the Nordic Model and Nordic Exceptionalism is constructed as *ideals* that portray *us* (Nordics) as slightly more *innocent and good* compared to our fellow White Europeans (e.g. Van Riemsdijk 2010). However, to understand this concept, we first need to embrace a *new* discourse that reconceptualises the terms *race* and *racism* in ways that that recognise these phenomena as current workings of an imperial and colonial legacy and as an institutionalisation of Whiteness that manifests in subtle racialised discursive patterns (e.g. teacher education policy and curriculum documents). In line with arguments promoted in current education policy research (Arneback and Quennerstedt 2016; Gillborn 2005), this article argues that teachers must come to understand that racism is not primarily about individual actions or beliefs, but that these are, as critical researchers of Whiteness have long argued (e.g. Scheurich 1993), only social effects. For example, future teachers must understand that the terrorist attacks by Anders Breivik on 22 July 2011 were not exceptional actions

of hate performed by a neo-Nazi mentally disturbed person, but rather symptomatic of a much bigger problem[12] (Muller Myrdahl 2014) that projected Norway onto the global stage of colonial, imperial and ideologically motivated racist violence[13] (Kershen 2012). In short, to promote social justice education, future teachers must be able to link the *pedagogy of amnesia* and the doxic ideal of *imagined sameness* and understand how such ideologies currently forge a *polished* national self-image that hides a 'dirty' and violent past.[14] This mental legacy of 'amnesia' requires that future teachers not only learn to 'diagnose', but also to 'treat' and 'cure'.

Second, future teachers must learn to accept the fact that we are all racially positioned (Scheurich 1993) and that, through our positionality, we partake in domination and sub-jugation of the Other by producing racialised discursive patterns that name and define it as such. However, this is not an easy task, because our positionality is embedded in the lies of *Nordic Exceptionalism* and the *Nordic Model* that blind us to our imperial and colonial Nordic legacy (e.g. Loftsdóttir and Jensen 2012). The theoretical perceptive of critical Whiteness studies and racialised discourses (Goldberg 1993, 2009), combined with a discourse analytical strategy (Laclau and Mouffe 2001) have made it possible to both detect and deconstruct the workings of Whiteness at the discursive micro level and, moreover, to link how these workings sustain a national ideology at the political macro level. In line with previous research on teacher education (Matias and Grosland 2016; Smith 2013), this article argues that future teachers need the competency to utilise critical discursive analytical tools for deconstruction, similar to those offered in this article. This competency is important not only because of the current rise in immigration through which the presence of the un-assimilative Other on Norwegian territory might imply that the *imagined sameness* ideology will frequently be proved false but also because these tools can enable teachers to detect the racialised patterns produced in teacher education policy discourses, as well as in themselves, that otherwise might be overlooked as mainstream political discursive routines (Gillborn 2005).

It is my hope that future teacher education policy and curriculum documents implement the abovementioned aspects of knowledge and competency as centrally important aspects of future teacher education and as means to ensure the production of the socially just discourses their explicit positionality *claims* to promote: that is, unless they want to allow *race* to continue to slip in 'through the back door' (Gullestad 2004, 177).

Notes

1. The expression *the Global South* refers here to the so-called developing countries, mainly in Africa and Asia (cf. Thomas, Changezi, and Enstad's [2016] definition).
2. The Norwegian *Core Curriculum for Primary, Secondary and Adult Education* (Ministry of Education and Research 2017) is one example of such a national and *ideal citizen* representation intended (although not explicitly stated) to ultimately motivate the fostering of economically contributing citizens, that actually created a dichotomic representation of an assumed *us* against an assumed *Other* (e.g. Breidlied 2015).
3. Despite this, some researchers do use the term *Whiteness*. For example, the Norwegian anthropologist Marianne Gullestad (2002) touches upon the term *Whiteness* and the work of Ruth Frankenberg (1993) in her book *The Norwegian Seen with New Eyes (Det norske sett med nye øyne)* in a discussion on what she refers to as the elite's racism.
4. *Race* used as an analytical concept in the Norwegian as well as in the wider Nordic academic context is deemed taboo and refuted as analytically valid (Muller Myrdahl 2014), based

on researchers' arguments of how this concept connotes references to the World War II Nazi ideas of the existence of biologically different human species. Even though researchers elsewhere have made explicit their definition of race as the social premise on which people are grouped and arranged in hierarchies (Goldberg 1993), the concept nevertheless seems to cause distress, also amongst researchers studying in fields associated with multicultural education. These researchers' unwillingness to apply *race* as an analytical concept has been *solved* by how researchers instead apply what are considered *safer* terms such as *culture* and *ethnicity* (e.g. Pihl 2010), or simply by avoiding the term altogether (e.g. Bangstad and Døving 2015); however, *race* nonetheless slips in 'through the back door' (Gullestad 2004, 177). I believe that such amnesic and silencing attitudes towards the term *race* have, for too long, led to the consequence that racism is not being recognised as systemic and subtle, and as such, have made possible the sustainment of minimal everyday racist practices.

5. The Norwegian concept of *imagined sameness* may be read as a *local* variation of Anderson's (1983) *imagined community* concept.

6. The institutions' programme plans, and the subject-specific plans are part of a lager set of data that includes informants. Therefore, with respect to the informants' confidentiality, the identity of these four documents is not referred to.

7. Even though Goldberg uses both the terms *racist* as well as *racialised* in his works when he discusses discourses, I have, in this article, for simplification, chosen to use the term *racialised* when discussing the detected patterns in the analysed document discourses.

8. In Norwegian, the terms that were found to be related to cultural diversity [*kulturelt mangfold*], and that might be of interest to a Scandinavian-speaking Nordic audience were: (*det*) *flerkulturelle* ((the) multicultural)*, flerspråklig* (multilinguistic)*, innvandrer(e)* (immigrant(s))*, kulturelt og språklig mangfold* (cultural and linguistic diversity)*, språklig minoritet(er)* (linguistic *minority/minorities), minoritet* (minority) and *mangfold* (diversity).

9. All translations in this article have been undertaken by the author in consultation with research peers.

10. In the Norwegian context, *special education* refers to an adjusted education, often located *outside* of the pupil's class, and offered for children defined as having learning difficulties or other special needs. It is contrary to other countries where special education is offered to, for example, so-called gifted pupils.

11. For example, it is not stated in the documents what is 'mirrored in the school', or what 'learning challenges' means, why this pupil category needs extra educational support, and why visualisation only creates good learning frameworks for this pupil group.

12. After all, Norwegian media has reported that, in the immediate hours of the aftermath of the terrorist attack, incidents of hate crimes were performed by White Norwegians against Norwegian *Muslim-looking* persons in the streets of Oslo (https://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/terrorangrepet-22-juli-politikk-og-samfunn/kadra-muslimer-ble-jaget-nedover-gatene/a/10088913/; https://www.nrk.no/ostlandssendingen/muslimer-trakassert-etter-22.juli-1.8043506). Interestingly, as Muller Myrdal (2014) argues, Breivik expected significant support for his White supremacist views because they were based on dominant Norwegian and European public debates about Islam and communities of colour.

13. What is important in this regard is that Breivik's actions were rooted in his self-authored *manifesto*, a document promoting *historical amnesiac* ideas of White superiority (Muller Myrdal, 2014).

14. We all know dysconsciously our history of dominance and violence against our Other minority populations, and how we have assimilated these Others by any means necessary. We all know (at least in theory) someone that could have become a Breivik, and we also know dysconsciously that these ideologically based forms of racism and White supremacy are not new. They are manifestations of an unrecognised historical, colonial and imperial mental legacy.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Sandra Fylkesnes is a PhD candidate in Educational Sciences for Teacher Education at OsloMet, Oslo Metropolitan University.

References

Afdal, H. W., and M. Nerland. 2014. "Does Teacher Education Matter? An Analysis of Relations to Knowledge among Norwegian and Finnish Novice Teachers". *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 58(3): 281–299. 10.1080/00313831.2012.726274.

Althusser, L. 2003. *The Humanist Controversy and other Writings*. London: Verso.

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Ansley, F. L. 1992. "White Supremacy (and What We Should Do About It)." In *Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, edited by R. Delgado and S. Stefanic, 592–595. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Antikainen, A. 2006. "In Search of the Nordic Model in Education." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 50 (3): 229–243.

Apple, M. 2014. *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. New York: Routledge.

Arneback, E., and A. Quennerstedt. 2016. "Locations of Racism in Education: A Speech Act Analysis of a Policy Chain." *Journal of Education Policy* 31 (6): 773–788. doi:10.1080/02680939.2016.1185670.

Atabong, A. A. 2016. "'Is There Such a Thing?' A Study of Antiracism Education in Finland." PhD diss., University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:951-51-2559-0.

Ball, S. 1994. *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-structural Approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bangstad, S., and C. A. Døving. 2015. *Hva er rasisme* [What is Racism]? Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Baratan, G. D. 2008. "The Song Remains the Same: Transposition and the Disproportionate Representation of Minority Students in Special Education." *Race, Ethnicity & Education* 11 (4): 337–354. doi:10.1080/13613320802478820.

Bonilla-Silva, E. 2006. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Braun, A., M. Maguire, and S. J. Ball. 2010. "Policy Enactments in the UK Secondary School: Examining Policy, Practice and School Positioning." *Journal of Education Policy* 25 (4): 547–560. doi:10.1080/02680931003698544.

Breidlied, H. 2015. "Et eksklurderende 'vi'. Verdier, kulturer og kulturarv i læreplanens generale del og formålsparagrafen: nasjonalt fellesskap, multikulturalitet og kulturell kompleksitet" [An Excluding 'We'. Values, Culture and Cultural Heritage in the Core Curriculum and in the Educational Law: National Community, Multiculturality and Cultural Complexity]. *Acta Didactica Norge* 6 (1): 1–18.

Brown, A. L., and N. De Lissovoy. 2011. "Economies of Racism: Grounding Education Policy Research in the Complex Dialectic of Race, Class, and Capital." *Journal of Education Policy* 26 (5): 595–619. doi:10.1080/02680939.2010.533289.

Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic. 2000. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Dowling, F. 2017. ""'Rase' og etnisitet? Det kan ikke jeg si noe særlig om – her er det 'Blenda-hvitt"! ['Race' and Ethnicity? That, I Cannot Say Anything in Particular About – Here, All Is 'Snow White'!]" *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift* 101 (3): 252–256. doi:10.18261/issn.1504-2987-2017-03-06.

Dyer, R. 1993. *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representation*. London: Routledge.

Dyer, R. 1997. *White*. London: Routledge.

Eberly, J. L., M. K. Rand, and T. O'Connor. 2007. "Analyzing Teachers' Dispositions Towards Diversity: Using Adult Development Theory." *Multicultural Education* 14 (4): 31–36.

Essed, P. 1991. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Fairclough, N. 2015. *Language and Power*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. 1989. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. 1993. *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*. London: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R., ed. 1997. *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*. London: Duke University Press.

Fylkesnes, S. 2018. "Whiteness in Teacher Education Research Discourses: A Review of the Use and Meaning Making of the Term Cultural Diversity." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 71: 24–33. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.005.

Garmon, M. A. 2004. "Changing Preservice Teachers' Attitudes/Beliefs About Diversity." *Journal of Teacher Education* 55 (3): 201–213. doi:10.1177/0022487104263080.

Gay, G. 2010. "Acting on Beliefs in Teacher Education for Cultural Diversity." *Journal of Teacher Education* 61 (1–2): 143–152.

Gillborn, D. 1995. *Racism and Race in Real Schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gillborn, D. 1998. "Racism, Selection, Poverty and Parents: New Labour, Old Problems." *Journal of Education Policy* 13 (6): 717–735. doi:10.1080/0268093980130604.

Gillborn, D. 2005. "Education as an Act of White Supremacy: Whiteness, Critical Race Theory and Education Reform." *Journal of Education Policy* 20 (4): 485.

Gillborn, D. 2008. *Racism and Education: Coincidence or Conspiracy?*. London: Routledge.

Gillborn, D. 2016. "Softly, Softly: Genetics, Intelligence and the Hidden Racism of the New Geneism." *Journal of Education Policy* 31 (4): 365–388. doi:10.1080/02680939.2016.1139189.

Goldberg, D. T. 1993. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Goldberg, D. T. 2006. "Racial Europeanization." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (2): 331–364. doi:10.1080/01419870500465611.

Goldberg, D. T. 2009. "The Social Formation of Racist Discourse." In *The Anatomy of Racism*, edited by D. T. Goldberg, 295–318. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.

Gullestad, M. 2002. *Det Norske Sett Med Nye Øyne: Kritisk Analyse av Norsk Innvandringsdebatt* [The Norwegian Seen With New Eyes: A Critical Analysis of the Norwegian Immigration Debate]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gullestad, M. 2004. "Blind Slaves to Our Prejudice: Debating 'Culture' and 'Race' in Norway." *Ethnos* 69 (2): 177–203.

Gullestad, M. 2006. *Plausible Prejudice*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gulson, K. N., and P. T. Webb. 2012. "Education Policy Racialisations: Afrocentric Schools, Islamic Schools, and the New Enunciations of Equity." *Journal of Education Policy* 27 (6): 697–709. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.672655.

Harris, C. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106 (8): 1707–1791.

hooks, B.. 1997. "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination." In *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, edited by R. Frankenberg, 165–179. London: Duke University Press.

Kershen, A. J. 2012. "Series Editor' Preface." In *Whiteness and Postcolonialism in the Nordic Region: Exceptionalism, Migrant Others and National Identities*, edited by K. Loftsdóttir and L. Jensen, xi–xii. Farnham: Ashgate.

King, J. E. 2004. "Dysconscious Racism: Ideology, Identity, and the Miseducation of Teachers." In *The RoutledgeFalmer Reader in Multicultural Education*, edited by D. Gillborn and G. Ladson-Billings, 71–83. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Laclau, E., and C. Mouffe. 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Leonardo, Z. 2002. "The Souls of White Folk: Critical Pedagogy, Whiteness Studies, and Global Discourse." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 5 (1): 29–50.

Leonardo, Z. 2004. "The Color of Supremacy: Beyond the Discourse of 'White Privilege'." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 36 (2): 137–152.

Leonardo, Z. 2005. "Through the Multicultural Glass: Althusser, Ideology and Race Relations in Post-Civil Rights America." *Policy Futures in Education* 3 (4): 400–420. doi:10.2304/pfie.2005.3.4.400.

Leonardo, Z. 2016. "Tropics of Whiteness: Metaphor and the Literary Turn in White Studies." *Whiteness and Education* 1 (1): 3–14. doi:10.1080/23793406.2016.1167111.

Loftsdóttir, K., and L. Jensen. 2012. *Whiteness and Postcolonialism in the Nordic Region: Exceptionalism, Migrant Others and National Identities*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Lovdata. 2013. "Lov om grunnskolen og den videregående opplæringa (opplæringslova)" [Law Concerning Mandatory Education and Upper Secondary Education]. Lovdata. http://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61.

Matias, C. E., and T. J. Grosland. 2016. "Digital Storytelling as Racial Justice: Digital Hopes for Deconstructing Whiteness in Teacher Education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 67 (2): 152–164.

Matias, C. E., K. M. Viesca, D. F. Garrison-Wade, M. Tandon, and R. Galindo. 2014. "'What Is Critical Whiteness Doing in OUR Nice Field Like Critical Race Theory?' Applying CRT and CWS to Understand the White Imaginations of White Teacher Candidates." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 47 (3): 289–304.

Mausethagen, S., and L. Granlund. 2012. "Contested Discourses of Teacher Professionalism: Current Tensions Between Education Policy and Teachers' Union." *Journal of Education Policy* 27 (6): 815–833. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.672656.

McVee, M. B. 2014. "The Challenge of More Light, the Complexity of Culture: Lessons Learned in Exploring the Cultural Positioning of Literacy Teachers." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 35 (1): 1–15.

Mikander, P. 2016. "Westerners and Others in Finnish School Textbooks." PhD diss., University of Helsinki. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-2500-2.

Mills, C., and J. Ballantyne. 2010. "Pre-service Teachers' Dispositions Towards Diversity: Arguing for a Developmental Hierarchy of Change." *Teaching & Teacher Education* 26 (3): 447–454. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.012.

Ministry of Education and Research. 2009. "Læreren: rollen og utdanningen" [The Teacher: The Role and The Education. Vol. 11. 2008–2009]. https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-11-2008-2009-/id544920/.

Ministry of Education and Research. 2010. "Nasjonle Retningslinjer for grunnskolelærerutdanningen, 1.-7. trinn" [National Guidelines for Primary School Teacher Education, Grades 1–7]. https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kd/rundskriv/2010/retningslinjer_grunnskolelaererutdanningen_1_7_trinn.pdf.

Ministry of Education and Research. 2017. "Core Curriculum for Primary, Secondary and Adult Edcuation." https://www.udir.no/globalassets/filer/lareplan/generell-del/core_curriculum_english.pdf.

Muller Myrdahl, E. 2014. "Recuperating Whiteness in the Injured Nation: Norwegian Identity in the Response to 22 July." *Social Identities* 20 (6): 486–500. doi:10.1080/13504630.2015.1004997.

Neumann, I. B. 2001. *Mening, materialitet, makt: en innføring i diskursanalyse* [Meaning, Materiality, Power: An Introduction to Discourse Analysis]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

OECD. 2010. *Educating Teachers for Diversity: Meeting the Challenge*. Educational Research and Innovation. OECD Publishing.

Orozco, R. A. 2011. "'It is Certainly Strange…': Attacks on Ethnic Studies and Whiteness as Property." *Journal of Education Policy* 26 (6): 819–838. doi:10.1080/02680939.2011.587540.

Pihl, J. 2010. *Etnisk mangfold i skolen: det sakkyndige blikket* [Ethnic Diversity in the School: The Expert View. Vol. 2]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Preston, J. 2008. "Protect and Survive: 'Whiteness' and the Middle-class Family in Civil Defence Pedagogies." *Journal of Education Policy* 23 (5): 469–482. doi:10.1080/02680930802054412.

Rizvi, F., and B. Lingard. 2010. *Globalizing Education Policy*. London: Routledge.

Robinson, C. C., and P. Clardy. 2011. "It Ain't What You Say, It's How You Say It: Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in the Classroom." *Journal of Cultural Diversity* 18 (3): 101–110.

Rugkåssa, M. 2012. *Likhetens dilemma: Om sivilisering og integrasjon i den velferdsambisiøse norske stat* [The Dilemma of Sameness: About Civilization and Integration in the Welfare Ambitious Norwegian State]. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Said, E. W. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Scheurich, J. J. 1993. "Toward a White Discourse on White Racism." *Educational Researcher* 22 (8): 5–10.

Sirnes, T. 1999. "'Alt som er Fast Fordamper'? Normalitet og Identitet i Endring" ['Everything Solid Evaporates'? Normality and Identity in Transformation.] In *Normalitet og Identitet i Norge. Makt- og demokratiutredningen 1998–2003* [Normality and Identity in Norway: The Power and Democracy Report 1998–2003], edited by S. Mayer and T. Sirnes, 29–75. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Sleeter, C. 2001. "Preparing Teachers for Culturally Diverse Schools: Research and the Overwhelming Presence of Whiteness." *Journal of Teacher Education* 52 (94): 94–106. doi:10.1177/0022487101052002002.

Smith, H. J. 2013. "A Critique of the Teaching Standards in England (1984–2012): Discourses of Equality and Maintaining the Status Quo." *Journal of Education Policy* 28 (4): 427–448. doi:10.1080/02680939.2012.742931.

Søreide, G. 2007. "Narrative Construction of Teacher Identity." PhD diss., University of Bergen. http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/2532.

Telhaug, A. O., O. A. Mediås, and P. Aasen. 2006. "The Nordic Model in Education: Education as Part of the Political System in the Last 50 years." *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 50 (3): 245–283. doi:10.1080/00313830600743274.

Thomas, P., S. H. Changezi, and M. Enstad. 2016. "Third Space Epistemologies: Ethnicity and Belonging in an 'Immigrant'-dominated Upper Secondary School in Norway." *Improving Schools* 19 (3): 212–228. doi:10.1177/1365480216643200.

Turner, E. 2017. "Marketing Diversity: Selling School Districts in a Racialized Marketplace." *Journal of Education Policy* 22: 1–25. doi:10.1080/02680939.2017.1386327.

Van Driel, B., M. Darmody, and J. Kerzil. 2016. *Education Policies and Practices to Foster Tolerance, Respect for Diversity and Civic Responsibility in Children and Young People in the EU [NESET II Report]*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. doi:10.2766/46172.

Van Riemsdijk, M. 2010. "Variegated Privileges of Whiteness: lived Experiences of Polish Nurses in Norway." *Social & Cultural Geography* 11 (2): 117–137.

Vaught, S. E. 2012. "Institutional Racist Melancholia: A Structural Understanding of Grief and Power in Schooling." *Harvard Educational Review* 82 (1): 52–77.

Vedøy, G. E., and J. Møller. 2007. "Successful School Leadership for Diversity? Examining Two Contrasting Examples of Working for Democracy in Norway." *ISEA* 35 (3): 58–66.

Vike, H., H. Lidén, and M. Lien. 2001. "Likhetens Virkeligheter" [The Reality of Similarity.] In *Likhetens Paradokser. Antropologiske Undersøkelser i det Moderne Norge* [The Paradoxes of Sameness: Anthropological Interrogations in the Modern Norway], edited by H. Vike, H. Lidén, and M. Lien, 11–31. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Article 3

Fylkesnes, S., Mausethagen, S., & Nilsen, A. B. (2018). The double meaning making of the term cultural diversity in teacher educator discourses. *Nordic Journal of International and Comparative Education, 2*(1), 16–38. doi:10.7577/njcie.2284

The Double Meaning Making of the Term *Cultural Diversity* in Teacher Educator Discourses

Sandra Fylkesnes[1]
>   Ph.D. Candidate, OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

Sølvi Mausethagen
>   Associate Professor, OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

Anne Birgitta Nilsen
>   Professor, OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

Abstract

Cultural diversity is assumed to be a central component of Western education and even though it has been extensively investigated in international research on teacher education, little knowledge exists about its usage and meaning making in teacher educator discourses. This article provides insights into the usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity based on semi-structured individual interviews with a total of twelve teacher educators from two Norwegian teacher education institutions. Drawing on the theoretical perspectives of discourse theory and critical Whiteness studies, we find that the term cultural diversity is used in a double meaning making pattern: Cultural diversity is presented as desirable and positive by teacher educators, yet it is also aligned with the notion of otherness. We discuss some possible methodological tools with which teacher educators can detect meaning making patterns and thus counter the production and reproduction of socially unjust discursive patterns.

Keywords: cultural diversity*;* discourse analysis; social justice; teacher educator discourses; whiteness

Introduction

Cultural diversity is assumed to be a central component of Western education and has been quite extensively investigated in international teacher education research (Gay, 2010; Leeman, 2008; Sleeter, 2008; Virta, 2009). However, the research rarely addresses how the term *cultural diversity* is understood or what content the term refers to (cf. Fylkesnes, 2018a). Less is known about how cultural diversity is used and understood in

---

[1] Corresponding author: Sandra.Fylkesnes@hioa.no

teacher educator discourses. Furthermore, most research on teacher education and cultural diversity has focused on student teachers' shortcomings, attitudes, and knowledge (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015). We know little about the knowledge and values held and communicated by teacher educators. This is important, as teachers' dispositions affect their pedagogical decisions (Eberly, Rand, & O'Connor, 2007; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that may also affect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010). Moreover, recent reviews of teacher education research still find that a discursive pattern featuring a lack of conceptual clarity persists (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Fylkesnes, 2018a). This has implications for teacher education regarding social justice and work against discrimination. For example, the term cultural diversity, because of its lack of conceptual clarity, may constitute a discursive ideology of White supremacy (Fylkesnes, 2018a).

In most Western contexts, White teachers and minoritized students have diverging everyday experiences. In Norway, most teachers (including teacher educators and student teachers) are generally ascribed (by themselves and others) an identity as members of the dominant social group (White), meaning that they share this group's overall norms and values. However, minoritized students are usually ascribed an identity as the Other (Gullestad, 2002; Thomas, Haug Changezi, & Enstad, 2016). As conceptualizations of terms in discourses, constituted by knowledge-producing institutions, work through educational curricula and practice (Afdal & Nerland, 2014), to interrogate the usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity is relevant and important because it helps us to understand how teacher educators can better prepare student teachers for pedagogical decisions that promote social justice in their future work as teachers.

This article aims to contribute to insights into the usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity in teacher educator discourses as produced by twelve teacher educators in two Norwegian teacher education institutions. The question guiding the article is: How is the term cultural diversity used and understood in discourses produced by a group of teacher educators? We draw on theoretical perspectives from critical Whiteness studies (CWS) and discourse theory. Importantly, this study focuses on one aspect of the social structures through which Whiteness works (discursive patterns).

Previous research

Little research exists on teacher educators and cultural diversity, both internationally, as well as within the Norwegian context (Bates, Swennen, & Jones, 2011; Dowling, 2017). As most research on teacher education and cultural diversity generally focuses on student teachers, recent developments in teacher education research point to the need for a greater focus on teacher educators (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Dowling, 2017; Goodwin et al., 2014; Hallett, 2010; Jacobs, Assaf, & Lee, 2011; Murray, 2014; Timmerman, 2009; Tryggvason, 2012; Williams, 2014). Whilst some studies have addressed how teacher educators often feel unprepared in terms of teaching cultural diversity-related issues (Gorski, Davis, & Reiter, 2012), others find that there is not necessarily a correlation between

teacher educators' self-understanding and their cultural diversity awareness (Brown, 2004). Generally, the importance of teacher educators' knowledge when preparing student teachers for a culturally responsive understanding is underscored (Richards, 2011). The relatively scarce body of research focusing on teacher educators, particularly on their cultural diversity dispositions, mirrors international teacher education research more generally (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015). Given how teacher educators' dispositions affect their pedagogical decisions (e.g. Eberly et al., 2007; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that ultimately affect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010), more insight into such processes could increase our knowledge about how to develop teacher education programmes that promote equity and social justice.

Theoretical perspectives

In this article, we draw upon theoretical perspectives from discourse theory and CWS. The main tenet of discourse theory (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001) is that the way a term is used and thereby filled with meaning in certain contexts has implications for how people act upon it: "How we are seen determines in part how we are treated; how we treat others is based on how we see them; such seeing comes from representation" (Dyer, 1993, cited in Gillborn, 1995, p. 18). Herein, we define a discourse as "a system of representation" (cf. Hall, 1992, p. 287) that provides a particular kind of knowledge that allows for certain representations whilst denying others. A set of representations often found in discourses are binary oppositions (MacLure, 2003). Such discursive constructions imply a system of representation that portrays positive representations of Us against negative representations of the Other (MacLure, 2003; Said, 2003; Van Dijk, 2006). These representations define the identity and difference boundaries—for those considered members and non-members of the dominant social group, for inclusion and exclusion, entitlements and restrictions, endowment and appropriation, and hence for dominance and subjugation (Goldberg, 1993, 2009).

A central CWS tenet is the recognition of Whiteness as a post-colonial and imperial legacy of race and racism. Even though, traditionally, the Whiteness concept has not been used when analysing socially-constructed systematic racial injustices in the Norwegian and wider Nordic context, the concept has recently gained further interest and acceptance (Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2012; Van Riemsdijk, 2010), also within the field of education (see Atabong, 2016; Dowling, 2017; Mikander, 2016)[2]. To draw on a CWS perspective in the analysis of teacher educator discourses in the Norwegian context is relevant and important. Despite Norwegian educational law demanding that all forms of discrimination

---

[2] As argued elsewhere, the reasons for such a lack of interest might be related to ideas of a general Nordic identity as based on the so-called Nordic model and Nordic Exceptionalism that results in a "pedagogy of amnesia" (Leonardo, 2004), and on how the term *race* is generally considered taboo (Dowling, 2017; Fylkesnes, 2018b).

should be eradicated (Lovdata, 2013), Norwegian schools continue to discriminate based on ethnic background (Dowling, 2017; Westrheim, 2014). Within CWS, *race,* a legacy of the modern categorization project, is understood as a concept embedded in Whiteness that describes the foundation of the socially-constructed phenomenon upon which people are grouped and given status according to a hierarchy. Importantly, the categorizer, the superior (White) race, is always positioned at the hierarchical apex (Dyer, 1997; Gullestad, 2004). *Racism*, within CWS, is understood as discrimination based on racial membership that manifests in minimal, subtle, omnipresent, systemic, ordinary and commonplace practices (Gillborn, 2005, 2008; Leonardo, 2002; Picover, 2009). Racism, as such, may be understood as subtle discursive patterns that categorize Us and the Other (Said, 2003). What is relevant to this article is that a major site for such representations and interpretations is, as Bonilla-Silva (2006) has pointed out, knowledge-producing educational institutions.

Importantly, Whiteness as a discursive ideology of White supremacy is generally produced in a dysconscious manner. By *dysconscious*, we refer to the workings of Whiteness as an uncritical and distorted way of thinking about race that accepts culturally-sanctioned assumptions, myths and beliefs, which in turn support and tacitly accept dominant White norms and privileges (King, 2004, p. 73). Whiteness, as such, manifests through subtle discursive patterns disguised as linguistic cues that draw attention to race by representations of the Other as inferior and different (McVee, 2014; Said, 2003). These representations always co-occur with assumptions that reflect ideas of a superior and homogenous (White) Us. If the concept of Whiteness, understood as ideas of a superior and homogenous White Us, is related to the context of Norway, it could be argued to work in similar racialized ways as the *imagined sameness* of *Norwegianness* (cf. Gullestad, 2001, 2002).

Focusing on the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity in teacher educator discourses, we draw mainly on the analytical concept of *binary oppositions*, the dichotomous systems of representations of Us and the Other (MacLure, 2003; Said, 2003; Van Dijk, 2006). Such systems may be found in discursive patterns of *othering*, that is, the discursive patterns that name and define the racially Other (e.g. Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2012; Said, 2003). Discursive patterns of othering are at the center of all identity formation (Goldberg, 2006) and are closely related to the processes of *objectification* (Essed, 1991)—the discursive pattern of othering based upon someone looking different. This form of othering implies that the Other does not naturally belong and is not part of what is regarded as ordinary (Essed, 1991). Moreover, the discursive patterns of othering may be traced via interrogating discursive patterns of *assumptions*, that is, how discursive patterns may expose taken-for-granted values that are understood as universal and normal (Fairclough, 2003). Assumptions are central to the construction of *all* identities and make particular social identities salient (Goldberg, 2006). As part of discursive Whiteness patterns, the identities made salient are all other identities than that of Whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993). As such, the identity of Whiteness appears as if (Leonardo, 2004) it is invisible and thereby produces what Frankenberg (1993) refers to as *normalization,* that is, the

invisible assumed standards of Whiteness (the dominating hegemonic norm) against which otherness is measured.

Methods

Before initiating this study, approval was given by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). In the following, we describe the sample, outline the data collection process and the analysis.

Sample

The data analysed for this study consists of transcripts of semi-structured individual interviews with twelve teacher educators from two teacher education institutions in Norway. These institutions are referred to as institution A and institution B, where institution A is one of five Norwegian teacher education institutions that upholds a multicultural programme profile. Even though the multicultural profile is not explicitly promoted by institution A, it is nonetheless evident in how its programme and subject-specific plans more frequently use terms such as *the multicultural, multilingual, immigrant, cultural and linguistic diversity, linguistic minority, minority* and *diversity* compared to institution B (e.g. Fylkesnes, 2018b). The teacher educators consisted of eight females and four males with similar academic backgrounds. Four teacher educators from institution A and five teacher educators from institution B held a master's degree in Educational Studies, one teacher educator from each institution held a master's degree in Special Needs Education, and one teacher educator from institution A held a master's degree in Multicultural Education. They all taught the course Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge. This integrative course in the national Norwegian primary school teacher education programme is concerned with pedagogical theories and instruction. It composes one fourth of the total teacher education programme, is supposed to be an overarching course that unifies the other courses and the student teachers are expected to learn about foundational pedagogical theories (e.g. Vygotsky, Piaget, Dewey) and related didactical practices. The course is also meant to provide student teachers with an identity as teachers and to ensure that critical thinking is a central component throughout the educational programme (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010). All student teachers are obliged to take this six-semester 60 ECTS course. Given that the teacher educators interviewed in this study teach the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course, we assume them to be "experts" on teacher identity and critical thinking.

Data collection

Author (a) recruited the informants, conducted the interviews and was in charge of the transcription process. The number of teacher educators interviewed was based on the

principles of theoretical saturation (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). The teacher educator interviewees were recruited in four steps, based on principles of purposive and snowball sampling (Patton, 2002). First, e-mails about the project with follow-up phone calls were directed to each institution's leader. Then, the institutional leaders recruited staff members that they felt would be interested in the topic, and thus, willing to partake in the interview. Finally, direct e-mail contact with potential teacher educator interviewees was established and follow-up phone calls were made for the final planning of meetings.

The teacher educators were interviewed during the 2013-2014 school year. The interviewer (Author a) followed the ethical guidelines and stages of the interview inquiry, as suggested by Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), and focused on the teacher educators' feelings of safety and on listening and asking encouraging questions when conducting the interviews. On average, the interviews lasted one and a half to two hours. They were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim, resulting in approximately 180 pages of transcript. The interviews were semi-structured, included different types of interview questions (cf. Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, pp. 135-136) and consisted of three parts (see Appendix 2). Part one addressed questions related to what teacher educators valued as important in their teaching on the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course. Part two addressed similar questions to those in the first part. However, in this second part the term cultural diversity was explicitly included. Part three addressed questions that encouraged teacher educators to both reflect on and compare terms repeatedly featured in Norwegian primary school teacher education policy and curriculum documents. This article focuses mainly on the second and third parts of the interview.

Data analysis

The transcribed interview material has been analysed as empirical data (Peräkylä & Ruusuvuori, 2017). This implies that the examples from the transcribed material of individual teacher educators' usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity illustrate variations in the features of the general patterns produced by them as a community. In our analysis, we drew on a structured three-reading strategy (adapted from Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012; Søreide, 2007, see Table 1). As part of the first reading, a word search was performed in the interview transcriptions to obtain an overview of the terms that appeared prominently and frequently in relation to the term cultural diversity. From these searches, excerpts were extracted for a deeper analysis of the usage of cultural diversity and its related terms. The second reading then focused on the extracted excerpts and on how cultural diversity and its related terms were used therein, particularly in relation to representations that invoked patterns of othering through objectification, assumptions, and normalization. The third reading aimed to detect discursive meaning making patterns of representation between the three parts of the interview as well as between the institutions (see Appendix 1, Table 1, for an outline of the three-readings strategy). To

ensure validation, we discussed the preliminary findings as well as possible interpretations of this study with colleagues in different research settings (e.g. conferences and paper sessions) (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

In the next sections, we present the analysis through the following four double meaning making patterns: cultural diversity as (1) positive *and* costly, cognitively challenging and non-Norwegian; (2) a positive and important multicultural resource *and* "less developed" student teachers; (3) desirable for teacher education *and* photos of difference; and (4) the knowledgeable student teacher role *and* knowledgeless minority parents.

Findings: The double meaning making patterns

The transcribed interviews with teacher educators provided rich material for insights into the patterns of representation in the teacher educator discourses on cultural diversity. In our analysis of the transcribed interview material, we detected a general double, but interrelated, discursive meaning making pattern. While one part of this discursive pattern pointed to how the term cultural diversity was explicitly presented as something positive, important and desirable about teacher education, the other part more subtly represented it as negative, challenging, cognitively "less developed" and knowledgeless. Importantly, it was common in the double meaning making pattern to assume that cultural diversity was generally meant to refer to the Other (Said, 2003). In the following, we present our analysis of this double meaning making pattern.

Cultural diversity as positive: Cultural diversity as costly, cognitively challenging and non-Norwegian

One double meaning making pattern of the term cultural diversity emerged from the transcribed interview material through how the term was related to the following terms: *the multicultural, multilingualism, bilingualism, resource, behavioural challenges, special education, dialogue, minority, integration, inclusion, another nationality* and *from a different country*. These terms are interesting because, even though some invoke positivity (e.g. resource, dialogue), they generally allude to more negative ideas of, for example, costly school resource usage (e.g. behavioural challenges), cognitive challenges (e.g. special education) and assumptions of how cultural diversity refers to ideas of non-Norwegianness (e.g. the multicultural, multilingualism, bilingualism, minority, integration, inclusion, another nationality and from a different country). Moreover, a general feature of the teacher educator discourses produced at both institutions was how the terms cultural diversity and the multicultural were used interchangeably[3]: While teacher educators at the multiculturally-profiled institution A tended to relate the term cultural diversity more

---

[3] These highlighted patterns of the terms and their relations are interesting because they mirror a discursive pattern detected in international research and Norwegian national policy and curriculum documents (Fylkesnes, 2018a, 2018b).

frequently to the terms multilingualism and bilingualism, teacher educators from institution B more frequently related the term cultural diversity to the terms another nationality and from a different country. These relations of terms indicate that the discourse at institution A on the term cultural diversity circles around issues of language, whereas for institution B, they circle around issues of nationality. These were the only differences in the usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity in the teacher educator discourses at the two institutions.

Cultural diversity as a positive and important multicultural resource: Cultural diversity as "less developed" student teachers

Another feature of the double meaning making pattern of the term cultural diversity was found in how it was represented both explicitly as a positive and important multicultural resource for the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course, but also through how it was simultaneously represented through assumptions of it being a less developed Other. The following excerpt, drawn from the second part of the interview where questions related to teaching about cultural diversity were addressed, exemplifies this double meaning making pattern:

> In the teacher education, the pedagogy [course] must take responsibility for this [cultural diversity] and promote the resource dimension of it [cultural diversity] … even though we, unfortunately, we do not have that many students from other cultures. I have worked within the bilingual bachelor's in teacher education, where we have 20-30 students that come from different cultures. Somalia, Iran, Japan and from all around. And they might originally be teachers. Some are perhaps doctors, but they want to develop, to educate themselves as teachers. Then a slightly different dimension appears. I wish that those 30 [bilingual bachelor's in teacher education students] were part of ordinary primary school teacher education. That they were part of this [ordinary teacher education] and not a small satellite on the outside … that there were more [students] in ordinary teacher education who were multicultural. Then we would have had even more of that pedagogy and the multicultural aspect as a glue and many nice conversations around how to think pedagogically in different contexts. (Teacher educator, institution B)

In the above excerpt, to teach about cultural diversity is initially represented as something that the pedagogy course needs to take responsibility for, and it is represented as something that needs to be promoted as having a "resource dimension". These representations may be understood as highlighting ideas of cultural diversity as positive, important and relevant to the pedagogy course. However, teaching about cultural diversity is also represented through assumptions of it being a concern related only to students who study in the bilingual bachelor's course in the teacher education programme. Importantly, these students are described as coming from other and different cultures and countries, as multicultural and as representing "a multicultural aspect". As such, these representations of teaching about cultural diversity appears to reflect ideas of it being conditioned by the presence of the Other.

Although the statement expressing a desire to include the 30 students from the bilingual bachelor's in teacher education as part of the "ordinary primary school teacher education" programme might be interpreted as reflecting an inclusive idea, it may also be

understood as representing an assumption of the existence of an *ordinary* teacher education programme. As such, an implicit idea of how these students and their education represents something unordinary compared to the assumed ordinary teacher education is introduced. Moreover, when the bilingual bachelor's in teacher education students are represented as to "come from different cultures", "multicultural" and as representing "a multicultural aspect" or related descriptions of the appearance of a "slightly different dimension", these ideas may reveal another assumption of how students enrolled in the "ordinary teacher education" programme are assumed to be ordinary. They are assumed neither to have "multicultural" or "different dimensional" features, nor as different linguistically, culturally, multiculturally or nationality, but to represent more or less homogeneity. Hence the statement: "we do not have that many students from other cultures".

Moreover, the description of how some of the bilingual teacher education students "might originally [already] be teachers" or even "perhaps doctors" who "want to develop" by studying for a bilingual bachelor's degree, points to possible degradation assumptions and ideas of this Other. Representing the Other as wanting to develop without explaining this idea further can moreover be understood as reflecting ideas of how the Other is generally assumed to be less developed. Importantly, this assumption may in turn rest on ideas of a developed Norwegian context. Such dichotomous ideas of Us and the Other can be seen as concurring with the Norwegian political practices of not accrediting educational degrees from outside of the Norwegian educational system (particularly of degrees from outside of what are considered "Western" countries)[4], in that they both might evoke ideas of the Norwegian education system being superior.

Furthermore, in the above excerpt, the general idea represented is how teaching about cultural diversity is partly a matter of how, by introducing the Other—by its very presence—such teaching is made possible. In other words, introducing bilingual bachelor's in teacher education students to the "ordinary teacher education" the pedagogy subject is assumed to automatically provide the pedagogy course with a "slightly different dimension" or a "multicultural aspect" to be utilised for the stimuli of "nice conversations around how to think pedagogically in different contexts". Interestingly, these representations may rest on assumptions of how the student teachers in the "ordinary teacher education programme", because of their assumed homogeneity, are understood to be irrelevant as possible contributors to teaching about cultural diversity.

Cultural diversity as desirable for teacher education: Cultural diversity as photos of difference

A third feature of the double meaning making pattern of cultural diversity was its representation as desirable for inclusion in teacher education and teacher educators' teaching, but also, assumptions that it represented difference. The excerpt below is also drawn from

---

[4] For more information about accreditation practices see: www.nokut.no/en/.

the second part of the interview where questions addressed teacher educators' ways of teaching about cultural diversity:

> We could have integrated it [cultural diversity] more. I try to integrate it [cultural diversity] in different ways, however, with examples. Photos that, for example, of course, when you have an ordinary theme and you bring in photos of different pupils, where you see that they have a different background. That is one way of getting it [cultural diversity] in because then you see it [cultural diversity]. (Teacher educator, institution B.)

In this excerpt, teaching about cultural diversity is represented as something that teacher educators ("we") could generally have integrated more in their teaching, in "different ways" and "with examples". As such, teaching about cultural diversity is represented as important to teacher education. Here, as in the two prior examples, cultural diversity appears to be, othered through assumptions of it referring to persons who are considered Other. However, in contrast to the prior example, cultural diversity does not refer to living persons who, with their cognitive ability, could perhaps contribute to pedagogical conversations. It is reduced to objects or artefacts: photos of visibly different pupils.

Similar to the prior example, the ideas presented in the excerpt above might imply how teaching about cultural diversity involves transforming "an ordinary theme" into one on cultural diversity simply by bringing in photos of pupils in which one "sees that they have a different background". This representation of cultural diversity rests on at least two main assumptions. First, the idea of how, by simply introducing the Other to an "ordinary [teaching] theme", this "ordinary theme" may be transformed into one about cultural diversity. This idea can furthermore rest upon another related assumption that there are themes in teacher education that are assumed to be "ordinary" and that cultural diversity generally does not exist—at least not in the form of a visibly present Other. Hence, cultural diversity is assumed to represent something unordinary. Second, the presented idea of how one can "see" pupils' "different background[s]" otherness an idea that conflates visible with different background and thus assuming that the following: if you look Other, then you must have a different background. Since looking Other and having a different background is not necessarily the same thing, this logic raises the relevant questions as to whether one might actually "see" different backgrounds of pupils in photos of them, or whether these differences rather allude to the photographed pupils' unordinary and therefore visible different bodily features (e.g. skin complexions, styles of clothing, or other visual markers). Importantly, this second assumption, similar to the first, can also imply that pupils who do not look Other in photos are assumed not to have different backgrounds.

Moreover, the description of how photos are one way of "getting it [: cultural diversity] in" to ordinary teacher education might point to an idea of how teaching about cultural diversity is more a concern with the means rather than the matter: It appears as if it does not matter what is taught about cultural diversity, but rather that something actually *is* taught. In other words, through this description, teaching about cultural diversity invokes ideas of it being an instrumental and uncritical enterprise.

Cultural diversity as the knowledgeable student teacher: Cultural diversity as knowledgeless minority parents

A fourth feature of the double meaning making pattern of the term cultural diversity was found through how the term was related to ideas that stressed the importance of the teacher role being one that involved minority parents in their children's initial learning. However, it was also found, similar to the preceding examples, through assumptions made about minority parents being knowledgeless, that is, devoid of knowledge. The following excerpt, drawn from the second part of the interview where questions were asked about what important and relevant knowledge student teachers should bestow in relation to cultural diversity after completing the full 60 ECTS pedagogy course, exemplifies this meaning making pattern:

> It is a precondition [for educational success] that the parents have both cultural and academic capital. There are many minority parents that do not have this … I believe that there actually are quite a lot of problems with a traditional cultural way of thinking, related to being a parent and making sure that the child receives the best possible preconditions for succeeding in school … [student teachers need] to actively involve them [: minority parents] in how to, in the best possible ways, work with their child at home during the initial reading and writing stage, including bilingual development, whereby the parents are analphabets, but [student teachers need to] get them to understand what a literacy hindrance within the home means. What it means for a child to sit down and read aloud to her mother. That her mother recognises [the importance of what it means for a child to sit down and read aloud to her mother], even though she does not understand the text herself. What kind of meaning does this have for reading and writing development? It means a great deal. Many [minority] parents are not aware of that. (Teacher educator, institution A)

In this excerpt, in contrast to the two previous excerpts, cultural diversity is presented neither as important, nor as a positive resource. Here, the important and relevant knowledge that student teachers should bestow about cultural diversity after completing the full 60 ECTS pedagogy course is represented as a concern with certain preconditioned expectations directed towards pupils' parents. For example, "parents [need to have] both cultural and academic capital". Moreover, the relevant knowledge student teachers should bestow about cultural diversity is also that "many minority parents do not have …cultural and academic capital", and that they have a "traditional cultural way of thinking" that is related to "quite a lot of problems", particularly when this is related to "being a parent and making sure that the child receives the best possible preconditions for succeeding in school". This important and relevant knowledge about cultural diversity that student teachers should bestow is also coupled with descriptions of how they, as teachers, need to involve minority parents actively in how to work with their child at home during the initial reading and writing stage. Such descriptions could be understood as promoting cultural diversity as a matter related to the teacher role of acting in socially inclusive ways based on principles of equity. For example, the student teacher may be understood as having important knowledge about a society consisting of a variety of parents with different preconditions, some of whom might require extra teacher support. However, these same descriptions, because they are initially related to minority parents and their descriptions, may also be understood to point to similar discursive patterns of othering

and degradation as those shown in the preceding excerpts. The othering and degrading representations of the minority parents are found through descriptions of minority parents as having traditional ways of thinking or being analphabets, and therefore it is assumed that minority parents are not able to understand what their assumed literacy hindrance means to their children's initial reading and writing stage. As such, these same parents appear to be represented as people who are knowledgeless of the things that student teachers are expected to know, for example, about how to assist their children during the initial reading and writing stage. However, what is interesting here is how the assumption of being analphabet is coupled with assumptions of cognitive (in)abilities. Such representations of the minority parents may be understood to promote subtle ideas of them as a group that is not only uneducated and knowledgeless, but moreover also possibly less able to comprehend certain things related to their children's cognitive abilities. Thus, such descriptions might invoke how this parental group represents particular challenges for the teacher (e.g. they might be users of extra teacher resources). When it comes to the important and relevant knowledge student teachers should bestow about cultural diversity after completing the full 60 ECTS pedagogy course, it seems to be that the student teacher should know her role as a knowledgeable teacher that should inform the knowledgeless minority parents.

The above presented double meaning making pattern of the term cultural diversity, we argue, may have implications for teacher education when it comes to social justice. In the next section, we discuss to how teacher education may better prepare student teachers for pedagogical decisions that hinder discursive meaning making patterns of othering and, instead, promote discourses of social justice in their future work as teachers.

Discussion

In this article, we have found that the double meaning making pattern of the term cultural diversity is featured by being both something explicitly positive, important and desirable for teacher education, yet also more subtly assumed to be something more negative and challenging: It is represented as a "less developed" and knowledgeless Other (Said, 2003). By extensively focusing on naming and defining the Other (Said, 2003), the workings of Whiteness primarily make salient other identities than Whiteness (Frankenberg, 1993), and thereby it appears *as if* Whiteness is invisible (Leonardo, 2004). As such, the findings of this article have illustrated how Whiteness works through teacher educator's dysconsciously (King, 2004) produced discourses. When cultural diversity is explicitly represented as something positive, important and desired in Norwegian teacher education, this pattern of meaning making, precisely because it may rest on subtler assumptions and meaning makings of cultural diversity, can be interpreted to mirror the "ideal" Whiteness ways in which cultural diversity ought to be represented. Importantly, this ideal representational surface shields the more non-ideal subtle ways that the term cultural diversity was also found to be represented in the teacher educator discourses—through the different

ways of othering that we have identified. Dowling (2017) argues that it is challenging to counter something that is not explicit. The methodological approach in the present article makes the subtle patterned meaning making of cultural diversity and the workings of Whiteness explicit and thereby possible to counter.

In the teacher educator discourses, the double meaning making pattern of the term cultural diversity did not appear through clear binary oppositions that, on the one hand promoted merely positive representations of Us, and on the other hand merely negative representations of the Other (MacLure, 2003; Said, 2003). The double meaning making that assumed cultural diversity as referring to the Other was part of a "messier" discursive system of representation (Fylkesnes, 2018a, 2018b) that we argue has the effect of confusing the already subtly-produced non-ideal ways of representing cultural diversity. For example, when cultural diversity was represented as a multicultural resource, this representation might most likely be understood as a positive representation. This is very important to emphasize as we believe that teacher educators wish to approach it in positive and inclusive ways.

Our findings have implications for teacher education with respect to the promotion of social and racial justice in Norwegian teacher education. Generally, the extensive subtle representations of the term cultural diversity through assumptions of it as Other is problematic when seen in relation to how promoting social justice and countering acts of social exclusion are crucial aspects of education and schooling today (Conklin & Hughes, 2015; Lovdata, 2013). However, the usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity through patterns of othering and exclusion produced in teacher educator discourses, despite also having patterns of explicit claims of cultural diversity as something positive, relevant, and important for teacher education, can arguably further constitute already established assumptions that produce discourses promoting racial injustice. We, therefore, believe it is important to ask what kinds of critical thinking about discourses regarding the term cultural diversity teacher educators and student teachers could be provided with.

Given that teachers' dispositions affect their pedagogical decisions (Eberly et al., 2007; Robinson & Clardy, 2011) in ways that ultimately affect social justice (Mills & Ballantyne, 2010), how we are viewed determines in part how we are treated, and how we treat others is based on how we view them as based on representations (Dyer, 1993, cited in Gillborn, 1995, p. 18). What the student teachers learn about cultural diversity through their teacher education programme may have influence on their future teaching and may also have implications regarding how pupils learn about the workings of Whiteness. From a pupil's perspective, social justice-related experiences of inclusion, othering, and exclusion are something they learn through their everyday experiences at school, not necessarily through what is explicitly said or done, but perhaps more profoundly through what is said and done subtly and in a dysconscious manner (King, 2004). Moreover, pupils' perceived experiences of Whiteness most likely diverge based on their socially-ascribed identities. Pupils who are ascribed (by themselves and by others) an identity of Whiteness, in that they share the dominant social Norwegian (and mainly White) group's

overall norms and values, probably learn about a more encouraging positive outlook regarding their possibilities in life than do minoritized pupils. Therefore, teacher educators, who may influence student teachers, could be given opportunities to learn how to deconstruct and counter ways in which minoritized pupils are othered in society, for example, through implicitly produced patterns of othering, produced in institutions, and oftentimes, dysconciously by themselves.

The teacher educators interviewed in this study generally highlighted cultural diversity as something positive, relevant, and important. At the same time—as most of Us do—they also produced dicursive meaning making patterns of othering and exclusion by the ways in which cultural diversity was found to always assume an identity as a degraded, objectified, "less developed" and knowledgeless Other (Essed, 1991; Said, 2003). Given that conceptualisations of terms in discourses constituted by knowledge-producing institutions work through educational curricula and practice, and that discourses produced in the academy over time become commonplace to students (Afdal & Nerland, 2014; Bangeni & Kapp, 2007), it is important for future teachers to gain knowledge about the discursive legacy of Whiteness. For teacher educators to be able to provide student teachers with critical knowledge about the concept and enactments of Whiteness, they would also need critical theoretical and analytical concepts that could work as useful tools for navigating the discursive production in their own teaching. Specifically, teacher education institutions could, for example, provide teacher educators with critical theoretical and analytical tools for deconstruction that enable them to question and disrupt the way in which Whiteness is normalized through the discourses produced (also by themselves) within institutions. Awareness of such double meaning making patterns of cultural diversity might also encourage all actors within education to start to question and to take steps towards altering their own discursive positionality.

Conclusion

This article has shed light on the usage and meaning making of the term cultural diversity according to teacher educators at two Norwegian teacher education institutions. Drawing on perspectives from CWS and discourse theory, we found that cultural diversity was represented through what we describe as a double meaning making pattern. Herein, the term cultural diversity, despite being explicitly claimed to be something positive, relevant, and important to teacher education, was nonetheless also extensively found to be assumed an identity as Other (Said, 2003). We have argued that the double meaning making patterns of cultural diversity, on the one hand, mirror the ideal Whiteness ways in which the term cultural diversity ought to be represented, but on the other hand, these patterns also shield the more non-ideal subtle ways in which cultural diversity was also assumed to be about the Other. Thus, we have highlighted the possibility of how discourses might also produce social and racial injustice. The discursive productions of othering, because of their implicit features, can be challenging to counter. However, by this

article, we have also offered some methodological and analytical tools that may contribute towards making these implicit patterns explicit and thus assist in countering similar discursive productions. Teacher educators may make use of these tools in their pedagogical endeavor for social justice.

References

Afdal, H. W., & Nerland, M. (2014). Does teacher education matter? An analysis of relations to knowledge among Norwegian and Finnish novice teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 58*(3), 281-299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2012.726274

Atabong, A. A. (2016). *"Is there such a thing?" A study of antiracism education in Finland* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki).

Bates, T., Swennen, A., & Jones, K. (2011). Teacher educators: A professional development perspective. In T. Bates, A. Swennen, & K. Jones (Eds.), The professional development of teacher educators (pp. 33-48). London: Routledge.

Bangeni, B., & Kapp, R. (2007). Shifting language attitudes in a linguistically diverse learning environment in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 4*(28), 253-269. https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd495.0

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brown, E. L. (2004). The relationship of self-concepts to changes in cultural diversity awareness: Implications for urban teacher educators. *Urban Review, 36*(2), 119-145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-004-0616-0

Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, Part II. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 109-121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114558268

Conklin, H. G., & Hughes, H. E. (2015). Practices of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *67*(1), 47-60. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115607346

Dowling, F. (2017). "Rase" og etnisitet? Det kan ikke jeg si noe særlig om – her er det "Blenda-hvitt"! ["Race" and ethnicity? That, I cannot say anything in particular about – here, all is "Snow White"!]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, *101*(3), 252-256.

Dyer, R. (1993). *The matter of images: Essays on representations.* London: Routledge.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.

Essed, P. (1991). *Understanding everyday racism: An interdisciplinary theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Eberly, J. L., Rand, M. K., & O'Connor, T. (2007). Analyzing teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Using adult development theory. *Multicultural Education, 14*(4), 31-36.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of Whiteness*. London: Routledge.

Fylkesnes, S. (2018a). Whiteness in teacher education research discourses: A review of the use and meaning making of the term cultural diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71*. 24-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.005

Fylkesnes, S. (2018b). Patterns of Racialised Discourses in Norwegian Teacher Education Policy: Whiteness as a Pedagogy of Amnesia in the National Curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy.* https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2018.1482503

Gay, G. (2010). Acting on beliefs in teacher education for cultural diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347320

Gillborn, D. (1995). *Racism and antiracism in real schools.* Buckingham: Pone University Press.

Gillborn, D. (2005). Education as an act of White supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(4), 485. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500132346

Gillborn. D. (2008). *Racism and education: Coincidence or conspiracy?* New York, NY: Routledge.

Goldberg, D. T. (1993). *Racist culture: Philosophy and the politics of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Goldberg, D. T. (2006). Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 29*(2), 331-364. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870500465611

Goldberg, D. T. (2009). The social formation of racist discourse. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), The anatomy of racism (pp. 295-318). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Goodwin, A. L., Smith, L., Souto-Manning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, M. Y., Reed, R., & Taveras, L. (2014). What should teacher educators know and be able to do? Perspectives from practicing teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 284-302. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114535266

Gorski, P. C., Davis, S. N., & Reiter, A. (2012). Self-efficacy and multicultural teacher education in the United States: The factors that influence who feels qualified to be a multicultural teacher educator. *Multicultural Perspectives, 14*(4), 220-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2012.725332

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation. *Field Notes, 18*(1), 58-82.

Gullestad, M. (2001). *Det norske sett med nye øyne.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gullestad, M. (2002). Invisible fences: Egalitarianism, nationalism and racism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 8*(1), 45-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.00098

Gullestad, M. (2004). Blind slaves to our prejudice: Debating "culture" and "race" in Norway. *Ethnos 69*(2), 177–203. https://doi.org/10.1080/0014184042000212858

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), *Formations of modernity* (pp. 275-320). Oxford: Polity Press.

Hallett, F. (2010). Do we practice what we preach? An examination of the pedagogical beliefs of teacher educators. *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*(4), 435-448. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.493347

Jacobs, J., Assaf, L. C., & Lee, K. S. (2011). Professional development for teacher educators: Conflicts between critical reflection and instructional-based strategies. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(4), 499-512. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2010.533587

King, J. E. (2004). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. In D. Gillborn & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in multicultural education* (pp. 71-83). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Qualitative interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Leeman, Y. (2008). Education and diversity in the Netherlands. *European Educational Research Journal, 7*(1), 50–59. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2008.7.1.50

Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of White folk: Critical pedagogy, Whiteness studies, and global discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 29-50. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320120117180

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of "White privilege". *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *36*(2), 137-152. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00057.x

Loftsdóttir, K., & Jensen, L. (2012). *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic region: Exceptionalism, migrant Others and national identities*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Lovdata. (2013). *Lov om grunnskolen og den videregående opplæringa (opplæringslova)* [Law concerning mandatory education and upper secondary education]. Retrieved from http://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17-61 [11. November, 2017]

MacLure, M. (2003). *Discourse in educational and social research*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Mausethagen, S., & Granlund, L. (2012). Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: Current tensions between education policy and teachers' union. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 815-833. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2012.672656

McVee, M. B. (2014). The challenge of more light, the complexity of culture: Lessons learned in exploring the cultural positioning of literacy teachers. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.739463

Mikander, P. (2016). *Westerners and Others in Finnish school textbooks* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki).

Mills, C., & Ballantyne, J. (2010). Pre-service teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Arguing for a developmental hierarchy of change. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 26*(3), 447-454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.012

Ministry of Education and Research. (2010). *Nasjonale Retningslinjer for Grunnskolelærerutdanningen, 1.-7- trinn* [National guidelines for primary teacher education, grades 1-7]. Oslo: Author. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Rundskriv/2010/Retningslinjer_grunnskolelaererutdanningen_1_7_trinn.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,0,792. [05. September, 2016]

Murray, J. (2014). Teacher educators' constructions of professionalism: A case study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(1), 7-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2013.870971

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Peräkylä, A., & Ruusuvuori, J. (2017). Analysing talk and text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (pp. 529-524). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Picover, B. (2009). The unexamined Whiteness of teaching: How White teachers maintain and enact dominant racial ideologies. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 2*(12), 197-215. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320902995475

Richards, J. (2011). Exploring two interventions to promote graduate education majors' dispositions toward culturally responsive teaching: Taking action to address my shortcomings as a literacy teacher educator. *Reading Improvement, 48*(2), 59-70.

Robinson, C. C., & Clardy, P. (2011). It ain't what you say, it's how you say it: Linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 18*(3), 101-110.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Freiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts (Vol. 3, pp. 559-582). New York, NY: Routledge and Association of Teacher Educators.

Søreide, G. (2007). *Narrative construction of teacher identity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bergen). Retrieved from http://bora.uib.no/handle/1956/2532.

Thomas, P., Haug Changezi, S., & Enstad, M. (2016). Third space epistemologies: Ethnicity and belonging in an "immigrant"-dominated upper secondary school in Norway. *Improving Schools*, *19*(3), 212–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480216643200

Timmerman, G. (2009). Teacher educators modelling their teachers? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 225-238. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760902756020

Tryggvason, M.-T. (2012). Perceptions of identity among Finnish university-based subject teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(3), 289-303. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2011.633998

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115-140. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908

Van Riemsdijk, M. (2010). Variegated privileges of Whiteness: Lived experiences of Polish nurses in Norway. *Social & Cultural Geography, 11*(2), 117–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360903514376

Virta, A. (2009). Learning to teach history in culturally diverse classrooms. *Intercultural Education, 20*(4), 285–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980903351920

Westrheim, K. (2014). Det flerkulturelle i et kritisk perspektiv [The multicultural from a critical perspective]. In K. Westrheim & A. Tolo (Eds.), *Kompetanse for mangfold. Om skolens utfordringer i det flerkulturelle Norge* [Competency for diversity: About the school's challenges in a multicultural Norway] (pp. 27-55). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Williams, J. (2014). Teacher educator professional learning in the third space: Implications for identity and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 315-326. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533128

Appendices

Appendix 1

Table 1: A three-reading strategy

	Aim	**Analytic Strategy**	**Empirical Research Questions**
1st reading	Get an overview of terms, concepts, and content related to cultural diversity	Word search Choice of words	What terms are prominent and frequently used in the transcribed interview material?
2nd reading	Identify how cultural diversity is used through representations of closely related terms	Representations Othering Objectification Assumptions Normalization	How are cultural diversity and its related terms described? How is cultural diversity represented as similar and different to other used terms and concepts and their descriptions?
3rd reading	Provide an overview of the main meaning making patterns of cultural diversity across the three interview parts as well as between the two institutions	Discursive patterns of representation Comparison	What main discursive pattern of representation of cultural diversity exists in the different parts of the transcribed interview material? Are there any differences between the two institutions?

Inspired by Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012; Søreide, 2007

Appendix 2: Interview guide (This guide has been translated form Norwegian by author a.)

Interview Guide: Primary School Teacher Educators (Individual interviews)

Introduction

As you have read about in the informed consent (that you have just signed), this interview is concerned with primary school teacher educators' understandings of cultural diversity. The interview will last approximately one hour, it will be recorded and your identity will be kept confidential in the transcribed material.

The interview is divided into three parts with an introductory section. In the first part of the interview, I address general questions related to what you value and regard as important in relation to teaching and learning on the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course. The second part of the interview focuses on cultural diversity, and the third part is a summary that focuses on terms and concepts that generally appear in primary school teacher education policy- and curriculum-related documents.

Main questions including follow-up questions

INTRODUCTION: Education and work experience(s)

Main questions	*Possible follow-up questions*
1. What is your work experience/educational background prior to joining this institution?	What is your educational background? Degree? Subjects? Additional courses? How long have you worked at this institution for? Have you taught other courses before the one you are teaching now? If so, where?
2. What are the key features of your institution, your faculty and your department?	Why did you choose to work at this institution? How does it compare to your earlier work experiences?

PART 1: Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge as a course in primary school teacher education

Main questions	*Possible follow-up questions*
1. How would you describe the main features of the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course?	What are the key features of this course? In what way is this course similar or different from the other courses in primary school teacher education?
2. If you reflect on the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course, on the way it was in *general teacher education*, how has it changed with the introduction of *primary school teacher education 1-7* (2010)?	What is new with the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course? What is similar and different to the *old* pedagogy course? What role does this new subject have in primary school teacher education? Has its role changed?
3. What specific values do you regard as important to your work with the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course?	Why are these values important to you? What values are not *really* that important? Have your values changed with time?
4. What knowledge from your field do you consider important for the primary school student teachers to bestow after they have completed the full 60 ECTS *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course?	Why is this so important?
5. How do the primary school student teachers learn the best – through theory or practice?	(e.g. in-school practice, reading theories, group work etc?) Why? What are your colleagues' views on this?
6. What texts and theories do you regard as important for the primary school student teachers to understand and be familiar with in order to perform their best when in their school practice?	More precisely, what texts do you think students should read? What literature should be on every primary school student teacher *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course's reading list? Why? What other theories could have been included? What texts could be excluded? Why?
7. What do the primary school student teachers *meet with* in their practice period?	For example, what can the student teachers expect to be met with regarding the following: the school, the pupils, colleagues, culture and society?

8. What experiences from the practice period do you regard as important for the primary school student teachers?	Why? In what way can such experiences further develop the primary school student teachers' identity as professional pedagogues?
9. How would you describe the ways in which the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course contributes towards fulfilling the educational mandate?	How is the educational mandate addressed (as part of teaching and learning) in the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course?

PART 2: Cultural diversity and the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course in primary school teacher education

Main questions	*Possible follow-up questions*
1. As part of the new national curriculum for primary school teacher education detailed in the "National guidelines for primary school teacher education, level 1-7" (2010), there is a focus on cultural diversity. How do you understand this?	What do you think is meant by cultural diversity herein? What is it all about?
2. In what way(s) has the focus on cultural diversity changed in the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course when general teacher education was replaced by primary school teacher education (2010)?	What is new? What has remained the same? What *space* is given to *cultural diversity* as part of the *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course?
3. If you teach about cultural diversity, how do you do it?	How could you have done it differently? Are you familiar with different methods regarding such teaching? How do your colleagues teach this topic?
4. What knowledge about cultural diversity, in your opinion, is important for the student teachers to bestow after they have completed the full 60 ECTS *Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge* course?	What is important? What is not that important? Has this changed over time? What aspects and dimensions of cultural diversity are important to bring forth?
5. What texts and theories about cultural diversity do you regard as im-	In your opinion, what texts should the student teachers read? What literature should be included on the *Pedagogy and Pupil*

portant for student teachers to understand and be familiar with in regard to their work in primary schools?	*Knowledge* course reading list? Why? Could any other literature also be included?
6. What experiences from the practice period do you perceive as important for the primary school student teachers to have with respect to their future teaching about cultural diversity in primary schools?	Why? In what way can such experiences contribute to developing the primary school teachers' sense of identity as professional pedagogues in a multicultural diverse society?

INTERLUDE: Autonomy

Main questions	*Possible follow-up questions*
1. Are there any circumstances in your institution, faculty, or department that set limits for your teaching about themes related to cultural diversity?	Do you regard this as positive? Negative? What perspectives does your department have on this?

PART 3: Knowledge and concepts

Main questions	*Possible follow-up questions*
1. What knowledge should the student teachers bestow after they have completed the full 60 ECTS Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course, in relation to …	a. The pupil b. The teacher role c. The school d. Pedagogy
2. Related to pedagogy, what do you think of when you hear the following words…?	a. Sociocultural (-background) b. Culture c. Cultural diversity d. Norwegian culture e. Cultural heritage f. Heritage g. Cultural tradition h. Tradition i. Identity j. The multicultural k. Multiculturalism l. Internationalisation m. Globalisation

	n. Solidarity
3. What are the similarities and differences between the following words…?	a. Culture b. Cultural diversity c. Multicultural

Follow-up questions
What do you mean by…?
Could you say something more about …?

Transitional questions
Could you describe, explain …?
What is your experience with…?

End questions
Considering this, what is most important to you; would you sum up your perspective on this? Is there anything you would like to add? Comments?

Thank you very much for participating in this interview! ☺

* The interview generally focused on the main question and the follow-up questions were only posed if they were regarded as relevant to what the interviewee was saying. Variations in the follow-up questions were sometimes also used in order to maintain the flow of the conversation.

Article 4

Nilsen, A. B., Fylkesnes, S., & Mausethagen, S. (2017). The linguistics in othering: Teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, *8*(1). doi:10.7577/rerm.2556

The linguistics in othering: Teacher educators' talk about *cultural diversity*

Anne Birgitta Nilsen, Anne-Birgitta.Nilsen@hioa.no
Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Professor

Sandra Fylkesnes, Sandra.Fylkesnes@hioa.no
Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, M.phil

Sølvi Mausethagen, Solvi.Mausethagen@hioa.no
Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, PhD

Abstract

'Othering' can be conceptually defined as the manner in which social group dichotomies are represented in language via binary oppositions of 'us' and 'them'. The article aims to contribute to a methodological approach for differentiating the concept of othering in educational settings. We will introduce new ways of conceptualising othering based on findings from an empirical critical discourse analytical study of how teacher educators talk about the term 'cultural diversity'. The study is based on transcriptions of interviews with Norwegian teacher educators. The findings illustrate that teacher educators talk about cultural diversity using seven different ways of othering. These ways of othering are important because teacher educators' discourses influence preservice teachers, in turn, influencing their future teaching in schools. We argue that a critical linguistic awareness of the ways in which pupils are 'othered' is an important tool in counteracting social exclusion and promoting social justice and equity.

Key words: othering, cultural diversity, teacher educators, critical discourse analysis, equity, social justice.

Introduction

Cultural diversity is an important concept in teacher education in Norway as well as in many other countries. However, most of the research on cultural diversity and teacher education has focused on how to address shortcomings in the attitudes and knowledge of preservice teachers (Cochran-Smith et al., 2015; Sleeter, 2008). Recent developments point to the need for a greater focus on teacher educators' knowledge and professional development (Goodwin et al., 2014; Hallett, 2010; Jacobs, Assaf, & Lee, 2011; Martinez, 2008; Murray, 2014; Timmerman, 2009; Tryggvason, 2012; Williams, 2014). Although empirical research on teacher educators' knowledge about today's increasingly demographically diverse society has been rather scarce (Goodwin et al., 2014), some studies have

addressed cultural diversity teaching in teacher education. For example, one study reports that teacher educators often feel unprepared (Gorski, Davis, & Reiter, 2012) and that there is not necessarily a correlation between teacher educators' self-understanding and their awareness of cultural diversity (e.g. Brown, 2004). Nevertheless, teacher educators' knowledge is important for helping preservice teachers develop culturally responsive understandings (Richards, 2011).

Based on a critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2001, 2003; Van Dijk, 2006) of how 12 Norwegian teacher educators use cultural diversity as a term and how they understand cultural diversity as a concept, this article contributes to the knowledge on teacher educators' competence in cultural diversity by examining how they construct others when they talk about the term cultural diversity. Furthermore, we contribute to a methodological approach to differentiating the concept of othering in educational settings. The analysis was guided by the following research questions:

- How do teacher educators use the term cultural diversity?
- What may their discursive practices of the term cultural diversity tell us about their conceptual understanding of cultural diversity?

Against this backdrop, the present study illustrates that although teacher educators seemed concerned with social justice and equity, they talk about cultural diversity via seven different ways of othering. In this article, othering refers to the manner in which social group dichotomies are represented in language in unintended ways via binary oppositions of 'us' and 'them' (Pandey, 2004).

It is important to note that in this article, othering is not the same as prejudice, discrimination or racism in terms of their more 'traditional' senses. Thus, othering is not about explicitly promoting ideas of biological inferiority or explicit practices of segregation and derogation. Rather, in this article, it has to do with how people are grouped and minoritised through discursive practices that categorise them as different. Furthermore, discursive practices of othering are a phenomenon that occurs not only amongst teacher educators, but also more generally amongst *all* members of society, including the elite and ordinary people. However, such in-practice ideologies (Van Dijk, 2006), although unconscious, may have a particular influence on teaching practice and, thereby, the ideas of teacher students. Othering is, therefore, an important concept in understanding the reproduction of inequality in society (Van Dijk, 1993). It may be seen as manifestations of power relations in which some groups are defined as others, excluded from the large 'we' in the larger society. They are not one of us.

Our findings are suitable for initiating a discussion of the ways of othering and of countering othering in teacher education, a field of research that hitherto remains largely unexplored. In fact, a search in Academic Research Premier of the terms 'othering' and 'teacher education' rendered only nine articles. None of these nine articles discussed ways of othering and discussed the term in more general ways. Hahl and Löfström (2016), for example, warn against how teacher educators may promote culturalist viewpoints and, from their more 'expert' position, pass these viewpoints onto student teachers who, in turn, project them onto their future students. In another article, Srinivasan and Cruz (2015) focus on including the need to train teachers to recognise and address how 'race' and colour operate overtly and covertly in school communities, mobilised through children's everyday experiences in school. Srinivasan and Cruz do not however discuss the more detailed linguistics that constitutes othering, but refer to race and colour. The linguistics of othering is thus our contribution to the reconceptualization of othering in educational research methodology.

The article is organised as follows. First, we present the methodology by outlining concepts related to critical discourse analysis and presenting our data and methods. Second, we present the findings from our analysis. Third, we present a discussion of our findings and argue that an awareness of the ways in which pupils are 'othered' in society is an important tool in counteracting social exclusion and promoting social justice and equity, which are crucial aspects of Norwegian education. We

conclude that our findings are important because teacher educators' ways of othering may influence preservice teachers and, in turn, their future teaching in schools. Thus, othering in the classroom may lead to the social exclusion of pupils.

Methodology

The methodology in our study is based on critical discourse analytical perspectives, primarily the work of Fairclough (2001, 2003) and Van Dijk (2006). Our empirical data are transcriptions of semi-structured individual interviews with teacher educators. As such, the research methodology used here turns the gaze toward the ongoing and taken-for-granted production of othering and unequal power relations that are discursively produced in the teacher education programme.

Theory

Discourses are believed to represent ideology (Van Dijk, 2006). Participants in particular discourse practices may construct polarisations of in- and out-groups by displaying their generally accepted attitudes, 'obvious' beliefs, opinions or 'common sense'. Yet, they may also construct binary oppositions of 'us' and 'the other' by using subtler discursive practices, which manifest in methods of representation that implicitly construct the other. This is what we found in our study of teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity.

An important concern in discourse analysis is the detection and deconstruction of particular groups' maintenance of social dominance and hegemony through the analysis of the workings of power. The workings of power in our analysis occur through the discourse practices of othering (DPOs), through which the others are represented as unordinary, as well as in the social distance that the teacher educators seem to express towards the others.

In our analyses, we draw on linguistic perspectives and presume that it is in and through linguistic choices that people encode and express their stances, norms, values and worldviews. It is worth underlining that we perceive talk, not only as an individual enterprise, but as a contextually- and historically-bound practice through which individuals speak as members of various communities. In our study, for example, the teacher educators, even though interviewed individually, speak both as individuals and as members of a teacher educator community. Therefore, we postulate that the teacher educator community of this study contains both shared and individual perceptions of cultural diversity.

We are guided by the theoretical perspective of multidisciplinary critical discourse analysis, whose primary emphasis is the study of 'the intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture' (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 253). Following these perspectives, our analytical approach examines the extent to which social attitudes and perceptions are reflected and sustained in the microstructures of words, sentences and text and how language is utilised by teacher educators to reflect and sustain social asymmetries. The extent to which language sustains social asymmetries is a matter of power, which is also an important concept in our discourse analysis. According to Van Dijk (2006), ideologies are socially shared representations of groups. They are the foundations of group attitudes and other beliefs. Thus, ideologies 'control the "biased" personal mental models that underlie the production of ideological discourse' (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 138). Ideological discourse is organised through positive self-representation and negative other-presentation. Such in-group–out-group polarisation has often been referred to as *othering*, which may be defined as the manner in which social group dichotomies are represented via language (Pandey, 2004, p. 155).

Following van Dijk (2006), we assume that 'if ideologies are organized by well-known ingroup–outgroup polarization, then we may expect such a polarization also to be 'coded' in talk and text. This

coding may happen by the use of pronouns such as us and them and by possessives and demonstratives such as our people and those people' (p. 126), explicitly or implicitly. Riggins (1997, p. 8) claims that the most revealing features of othering are inclusive and exclusive pronouns and possessives, such as we and they, us and them, and ours and theirs. Therefore, in addition to studying the teacher educators' use of nouns and adjectives in their talk about cultural diversity, we also study their use of pronouns.

Data

The study data comprise transcriptions of 12 semi-structured individual interviews with 12 teacher educators involved in teaching the course 'Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge'. This course is concerned with pedagogical theories and knowledge instruction and is mandatory for all preservice teachers. Since this particular course is supposed to be integrative in Norway's national teacher education programme, it is mandated to provide preservice teachers with an identity as teachers and serves to override and unify other courses (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010). We purposely chose teacher educators teaching within the subject of pedagogy because they have formative influence on preservice teachers.

The teacher educators were recruited in four steps. First, informative e-mails on the project, along with follow-up phone calls, were directed to the leaders of the two selected institutions. These leaders then recruited staff members who they considered likely to be interested in the topic and, thus, willing to participate in the interview. Third, direct e-mail contact with possible informants was established, and follow-up phone calls were conducted to plan the meetings with those who had a preference for oral communication.

The teacher educators were interviewed during the 2013 to 2014 school year. On average, the interviews lasted 1.5 to 2 hours. They were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim, resulting in approximately 180 pages of transcriptions. Each interview consisted of three parts: (1) questions relating to what the teacher educator valued as important in his or her teaching in the course 'Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge' (e.g. What values are important to you in your teaching? What kind of knowledge do you consider important for a student teacher to have by their completion of the Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge course? What texts/theories do you consider crucial for a student teacher to be familiar with in order to become a good teacher?); (2) questions similar to those in the first part, though with an explicit focus on the term cultural diversity, and (3) teacher educators' reflections on terms and concepts repeatedly featured in Norwegian primary school teacher education policy and curriculum documents (e.g. In relation to the 'Pedagogy and Pupil Knowledge' course, what do you think of when you hear the following terms: cultural diversity, culture, cultural tradition, cultural heritage, Norwegian culture, identity, multicultural, multiculturalism, globalisation, internationalisation, solidarity?) The first and second parts of the interview were designed to facilitate a comparison of individuals' responses across these two sections. The third part was designed to investigate the teacher educators' perceptions of and responses to the Norwegian educational discourse on teacher education, as expressed in policy and curriculum documents. The analysis presented in this article focuses mainly on the two latter parts of the interviews.

Analysis

We analysed the use of words (i.e. nouns, adjectives and pronouns), their semantic categorisations and how they co-occur with cultural diversity *across* the data. Furthermore, we identified discourse practices based on our semantic categorisations.

Using a critical linguistic discourse analysis, we applied a four-step process (adapted from Fairclough, 2001; Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012) to teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity." For the first analysis, we created a list of the nouns, adjectives and pronouns used by the teacher educators as they talked about *cultural diversity* across the interviews and between the two institutions. The

main analytical strategy employed in this first step was a manual search that identified these terms and then determined the most commonly used nouns, adjectives and pronouns.

The second step of the analysis focused on detecting the ideologically significant semantic categories in which the words from the first step could be categorised. The ideologically significant semantic categories identified serve as indications of the discourse practices related to teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity. Thus, in the third step of our analysis, we identified the discourse practices related to the teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity.
In the fourth step of the analysis, we discussed the consequences of the discourse practices we identified in the previous step. The steps of the analysis are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1:
The four-step analysis

	Aim	Strategy for Analysis	Research Questions
1st analysis	An overview of the nouns, adjectives and pronouns used by the teacher educators when they talked about cultural diversity	Make a list of nouns, adjectives and pronouns	Which nouns, adjectives and pronouns co-occur with cultural diversity?
2nd analysis	A semantic categorisation of the nouns and adjectives based on the 1st analysis	Detect ideologically significant semantic categories representing discourse practices	Which are the ideologically significant semantic categories?
3rd analysis	A list of discourse practices based on categories from the 2nd analysis	Identify discourse practices	What are the discourse practices related to cultural diversity?
4th analysis	A discussion of the consequences of the discursive practices	Discuss discursive practices in a broader context	What are the consequences of the discursive practices?

Findings: Ways of Othering

In our study, we generally found that the teacher educators talked about 'cultural diversity' as something concerning the others. The teacher educators discussed how pupils and parents differed from themselves and did not seem to see themselves as part of Norway's cultural diversity. In talking about how the others differ from themselves, a dichotomy was created between two groups via binary oppositions of us and the others, as represented in the table below. In the interviews, the others were the pupils and parents, who differed from the teacher educators in various ways. The others had different cultures, languages, migratory histories and religions and were visibly and socially different. This way of talking can be described as a DPO (discourse practice of othering) in which the 'ordinary' represents us and the 'unordinary' represents them via implicit or explicit discursively constructed contrasts.

Abu-Lughod (1991, p. 143) claims that culture is the essential tool in creating the other. The findings from our study support this claim by depicting the centrality of culture in our data in making the other. However, by applying a critical discourse analytical approach to the interviews with the

teacher educators, we also find other means of making the other. In what follows, we describe seven different DPOs: cultural, social, cognitive, multilingual, migrational, visible and religious.

The seven ways of othering are presented below in Table 1, where we have categorised the typical features of the seven DPOs based on the contrasts between positive self-representations and negative other representations (Bhabha, 1994). From the 1st analysis, we identified what we found to be the most typical nouns, adjectives and pronouns in the teacher educators' talk about cultural diversity. The original list of nouns connected to culture included approximately 30 different words across the interviews; the list of adjectives connected to social aspects included 28 different words; and the list of nouns connected to visibility and religion included 4 different words in each category. The most nouns and adjectives were found in cultural, social and linguistic othering.

Our findings from the 2nd step of our analysis illustrate that othering in teacher education seems to occur in discursive practices related to these semantic categories: culture, social aspects, multilingualism, migration, nationality, visibility and religion. The adjectives representing the DPOs in the left-most column in the table below are the results of our 3rd analysis where we identified the discourse practices related to the semantic categories.

Table 1: Discursive practices of othering

DPOs	Nouns	Adjectives	Pronouns
Cultural	Ethnicity, pizza, experience, music, dance, others, the foreign, barriers, values	Cultural, mono-cultural, multicultural, different	They
Social	Inclusion, racism, crises, prejudices, depression, violence, belonging, integration, minority, majority, discrimination, pupil groups	Behavioural, emotional, less, multicultural, inclusive, socio-economic, stigmatising, different	This These They Your
Linguistic	Pupils, resources, minorities, plurality, challenges, parents, children, competence	Linguistic, low, bi-multilingual, adapted, Norwegian, foreign, less	They These
Cognitive	Difficulties, dyscalculia, dyslexic children's development, differences	Individual, learning	These
Migrational	Persons, immigrant, majority, minority Nationalities, country, parents	Non-Western, new national, other, different	Implicit those, they
Visible	Skin colour, pupils	Different	Implicit they
Religious	Islam, pupils	Different	Implicit they

Similar to the findings in a study of discourse strategies conducted by Pandey (2004, p. 161), the various discursive practices identified here occur, not in isolation but, rather, in tandem with one another.

Cultural othering. A focus on the culturally different is what we refer to as cultural othering. In the interviews, the teacher educators talked about the cultural differences between pupils and parents and themselves. The teacher educators seemed to think that cultural diversity was about the others: that is, pupils and parents of different cultural backgrounds than their own. Examples of cultural

differences were the teacher educators' talk about ethnicity, the foreign, cultural barriers etc., as illustrated in the table above. The teacher educators spoke in a manner that suggested that only the others have a culture where the others were represented in the explicit pronoun they. In so doing, the teacher educators seemed to position their own culture as the ordinary and the culture of others as the unordinary. The contrast in cultural othering is between the stranger and the native

Social othering. Social factors can also play a role in discursive practices of othering, for example, when cultural diversity is about inclusion. Inclusion in this context is about the need for the others to be included in society as opposed to the ordinary, who are already included. The use of phrases such as *these children* and *their parents* may be interpreted as creating social distance between the speaker and the referenced group of children. The phrases may therefore have been used to mark social distance between the teacher educators and the others. Social othering becomes visible in the implicit contrast between the dependant, who requires special attention and help, and the non-dependant or ordinary.

Multilingual othering. Multilingual othering occurred most frequently in the interviews. The teacher educators talked about the multilingual and the bilingual pupils when they talked about cultural diversity. The importance of working with bilingual children so that *they* can follow ordinary lessons was for example emphasised. The others were the multilingual. The contrast in multilingual othering is between the monolingual and the multi- or bilingual.

Migrational othering. This manifests through contrasts between migrants and non-migrants, with non-migrants representing the ordinary and migrants representing the unordinary. Cultural diversity is about people who come to Norway. The implicit others are those who have migrated to Norway or who have parents who have migrated to Norway. With their many nationalities, the *pupils* were described as nationally different from the preservice teachers, who share a single nationality: Norwegian. Thus, the pupils represent the unordinary.

Cognitive othering. This othering occurs when talking about how to make learning development happen in *these* children, with these children referring to the unordinary pupils who were considered cognitively different (and, implicitly, cognitively impaired). The contrast in cognitive othering is between pupils with high versus low cognitive abilities.

Visible othering. Visible othering is a way of othering by referring to visible differences where the visibly different is the unordinary, whereas the visibly similar is the ordinary. The visibly different included, for example, pupils of a different skin colour or those with disabilities. The contrast in visible othering, therefore, is between the coloured and the non-coloured and between the disabled and the non-disabled.

Religious othering. Religious othering is a way of othering by referring to religious differences in binary oppositions. The contrast in religious othering is between people of one religion and those of different religions.

Similar to findings by Pandey (2004, p. 161), the different discursive practices identified do not occur in isolation but, rather, in tandem. An overview of the contrasts in the DPOs is presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Contrasts in DPOs

DPOs	Implicit contrasts between groups
Cultural othering	The stranger and the native
Social othering	The dependant and the non-dependant
Linguistic othering	The multilingual and the monolingual
Cognitive othering	Persons with high and low cognitive abilities
Migrational othering	The migrant and the non-migrant
Visible othering	The coloured and the non-coloured The disabled and the non-disabled
Religious othering	The religiously different and the religiously non-different

Discussion

The aim of this article was to contribute to a methodological approach to differentiating the concept of othering in educational settings. Our analysis provides an account of how 12 teacher educators may promote social inequality through the use and meaning-making regarding cultural diversity. Our findings show that teacher educators, like other members of society, can express their conceptualisations of cultural diversity in linguistic terms that constitute othering. However, one important difference between teacher educators and 'other members of society' is that teacher educators bestow a certain amount of power to their knowledge and the processes and practices conveying it.

We hope to have demonstrated that it is in the language used to represent cultural diversity that teacher educators can best comprehend the true complexity of representation and exclusion. It is through linguistic choices that teacher educators engage in representations of cultural diversity and, thus, in discursive exclusions. Othering may be seen as a manifestation of power relations in which the other is disempowered through the process of being defined as the other and not as included in the large 'we' of society, as ordinary members of society. Given how teacher educators' meaning-making might influence their teaching (Trent, Kea, & Oh, 2008), further insight into such processes could increase our knowledge about how to develop teacher education programmes that promote social justice and equity.

As noted by Pandey (2004, p. 176), it is in the collective portrayal of groups and the choice of othering practices that social injustices have the potential to be replicated in the collective consciousness. The potential for replication is particularly significant in teacher educators' discourse practices of othering, since teacher educators hold trifold power – they are members of the majority; they hold positions within institutions; and they are the experts on teachers – in that, they teach preservice teachers the skill of teaching. Thus, teacher educators' ways of othering may influence preservice teachers and, in turn, their future teaching in schools.

When teacher educators give meaning to the term cultural diversity through the construction of binary oppositions of us and the other in their discourse practices, they discursively reinforce othering and assist in preserving identities that represent the ordinary and the unordinary. DPOs can, therefore, also be viewed as linguistic acts of exclusion.

Following Van Dijk (2006), we consider DPOs to be representations of ideology. We have identified aspects of how processes of othering might be discursively produced in teacher education. DPOs

indicate group ideologies and function as expressions of teacher educators' affiliations with and distances from groups: in this case, pupils and their parents who are different in various ways.

Such in-practice 'ideologies' (Van Dijk, 2006), although unconscious, may influence the teaching practice and, thereby, the language and ideas of teacher students. It is through linguistic choices that teacher educators engage in representations of cultural diversity and, thus, in discursive exclusions. One of the teacher educators reflected on our own opinions when she said that teaching cultural diversity is a dilemma. We believe that the dilemma here is that the more teacher educators talk about cultural diversity, the more they contribute to dichotomies and construct otherness.

Promoting social justice and countering acts of social exclusion are crucial aspects of modern education and schooling. In addition to being taught how to address the needs of all students, preservice teachers must be made aware of and learn how to deconstruct and counter ways in which pupils are 'othered' in society, including implicit practices of discursive exclusions. This is important knowledge, both in terms of these preservice teachers' future work with inclusion (Smith & McCully, 2013) and in terms of equity and social justice (Conklin & Hughes, 2016). In line with Pandey (2004, p. 176), we suggest that not only teacher students but also teacher educators have means to critically explore their repertoires of othering strategies. We believe that such explorations could contribute to an awareness of oneself as a part of cultural diversity and to a critical reflection on teacher educators' linguistic practices.

The aim of education is to create an arena in which all pupils feel included, independent of their differences. Such an aim requires teachers to talk in critically reflective ways that avoid the dominant constructs that foster linguistic othering. We need to develop and educate teacher educators who see themselves as part of cultural diversity and who move away from the notion that cultural diversity is the exclusive terrain of the others—pupils and parents who have special needs, who do not have sufficient competence in Norwegian, who are subjected to racism and prejudices, etc. To provide teacher students with such perspectives, teacher educators require deeper insights into critical theory and more theoretical concepts, which they can use self-critically to reflect on their own teaching and processes of learning and development as teacher educators in an increasingly diverse society. We argue that teacher educators *need more than an appreciation of diversity*; they also need linguistic tools to critique power relations and the discourses that hold down certain members of society through DPOs. Such linguistic tools could counteract discrimination and inequality. Further insight is needed into the actual teaching practices of teacher educators, so as to develop a more comprehensive picture of their discursive practices as well as to suggest implications for their teaching practices.

Concluding remarks

In this article, we have contributed to ways of conceptualising othering by presenting findings from an empirical linguistic critical discourse analytical study of how teacher educators use and make meaning of the term cultural diversity. More precisely, we have explored how teacher educators' use of discursive practices represents their understanding of cultural diversity as a concept. We hold that a critical linguistic analysis of these discursive practices can shed light on the kinds of experiences, attitudes and knowledge in relation to cultural diversity that teacher educators bestow.

Our findings illustrate that othering in teacher education seems to occur in discursive practices relating to culture, social aspects, multilingualism, migration, nationality, visibility and religion. We argue that it is critical to discuss preservice teachers' opportunities to develop the linguistic criticality needed to counter acts of social exclusion in their work as future teachers in demographically diverse societies.

Finally, we suggest that further research should focus on the actual teaching practices of teacher educators to develop a more comprehensive picture of the power relations expressed in discursive practices.

References

Abu-Lughod, L. (1991). Writing against culture. In R. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present* (pp. 137–162). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Brown, E. L. (2004). The relationship of self-concepts to changes in cultural diversity awareness: Implications for urban teacher educators. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education, 36*(2), 119–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-004-0616-0

Cochran-Smith, M., Villegas, A. M., Abrams, L., Chavez-Moreno, L., Mills, T., & Stern, R. (2015). Critiquing teacher preparation research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(2), 109–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114558268

Conklin, H. G., & Hughes, H. E. (2016). Practices of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(1), 47–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115607346

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Goodwin, A. L., Smith, L., Souto-Manning, M., Cheruvu, R., Tan, M. Y., Reed, R., & Taveras, L. (2014). What should teacher educators know and be able to do? Perspectives from practicing teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 284–302. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114535266

Gorski, P., Davis, S., & Reiter, A. (2012). Self-efficacy and multicultural teacher education in the United States: The factors that influence who feels qualified to be a multicultural teacher educator. *Multicultural Perspectives, 14*(4), 220–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2012.725332

Hahl, K., & Löfström, E. (2016). Conceptualizing interculturality in multicultural teacher education. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 11(3), 300-314. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1134544

Hallett, F. (2010). Do we practice what we preach? An examination of the pedagogical beliefs of teacher educators. *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*(4), 435–448. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.493347

Jacobs, J., Assaf, L. C., & Lee, K. S. (2011). Professional development for teacher educators: Conflicts between critical reflection and instructional-based strategies. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(4), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2010.533587

Martinez, K. (2008). Academic induction for teacher educators. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(1), 2035–2051 https://doi.org/10.1080/13598660701793376

Mausethagen, S., & Granlund, L. (2012). Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: Current tensions between education policy and teachers' union. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 815–833. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2010.533587

Murray, J. (2014). Teacher educators' constructions of professionalism: A case study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(1), 2017–2021. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2013.870971

Pandey, A. (2004). Constructing otherness: A Linguistic analysis of the politics of representation and exclusion in freshmen writing. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 14*(2), 153–184.

Richards, J. (2011). Exploring two interventions to promote graduate education majors' dispositions toward culturally responsive teaching: Taking action to address my shortcomings as a literacy teacher educator. *Reading Improvement, 48*(2), 59–70.

Riggins, S. H. (1997). *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 559–582). NY: Routledge Association of Teacher Educators.

Smith, R., & McCully, A. (2013). Organisational self-evaluation and teacher education for community relations in a transforming society? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(3), 320–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2012.757302

Srinivasan, P., & Cruz, M. (2015). Children colouring: Speaking "colour difference" with diversity dolls. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 23*(1), 21–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2014.919343

Timmerman, G. (2009). Teacher educators modelling their teachers? *European Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 225–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760902756020

Trent, S. C., Kea, C. D., & Oh, K. (2008). Preparing preservice educators for cultural diversity: How far have we come? *Exceptional Children, 74*(3), 328–350. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290807400304

Tryggvason, M.-T. (2012). Perceptions of identity among Finnish university-based subject teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(3), 289–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2011.633998

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483326184

Williams, J. (2014). Teacher educator professional learning in the third space. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*(4), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114533128