

EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS ARCHIVES

English Editor: Sherman Dorn
College of Education
University of South Florida

Spanish Editor: Gustavo Fischman
Mary Lou Fulton College of Education
Arizona State University

Volume 17 Number 1

January 9, 2008

ISSN 1068–2341

The Segregation of American Teachers

Erica Frankenberg
University of California, Los Angeles

Citation: Frankenberg, E. (2009). The segregation of American teachers. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 17(1). Retrieved [date] from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v17n1/>.

Abstract

Data from a unique new survey of over 1,000 teachers in K-12 public schools across the country show that our teaching force is largely segregated. Using this new dataset, I find that teachers of different races are teaching students of very different racial composition, adding an extra dimension to growing student racial segregation. White teachers comprise an overwhelming majority of the nation's teachers. Yet at the same time, they were the least likely to have had much experience with racial diversity and remain remarkably isolated. The typical African American teacher teaches in a school where nearly three-fifths of students are from low-income families while the average white teacher has only 35% of low-income students. Latino and Asian teachers are in schools that educate more than twice the proportion of English language learners as schools of white teachers. Nonwhite teachers and teachers who teach in schools with high percentages of minority or poor students are more likely to report that they are contemplating switching schools or careers. The article concludes with recommendations for diversifying the teaching force and ensuring that schools serving students of all backgrounds have a racially integrated, highly qualified faculty.

Keywords: Teacher distribution; student diversity; diversity (faculty); faculty mobility.



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives (Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas)**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA/AAPE**. **EPAA/AAPE** is published jointly by the Colleges of Education at Arizona State University and the University of South Florida. Articles are indexed by the Directory of Open Access Journals, H.W. Wilson & Co., and SCOPUS.

La segregación de los docentes Norte Americanos

Resumen

Los datos de una nueva encuesta realizada entre más de 1000 maestros de escuelas públicas primarias y secundarias en todo el país señalan que la profesión docente esta en gran medida segregada racialmente. Utilizando este nuevo conjunto de datos, este artículo identifico que docentes de diferentes razas enseñan a estudiantes de grupos raciales diferentes a los de los docentes, lo que añade una dimensión extra a la cada vez mayor segregación racial de los estudiantes. Profesores/as blancos/as son la inmensa mayoría de los docentes del país. Sin embargo, este grupo, es el que tenía las menores probabilidades de haber tenido experiencia con grupos raciales diversos y siguen estando muy aislados. Un docente negro, típicamente enseña en una escuela donde casi las tres quintas partes de los estudiantes son de familias con bajos ingresos, mientras que en promedio profesores blancos sólo tienen un 35% de estudiantes que provienen de familias con bajos ingresos. Docentes latinos y asiáticos trabajan en escuelas donde más del doble de estudiantes que están aprendiendo Inglés, comparados con sus colegas blancos/as. Maestros y profesores no-blancos que enseñan en las escuelas con altos porcentajes de minorías o los estudiantes pobres tienen más probabilidades de informar de que están contemplando cambiar de escuelas o de profesión. Este artículo concluye con recomendaciones para aumentar la diversidad racial en la profesión docente y para garantizar que las escuelas que prestan servicios a estudiantes de todos los orígenes raciales tengan acceso a profesores racialmente integrados y altamente calificados.

Palabras claves: distribución de profesores/as; diversidad de estudiantes; diversidad (profesores); movilidad del profesorado.

Introduction: Diverse Faculties in a Racially Transitioning Society

The Supreme Court's most important decision defining successful school desegregation declared that schools must have desegregated faculties to be fully desegregated (Green, 1968). The racial isolation of students continues more than fifty years after the Supreme Court in *Brown* declared that separate schools were inherently unequal, but less is known about faculty desegregation, teachers' own racial experiences, and how teachers' commitment to their schools may differ by the race of themselves, their faculty colleagues or their students. Segregated schools where almost all students are from one racial/ethnic background do not allow students the opportunity to build cross-racial understanding, to learn and work with one another. At the same time, social science research confirms the central premise of *Brown*, that when schools are racially minority segregated—which are often unequal to schools with higher percentages of white students in terms of tangible and intangible resources—they offer an inferior education, which is likely to harm students' future life opportunities (e.g., Brief of 553 Social Scientists, 2006; Linn & Welner, 2007). In particular, teachers are one of the most important influences on the educational outcomes of students (Darling-Hammond, 2003). No Child Left Behind (NCLB)'s requirement that each state

devise a plan to ensure that low-income and minority students have qualified teachers in their classrooms is the latest policy reflecting the importance of teachers for students.

The 2000 Census demonstrated that the nation is in a vast racial transformation that is changing even many formerly homogeneous communities (Frey, 2001). These changes are having a profound impact on students in public school districts, including those that were formerly almost entirely white (Frankenberg & Lee, 2002). As the public school enrollment grows increasingly diverse and multiracial, school segregation has also increased (Orfield & Lee, 2007; Reardon & Yun, 2005). Although there are regional variations, there are currently more Latino students in the nation's public schools than African American students, and Latino students are also experiencing the highest levels of segregation of any minority group. The segregation of African American students has been increasing since the late 1980s, after two decades of increasing integration with white students, particularly in the South (Orfield & Lee, 2007).

In 2004, there were almost 3.1 million teachers in our public schools, a figure that is projected to rise to almost 3.5 million in the next decade (U. S. Department of Education, 2006b, table 4). Yet, as the number of teachers grows along with an accelerating growth of nonwhite public school students (Orfield & Lee, 2007), the racial diversity of the teaching force remains low. Analyses of National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) staffing data confirm that teachers of color are a much smaller percentage of the teaching force than students of color are in comparison to the entire student enrollment (see Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Researchers report that new teachers are more diverse than their veteran colleagues, but the entire teaching force still remains overwhelmingly white (Kirby, Berends, & Naftel, 1999; Shen, Wegenke, & Cooley, 2003). The racial composition of undergraduate teacher preparation programs also lag in terms of diversity as compared to students (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1999), and there may be declining shares of minority teachers (Hodgkinson, 2002) although data on the demographics of teachers and in particular new or young teachers is contradictory (Zumalt & Craig, 2005).

The low percentage of teachers of color is due both to many factors that may limit the number of nonwhite teachers as well as the fact that the Civil Rights Movement resulted in broadening the access for African-Americans and other minorities to careers that had previously been difficult to enter (see Irvine, 1988). Despite expanding access to educational opportunity, there remains limited minority access to higher education, and as a result, as with other careers, teaching competes to attract a relatively small pool of minority college graduates. According to the 2005 American Community Survey, among Americans 25 or older, almost 50% of Asians and 30% of non-Hispanic whites had a bachelor's degree, while only 17% of African Americans and 12% of Hispanics (of any race) had a bachelor's degree (American Community Survey, 2006). Within teacher education programs at universities, teaching candidates of color often lack emotional, financial, and personal support and feel marginalized in programs that often have a majority of white students and faculty (Branch, 2001; Miller & Endo, 2005).

An additional barrier to a more diverse teaching force is the teacher credentialing process, which in many states includes requiring that teachers pass standardized tests. One study found that African American candidates had disproportionately low passing rates on a commonly-used test that teaching candidates are required to pass for certification (Gitomer, Latham, & Ziomek, 1999).¹ More

¹ Alabama has been prevented from using a test for new teachers as a result of settling a lawsuit that alleged using a teacher test unfairly discriminated against black teachers (*Allen v. Alabama State Board of Education*). In 2004, 35 states required prospective teachers to pass subject matter tests to gain certification to teach in high schools (Jacobson, 2004).

recent data from Massachusetts suggest that in addition to African American teachers, Latino and Asian teachers do not pass writing and reading teaching exams at the same rate as white prospective teachers. While 76% of white applicants passed the writing test, less than half of African American (40%) and Latino (43%) teachers passed the same test (Jan, 2007).

Teacher credentialing began to receive more attention after the *Brown* decision when courts required faculty desegregation as well as student segregation as districts responded to orders that they dismantle systems of segregated schools. This process pushed many minority teachers out of jobs in the South as faculties were integrated. This system of certifying teachers may continue to disproportionately limit the number of minority teachers who are certified. In the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Congress required that schools of education achieve high percentage of passing rates on state exams by their graduates or lose federal funding, leading many to pretest prospective students. This is of concern not only for the potential barriers for teaching candidates of color but also because there are a number of reasons to believe that having a racially diverse group of teachers is important for both minority and white students. In the 1968 *Green* decision, the Supreme Court stated that racial identification of schools was not solely by the composition of the student bodies but also other factors, including the faculty and staff. Relying on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fifth Circuit Court declared, "Faculty integration is essential to student desegregation. To the extent that teacher discrimination jeopardizes the success of desegregation, it is unlawful wholly aside from its effect upon individual teachers...as long as a school has a Negro faculty it will always have a Negro student body" (*United States v. Jefferson County Bd. Of Education*, 1966, at 883; see also *Bradley v. School Board of the City of Richmond*, 1965).

A number of districts have pursued teacher integration policies: many that were once legally required to but maintained such policies as administrators and local boards decided that it was an important goal to sustain even after court supervision ceased (Hendrie, 1998). In addition to helping to fully desegregate schools, the importance of sustaining those goals without active court supervision was recognized in the longest dissent in the *Parents Involved* (2007) case, where Justice Bryer acknowledged the importance of teachers in attracting and retaining a diverse student body: "The histories [of Seattle and Jefferson County] also indicate the complexity of the tasks and the practical difficulties that local school boards face when they seek to achieve greater racial integration. The boards work in communities where demographic patterns change, where they must meet traditional learning goals, where they *must attract and retain effective teachers...*" (*Parents Involved*, 2007, at 2811; emphasis added).

Why have judges recognized and districts endorsed such policies? Teachers of color can serve as role models for nonwhite students, to serve as examples of professionals who are responsible and successful, and are from the same background as them. They may also provide a support system for minority students in the school (Shen, Wegenke, & Cooley, 2003). Further, minority teachers, particularly those who have been in teacher preparation programs that help them draw on their own backgrounds in their classroom teaching, also have understanding of a shared culture with students of color and the experience of being part of a minority group in our society (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In addition to helping to connect with students, teachers of color may also help to strengthen ties between home and school.

Teachers of color bring knowledge, insights, and perspectives to the school that otherwise would not be there, including raising issues of structural inequality present in schools and society (see Delpit, 1995, for a discussion of African American teachers' voices). This not only allows them to connect with students of color, but also to raise awareness among white teachers, and bring insights to white students. As the growth of minority students spreads to districts that were formerly almost all white (Orfield & Frankenberg, 2008), the presence of teachers of color in these districts

could help their schools equitably integrate and educate their changing student enrollment. Though the presence of teachers of color is often cited as important for students of color, exposure to teachers of color is also important for white students who generally experience the highest racial isolation because these teachers could bring new ideas and perspectives to help prepare students for a racially changing society (Orfield & Lee, 2007). For example, working with teachers of color can challenge students' racial stereotypes. Educational experts agree that an essential component of implementing effective school desegregation is to have a racially diverse faculty (see Hawley et al., 1983). In addition, having teachers and administrators from different racial backgrounds allows for interracial contact while demonstrating equal status of all, regardless of race and approval of authorities for interracial contact—two important conditions that can lead to reduced prejudice for students (Allport, 1954). Schools with higher percentages of minority teachers may help equalize power among teachers of all backgrounds on the faculty (Cohen, 1980).

This article examines the context of where teachers work, to understand the kinds of teachers' schools in terms of their student and faculty composition. First, what are the racial experiences of teachers? Second, (how) do schools that white teachers work in differ from those where teachers of color teach? Finally, does the distribution of teachers relate to their job satisfaction and plans to remain in teaching anywhere or to stay at their current school? Using a unique new dataset of more than 1,000 teachers from across the country, I examine these questions and thereby explore the important role that teachers can have in creating school environments where students can learn from and with people from a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds as they prepare for their future as citizens in a multiracial nation and world.

Data Sources

In fall 2005, in collaboration with the Southern Poverty Law Center, Greenwald & Associates,² and a group of educational experts with expertise in school desegregation and teaching in diverse schools,³ the Civil Rights Project designed a survey to investigate teachers' beliefs and practices as they relate to race in their schools. The telephone survey consisted of 47 items, including background questions about teachers and the schools in which they taught. Questions addressed teachers' training for working in diverse classrooms, school environments, racial attitudes, curricular resources available to address diversity, and teaching practices. Teachers were assured of the confidentiality of their responses to minimize social desirability response bias. The intent was to gain a more accurate understanding of the racial/ethnic factors that interact with teaching and learning in public schools at the beginning of the 21st century.

The survey was pilot tested by the Civil Rights Project in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and by National Research,⁴ and minor modifications to the survey instrument were made for clarity in

² Greenwald & Associates is a public opinion and market research company.

³ The group of educational experts who helped develop the survey instrument included Linda Darling-Hammond, Stanford University; Patricia Gándara, University of California; Willis Hawley, University of Maryland; Christine Sleeter, California State University, Monterrey Bay; and William Trent, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Stanley Presser, University of Maryland, with expertise in survey methodology, also participated in the initial survey development meeting along with CRP, SPLC, and Greenwald & Associates staff.

⁴ National Research is affiliated with Greenwald & Associates, and is a data-collection firm with experience in telephone interviewing.

response to teachers' feedback. National Research then conducted the survey by telephone during November and December 2005 using a sample list of teachers that was generated from the National Education Association (NEA) membership lists. The NEA provided a list of 25,000 teachers randomly selected from their membership lists. National Research randomly contacted teachers from the list, and an initial screening question ensured that the respondent was a classroom teacher.⁵ To ensure proper sampling, National Research made up to six attempts (at different times on different days, including weekends) by professional interviewers for each sample record. Seventy-seven percent of the NEA members who were contacted agreed to participate in the survey, and 48% met the inclusion criteria and completed the survey.⁶ Because of the subject of this study, there was a target of having 60% of teachers in the sample from demographically diverse schools, which was defined for sampling purposes as between 10 and 90% white students.

The final sample included responses from 1,002 public school teachers from 48 states.⁷ Teachers' school characteristics (including information about the racial and poverty composition of the student body and total enrollment size) were obtained by merging each teacher's responses to the survey with data about their school as listed on their NEA record from the 2005–06 Public School Universe of NCES Common Core Data (CCD).⁸

Sample Description

In general, the characteristics of teachers in this sample are comparable to those of the entire public school teaching force; in particular, the racial and gender composition of teachers is similar to the public teaching population (see Table 1). The teachers in the sample are drawn from urban, suburban, and rural districts, including some of the largest districts in the country. Teachers in the sample had more years of teaching experience on average and fewer teachers were new to their schools than the entire teaching force, however. Given the fact that the sample included more experienced teachers on average it is not surprising that among teachers in the sample, compared to the entire teaching force, there was a higher percentage of teachers with education beyond a bachelor's degree and with certification in the subject they were teaching.

These differences may be due to the fact that the sample is entirely NEA teachers. The NEA includes more suburban, fewer urban teachers than does the membership of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), which is the other major teacher union (although in several large states or locals, the unions have merged). We also requested a list of teachers from the AFT so that our sample could include teachers from both major unions, but they did not grant our request. In addition, because the sample was drawn from NEA members, there is virtually no inclusion of charter school teachers since the vast majority of these teachers are not unionized. The racial composition of the teachers in this sample as well as the national teaching force reflects the fact that

⁵ The first question asked, "In your current job, are you primarily responsible for providing classroom instruction to students?" If respondents answered "No," the call was terminated.

⁶ The lower percentage of people completing the survey could be due to the fact that counselors, administrators, and support staff may also be members of NEA but no longer classroom teachers and therefore would have responded no to the initial screening question. The NEA has over 3 million members, which includes K-12 teachers, support staff, administrators, and higher education faculty.

⁷ There are no teachers from Michigan or Pennsylvania in the dataset.

⁸ Although one of the survey questions asked teachers to give an estimate of the racial composition in their school, in most tables below, we have relied on NCES data as a measure of the racial composition of the schools' student bodies unless otherwise noted.

the teaching profession remains overwhelmingly white. Because the characteristics of teachers in this sample roughly approximate the teaching force (except for the differences noted) and because the student racial/ethnic composition of the schools of teachers in the sample also reflect the national universe of public schools, this study does not apply weights in analyzing the sample. To ensure that the differences noted between the characteristics of teachers in this sample and in the entire public school teaching force did not substantively alter patterns reported below, I also analyzed novice teachers separately from all teachers and discuss that subsample where appropriate.

Table 1

Characteristics of Teachers in Sample and All Public School Teachers

Variable	Sample	National
Years as a teacher (average)	16.9	14.0
Novice teachers (<3 years)	9.8%	17.8%
New at current school (<3 yrs)	24.9%	42.8%
Race/Ethnicity ^a		
Non-Hispanic white	85.0%	83.1%
Non-Hispanic African American	5.7%	7.9%
Hispanic	4.0%	6.2%
Multiracial	2.3%	0.7%
Asian	1.4%	1.3%
Age (average)	45.6	42.5
Female	79.5%	75.0%
Bachelors or less was highest degree	40.5%	51.9%
Certification in subject taught	96.2%	87.3%

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey questions 1a, 1b, 3, 45, 46, 47a, 47b, & 48; National numbers from 2003–04 Schools and Staffing Survey, NCES 2006-313.

^a The racial/ethnic categories in this survey are different from how teachers were categorized by NCES's Schools & Staffing Survey. There were also 6 teachers that identified as Native American, 2 as other, and 8 refused to identify their race or ethnicity. Due to the small numbers of each, when analyzing responses by teacher race, these categories are not included below. The terms Latino and Hispanic are used interchangeably in this article.

The students taught by teachers in the sample are similar to all public school students. The racial composition of students taught by teachers in this sample is similar to the racial composition of students nationally, with a slightly higher percentage of white students taught by teachers in the sample and lower percentages of African American and Hispanic students (Table 2). Although virtually every school in the sample has students receiving free or reduced price lunch,⁹ there is a slightly lower percentage of low-income students overall in our sample's schools than nationally. There are also a higher percentage of students who are English language learners (ELL) in the sample, although the percentage of ELL students in the sample was estimated by teachers.

⁹ Free/reduced price lunch is a commonly-used, publicly available measure of students from low-income families.

Table 2

*Characteristics of Students in Schools of Teachers in Sample and All Public School Students*¹⁰

Variable	Sample (%)	National (%)
Race		
Non-Hispanic White	60	57
Non-Hispanic African American	15	17
Hispanic	18	20
American Indian/Alaskan native	1	1
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	5
Schools receiving Title I funds	51	54
Schools participating in National School Lunch Program	97	95
Students receiving free or reduced price lunch	37	41
Students who are Limited English Proficient	15	10

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, question 8; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06.

Teacher Exposure to Diversity

There is little systematic evidence of the racial experiences of the national teaching force, though it would stand to reason that teachers' prior exposure to racial diversity—or lack thereof—might have an important effect on a teacher's racial attitudes, feelings of efficacy in diverse schools, and even influence where teachers took teaching positions or whether they decided to stay in schools of differing racial contexts. I am able to examine teachers' exposure to racial diversity in two important ways—their own educational experience and as part of their current faculty.

Teachers in the sample of different races/ethnicities experience varying levels of diversity among their faculty peers. Using teacher estimates of the percentage of white teachers on their faculty, I analyzed the average percentage of white teachers by teacher race for each respondent. White teachers teach on faculties that are nearly 90% white, on average (see Table 3). Latino teachers teach with the second highest percentage of white teachers, almost three-quarters. By contrast, black and Asian teachers are in schools with smaller percentages of white teachers. Black teachers have, on average, one of the lowest percentages of white teachers on their faculty: less than two-thirds of their fellow teachers are white, which is substantially lower than their white counterparts. Asian teachers teach, on average, with the fewest percentage of white teachers, only 60%.

¹⁰ Unless specified otherwise, any discussion of students or teachers in this report refers solely to those in public schools. The demographics of students and teachers in private schools differ, and are subject to different policies.

Table 3
Exposure to Faculty Diversity by Teacher Race in Sample

Teacher race	% of peers who are white		
	Mean	N	SD
White	89	847	16
African American	63	57	31
Latino	74	40	26
Asian	60	14	27
Mixed Race	67	23	33
All	86	997	20

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 10, 47a, & 47b; $p < .01$.

Regional Differences among Faculty and Student Racial Composition

Because regions of the country vary in terms of the racial/ethnic composition of their population, it is important to examine how faculty and students were distributed across the country. This analysis finds that faculty diversity in the sample differs by region of the country, as does the racial/ethnic composition of students.¹¹

Table 4
White Proportion of Faculty and Students, by Region¹²

Region	Faculty % white	Student % white
Northeast	93	65
South	77	50
Border	86	68
Midwest	94	73
West	82	45
Total	86	57

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 10; Orfield and Lee, 2007, Table 2

The South has the most diverse teaching force of any region. Schools in the South and the West—the two regions with the greatest percentages of nonwhite students—also average the lowest percentage of white teachers. The South has the lowest percentage of white teachers, which, with 77% of teachers who are white, is substantially lower than the national average of 86% white

¹¹ The data in this section are averages of teacher-reported faculty composition figures. The correlation between teacher-reported estimates of student racial composition were somewhat strongly correlated, but not perfectly correlated, so these teacher estimates should be interpreted with some caution.

¹² The region definitions are--**South:** Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, & Virginia. **Border:** Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, & West Virginia. **Northeast:** Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, & Vermont. **Midwest:** Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, & Wisconsin. **West:** Arizona, California, Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, & Wyoming. Alaska & Hawaii are not included in regional definitions because of their unique ethnic compositions, which differ substantially from the regions studied.

teachers in the teaching force (see Table 4). In comparison, in the Northeast and Midwest, faculties are over 90% white, on average. In every region there is a sizeable gap between the percentage of white teachers and white students, particularly in the West, which has the most racially diverse group of students and where there was a 37% difference between the proportion of students who were white and the proportion of faculty who were white.

Although the percentage of nonwhite students is much higher than the percentage of nonwhite teachers in each region in this sample, higher percentages of African American and Latino teachers work in regions of the country with higher percentages of African American and Latino students. The highest percentages of African American teachers work in the South and the Border regions, the two regions with the highest percentage of African American students (27% and 21%, respectively). African American teachers comprise less than 4% of the average faculty in every other region of the country (see Table 5). Likewise, the West has the highest percentage of Latino teachers and students, although here too there are a higher percentage of Latino students (38%) than teachers (11%). The South (21%) and Northeast (14%) also educate large percentages of Latino students, but these regions have very small percentages of Latino teachers (less than 3%).

A generation ago, there was concern about African American teachers losing their jobs in the South as desegregation was implemented to comply with the faculty desegregation requirement first defined by the Supreme Court in the *Green* decision (*Green v. New Kent County*, 1968). It is likely that most teachers of that generation have already retired, however. These data demonstrate that for the South and Border regions—where the most desegregation plans were implemented—they are the two regions with the highest percentage of African American teachers. The South, which has the highest share of African American students (27%), has the highest percentage of African American teachers as well, 19%. The South has more than twice the share of African American teachers as any region, and five times as high a share as the Northeast and Midwest. The disparity between the percentage of African American teachers and students in the Midwest and the Northeast is large.

Table 5
Racial Composition of Teaching Force, by Region in Sample

Region	White	African American	Latino
Northeast	93	4	3
South	77	19	2
Border	86	10	2
Midwest	94	4	2
West	82	4	11
Total	86	7	5

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 10.

Although the percentage of Latino students in the South has been rapidly increasing and the South has the second highest share of Latino students (20% of students in the South are Latino) of any region, the percentage of Latino teachers (2.3%) in the sample is much lower. The West, with the largest percentage of Latino students, also has the largest share of Latino teachers with over 11% of all teachers who are Latino, which is three times the share of Latino teachers in any other region. Nationally, while 19% of public school students are Latino, less than 5% of teachers on the faculties in the sample are Latino, on average.

Teachers’ Early Exposure to Diversity

Prior research has shown that white teachers tend to have attended white, middle-class educational institutions and lived in white communities. As a result of these experiences, white teachers may have difficulty understanding or relating to those who do not benefit from the white, middle-class privilege that they have (Gomez, 1993; Sleeter, 2007; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Further, Freeman, Brookhart, and Loadman (1999) found that most teachers currently teaching in diverse schools had had few schooling experiences that brought them into contact with students of other racial or socioeconomic groups. Thus, this study also examined the exposure of teachers to diversity, in their elementary school (when the teacher was a student).

In this sample, among all teachers, white teachers attended elementary schools with the lowest percentage of students who were a different race than they were: On average, white teachers had attended elementary schools that were over 90% white (see Table 6).¹³ On the other hand, Asian teachers attended schools in which 70% of students were non-Asian, a statistic that is not surprising given the high levels of Asian student integration and the small percentage of Asians overall (e.g., Orfield & Lee, 2007). African American and Latino teachers each attended schools where approximately 30% of students were of a different race from themselves.

I also analyzed the educational experiences of novice teachers in the sample—teachers who have 1–3 years of experience—and the novice teachers had attended substantially more integrated elementary schools than their more veteran colleagues. This greater exposure to integration may be due to the fact that these novice teachers were elementary school students themselves after widespread desegregation had been implemented in many districts around the country and particularly in the South, as a result of Supreme Court decisions in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In addition, since the late 1960s, there has been growth of non-white students across the country,

¹³ For white teachers, this refers to the percentage of nonwhite students in their elementary school, but for black teachers, for example, this question referred to the percentage of non-black students.

which could also explain the higher interracial exposure in elementary school for novice teachers (Orfield & Lee, 2007). Novice teachers attended schools where almost 20% of students were of another race/ethnicity than their own on average which is 6.6 percentage points higher than all teachers (see Table 6). Although white novice teachers remain the group of teachers attending the most isolated schools, their average exposure to nonwhite students is 5% greater than the exposure of all white teachers. The exposure of African American teachers to other race students is twice as high for novice teachers (57%) as for all African American teachers (28%). Latino teachers are the only teachers in which novice teachers have less exposure to other-race students.

Table 6

Teachers' Exposure to Diverse Students by Teacher Race, All and Novice Teachers in Sample

Teacher race	% other-race students in elementary school	
	All teachers	Novice teachers
	Mean (N)	Mean (N)
White	10% (832)	14% (73)
African American	28% (54)	57% (7)
Hispanic	30% (40)	24% (6)
Asian	70% (12)	—
Mixed Race	35% (23)	36% (5)
Total	13% (976)	20% (94)

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, questions 1a, 12, 47a, & 47b; $p < .01$.

If the trends seen among novice teachers in more diverse educational experiences are a sign of generational change, then there may be a gradual shift towards a teaching force that has had more integrated schooling experiences of their own. However, the extent of school desegregation has been declining since the early 1990s (Orfield & Lee, 2007), a trend that suggests that the increased exposure to students of other races may be a short-lived burst for today's novice and younger teachers. Though there are differences between novice teachers as compared to the entire teaching force in terms of exposure to diverse students, white teachers of all levels of experience have the least diverse exposure to students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. As mentioned above, white teachers remain the overwhelming majority of the teaching force, suggesting low levels of prior experience in racially diverse schools.

In sum, these tables demonstrate that white teachers in this sample, who make up the overwhelming majority of the teaching force nationally, are also the least likely to have experience in racially diverse settings, either as students themselves or as part of their faculty. Not only did white teachers attend schools that were over 90% white, they are currently teaching in schools where almost 90% of their faculty colleagues are white and over 70% of students are white. The repetitive nature of the trends reported in the tables in this section underscore the comprehensive isolation of white teachers.

Segregation between Faculty and Students by Race

Research has consistently demonstrated the deep segregation of students in public schools (Orfield & Lee, 2007), private schools (Reardon & Yun, 2002), and charter schools (Frankenberg & Lee, 2003) at the beginning of the 21st century. One common measure of student segregation employed in this paper is the exposure index, which evaluates the contact a member of one group has with another racial group (Clotfelter, 2004; James & Tauber, 1985; Orfield & Lee, 2007). Unlike

other measures of segregation—such as the index of dissimilarity or the Gini index, which measure “evenness” of distribution—the exposure index is influenced by the size of the target group (Massey & Denton, 1988). As used in this article, the exposure index is a weighted average of the percentage of students of group X encountered by teachers of group Y; if schools were perfectly integrated then teachers of all races would have exposure to a certain group that was equal to that group’s share of the enrollment.¹⁴ Because the exposure index is a measure of central tendency, the exposure of a given group is common referred to as the exposure of the “average student/teacher” (also known as “typical”). This is not meant to imply that all white teachers have 70% white students in their school, but that if we took the average of the white percentage of students in the schools of all white teachers it would be 70%.

Table 7

Racial Composition of Students in Schools by the Average Teacher of Each Race in Sample

Student race/ethnicity	Racial composition of school experienced on average by teachers				
	White teachers	African American teachers	Latino teachers	Asian teachers	Mixed race teachers
White	70	30	37	30	49
African American	10	55	13	14	20
Latino	14	12	40	34	19
Asian	4	2	8	22	10
Native American	1	1	1	1	2
Column total (%) ^a	99	100	99	101	100
Teacher N	852	57	40	14	23

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 47a & 47b; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; $p < .01$.

^aTotal may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Data from this survey indicate that teacher segregation in public schools is a relatively unnoticed but important facet of segregation of students by race, poverty, and language. The average white teacher teaches in a school where nearly three-quarters of students are white—a disproportionately higher percentage of white students than in the total enrollment (see Table 7).¹⁵ One-tenth of students in the average white teacher’s school are African American, and only 14% are Latino. In comparison, African American teachers on average teach in schools where African American students comprise a majority of the student population, white students are less than one-third of their schools, and Latino students are just 12% of the student population. The typical Latino teacher works in a school where more than one-third of the students are also Latino, 37% of students are white, less than 15% of students are African American, and 8% of students are Asian (roughly twice the share of Asian students overall). Over one-fifth of Asian teachers’ students are Asian, just under one-third of students are white, another one-third Latino, and 14% are African American. Finally, mixed-race teachers work in schools that most closely resembled the national

¹⁴ The isolation index is calculated the same as the exposure index except that it refers to the exposure of teachers of group X to their own group. It is referred to as exposure in this paper.

¹⁵ For comparative purposes, the racial composition of the students in our sample is 60% white, 15% black, 18% Latino, 6% Asian, and 1% Native American. This differs slightly from the composition of all public school students, as shown in Table 2 of this report.

racial composition of students, though with fewer white students than the overall student population. As Table 7 demonstrates, the racial composition of students in a school varies substantially by teacher race. Teachers have a disproportionately higher percentage of students of their own race/ethnicity in their school.

I examined how the percentage of white teachers varies by the percentage of students of color as another way to understand the relationship between the racial distribution of faculty and students. On average, the percentage of white teachers in a school is lower in schools with higher shares of African American and Latino students (see Table 8).¹⁶ Schools where less than 10% of students are African American or Latino tend to have a virtually all-white faculty (96% white), while in schools where over 90% of students are African American or Latino, less than 40% of the faculty is white, on average. Further, schools that are predominantly African American and Latino have faculties that are usually less than three-quarters white, which is also substantially lower than schools with few African American and Latino students.¹⁷

These data have important implications for both students and teachers. For students in predominantly African American and Latino schools, they are less exposed to white teachers than their peers. Students in schools with few African American and Latino students, however, are exposed to few nonwhite teachers (less than 4% of teachers). Although teachers of another race can broaden the perspectives present in a school, these trends suggest that is not possible in many of the racially isolated white schools in this sample. Further, these trends demonstrate that teachers of color are less likely to be teaching in overwhelmingly white schools—which are 38% of schools nationally¹⁸—either due to their own choice or structural barriers that might limit their opportunity.

Table 8

Relationship between Student Race and Faculty Race in Sample

Measure	% Students African American or Latino										
	<10	10–20	20–30	30–40	40–50	50–60	60–70	70–80	80–90	90–100	Total
School <i>N</i>	389	154	87	76	62	57	41	45	35	51	997
% white teachers	96	92	88	85	82	78	74	74	62	38	86
<i>SD</i>	10	11	12	16	15	17	22	18	25	25	20

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 10; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; $p < .01$.

¹⁶ In some tables in this article, the percentage of black and Latino students is used instead of all nonwhite students because students from these two racial/ethnic groups are the two groups that have been historically disadvantaged in public schools, albeit in different ways.

¹⁷ Shen et al. (2003) analyzing 1999–2000 national staffing data also found a similar pattern of black and Latino teacher overrepresentation in schools where a majority of the students were minority (Table 7). A similar trend is evident in schools in central cities where black teachers comprised 15% of teachers (as compared to 8.9% overall) and Latino teachers were 10.4% of teachers (6.2% overall) (U. S. Department of Education, 2006a).

¹⁸ See Orfield and Lee (2007), Table 6.

Racial Segregation within Schools

Given the prevalence of second-generation segregation (or segregation of students within a school, between classrooms) that further separates students of different races (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2005a; Mickelson, 2005; Oakes, 2005) and leads to higher percentages of African American students being exposed to novice teachers (Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor, 2005b), I also investigated teacher-reported student racial composition in their classrooms.

Table 9

*Percentage of White Students in a Teacher's Classroom and School, by Teacher Race in Sample*¹⁹

Teacher's race/ethnicity	Measure	% white students in school	% white students in teacher's class
White	Mean	69%	59%
	<i>N</i>	852	492
	<i>SD</i>	28%	51%
African-American	Mean	29%	35%
	<i>N</i>	55	40
	<i>SD</i>	29%	32%
Latino	Mean	43%	28%
	<i>N</i>	39	29
	<i>SD</i>	35%	25%
Asian/ Pacific Islander	Mean	34%	25%
	<i>N</i>	14	12
	<i>SD</i>	25%	30%
Mixed race	Mean	47%	50%
	<i>N</i>	23	15
	<i>SD</i>	33%	31%
All teachers	Mean	64%	55%
	<i>N</i>	999	600
	<i>SD</i>	31%	49%

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, questions 7, 9, 47a, & 47b; $p < .01$. The question about percentage of white students was asked of 600 teachers, those who were coded as diverse because they reported between 10% and 90% of students at their school were white.

¹⁹ Instead of using CCD data to calculate the percentage of white students in schools, this table uses teacher estimates of school white percentage since this table also includes teachers' estimates of the white percentage of students in their classroom. It should be noted that on average, teachers' estimates of white percentage were 1 percentage point less than the white percentage according to CCD data although this differed by teacher race/ethnicity. For example, Latino teachers' estimates were 6 percentage points higher on average than actual school white percentage. NCES data does not provide information on student racial composition within schools so it is impossible to compare teachers' classroom estimates with school-reported data. Thus, these estimates should be interpreted with caution.

Perhaps not surprising given the differences in schools' student racial composition by teacher race discussed above (and shown in the right column of Table 9), there are also stark differences among teachers of different races/ethnicities in terms of the percentage of white students they report teaching in their classroom. While white teachers report that almost 60% of the students in their classrooms are white, Latino and Asian teachers report that they have less than half that share of white students in their classrooms, 28% and 25% respectively (see Table 9). In the classrooms of African American teachers, only one of every three students was white. African American and mixed race teachers are the only teachers in which the estimate percentage of white students in a teacher's class is higher than the estimated percentage of white students in the teacher's school, although in both instances the mean percentage of white students in a teacher's classroom is lower than that of white teachers. These differences at the classroom-level suggest the importance of subsequent research on this topic examining how students may be segregated from teachers at both the school and classroom level.

Segregation between Faculty and Students by Poverty and Native Language

One of the pernicious effects of racial segregation of students continues to be the relationship between schools with high percentages of African American and Latino students and schools of concentrated student poverty (Orfield & Lee, 2007), which tend to be schools that concentrate educational disadvantages for the students in them (Phillips & Chin, 2004; Yun & Moreno, 2006). Of the schools in the sample that were intensely segregated African American and Latino schools (in which African American and Latino students were more than 90% of the enrollment), 89% were also schools in which more than half of students came from low-income families (see Table 10). By comparison, just 15% of schools with less than 10% African American and Latino students were schools where a majority of students were low-income. In other words, racially isolated African American and Latino schools were six times as likely to have impoverished student bodies as the schools with very few (0–10%) African American and Latino students.²⁰

Student poverty is also associated with English language learner (ELL) status of students in the sample—schools with higher concentrations of low-income students also have higher shares of ELL students (see Table 11). Schools with more than half of their students from low-income families are also schools in which a quarter of students are not native English speakers, on average. The share of ELL students in schools with a majority of low-income students is three times the share of ELL students in schools with less than 10% low-income students.

²⁰ There are similarly strong relationships between racial and poverty segregation in schools nationally. See Orfield and Lee, 2007, Table 6.

Table 10

Relationship between Segregation by Race and by Low-income Students Taught by Teachers in Sample

% low-income	% of students who were African American or Latino									
	<10	10–20	20–30	30–40	40–50	50–60	60–70	70–80	80–90	90–100
0–10%	25	14	7	1	2	2	0	0	0	2
10–25%	29	31	31	13	3	11	5	2	0	0
25–50%	32	40	40	50	46	20	32	13	11	10
50–100%	15	15	23	36	49	68	63	84	89	89
Total %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Schools	389	153	88	78	63	56	41	45	35	52

Source: NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06. Each cell in the first four rows of data is the percentage of schools where the students fall in the poverty range indicated in the left column. For example, of the 35 schools where 80–90% of students were African American or Latino, four of those schools (or 11%) were reported to the Common Core of Data as having between 25% and 50% of students who were low-income.

Table 11

Relationship between Low-Income and English language learner (ELL) Status of Students Taught by Teachers in Sample

% of low-income students in schools	Average % of ELL students in schools	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>
0–10%	7	126	13
10–25%	8	205	14
25–50%	12	321	15
50–100%	24	335	26
Total	15	987	21

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 8; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; $p < .01$.

The characteristics of students in schools with a predominantly nonwhite faculty differ along several dimensions from those in schools with an overwhelmingly white faculty: percentage of white students, percentage of low-income students, and percentage of ELL students. Schools with predominantly minority faculties average less than one in five students who are white and nearly two out of three students are low-income (see Table 12). Thirty percent of students in these schools on average are English language learners. Further, schools where at least 20% of the faculty was nonwhite were schools in which white students were on average less than 50% of the student population.

On the other hand, schools with virtually all-white faculties have on average nearly 90% white students—more than five times as many white students as schools with predominantly minority faculties. Schools with nearly all-white faculties also educate student bodies in which one-third of students are low-income, or half the share of low-income students as schools with predominantly minority faculties. Almost all-white faculties also teach on average 7% of English language learner students, or one-fourth the share of these students in schools where the faculty is predominantly minority. Taken together, these data indicate that schools with virtually all-white faculties teach a different group of students, and these teachers do not face the challenges of teaching students who are low-income or learning English as often as their peers on more diverse faculties.

Table 12

Percentage White, Percentage Low-income, and Percentage ELL of Student Enrollment by Racial Composition of Faculty in Sample

Indicator		Racial composition of faculty			
		0–50% white	50–80% white	80–95% white	95–100% white
White	Mean	17	46	64	86
	<i>N</i>	92	190	299	416
	<i>SD</i>	25	25	26	16
Low-income	Mean	65	46	38	33
	<i>N</i>	92	189	298	416
	<i>SD</i>	25	24	23	22
English language learners	Mean	30	21	16	7
	<i>N</i>	90	184	294	414
	<i>SD</i>	28	22	19	13

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 8 & 10; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; $p < .01$.

Another important finding is the pronounced differences in the percentage of low income and ELL students by teacher race. Not only are teachers on predominantly minority faculties more likely to have higher percentages of low-income and ELL students, but regardless of faculty composition, minority teachers work in schools that typically have higher shares of these students. White teachers work in schools that on average have the lowest percentages of low-income students (38%) (see Table 13).

Table 13

Composition of Student Population (Poverty and English language learner Status) in Schools of the Average Teacher of Each Race in Sample

Student characteristic		Teacher race/ethnicity				
		White	African American	Latino	Asian	Mixed Race
Low-income	Mean	38%	60%	45%	45%	46%
	<i>N</i>	851	57	40	14	23
	<i>SD</i>	24%	22%	28%	31%	24%
English language learners	Mean	13%	13%	31%	34%	21%
	<i>N</i>	838	56	40	13	23
	<i>SD</i>	19%	20%	28%	31%	21%

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 8, 47a, and 47b; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; $p < .01$. Teachers who indicated “don’t know” in response to how many English language learner students were in their school were not included in the bottom row of mean percentages.

On the other hand, African American teachers work in schools with the highest percentage of low-income students, where more than half of students (60%) were from low-income families, 22% higher than the share of low-income students in schools of white teachers. Latino, Asian, and mixed race teachers work in schools which on average have more than 40% of students who are low-income, but they do not typically teach the same high percentage of low-income students as

African American teachers. Asian and Latino teachers also taught in schools where over 30% of students on average were English language learners, which may be related to these teachers' own native language and the ability to communicate with non-English speakers. However, Latino and Asian teachers in this sample disproportionately face the challenge of trying to educate students of varying English mastery. White and African American teachers typically taught in schools where 13% of students are English language learners, or less than half the share of students with whom their Asian and Latino peers work.

Finally, in data analyses not shown here, white teachers comprise over 90% of the faculty in the two categories of schools where a quarter or less of the students are low-income. On average, only two-thirds of teachers are white in schools where more than three-quarters of the students are low-income. Taken together, mirroring national trends, students of teachers in this sample are segregated not just by race, but schools with high percentages of nonwhite students are also more likely to have higher percentages of students from low-income families and students who are not native English speakers. These data demonstrate that nonwhite teachers as well as teachers on faculties with higher percentages of nonwhite teachers are disproportionately teaching in schools that have higher percentages of English language learners and concentrate students of poverty, which often are also schools that have fewer resources and thus more challenging to work in (Oakes, Rogers, Silver, Horng, & Goode, 2004; Education Trust, 2005). These schools are not inherently more challenging, but this pattern instead reflects the lack of resources that are traditionally associated with such schools due to structural inequality.

The Context of NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress Status

Federal and state policies are putting more pressure on schools to improve student performance and have targeted teachers as central to improving this. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act includes a requirement that every class is taught by a highly qualified teacher. To be highly qualified under the law, a teacher must have a bachelor's degree, be certified according to state requirements, and demonstrate subject matter knowledge. Although there are various measures by which researchers, educators, and policy makers define teachers as qualified, the general consensus of the research is that regardless of definition, schools with higher percentages of African American and Latino students tend to have fewer qualified teachers.²¹ For example, authors of one review concluded, "there is a systematic sorting of the least qualified teachers into schools with the highest minority enrollments" (Loeb & Reininger, 2004, p. 27).²²

Under NCLB, schools are identified for improvement and subject to sanctions outlined in the law if they do not meet a state's adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for two consecutive years. Each state divides students into demographic subgroups—including all racial groups, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English language learners—and each subgroup in a school is required to post yearly increases on standardized testing. This means that even if a teacher's classroom of students scores very well, if one or more subgroups in the school do

²¹ There are similar trends of lower quality teachers more often teaching in schools with higher numbers of low-income students.

²² Although not a focus here, research examining the distribution of teachers in North Carolina finds that there may be sorting within schools in addition to sorting between schools based on the percentage of black students. Their research found that as a result of both sorting trends, black students were disproportionately exposed to less experienced and unqualified teachers (see Clotfelter et al., 2005b).

not score highly enough, individual teachers will share in the school's sanctions. Research has documented that because racially diverse schools have more subgroups of students, they are more likely to face sanctions for not making AYP (Kim & Sunderman, 2005).²³

When examining how teachers in the sample were distributed between schools that made AYP and those that did not, there were differences by teacher's race. AYP status is self-reported by teacher, and the indicator in this article refers to each school's AYP during the 2005–06 school year. In 2005–06, higher percentages of white and Asian teachers worked in schools that made AYP, compared to schools where African American, Latino and mixed race taught. Over a quarter of African American teachers worked in schools that did not make AYP—twice the proportion of white teachers in non-AYP schools. Over one-fifth of Latino teachers worked in schools that also did not make AYP (see Table 14).

Table 14
Teacher Race by School's AYP Status in Sample

Teacher race	% teachers in schools making AYP	% in schools not making AYP	% who don't know AYP status	N
White	84	13	3	852
African American	72	26	2	57
Latino	75	23	3	40
Asian	86	7	7	14
Mixed race	78	22	0	23
All teachers	83	14	3	1002

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, questions 11, 47a, & 47b; differences in percentages are not statistically significant.

Schools that made AYP educate much higher percentages of white students (68%) and lower percentages of low-income students (see Table 15). Schools that did not make AYP educate slightly less than 50% of white students on average, and over half of their students come from low-income families (see also Owens & Sunderman, 2006). Kim and Sunderman (2005) also found that schools making AYP differed systematically from those that did not or were identified for improvement.

The data in Table 16 also indicate that a lower percentage of faculties with more teachers of color did not make AYP. Only seven out of every ten schools where the faculties were predominantly nonwhite made AYP while nine out of every ten schools did where the faculty was 95% or more white. Thus, the white isolation of teachers in low-poverty and more heavily white schools discussed earlier means that teachers in schools with a higher percentage of nonwhite faculty members are more likely to be in schools facing pressures due to the threat of sanctions.²⁴ Teachers in schools not making AYP may be in schools facing sanctions, allowing students to transfer out of their schools, and being publicly labeled as a failing school. Such teachers may be more likely to leave their schools, which in this sample are schools with greater percentages of minority or low-income students.

²³ For more information on the NCLB Act and the sanctions relating to AYP status, see Sunderman, Kim, and Orfield, 2005.

²⁴ See Chapter 5 in Sunderman, Kim, and Orfield (2005) for analysis from a survey of teachers in schools facing NCLB sanctions.

Table 15

Percentage White and Percentage Low-income of Student Enrollment by AYP Status of Teacher's School in Sample

AYP status of school		% low-income	% white
Yes	Mean	38	68
	N	830	832
	SD	25	29
No	Mean	53	48
	N	142	142
	SD	23	33
Don't know	Mean	33	74
	N	26	26
	SD	24	25
Refused to respond	Mean	71	38
	N	2	2
	SD	39	26
Total	Mean	40	65
	N	1000	1002
	SD	25	31

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, question 11; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06.

Table 16

Racial Composition of Faculty by School's AYP Status in Sample

% White (faculty)		AYP status				Total
		Yes	No	Don't know	Refused to respond	
0–50%	Count	64	27	1	0	92
	%	70%	29%	1%	0%	100%
50–80%	Count	148	37	4	1	190
	%	78%	20%	2%	1%	100%
80–95%	Count	241	44	13	1	299
	%	81%	15%	4%	0%	100%
95–100%	Count	374	34	8	0	416
	%	90%	8%	2%	0%	100%
Total	Count	827	142	26	2	997
	%	83%	14%	3%	0%	100%

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, questions 10 & 11; $p < .01$.

Implications of Segregation for Teacher Satisfaction and Retention

Particularly as a result of the projected teacher shortage, teacher retention is essential to schools' efficacy and to student achievement. Teacher mobility can be disruptive to schools, when

schools are forced to continually replace teachers who leave for other schools. National data show that on average, 17% of a school's faculty is new to the school every year (Chandler, 2004).²⁵ High turnover leads to having less experienced teachers on staff, and as discussed below, research shows that teachers with at least a few years of teaching experience are more effective than novice teachers. Further, it stands to reason that schools with more openings may find it more difficult to fill each opening with a highly-qualified teacher (Podgursky, Monroe, & Watson, 2004). To replace teachers who leave the profession or who transfer—not including retirees—the costs is estimated to be just under \$5 billion annually, or approximately \$12,500 per teacher. This financial impact does not include more intangible but significant costs of teacher turnover such as a reduction in teacher quality and subsequent impacts on student achievement (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005).

Although prior research has documented the higher mobility rates at high minority and high poverty schools, it is less clear what the explanation for these patterns is. There are a number of reasons that teachers may choose to leave predominantly minority or low-income schools, either to go to other schools or to leave the teaching force altogether, many of which are related to working conditions that are traditionally associated with high poverty, high minority schools. As discussed above, high minority schools are more likely to have novice teachers, who have high attrition rates. In addition, they are more likely to face sanctions under NCLB or other accountability systems as well as being branded as failing, an administrative label that allows students to transfer out of these schools. In other words, there are disincentives for teachers to remain in such schools because working conditions are more likely to be challenging. A review of research on teacher satisfaction and retention suggests that district policies such as higher salary (particularly in comparison to surrounding districts), mentoring programs, and feeling of administrative support and teacher autonomy were associated with higher levels of teacher satisfaction (Alt & Henke, 2007) and lower teacher turnover (Guarino et al., 2006). However, some of these policies such as paying higher salaries and mentoring require financial commitments by districts. Research in California confirms that factors such as teacher perceptions of school conditions and resources could reduce the predictive power of student composition (race or poverty) for teacher attrition (Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005).

The impact of teacher mobility patterns is significant on schools that teachers leave. Aside from the time and resources invested in searching for, hiring, and training a new teacher, research has suggested that differential rates of teacher leaving might be a proxy for teacher quality. Schools with high teacher turnover may have more low-performing teachers for several reasons: high turnover leads to less experienced teachers; better teachers are more likely to move; and schools with a larger ratio of applicants to openings should theoretically yield better teachers (Freeman, Scafidi, & Sjoquist, 2005; also see Podgursky, Monroe, & Watson, 2004). In a related way, teacher turnover can also undermine a school's stability and effectiveness (Esch et al., 2005). Given the strain that teacher mobility places on schools and the possible impact on student achievement, this section explores whether teachers' career satisfaction and decisions to leave schools or teaching are related to the composition of the students they teach.

²⁵ This includes transferring teachers (9%), teachers returning after a hiatus (4%), and brand-new teachers (5%).

Teacher Satisfaction

The MetLife (2006) survey of teachers found that in schools where minority students are at least two-thirds of the student enrollment, only 15% of teachers rate their satisfaction as excellent compared with 25% of teachers in schools where one-third or less of the student population are minority students. An analysis of recent bachelor degree recipients found that the percentage of minority students in the teacher's school was related to their satisfaction with their teaching job and their perception of the support they received from their school. In virtually every aspect of teaching satisfaction (e.g., learning environment, student behavior, parent support, society's perception, class size, and administration support), lower percentages of teachers report they are "very satisfied" when they work in schools where minority students comprise at least 75% of the enrollment (Henke, Peter, Li, & Geis, 2005). This suggests that factors such as larger class sizes, lower levels of parental involvement, and inferior facilities that are traditionally related to schools with high percentages of minority students—and not minority students themselves—could explain why there are lower percentages of teachers in high minority schools that express satisfaction as a teacher.

Over 60% of teachers in this sample who teach in low minority schools report that they are "very satisfied" in the profession (see Table 17).²⁶ In comparison, just 40% of teachers in schools with high concentrations of African American and Latino students report a similar level of satisfaction. Further, 14% of teachers in segregated minority schools are either "not too satisfied" or "not at all satisfied" with teaching, more than three times the percentage (4%) of teachers in schools where less than 10% of students are African American and Latino express such levels of dissatisfaction. In data not shown, African American, Latino, and Asian teachers were the least likely to express that they were very satisfied as teachers while a majority of white and mixed race teachers report that they are very satisfied with their career.

Table 17

Student Racial Composition and Teacher Satisfaction in Sample

Where teachers work	Satisfaction with career as teacher					N
	Not at all satisfied	Not too satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	
0–10% African American and Latino students~	1%	3%	12%	24%	60%	389
90–100% African American and Latino students*	4%	10%	33%	14%	40%	52
All teachers	1%	3%	16%	25%	55%	1002

Source: "Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools" survey, question 42; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; * $p < .01$; ~ $p < .10$.

²⁶ The question asked specifically related to satisfaction with their career as a teacher, not about their satisfaction with teaching at their current school.

Table 18
Teacher Satisfaction, by Student Racial Composition and Teacher Race in Sample

% of white students		Satisfaction with Career as Teacher					N
		Not at all satisfied	Not too satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	
0–25%	White teachers	1%	6%	23%	21%	49%	87
	Nonwhite teachers	3%	6%	28%	24%	39%	67
25–50%	White teachers	1%	4%	19%	25%	51%	114
	Nonwhite teachers	0%	3%	12%	29%	53%	34
50–75%	White teachers	1%	3%	17%	27%	52%	162
	Nonwhite teachers	0%	0%	13%	32%	52%	31
75–100%	White teachers	1%	3%	13%	23%	61%	489
	Nonwhite teachers	0%	6%	6%	44%	44%	18
All teachers		1%	3%	16%	25%	55%	1002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 42, 47a, & 47b; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; differences not statistically significant.

Both white and nonwhite teachers report more satisfaction with their teaching career at schools with the highest percentage of white students (see Table 18).²⁷ Conversely, the highest percentages of both white and nonwhite teachers reporting that they were “not at all satisfied” were in schools with less than a quarter white students—and a higher percentage of nonwhite teachers expressed this dissatisfaction. Further, a lower percentage of nonwhite teachers (39%) reported that they were “very satisfied” in schools that were 75–100% nonwhite than white teachers (46%).²⁸ Due to faculty segregation discussed above, there were few nonwhite teachers in majority white schools and the differences reported in Table 18 were not statistically significant.

Teacher Mobility

This analysis finds that a teacher’s likelihood of leaving his or her current school is higher in schools with higher percentages of minority and low-income students. Of teachers who were the most likely to leave their current schools (who responded “very likely”), they work on average in schools where white students were a slight minority of the total enrollment (47%). Just under half of the students in these teachers’ schools were low-income (49%), on average. On the other hand, teachers who were “not at all likely” to leave their school in the next three years teach students who are on average almost 70% white and only 36% low-income (see Table 19). The difference among those not likely to leave and those very likely to leave in average percentage of white students is 22%. The differences in percentage of low-income and white students by teachers’ likelihood of transition were both statistically significant ($p < .01$)

These findings corroborate other research on teacher mobility patterns, which suggests that there is higher teacher turnover in high minority and high poverty schools. A recent literature review

²⁷ Because of the small number of nonwhite teachers that teach in schools with a high percentage of white students, all nonwhite teachers are combined together to analyze whether teacher satisfaction in schools of different racial composition differed by teacher’s own race/ethnicity.

²⁸ I also examined whether teacher satisfaction differed by the interaction of teacher’s own race/ethnicity and racial composition of their faculty members. Please see Table A-1 in the Appendix.

about teacher labor markets concluded, “[T]here are higher turnover rates in schools with higher proportions of African-American and Hispanic students” (Loeb & Reininger, 2004, p. 35). In addition, Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin (2004) found in their analysis of teacher mobility patterns using a unique Texas dataset that “student racial composition is an important determinant of both the probability of leaving the public schools entirely and the probability of switching districts” (347). Specifically, they found that higher proportions of Latino or African American students made it more likely that non-African American and non-Hispanic teachers left their schools (see also Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2002; Watson, 2001), patterns that exist even when accounting for differences in teacher salary. This research, however, did not account for working conditions at the school, which might explain why teachers made their decisions about where to teach (Loeb, Darling-Hammond, & Luczak, 2005).

More than half of all teachers in this sample report that they are not at all likely to change schools. Teachers at schools with low concentrations of African American and Latino students report being quite likely to stay at their current school: nearly 85% of these teachers respond that they are “not at all likely” or “not too likely” to change schools within the next three years (see Table 20), including 61% who say that they are not at all likely to leave. By contrast, just over two-fifths of teachers in schools with 90–100% African American and Latino students agreed that they were not at all likely to leave. One-third of teachers in racially isolated minority schools said that they were at least somewhat likely to leave their current schools, and 17% reported being very likely to leave. Less than 4% of teachers in schools with few African American and Latino students are as likely to leave. These findings are not surprising given the earlier data regarding teacher satisfaction by student racial composition. Another contributing factor to these patterns might be the fact that novice teachers are more likely to transfer schools, as will be discussed below, and novice teachers in this sample are also more likely to teach in high minority schools. Regardless, if teachers follow through on their expressed desire to change schools, their mobility will likely contribute to the trend of shorter tenures of teachers and corresponding instability due to higher teacher turnover rates in higher minority schools.

In data not shown here, disproportionately fewer teachers (43%) in high-poverty schools (where 50–100% of students are low-income) are likely to say that they are “not at all likely” to change schools, while at least 57% of teachers in all other lower poverty schools believe that they are unlikely to change schools in the next three years. Of teachers in high-poverty schools, 17% or three times the share of teachers in low-poverty schools say that they are the least likely to leave their current schools in the next three years; these differences are statistically significant ($p < .01$). As with the trends in high minority schools discussed above, these preferences to leave high-poverty schools at disproportionate rates portend harmful educational consequences for the students who attend such schools if the statements of intentions are realized and teachers leave these schools at higher rates. Again, it is important to emphasize that we do not know what about these schools that cause teachers to want to transfer from them given the fact that—as documented elsewhere—schools with high concentrations of low-income or African American and Latino students tend to be associated with a number of factors that make the working conditions in these schools more challenging for teachers. These conditions may explain teachers’ transfer decisions, *not* the fact that teachers do not want to teach students of color or students from low-income families.

Table 19
Teacher Transition, by Percentage White and Percentage Low-income of Student Enrollment in Sample

Likelihood of changing schools in next three years	Measure	% low-income	% white students
Not at all likely	Mean	36%	69%
	N	533	534
	SD	24%	29%
Not too likely	Mean	42%	66%
	N	249	249
	SD	26%	30%
Somewhat likely	Mean	42%	61%
	N	98	99
	SD	26%	31%
Likely	Mean	48%	58%
	N	48	48
	SD	25%	32%
Very likely	Mean	49%	47%
	N	69	69
	SD	26%	33%
Don't know	Mean	51%	69%
	N	2	2
	SD	5%	43%
Refused to answer	Mean	65%	43%
	N	1	1
	SD	—	—
Total	Mean	40%	65%
	N	1000	1002
	SD	25%	31%

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 43; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; $p < .01$.

Table 20
Teacher Transition, by Student Racial Composition in Sample

Where teachers work	% teachers reporting their likelihood of changing schools in next 3 years					N
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
0–10% African American and Latino students*	60%	23%	9%	4%	4%	389
90–100% African American and Latino students	42%	25%	10%	6%	17%	52
All teachers	53%	25%	10%	5%	7%	1002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 43; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; * $p < .01$.

Novice teachers, who teach in disproportionately nonwhite schools, are the least likely to believe that they will stay at their current school. Just over one quarter of novice teachers respond that they are “not at all likely” to change schools in the next three years (see Table 21). By contrast, almost three-quarters of veteran teachers say that they are as unlikely to change schools. More than four times as many novice teachers (18%) say that they are “likely” or “very likely” to leave their current schools than veteran teachers (4%). Thus, teacher mobility is more likely to negatively affect schools with higher percentages of novice teachers.

Table 21
Teacher Transition, by Years of Experience in Sample

Years of experience	Likelihood of changing schools in next 3 years					N
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
Less than 3 years	27%	35%	20%	5%	13%	98
4–10 years	38%	31%	14%	8%	10%	236
11–20 years	50%	26%	10%	7%	7%	304
More than 20 years	73%	18%	4%	1%	3%	364
All teachers	53%	25%	10%	5%	7%	1002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 1a & 43; $p < .01$.

Teacher turnover is also likely to impact schools with higher percentages of nonwhite teachers. One-quarter of African American teachers, for example, say that they are at least “likely” to change schools within three years (see Table 22). Twenty percent of Latino teachers and 35% of mixed race teachers report a similar likelihood that they will transfer schools. By contrast, less than 10% of white teachers say they are as likely to change schools. More than half of white teachers say that they are not at all likely to change schools. Of course, due to teacher segregation patterns described above, schools’ student composition—and perhaps other characteristics—vary widely by teacher race/ethnicity.

Table 22
Teacher Transition by Teacher Race in Sample

Teacher race	Likelihood of changing schools in next 3 years					N
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
White	56%	25%	10%	4%	6%	852
African American	40%	32%	4%	12%	12%	57
Latino	35%	23%	23%	8%	13%	40
Asian	36%	29%	29%	0	7%	14
Mixed race	39%	26%	0	17%	17%	23
All teachers	53%	25%	10%	5%	7%	1002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 43, 47a, & 47b; $p < .01$.

As seen above, more teachers in schools with higher percentages of nonwhite students report that they are the most likely to leave their current school. Somewhat surprisingly, among teachers in 0–25% white schools, a higher proportion of nonwhite teachers report that they are very

likely to leave than do white teachers (see Table 23).²⁹ By contrast, a higher proportion of white teachers in each category of schools reports that they are unlikely to leave and this share is higher among schools with higher percentages of white students.

Table 23

Teacher Turnover by Teacher Race and Student Racial Composition in Sample

% White (students)		Likelihood of changing schools in next 3 years					N
		Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
0–25%	White teachers	45%	23%	15%	6%	12%	87
	Nonwhite teachers	39%	25%	10%	6%	19%	67
25–50%	White teachers	53%	23%	8%	7%	9%	114
	Nonwhite teachers	32%	32%	12%	12%	9%	34
50–75%	White teachers	56%	21%	13%	3%	7%	162
	Nonwhite teachers	39%	26%	16%	7%	13%	31
75–100%	White teachers	59%	26%	8%	3%	4%	489
	Nonwhite teachers	44%	22%	11%	22%	0%	18
All Teachers		53%	25%	10%	5%	7%	1002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 43, 47a, & 47b; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; *Note*: differences between white and nonwhite teachers in 75–100% white schools are statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Teacher Attrition

Almost two-thirds of teachers in schools with the lowest shares of African American and Latino students report that they are not at all likely to leave teaching in the next few years, while less than half of teachers in high minority schools (44%) express similar confidence that they will be teaching in three years (see Table 24). Further, one-quarter of teachers in schools with 90–100% African American and Latino students say that they are likely or very likely to leave teaching in three years. Of the teachers in schools with less than 10% African American and Latino students, 13% believe that they are likely or very likely to be out of teaching soon. This was approximately half the share of teachers in 90–100% African American and Latino schools who held similar beliefs.

²⁹ For analysis of how faculty racial composition by teacher race affected teachers’ plans to change schools, please see Table A-2 in the Appendix.

Table 24
Teacher Attrition by Student Racial Composition in Sample

Where teachers work	Likelihood of changing careers in next 3 years					N
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
0–10% African American and Latino students	63%	17%	8%	2%	11%	389
90–100% African American and Latino students*	44%	17%	14%	10%	15%	52
All teachers	60%	20%	7%	3%	11%	1,002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 44; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; * $p < .01$.

There are also differences in teachers’ plans to leave teaching by teacher race. Over 20% of African American and mixed race teachers report that they are either likely or very likely to leave teaching within the next three years. In addition, less than half of African American teachers say that they are “not at all likely” to leave teaching, which is the lowest proportion of teachers of any racial/ethnic group (see Table 25). Conversely, only one-eighth of white teachers are likely or very likely to leave teaching in three years, and more than 60% of white teachers say that they are not at all likely to change careers. White teachers were also the least likely above to plan to change schools in the next three years. Given the under-representation of minority teachers, these patterns of attrition suggest that further diversifying the teaching force will require efforts to try to retain minority teachers, who in this sample are more likely to leave teaching as well as leave their current school.

Similar to teachers’ reported plans to switch schools, a higher proportion of nonwhite teachers in heavily nonwhite schools report that they are likely to leave teaching than do white teachers (see Table 26). The proportion of nonwhite teachers who believe that they are likely to switch careers within three years is lower in schools with higher percentages of white students. In general, there are no consistent patterns of teachers’ stated plans suggesting whether differential rates of teacher attrition from minority schools is driven by white teachers leaving schools with high percentages of students of color (at least in this sample).³⁰ Although some research has found that African-American teachers tend to move to schools with higher percentages of African-American students (Freeman et al., 2005), nonwhite teachers in this sample—like white teachers—were most likely to remain in teaching in schools with the highest percentage of white students. This may lend support to the belief that teachers leave heavily nonwhite or low-income schools because of the working conditions, which are often more difficult in such schools.

³⁰ There are similarly mixed patterns of teachers’ plans to change careers when analyzing responses by teacher race and faculty racial composition (see Table A-3 in the Appendix).

Table 25
Teacher Attrition, by Teacher Race in Sample

Teacher race	Likelihood of changing careers in next 3 years				
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely
White	61%	19%	7%	2%	11%
African American	49%	21%	7%	11%	13%
Latino	55%	23%	13%	0%	10%
Asian	57%	29%	0%	7%	7%
Mixed race	52%	13%	13%	0%	22%
All teachers	60%	20%	7%	3%	11%

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 44, 47a, & 47b; $p < .01$.

Table 26
Teacher Attrition, by Teacher Race and Student Racial Composition in Sample

% White students		Likelihood of changing careers in next 3 years					N
		Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
0–25%	White teachers	48%	28%	9%	6%	9%	87
	Nonwhite teachers	51%	16%	12%	6%	15%	67
25–50%	White teachers	60%	19%	8%	0%	13%	114
	Nonwhite teachers	41%	32%	9%	3%	12%	34
50–75%	White teachers	57%	22%	6%	2%	12%	162
	Nonwhite teachers	52%	26%	3%	7%	13%	31
75–100%	White teachers	65%	17%	7%	2%	10%	489
	Nonwhite teachers	67%	11%	6%	6%	11%	18
All teachers		60%	20%	7%	3%	11%	1002

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 44, 47a, & 47b; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06; *Note*: differences between white and nonwhite teachers in 25–50% white schools are statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Regardless of poverty concentration, a majority of teachers at all schools report that they are not at all likely to leave teaching in the next three years (see Table 27). Yet a lower proportion of teachers in schools of concentrated poverty (53%) say that they are not at all likely to leave teaching than in all other categories of schools with fewer low-income students. Almost one-quarter (24%) of teachers in high poverty schools say that they are at least somewhat likely to leave teaching in three years. When comparing Table 27 to those above, the differences by student poverty are not as stark as the differences by student racial composition and the differences are not statistically significant.

Table 27
Teacher Attrition by Student Poverty Composition in Sample

% students	Likelihood of Changing Careers in Next 3 Years					<i>N</i>
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	
low-income						
0–10%	59%	20%	7%	4%	10%	128
10–25%	65%	17%	4%	2%	12%	206
25–50%	63%	18%	7%	1%	11%	327
50–100%	53%	23%	9%	4%	11%	339
All teachers	60%	20%	7%	2%	11%	1000

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, question 44; NCES Common Core of Data, 2005–06.

Discussion

Data from a survey of 1,002 teachers across the country show considerable segregation of teachers and between teachers and students, segregation that is related to harmful consequences for teachers and students. This study describes the context of where teachers are teaching and finds substantial differences, and though we cannot be sure what the explanation is for the trends reported above, they demonstrate that teachers add an extra layer of segregation to the increasing segregation of public school students. This segregation, like student segregation, is tied not only to student racial composition but also to student poverty composition and the proportion of native English speakers. These data allow for the examination of teachers and students in their school at only one point in time, 2005–06. In addition, this sample under-represents new teachers and also slightly under-represents teachers in large urban areas. Given the debate in the literature about the racial composition of the teaching force and whether it is growing more diverse or not along, the analysis of this dataset suggest the importance of a publicly-available dataset to allow researchers to study issues of faculty segregation over time.

An important contribution of this study is the examination of teachers across different school contexts. Although earlier studies using SASS data have found that there are higher percentages of teachers of color in urban schools and schools with a majority of students of color (e.g., Shen et al., 2003), this analysis finds substantial differences within schools where 50% or more are students of color. In addition, these data allow for analysis of teachers’ exposure to racial diversity, and there are distinct differences on average for early exposure to people of other races/ethnicities. This survey also found substantial regional variations among the racial compositions of teachers’ faculties, although a consistent trend across all regions is the fact that there is a faculty-student racial mismatch, or a much higher percentage of white teachers than white students.

These data also allow for a cross-cohort examination, which suggests that teachers with fewer years differ in several important aspects from their more veteran peers. A recent analysis of one cohort of college graduates found that nearly 90% of teachers who remained in teaching a decade after college graduation said that they would choose the same career over again, yet this study also noted that African-American teachers were much less likely to envision remaining as a teacher for the rest of their career than were their white colleagues (Alt & Henke, 2007). The findings reported here, which differ from the Alt and Henke study by analyzing responses of teachers of varying years of experience, indicate that important differences in satisfaction and likelihood to remain as a teacher exist both when considering teacher race/ethnicity as well as the

racial/ethnic composition of students in a teacher's school. With high and increasing racial segregation of students, these findings have important implications for our nation's teaching force.

The isolation of white students is exacerbated by overwhelmingly white faculties who teach them and teachers who have had few diverse experiences of their own. The fact that nonwhite teachers had more exposure to diversity suggests that one of the benefits of increasing the percentage of nonwhite teachers could be their ability to draw on their previous experiences in racially diverse schools and classrooms.

School districts, school desegregation experts, federal judges, and federal legislation for decades have also recognized the importance of an integrated faculty: to provide role models from different racial backgrounds for students, help white students understand diversity, bring a richer knowledge base and commitment to social justice, and ensure that there are high expectations for all students. In addition to the isolation of white teachers, African American teachers and Latino teachers are teaching in contexts that differ from whites but also from each other. Thus, the issue of creating a diverse faculty must also be one in which the focus is on the creation of a multiracial faculty and this may require different strategies for schools depending on the students they educate.

This does not mean to imply that white teachers cannot be good teachers for students of color—there are many examples of exemplary teachers—or that they cannot learn to be sensitive to race, class, and language dynamics that arise in diverse schools. Whites remain the majority of teachers in virtually every type of school examined here (with a few exceptions), and under virtually any scenario, white teachers will remain a majority of teachers for the foreseeable future even as the student enrollment is rapidly changing. Like many other whites who are highly isolated, these white teachers have few diverse experiences of their own or among their school's faculty. However, the findings here highlight the need to prepare more minority teachers and to diversify faculties with our existing teaching force. The under-representation of people of color in the teaching professions combines with the patterns of teacher segregation to leave schools with a majority of white students virtually bereft of teachers of color. While it is possible that these schools may be able to hire paraprofessionals or other staff members from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds, the lack of a diverse faculty reinforces the isolation of white students in their schools and neighborhoods and takes away professionals of color who can serve as role models.

One way to address the low numbers of teachers of color nationwide is by restructuring teacher preparation programs to provide supportive environments for teaching candidates of color, hiring faculty of color, and a sustained commitment to preparing white and nonwhite teachers to teach in racially and economically diverse schools (Sleeter, 2007). This might include re-evaluating admissions requirements (e.g., entrance tests that some teacher preparation programs require) that may limit the number of teaching candidates of color or giving preference to prospective students who will commit to teaching in diverse schools.³¹ Diversifying teacher preparation programs will accomplish two goals: helping to train a new racially diverse generation of teachers and providing valuable learning experiences for white teachers that will help prepare them for, and perhaps cause them seek out, teaching positions in racially diverse schools.

Alternative certification programs have shown some success in training a higher percentage of teachers of color who show a higher tendency to remain as teachers (Guarino et al., 2006), although the quality of these programs is mixed. Providing training for paraprofessionals in high

³¹ The Higher Education Act has increased pressure on teacher training institutions, including threats of withholding federal funding depending on the passing rates of their graduates on state credentialing tests, and as a result, some programs have begun requiring passing tests as a requirement to entering the program, which may disproportionately exclude prospective teaching candidates of color.

minority, low-income schools to become certified teachers in exchange for a commitment to remaining as a teacher in their schools could be one way to ensure a stable teaching force at schools where it is hard to retain teachers.

In June 2007, the Supreme Court struck down two voluntary, race-conscious student integration plans in Seattle, Washington, and Louisville, Kentucky. Together with social scientists and professional social science and education organizations who filed *amicus* briefs, these districts argued that these plans were essential to maintaining diversity in their schools and cited evidence that without such plans, resegregation of students would occur (Linn & Welner, 2006, for a summary of social science evidence). Although it is too early to know what the precise impact of this ruling will be on student segregation, if this decision does facilitate further resegregation, it is important to also consider whether that might further exacerbate the patterns of teacher segregation and retention shown here. Further, future teachers who are themselves students now will reverse the trend seen here of increased exposure at an early age to people of other races, at least in schooling contexts. Within the Court's new limits, school boards should devise student assignment policies to eliminate schools of minority student isolation, which a majority of Justices found was a compelling governmental interest and which will also eliminate schools with working conditions that cause teachers to leave at disproportionately high rates. These policies should also target diversifying schools that have overwhelmingly white student bodies and faculties. Creating integrated schools is a policy that may not only provide important educational benefits for public school students as a majority of the Court noted but the implications of this analysis suggest that it will also help establish stable schools that attract and retain a diverse, qualified teaching force.

In fact, while the recent Supreme Court decision imposed new restrictions on race-conscious measures that districts might employ in seeking to voluntarily integrate their students, Justice Anthony Kennedy's controlling opinion specifically notes that race-conscious actions such as teacher recruitment and tracking of data by race remain permissible. In a key section of his opinion delineating possible options for school districts that he believes would be constitutionally permissible, Kennedy writes, "School boards may pursue the goal of bringing together students of diverse backgrounds and races through other means, including... recruiting students and faculty in a targeted fashion" (127 S.Ct. 2738, 2792). Thus, it seems that the decision condones actions to create a racially diverse faculty in schools, and perhaps districts may focus anew on efforts to more evenly distribute *teachers* of different races if policies to assign *students* are increasingly under legal scrutiny.

It is critical to ensure access for children from all backgrounds to a qualified, experienced teacher. Schools that are unable to retain teachers will, of course, find it hard to retain high-quality teachers. Although racial segregation continues to be strongly related to inequality along a number of dimensions, the concentration of students from high poverty, ELL, or racial minority backgrounds should not be a determining factor in the stability or quality of teachers in a given school. Given the increasing body of research that associates high quality teaching with student achievement (e.g., Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004; Sanders & Rivers, 1996), teacher distribution and retention trends may disproportionately harm students in segregated minority or concentrated low-income schools. School districts can play an important role in how they recruit, assign, and try to retain teachers. If districts' hiring or teacher assignment policies result in the assignment of teachers of color to schools where working conditions are more challenging, we should not be surprised by the above patterns that nonwhite teachers are more likely to be planning to leave the teaching profession. Administrators should make it a priority to try to hire a diverse teaching force for each school. Districts should, for example, examine whether policies that give teachers with seniority preference in transferring schools contribute to faculty segregation. In addition, school leaders must ensure that the school is a welcome working environment for teachers from every background and put in place policies that are equitable. The stability of school leaders, with experience in diverse

school environments and who will establish a hospitable working environment, is instrumental in recruiting and keeping a talented faculty.

Although this survey did not ask teachers why they were contemplating changing schools, this evidence suggests that teachers might be less satisfied with the working conditions that are often prevalent in high minority, low-income schools and that the prospect of being sanctioned under NCLB may contribute to decisions to change schools (see also Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Aliaga-Diaz, 2004).³² The testing and sanctions pressure from NCLB may add an added layer of stress for teachers in minority schools. Ironically, the turnover of teachers in schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) may only further disrupt the school's educational environment for teachers and students who remain there. An unintended consequence of NCLB's AYP requirement may be that it makes the teaching context for minority teachers more difficult at the same time that minority teachers continue to be underrepresented in the teaching force. Longitudinal research involving 50 teachers in Massachusetts suggests that teachers who feel successful with their students and believe that the school is organized in a way that supports their teaching are more likely to stay at their school and in teaching (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003).

It is unlikely that ignoring issues of race and segregation among students and faculty will solve stratification and inequality. The inequality that is stubbornly linked to schools with high percentages of low-income students, English language learners, and students of color make these schools more challenging for teachers to work in despite educators' deep commitment to their students. NCLB may intensify the challenges of teaching in many schools that need the best teachers. We cannot afford to ignore how significant these issues are in how they affect the classroom and must provide ways—either in teacher preparation programs, as professional development, or preferably both—for teachers to think about how to teach in racially diverse schools or to teach students from different racial/ethnic backgrounds than their own.

³² The survey did contain questions about family involvement and how the administration handled diversity issues—which will be analyzed in subsequent studies—but it is unclear whether teachers' perceptions of families and administrators may relate to their plans to change schools.

References

- Alliance for Excellent Education. (Aug. 2005). *Teacher attrition: A costly loss to the nations and the states*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/TeacherAttrition.pdf>.
- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc.
- Alt, M. N., & Henke, R. R. (2007). *To teach or not to teach? Teaching experience and preparation among 1992–93 bachelor's degree recipients 10 years after college* (NCES 2007-163). U. S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (1999). *Teacher education pipeline IV: Schools and departments of education enrollments by race, ethnicity, and gender*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Community Survey (ACS). (Nov. 2006). *Selected population profiles: Data highlights*. Washington, DC: U. S. Census Bureau.
- Bradley v. School Board of the City of Richmond*, 382 U.S. 103 (1965).
- Branch, A.J. (2001). Increasing the numbers of teachers of color in K-12 public schools. *The Educational Forum*, 65(3), 256–261.
- Chandler, K. (2004). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the teacher follow-up survey, 2000–01*. (NCES 2004301). U. S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2004). *After Brown: The rise and retreat of school desegregation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. (2005a). Classroom-level segregation and resegregation in North Carolina. In J. C. Boger & G. Orfield (Eds.), *School resegregation: Must the south turn back?* (pp. 70–86). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. (2005b). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers. *Economics of Education Review*, 24(4), 377–392.
- Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., Vigdor, J. L., & Aliaga-Diaz, R. (2004). Do school accountability systems make it more difficult for low performing schools to attract and retain high quality teachers? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 23, 251–271.
- Cohen, E. G. (1980). Design and redesign of the desegregated school: Problems of status, power, and conflict. In W. G. Stephan & J. R. Feagin (Eds.), *School desegregation: Past, present, and future* (pp. 251–278). New York: Plenum.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping Good Teachers: Why It Matters, What Leaders Can Do. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 6–13.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Education Trust. (Winter 2005). *The funding gap 2005: Low-income and minority students shortchanged by most states*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Esch, C. E., Chang-Ross, C. M., Guha, R., Humphrey, D. C., Shields, P. M., Tiffany-Morales, J. D., et al. (2005). *The status of the teaching profession 2005*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Frankenberg, E. & Lee, C. (2002). *Race in American public schools: Rapidly resegregating school districts*. Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Frankenberg, E., & Lee, C. (2003). Charter schools and race: A lost opportunity for integrated Education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 11(32). Retrieved May 13, 2008, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n32/>.
- Freeman, C., Scafidi, B., & Sjoquist, D. (2005). Racial segregation in Georgia public schools, 1994–2001: Trends, causes and impact on teacher quality. In J. C. Boger & G. Orfield (Eds.), *School resegregation: Must the south turn back?* (pp. 148–163). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Freeman, D. J., Brookhart, S. M., & Loadman, W. E. (March 1999). Realities of teaching in racially/ethnically diverse schools: Feedback from entry-level teachers. *Urban Education*, 34, 89–114.
- Frey, W. H. (2001). *Melting pot suburbs: A Census 2000 study of suburban diversity*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Center on Urban & Metropolitan Policy.
- Gitomer, D. H., Latham, A. S., & Ziomek, R. (1999). *The academic quality of prospective teachers: The impact of admissions and licensure testing*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Gomez, M. (1993). Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching diverse children: A review with implications for teacher education and practice. *Journal of Negro Education*, 62(4), 459–474.
- Green v. New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).
- Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173–208.
- Hanushek, E., Kain, J., & Rivkin, S. (2004). Why public schools lose teachers. *Journal of Human Resources*, 39(2), 326–354.
- Hawley, W., et al. (1983). *Strategies for effective school desegregation: Lessons from research*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Hendrie, C. (1998). Legal issues complicate efforts to integrate school staffs. *Education Week*, 17(41), 7.
- Henke, R. R., Peter, K., Li, X., & Geis, S. (2005). *Elementary/secondary school teaching among recent college graduates: 1994 and 2001*. (NCES 2005-161). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics and teacher education: An overview. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 102-105.
- Irvine, J. J. (May, 1988). An analysis of the problem of disappearing black educators. *Elementary School Journal*, 88(5), 503-513.
- Jacobson, L. (Nov. 2004). Petition may scuttle teacher testing in Ala. *Education Week*, 24(10), 24, 28.
- James, D. R., & Tauber, K. E. (1985). Measures of segregation. *Sociological Methodology*, 15, 1-32.
- Jan, T. (2007, August 19). Minority scores lag on teaching test. *Boston Globe*.
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a 'sense of success': New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617.
- Kim, J. S., & Sunderman, G. L. (2005). Measuring academic performance under NCLB: Implications for educational equity. *Educational Researcher* 34(8), 3-13.
- Kirby, S. N., Berends, M., & Naftel, S. (1999). Supply and demand of minority teachers in Texas: Problems and prospects. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(1), 47-66.
- Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2002). Teacher sorting and the plight of urban schools: A descriptive analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1), 37-62.
- Linn, R. L., & Welner, K. G. (Eds.). (2007). *Race-conscious policies for assigning students to schools: Social science research and the Supreme Court cases*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education.
- Loeb, S., & Reininger, M. (2004). *Public policy and teacher labor markets: What we know and why it matters*. East Lansing, MI: Education Policy Center at Michigan State University.
- Loeb, S., Darling-Hammond, L., & Luczak, J. (2005). How teaching conditions predict teacher turnover in California schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80(3), 44-70.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1988). The dimensions of racial segregation. *Social Forces*, 67, 281-315.

- Mayer, D., Mullens, J., & Moore, M. T. (2000). *Monitoring school quality: An indicators report*. U. S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- MetLife. (2006). The MetLife survey of the American school teacher: Expectations and experiences. Hartford, CT: Author. Retrieved November 12, 2006, from <http://www.metlife.com/WPSAssets/81821402701160505871V1F2006MetLifeTeacherSurvey.pdf>.
- Mickelson, R. A. (2005). The incomplete desegregation of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools and its consequences, 1971–2004. In J. C. Boger & G. Orfield (Eds.), *School resegregation: Must the south turn back?* (pp. 87–110). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Miller, P. C., & Endo, H. (2005). Journey to becoming a teacher: The experiences of students of color. *Multicultural Education*, 13, 2–9.
- Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J., Rogers, J., Silver, D., Horng, E., & Goode, J. (2004). *Separate and unequal 50 years after Brown: California's racial "opportunity gap."* Los Angeles, CA: Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access, University of California-Los Angeles.
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2007). *Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies*. Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2008). *The last have become first: Rural and small town America lead the way on desegregation*. Los Angeles, CA: Civil Rights Project/ Proyecto Derechos Civiles.
- Owens, A., & Sunderman, G. L. (2006). *School accountability under NCLB: Aid or obstacle for measuring racial equity?* Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Phillips, M., & Chin, T. (2004). School inequality: What do we know? In K. Neckerman (Ed.), *Social inequality* (pp. 467–519). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Podgursky, M., Monroe, R., & Watson, D. (2004). The academic quality of public school teachers: An analysis of entry and exit behavior. *Economics of Education Review*, 23, 507–518.
- Provasnik, S., & Dorfman, S. (2005). *Mobility in the teacher workforce: Findings from the Condition of Education 2005*. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences.
- Reardon, S. F., & Yun, J. T. (2002). *Private school racial enrollments and segregation*. Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Reardon, S. F., & Yun, J. T. (2005). Integrating neighborhoods, segregating schools: The retreat from school desegregation in the south, 1990–2000. In J. C. Boger & G. Orfield (Eds.),

- School resegregation: Must the south turn back?* (pp. 51–69). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (March 2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, *73*(2), 417–458.
- Rockoff, J. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement: Evidence from panel data. *American Economic Review*, *94*(2), 247–252.
- Sanders, W., & Rivers, J. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee, Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.
- Shen, J., Wegenke, G. L., & Cooley, V. E. (2003). Has the public teaching force become more diversified? *Educational Horizons*, *81*(3), 112–118.
- Sleeter, C. (2007). Preparing teachers for multiracial and historically underserved schools. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools* (pp. 171–189). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Sunderman, G. L., Kim, J., & Orfield, G. (2005). *NCLB meets school realities: Lessons from the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- U. S. Department of Education (2006a). *Characteristics of schools, districts, teachers, principals, and school libraries in the United States, 2003–04 schools and staffing survey*. NCES 2006-313. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2006b). *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- United States v. Jefferson County Bd. of Education*, 372 F.2d 836 (5th Cir., 1966).
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Watson, S. (2001). *Recruiting and retaining teachers: Keys to improving the Philadelphia public schools*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Wells, A. S., & Crain, R. L. (1994). Perpetuation theory and the long-term effects of school desegregation. *Review of Educational Research*, *64*, 531–555.
- Yun, J. T., & Moreno, J. F. (2006). College access, K–12 concentrated disadvantage, and the next 25 years of education research. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(1), 12–19.
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Research on the indicators of quality. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 157–260). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Appendix

Table A-1

Teacher Career Satisfaction by Teacher Race and Faculty Racial Composition in Sample (%)

% peers who are white	Not at all satisfied	Not too satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
White teachers					
0–50%	2.3	9.3	20.9	23.3	44.2
50–80%	0.7	2.7	16.7	23.3	56.7
80–95%	0.4	1.9	18.5	30.1	49.0
95–100%	0.8	3.5	12.4	20.0	63.0
Nonwhite teachers					
0–50%	4.1	4.1	24.5	32.7	34.7
50–80%	0	5.0	17.5	42.5	35.0
80–95%	0	2.5	20.0	12.5	62.5
95–100%	0	4.8	4.8	28.6	57.1

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 10, 42, 47a, & 47b.

Table A-2

Teacher Transition by Teacher Race and Faculty Racial Composition in Sample (%)

% peers who are white	Likelihood of changing schools in next 3 years (%)				
	Not at all likely	Not too likely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely
White teachers					
0–50%	44.2	16.3	14.0	7.0	18.6
50–80%	48.0	28.7	10.0	7.3	6.0
80–95%	56.4	23.6	10.8	3.5	5.8
95–100%	60.0	24.8	8.1	2.8	3.8
Nonwhite teachers					
0–50%	36.7	26.5	12.2	4.1	20.4
50–80%	35.0	27.5	15.0	15.0	7.5
80–95%	40.0	30.0	10.0	10.0	7.5
95–100%	42.9	19.0	9.5	9.5	19.0

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 10, 43, 47a, & 47b.

Table A-3
Teacher Attrition by Teacher Race and Faculty Racial Composition in Sample (%)

% peers who are white	Likelihood of changing schools in next 3 years (%)				
	Not at all likely	Not at all likely	Not at all likely	Not at all likely	Not at all likely
White teachers					
0–50%	46.5	30.2	9.3	4.7	9.3
50–80%	54.7	22.7	6.7	2.7	12.7
80–95%	63.3	19.3	6.9	1.9	8.1
95–100%	63.8	16.7	6.3	1.5	11.6
Nonwhite teachers					
0–50%	51.0	12.2	10.2	12.2	14.3
50–80%	42.5	32.5	12.5	2.5	10.0
80–95%	47.5	27.5	5.0	2.5	15.0
95–100%	71.4	9.5	4.8	0	14.3

Source: “Teaching in Multi-Racial Schools” survey, questions 10, 44, 47a, & 47b.

About the Author

Erica Frankenberg

University of California Los Angeles

Email: frankenberg@gseis.ucla.edu

Erica Frankenberg (Ed.D., Harvard University) Erica Frankenberg (Ed.D., Harvard University) is the research and policy director of the Initiative for School Integration at the Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA.. Her research interests focus on racial desegregation and inequality, and the connections between school segregation and other metropolitan policies. She is the co-editor of *Lessons in Integration: Realizing the Promise of Racial Diversity in America's Schools* (with Gary Orfield, 2007) from the University of Virginia Press; other publications include journal articles, book chapters, and reports about trends, causes, and consequences of school segregation.

EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS ARCHIVES <http://epaa.asu.edu>

Editor: Sherman Dorn, University of South Florida

Production Assistant: Chris Murrell, Arizona State University

Editorial Assistant: Judy Castillo, University of South Florida

General questions about appropriateness of topics or particular articles may be addressed to the Editor, Sherman Dorn, epaa-editor@shermamdorn.com.

Editorial Board

Noga Admon	Jessica Allen
Cheryl Aman	Michael W. Apple
David C. Berliner	Damian Betebenner
Robert Bickel	Robert Bifulco
Anne Black	Henry Braun
Nick Burbules	Marisa Cannata
Casey Cobb	Arnold Danzig
Linda Darling-Hammond	Chad d'Entremont
John Diamond	Amy Garrett Dikkers
Tara Donohue	Gunapala Edirisooriya
Camille Farrington	Gustavo Fischman
Chris Frey	Richard Garlikov
Misty Ginicola	Gene V Glass
Harvey Goldstein	Jake Gross
Hee Kyung Hong	Aimee Howley
Craig B. Howley	William Hunter
Jaekyung Lee	Benjamin Levin
Jennifer Lloyd	Sarah Lubienski
Les McLean	Roslyn Arlin Mickelson
Heinrich Mintrop	Shereeza Mohammed
Michele Moses	Sharon L. Nichols
Sean Reardon	A.G. Rud
Ben Superfine	Cally Waite
John Weathers	Kevin Welner
Ed Wiley	Terrence G. Wiley
Kyo Yamashiro	Stuart Yeh

EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS ARCHIVES <http://epaa.asu.edu>

**New Scholar Board
English Language Articles
2007–2009**

Wendy Chi	Corinna Crane
Jenny DeMonte	Craig Esposito
Timothy Ford	Samara Foster
Melissa L. Freeman	Kimberly Howard
Nils Kauffman	Felicia Sanders
Kenzo Sung	Tina Trujillo
Larisa Warhol	

Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas <http://epaa.asu.edu>

Editor

Gustavo E. Fischman

Arizona State University

Asistentes editoriales: Rafael O. Serrano (ASU) & Lucia Terra (UBC)

Hugo Aboites

UAM-Xochimilco, México

Claudio Almonacid Avila

UMCE, Chile

Alejandra Birgin

FLACSO-UBA, Argentina

Mariano Fernández Enguita

Universidad de Salamanca. España

Roberto Leher

UFRJ, Brasil

Pia Lindquist Wong

CSUS, USA

Alma Maldonado

University of Arizona, USA

Imanol Ordorika

IIE-UNAM, México

Miguel A. Pereyra

Universidad de Granada, España

Romualdo Portella de Oliveira

Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

José Ignacio Rivas Flores

Universidad de Málaga, España

José Gimeno Sacristán

Universidad de Valencia, España

Susan Street

CIESAS Occidente, México

Daniel Suárez

LPP-UBA, Argentina

Jurjo Torres Santomé

Universidad de la Coruña, España

Armando Alcántara Santuario

CESU, México

Dalila Andrade de Oliveira

UFMG, Brasil

Sigfredo Chiroque

IPP, Perú

Gaudêncio Frigotto

UERJ, Brasil

Nilma Lino Gomes

UFMG, Brasil

María Loreto Egaña

PIIE, Chile

José Felipe Martínez Fernández

UCLA, USA

Vanilda Paiva

UERJ, Brasil

Mónica Pini

UNSAM, Argentina

Paula Razquin

UNESCO, Francia

Diana Rhoten

SSRC, USA

Daniel Schugurensky

UT-OISE Canadá

Nelly P. Stromquist

USC, USA

Antonio Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona, Lisboa

Lílian do Valle

UERJ, Brasil