This book provides pragmatic ideas and analyses from contributors with multicultural backgrounds and educational experiences, on how to implement multicultural education in college and university courses of study; and presents strategies for transforming both the curricula and the training of effective multicultural educators. Section 1 offers insights from their classroom experience and research in instructional strategies. The essays in Section 2 affirm how far-reaching and multifaceted multicultural education is, from how many perspectives it can be studied, and on how many levels it impacts curriculum. Section 3 contains papers that examine the creation of the climate for change. Chapters and their authors are the following: "Using Humor to Promote Multicultural Understanding" (Samuel Betances); "The Point of the Story" (Joan Livingston-Webber); "Teaching Education Majors: How to Foster Resiliency in Their Students" (Kimberly A. Gordon); "Conflict and Resistance in the Multicultural Classroom" (Linda Dittmar); "Classroom Closets: The Invisible History of Gays and Lesbians" (R. Jovita Baber); "Multiculturalism in U.S. Society and Education: Why an Irritant and a Paradox?" (Carlos J. Uvando and Luise Prior McCarty); "Teaching About Race in the Race-Conscious United States" (J. Q. Adams); "Understanding Asian Americans: A New Perspective" (Shin Kim); "Tech Prep: Preparation for Work Force Diversity" (Kerry A. Kerber and Anthony Falgiani); "Assessing the Effectiveness of Multicultural Curriculum Initiatives in Higher Education: Proving the Self-Evident" (Patricia L. Francis); "A Study of the Campus Climate: Methodology and Results" (Catherine A. Riordan); "Multicultural Perspectives in Counseling" (Edward Johnson and Linda S. Aguilar); "Postsecondary Education and Persons with Disabilities" (Judith J. Smithson); and "Moving Toward Justice, Equity, and Diversity at Western Illinois University" (Janice R. Welsch). Each chapter concludes with its own reference list. The volume also contains two appendices: (1) "Multicultural Education: Voices of the Nineties—A Selective, Annotated Bibliography of Journal Articles, Special Journal Issues, and Books" (Katherine Dahl); (2) "Film and Videos for the Multicultural Classroom" (Janice R. Welsch). (GLR)
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FOREWORD

Edmund W. Gordon
John M. Musser Professor Emeritus of Psychology, Yale University
Professor of Psychology, City University of New York
Professor of Black Studies, City College of New York

In contemporary practice on many of our college and university campuses multicultural education is approached through courses in ethnic studies, pluralism and diversity, or the teaching about specific cultural or ethnic groups. In well intentioned efforts at broadening the exposure of students to cultures other than one's own, these courses tend to focus on teaching about other groups. In large measure they address the perceived need for information and some degree of appreciation for those unlike me. This approach to multicultural education is in recognition of the fact that we are and have always been a diverse society, rich with different cultural histories, heritages, and contributions from peoples with many diverse backgrounds. The argument has been advanced that the education of students cannot be considered complete unless it gives students a fully inclusive view and understanding of all cultures and their contributions and value to our society. In efforts to achieve this end, conscientious educators have run into the problems of adequate coverage when comprehensive inclusiveness is the standard. In addition, much of the current debate concerning the boundaries of the canon is the result of this concern for inclusion and representation. It has led to questions concerning whose history, which cultures, and what voices shall be taught and heard.

In an emergent approach to multicultural education (Gordon & Roberts, 1990) the rationale is shifted from a focus on the need to teach about and to provide information concerning specific groups to the use of such knowledge and experience to serve one of the highest functions of education better, that of the development of human intellect. In this view multicultural education is not intended to simply teach about people but to enhance such cognitive capacities as analysis, synthesis, perspective taking, and, ultimately, to enable critical interpretation and contextual understanding. This approach to multicultural education reflects contemporary thought which urges that students be educated, not trained, in such a way they are capable of using intellect to access, analyze, compare, and interpret information critically. To achieve this, the educative process should use multicultural and other information and knowledge, not with content mastery as its end, but as the vehicle by which critical thinking is enabled and intellective capacity is enhanced.

People are indeed more diverse than was once believed, but that belief is circumscribed by its origins. It is the globalization of communication, commerce, and the movement of peoples that is shattering the provincial beliefs which have for so long truncated our knowledge of the world and its peoples. At the same time that recognition of diverse cultures has emerged, there has been a parallel recognition of the limitations of situated knowledge. Increasingly it is recognized that the validity of specific information may depend upon the context which is its referent: that knowledge and information are shaped by who produces it and for what ends. Such considerations force us to make decisions about what and whose information we choose for what pur-
poses. Thus representation and inclusion are not simply matters for political decision making, rather they demand conceptual comprehensiveness as an essential condition for the enablement of competent intellective functioning. In this view, what the intelligent and educated person is constantly called upon to do is to collect information from a wide variety of sources and perspectives as a prerequisite to eventually making judgments. Those judgments or conclusions are likely to be more appropriate and sound if the body of information available is comprehensive with respect to available conceptions, rather than truncated by narrowness of experience and perspective.

In applying these notions to the implementation of a multicultural curriculum several problems arise. There is the very practical pressure of the need to program for students from many diverse cultures. There are the challenges that arise from scholars who are uncomfortable with or reject relativistic approaches to knowledge. There are issues related to the nature and integrity of the canon. In order for the academy to implement a multicultural curriculum it may be necessary to agree on what the canon should embody. What is acceptable knowledge within the boundaries of the canon? Gordon and Bhattacharyya (1992) have identified several criteria by which the integrity of the canon can be judged. They assert that the canon:

1. must be viewed as dynamic, responsive to contextual and temporal variance, and subject to change;
2. should be capable of accommodating diverse and conflicting information, perspectives, and techniques;
3. should comprehensively reflect the universe of situated knowledges, perspectives, and techniques, as well as those which may be more universal;
4. should contribute to the conservation and stability of knowledge, techniques, and world views without the imposition of rigidity;
5. should be accessible to and engageable by a wide range of audiences;
6. should reflect functional and meaningful relationships between prior knowledge and the requirements of learning to understand available knowledge and the construction of new knowledge; and
7. should enable imagination, reflection, accommodation, and transformation as active and creative processes in the service of understanding and human action.

Thus in making multicultural curriculum adaptations, it may be helpful to focus less on the accumulation of facts about single human cultures and human groupings and to direct more attention to the understanding of broad concepts concerning the shared as well as idiosyncratic behaviors of human beings. Such broad concepts could then be addressed from the contexts and perspectives of various peoples and situations, and almost never solely from one. For specific purposes, the multicultural curriculum could include both celebration and representation of different cultures, but it should not be limited to these purposes. A truly multicultural curriculum should seek to move students toward accessing and processing information from diverse contexts and sources, toward its contextual analysis and synthesis, and toward its critical interpretation and understanding. When students have the ability to process information and knowledge in this manner, they are likely also to be able to orient and manage themselves in a multicultural world and to engage the problems of such a world productively and with compassion.

Obviously, educators need to accommodate our ever changing society by address-
ing views from many different perspectives. The writings included in this volume take into consideration this need for inclusiveness of many manifestations of diversity in a multicultural curriculum while also addressing the methods for dealing with this knowledge. The works of these and other authors who document special experiences and perspectives adds to the resources available to the academy in its response to the facts of diversity and pluralism as we move toward a broader pedagogical purpose for multicultural education. Beginning with information and moving through analysis and synthesis to greater contextual understanding, we can enhance our own and our students' ability to make sound judgments within a world of increasingly multicultural communication and interaction.

REFERENCES


PREFACE

In this third volume of *Multicultural Education: Strategies for Implementation in Colleges and Universities*, we have tried to cover areas not covered in either the first or second volumes and to signal the importance of continually questioning and evaluating the underlying premises and goals of multicultural education. In inviting persons from a broad spectrum of cultural groups as well as educational units to contribute, we are reflecting our belief that the cultural diversity we must recognize and work with 1) goes beyond questions of ethnicity to encompass issues of gender, class, sexual orientation, ability, age, and other cultural variants and 2) demands the combined attention and efforts of every person involved in education, no matter what their position or title. And indeed, our contributors, identified with multiple cultural backgrounds, different educational experiences, and varied multicultural perspectives have joined the “rainbow coalition” of contributors to volumes one and two to address an ever-widening range of diversity issues.

Discussing instructional strategies in Section I, Samuel Betances, Joan Livingston-Webber, Linda Dittmar, Kimberly Gordon, and Jovita Baber offer insights from their classroom experience and research. Betances focuses on humor, “the sugar that helps the medicine go down,” and discusses how to use it effectively to promote communication, cross-cultural understanding, and a society made “safe for differences.” Among the types of humor he suggests is that based on personal experiences, personal narratives. Livingston-Webber makes narratives the center of her essay and clearly links storytelling to multicultural education. “Being multicultural, in part, means,” she says, “being able to recognize the intentions encoded in the stories we live by and tell each other, stories by which we make ourselves and our lives known.” She suggests that, as educators, we have a responsibility to learn how to listen to our students’ stories—whether they are narratives about why they missed class, how they are interpreting an idea, or why they can’t fill out the financial aid form by the specified date. Gordon also stresses the importance of listening carefully to one’s students, of attuning oneself to their cultural backgrounds and to their specific communication and behavioral patterns. She offers information based on studies of resiliency and motivation that will help education majors recognize and tap into students’ strengths: the information is of value to all teachers, of course.

Betances, Livingston-Webber, and Gordon all point in one way or another to teacher responsibility, and mutual teacher-student respect as essential aspects of successful multicultural teaching. Implicit if not explicit in how they define this responsibility and respect is a focus on individual students. Dittmar echoes and further explicates this emphasis as she discusses how she has responded to difficult and sometimes painful moments when critical but controversial multicultural issues have evoked racist, sexist, or homophobic responses from some students while others question the validity of her position of tolerance and respect for difference. To guide students effectively through such discussions we must, she says, “pay attention to each individual in ways that exceed the standard delivery of services our job descriptions imply.” Like Dittmar, Baber offers concrete suggestions about introducing controversial multicultural material into our classrooms. She does so through a careful analysis of how James Banks’ model for curriculum integration can be applied to sexual orientation information and issues.
Before exploring how one can incorporate information about gay and lesbian lifestyles and culture into courses, Baber reviews some of the changes in family structure and in attitudes toward sexuality, making her essay an appropriate bridge to Section II which focuses on curriculum issues. The essays here affirm how far-reaching and multifaceted multicultural education is, from how many perspectives we can study it and on how many levels it impacts curriculum. Carlos Ovando and Luise Prior McCarty combine philosophical and instructional approaches as they examine concepts of culture, finding that cultures are essentially dialogical, interactive, and continuously in flux rather than separate, isolative, and “completely representable as information.” They follow their “fluid and shifting-sand characterization” of cultures with an analysis of how such a conceptual change will influence our classroom explorations of U. S cultural values. J. Q. Adams also explores a concept basic to multicultural education—the concept of race—and provides a detailed study of how to integrate this concept with its inherent complexities into the curriculum. Sharing insights garnered from 20 years of multicultural teaching, he moves through specific preparatory steps for instructors as they consider teaching about race to scientific and sociological definitions of the term. He then considers our country’s legacy of racial prejudice and discrimination through the study of specific court cases that vividly chronicle our nation’s heritage of racism.

Shin Kim explains a related complexity, that associated with our shorthand methods of identifying and labeling ethnic groups. In her review of the immigration patterns and cultural values of Asian Americans, she not only notes the diversity among various Asian American groups—the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, South Asian, and Hmong, for instance—but also the generational, educational, and other differences within each of these groups. If we are to move beyond stereotypes to genuine understanding, we must acknowledge and respect this diversity. Such understanding is becoming an essential prerequisite in the work force, a reality the representatives of business recognize and that Kerry Kerber and Anthony Falgiani address in their essay about diversity training. Their interest is in the preparation of tomorrow’s workers and managers and in a skills-based multicultural education that helps students learn to communicate across cultures and to resolve conflicts effectively. They call for the inclusion of diversity skills training in Tech Prep programs as a necessary complement to technical training.

As different as the above essays are, they do not represent all of the directions one could take when discussing multicultural curriculum issues. Patricia Francis takes one of those alternate directions in her study of assessment initiatives. She looks at course and program assessment and finds “that systematic evaluation is the exception rather than the rule,” though assessment has increased in the past ten years. Happily, available evaluation information “suggests that curriculum transformation efforts have had a positive impact . . . [on] student-faculty attitudes, students’ personal development, and pedagogical practices.” More attention needs to be given this aspect of multicultural study—to improve the teaching of those involved and to document the validity and value of a multicultural curriculum. While colleges and universities that have multicultural studies programs develop assessment plans, these and other schools may benefit from studies evaluating their campus climates. Catherine Riordan provides an excellent model for such an evaluation in her essay.
Riordan, in the chapter that opens Section III, Creating the Climate for Change, describes a study of campus climate done at a midwestern technological university. Prompted by the need to attract and retain a more diverse student population in its engineering programs, the study was conducted to determine the “comfort factor” of its female and ethnic minority students and “to educate the greater campus community in a nonthreatening and persuasive way about the experience of ethnic minority students, staff, and faculty” on campus. Developing a climate supportive of a diverse student population requires the cooperation of everyone on campus, and in their article, Edward Johnson and Linda Aguilar discuss how counselors, who are aware of students’ cultural backgrounds and familiar with the values and behaviors of those cultures, can contribute to the comfort and success levels of students seeking their help. Before analyzing specific case studies, Johnson and Aguilar survey and critique counseling theories from a multicultural perspective and provide readers with a valuable overview of multicultural counseling principles.

Judith Smithson offers another kind of overview as she explains legislation that explicitly extends civil rights to persons with disabilities. In reviewing the provisions of the American Disabilities Act and Section 504 (the regulations stemming from the 1973 Rehabilitation Act) as they impact colleges and universities, she clearly illustrates what we can do to create a welcoming campus climate for students with disabilities. Moving to yet another overview, Janice Welsch summarizes what has been done at one Illinois university to further multicultural sensitivity and understanding. A chronicle of action by administrators, by committees, and by individuals across campus, her account suggests some of the ways a committed cadre of multicultural advocates can effect change. We conclude this volume with two appendices that we hope readers will find useful: Kathleen Dahl’s annotated bibliography of multicultural “Voices of the Nineties” and Janice Welsch’s list of films and videos that focus on diverse cultural groups. Each is suggestive and will, we hope, lead readers to additional resources.

As we did in volume two, we call attention to the challenge of language, of naming. Language is powerful. It can erect barriers and shut down lines of communication and it can promote understanding and help us move toward greater cross-cultural interaction. It can hurt or heal. Finding the language to facilitate intercultural communication is not easy. Who chooses the words we use? The names that identify us, even define us? We have been struggling with these questions for a long time but we still have no answers. We do believe the privilege of naming belongs first and foremost to the persons being named and that their choices merit respect. When discussing the positions and identities of the millions of individuals and the cultural groups within our pluralist nation and trying to reach a level playing field, a place of diversity and equity, our words can be critical. And yet we don’t have suitable language to give people—as individuals or as members of a group—their due. So we continue our struggle with words and ask both our contributors and our readers to continue the struggle with us, to continue—paradoxically—the dialogue about words that will make further dialogue possible.

The views expressed in this volume are those of the authors, not the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
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Section I: Instructional Strategies for Diverse Student Populations
USING HUMOR TO PROMOTE MULTICULTURAL UNDERSTANDING

by

Samuel Betances

As keynoter, workshop leader, teacher, and guide on issues related to diversity and multicultural concerns I have been approached with increasing frequency by people who have participated in one or more of my presentations and found them both engaging and entertaining. They earnestly desire to do what I do: engage an audience through humor while discussing critical issues. My effective use of humor creates bonds among workshop participants, audience members, and students and helps release tension, making humor an essential tool in the consciousness raising that is my goal.

What follows is a series of reflections and suggestions about humor that provide both a philosophy and a point of view teachers and presenters can use in promoting collaboration among diverse groups. Since my quest is to educate and to promote critical thinking through the use of humor, I like to think of myself as an “edutainer.” What makes the performance of an “edutainer” memorable and significant has to do with both the nature of a diverse society and the process of teaching itself. The burning and controversial issues of diversity cannot be discussed, presented, or analyzed unless students are fully attentive, but competing for students’ attention in our technological media age is very demanding.

No matter how poor or humble the origins of a student may be or how lacking in resources a rural or urban sector may be, our students have an awareness of what quality is in the world of highly polished, technically sophisticated media performances. Competition for their attention by advertising, general entertainment, news broadcasting, and cultural events has familiarized them with an array of mind-grabbing techniques and frequently left them with little patience for carefully paced, logically developed formal expository lectures. Students quickly distinguish a boring presentation from a lively one. However, as educators we are not likely to have access to the media techniques familiar to students weaned on HBO, sitcoms, sports broadcasting, MTV, soap operas, CNN, the Discovery Channel, Nintendo games, and rock concerts. To capture and hold our students’ interest we need look for other tools. One of the most powerful I have found is humor. The effective use of humor contributes to good communication and to understanding. It can help us make our society safe for differences.

I am not suggesting we become comedians or buffoons and make a mockery of our profession or trivialize serious subject matter. Rather, I am suggesting that we as professionals learn to pay attention to how we present ourselves, that we exhibit a profound respect for our students by bringing them into the learning process through experiences that make us human. We are, after all, more similar than different and nowhere is that more likely to be exhibited than in our common human—and frequently humorous—experiences.

I’ve learned to poke fun at myself about issues related to my body, social identity, gender relationships, absurd assumptions and fears, and how I have grown and unlearned bad lessons while learning new good ones. I walk my students through my own personal journey to understanding, and I have fun while I do it. Powerful personal
lessons can make a message memorable and motivate students to want to hear more. Entering into a dialogue with them about my personal struggles while respecting myself enough to reject rejection allows me to guide them to discover better ways of avoiding their own potential pitfalls. Accomplishing this with humor both catches their attention and encourages them to remember the lessons.

Through humor we can recognize our collective human experiences and can share, in a spirit of respect and fun, the insights born out of each other’s social realities. Laughter creates bonds through which students and teachers agree to suspend certain rules of authoritative behavior that may prevent trust and real learning from taking place. Often students have the idea that abstract knowledge or information learned in a classroom cannot be useful in their world. Humor based on the teacher’s experiences can convince them otherwise. When a teacher uses humor in the classroom, especially when sharing personal stories to illustrate points, students learn very quickly that their instructor is a “real” person who trusts them with personal information and who does not reside in an unattainable or irrelevant “ivory tower.”

My sense is that John Dewey was correct in arguing that one cannot become a great teacher unless the abstract and theoretical lessons being taught are connected by illustrations to the concrete experiences of students. Whether we begin with their experiences or our own to achieve this, we are likely to find humor in the telling appropriate and satisfying. By knowing very well what is going on in the lives of students, we can bring their experiences to the classroom and integrate them into our presentations in a humorous fashion so students not only understand and relate to what is being taught but relate to us as well. Successful comedians, in touching on situations to which their audiences can relate, establish connections with them. The same principle applies in the classroom as shared humor increases teacher-student rapport. Accomplishing this, the journey into new areas of knowledge is made easier because of the attachment and trust established through laughter and common threads of experience.

Does learning have to be fun? Not always. Many of us learn our most important lessons in life at “Hard Knocks University.” Through painful experiences we learn to avoid certain things and embrace others. But learning in the classroom can be fun. Certainly teaching can be. The challenge of teaching students in a diverse society is teaching important lessons about getting along with each other as individuals and as members of various groups: engaging human beings so they recognize their common humanity and identify with a collective “we.” Reaching this experience of our shared humanity becomes more important than teaching facts and figures. We must think of ourselves more as teachers of human being than as experts in our field. From this perspective, humor is indispensable. It allows students to let down their guard in a spirit of family.

We cannot, of course, ignore facts and figures or overlook the ideas and critical thinking skills that will form the basis of students’ understanding of our multicultural society. We cannot fulfill our intellectual duty of sharing new and important information or of stimulating our students to think, however, unless their minds are open and ready to engage the ideas and perspectives we offer them. I’ve learned that using humor in an intelligent and respectful way is the key to bridging the chasm that often separates seemingly esoteric concepts from daily living.
I've read books on humor and comedy to learn to uncover the humor in situations. Used book stores have proven to be an invaluable resource for materials about humor, and the lives of great comics have enhanced my comedic repertoire. I've learned a lot about telling stories in an entertaining fashion and about the importance of timing and sequencing. I've also become aware of pitfalls to avoid. My teachers have included Steve Allen, Bill Cosby, Joan Rivers, and Hal Roach. From Bill Cosby, for example, I learned to embrace the obvious lessons of day to day middle-class family life. Reading his _Fatherhood_ sparked my memory of my family life in a barrio and uncovered the humor in many family situations. It prompted me to explore humor across socioeconomic classes and to incorporate my own family experiences into my presentations on the family. Studying Cosby's vision and humor expanded my vision and has led me to become a bit more pleasant, interesting, and entertaining in my teaching.

Because of his interest in education as well as entertainment, comedian Bill Cosby fits into the category of edutainer I suggested for teachers. Comedians who identify themselves exclusively or primarily as entertainers frame their messages and their insights into human experience to lead people to laughter and to establish their reputations as comics—sometimes with a reckless disregard for certain groups. Educators—edutainers—need to frame their knowledge of humanity in humor to lead students to understanding and to become great teachers, explicators of social reality and of the human spirit. And in the sensitive area of diversity, we must avoid being reckless with the reputation of any group. This does not, of course, mean that we can never refer to the ethnicity, gender, or other determinants of a group's identity. For example, my Puerto Rican heritage allows me to heighten consciousness of the media's use of scripts that recycle debilitating stereotypes of Puerto Ricans.

For instance, "The West Side Story could not have been written by a Puerto Rican," I tell my students.

"Why?" they ask.

"Because you cannot call for Maria at three o'clock in the morning in a Puerto Rican neighborhood and have only one window open!"

The spontaneous laughter this elicits is partly inspired by the punch line and partly by my respect for timing and a careful attention to setup that allow me to push the students toward the unexpected finish and then lead them to a discussion about the scripts Hollywood uses to portray not only Puerto Ricans but also women, African Americans, or people who are librarians or “absent minded professors.” Diversity discussions come out of the powerful illustration from my own heritage group without dumping on it. My real target is not even the media but the uncritical scripts and forces that have shaped our world view and may cause us to internalize limiting or destructive visions of ourselves or others. Humor helps dissolve the tensions associated with group conflict and the “isms”—such as racism and sexism—that prevent cohesion and collaboration in a diverse society.

As a professor of sociology, my greatest challenge is to motivate and teach students about classism. Sociologists identify that process in our lectures and readings as “stratification.” As successful professionals we enjoy positions of relative security and comfort. Poverty is a concept very hard to comprehend in our status within the middle class or what many of our students identify as a sea of plenty. Using humor based on my personal life helps me utilize my present socioeconomic status to promote concepts of so-
cial justice and to make the transition between the abstract sociological literature and concrete examples more smoothly and clearly. As a former welfare child from a broken home and as a member of a stigmatized group, I could be very angry, and perhaps alienating, because of this background, but I choose instead to use humor to evoke the sympathy of my students, whatever their class background, and to help them recognize the abuses of higher socioeconomic classes against those in lower stratas of society.

“I was very poor,” I share with them. My students’ interest is sparked since I also attended Harvard University. “So poor, that once someone broke into our little apartment on the west side of Chicago and didn’t take anything.” Out of the smiles and chuckles that come out of the tale, come precious teaching moments as I explain how some victims of break ins feel very bad when they lose jewelry, a VCR, money, a camera, or other quick-sell items. “But real victims may very well be persons like those in my family on the day thieves broke in and did not take anything.”

Powerful insights about the meanings of material things and how the criminal justice system operates in neighborhoods where some of us are often overpoliced but underprotected follow. Humor allows the students and instructors to share laughter and to create a “we” climate that promotes understanding. The tragic consequences of our inhumanity to each other can thus be countered or offset. Academicians from groups that have experienced oppression may be in a unique position to help students understand that oppression. But without humor, those lessons can be lost to a classroom of middle-class students bombarded with so much sober and serious criticism they feel they are the target of an inappropriate radical agenda.

Humor is the sugar that helps the medicine go down. Students will laugh at an experience, an event, or a story meant to be funny by those orchestrating, performing, or swapping tales to the degree that they are in humor. To be in humor requires a mindset which is distant enough to the absurd situation described so as to be in fun. If a listener is too emotionally attached to the person or group that is the subject of humor, the listener will not be in fun and will view the experience as offensive, injurious, and debilitating. A similar response can be evoked by “going too far.” Victimized by the situation, what is the person to do? Since the victim may not fully know how to protest, she/he may experience peer pressure at that moment and actually laugh and thereby cooperate in an inhumane, hostile encounter packaged in laughter.

Some circumstances make it impossible to be in humor. For example, one cannot be in fun about death while still in mourning. Promoters of healthy relationships cannot be in fun about child molestation, the tragic consequences of airplane crashes, or the ravages of an ongoing war. Women and men, having had an experience of sex as a powerful weapon of assault, may never be in humor about rape. Members of groups labeled minorities will not be in fun when they are set up by jokes that demean and debilitate them through stereotypes depicting them as worthless, criminal, dirty, stupid, lazy, drunken, cheap, or as sexual animals.

Respect for people with different lifestyles, who speak different languages and whose physical condition is not the same as that of the majority population, must never be undermined through dysfunctional humor. If a teacher is ever in doubt as to whether a “funny” situation might offend students, the rule is don’t tell it. Sit on the urge. Better to miss out on some laughter and be inclusive and respectful than to alienate and cause injury in one’s quest for a laugh. Every joke that recycles a stereotype
about a group contributes to frustration and sets up barriers to collaboration, respect, and coalition building. The classroom must be freed from such oppression.

While I do not want to discourage the use of humor and laughter or teaching that incorporates jokes and humorous insights, I do want to prevent uncritical people from using such tools to cause injury. For example, ethnic jokes and the like can be weapons that assault the dignity of groups with little power to defend themselves. How often do people in public life, responding to criticism for telling ethnic jokes, explain that no harm was intended. Yet harm was done. By choosing affirming rather than debilitating humor, our efforts to simultaneously educate and entertain will be rewarded without sacrificing laughter and fun in the process.

Laughing with people of a certain interest group is very different from laughing at them. The real edutainers, who are committed to communicating diversity, can present insightful, entertaining presentations where laughter bonds, helps to release tension, and promotes understanding by exposing apparent contradictions not easily revealed or readily accepted when presented through a didactic lecture. The sugar of humor can indeed help make difficult truths palatable, but the humor must be a humor grounded in tolerance and respect. This is the opposite of a humor of intolerance and bigotry. Bigotry, whether by lynching or by laughing, is wrong.

We do not tolerate the extreme bigotry of physical assaults in our institutions, yet we still sometimes enjoy a joke at the expense of a socially defined “inferior” cultural group. At the core of the evil in the humor of intolerance is a philosophy, a mindset, that certain groups are less than human. Such groups, the popular culture says, do not deserve to be viewed with awe and respect. They can be ridiculed through laughter, through ethnic jokes. What gets packaged as ethnic humor in our society often promotes stereotypes and caricatures that dehumanize. We recognize those stereotypes as reflected in jokes about the stupidity of Poles, the drunken behavior of the Irish, the homosexual tendencies among Greeks, the uncontrolled sexual appetites of men, the money hungry Jews, the criminal behavior among African Americans, the laziness of Mexicans, the graffiti prone Puerto Ricans, the Mafioso Italians, the brutal Germans, the sly Oriental, the bimboism inherent in females or the terrorist, belly-dancing Arabs. There are others to be sure. Each group is laughed at by others.

Group cohesion among those sharing the “in fun” experience occurs at the expense of the group victimized through debilitating humor. The outgroup may counter by staying away from the people expressing such hostilities. The outgroup may also enjoy its own “anti-other” group humor. Social distance results and the social disease of the “isms,” fed on stereotypes perpetuated through humor, runs rampant and strangles any hope of unity. Fragmentation is heightened and the possibility of establishing goodwill in schools by creating winning diversity teams is thwarted. Hostility feeds counter hostility. Yet, ironically, everyone is smiling. When people are forced into laughter through jokes at their expense, they may grin and bear it, but sensing danger or hostility they will also strengthen their defenses against the pain of the situation.

In some contexts laughter can help dissipate the pain of oppressive situations. Much of life involves suffering, abuse, and conflict. This is certainly true in situations defined by intolerance based on ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, or religion, but a wise teacher can use humor to expose the absurdities underlying and surrounding such bigotry—as in the arguments dominant groups offer to justify oppressive behavior—
and to release the tension discussions of controversial issues sometimes create. The principle guiding our introduction of humor into these or any discussions must be that the humor be affirming.

Multicultural leaders must be consistent and vigilant in “walking the talk” by using humor only to move towards a freer and healthier society. The classroom and campus must be safe for students who are eager to contribute to the collective well-being. All too frequently, however, colleges and universities are places where social, yet dysfunctional, values that tolerate selected group bashing through humor, are allowed to flourish. Still, we need more, not less laughter on campus and in the classroom because laughter can be healing and bring people together.

Diversity cannot be achieved without humor. This is my deepest, personal conviction. We must have fun and not take life so seriously that we miss opportunities to share in the common emotion of bonding through laughter. Laughter is a great human attribute. It brings joy and contentment. Some of us may be more gifted than others in being able to generate this most precious of human responses but most of us can learn styles of storytelling and presentation that incorporate humor. As noted above, however, that humor must be affirming. Injecting debilitating humor only leads to alienation, and the building of barriers to good relations are effective communication.

Clearly, we must transform barriers to understanding into bridges of understanding in our diverse society. Laughter and humor are wonderful resources to promote a healthy vision of a heterogeneous society. But to be effective, multicultural teachers must learn to take humor seriously. Edutainers must be literate about the potential of humor as a force for good or evil. They must reject negative uses of humor and, in a spirit of fun, with compassion and enthusiasm, embrace its healing and liberating potential. This, of course, is the real challenge of using humor in the classroom: to make it a resource in our efforts to help our students become full partners in the building of a society that is stronger, healthier, and freer than we found it. Comedians may use humor simply to be funny. As educators we need to use humor to make the dream of wholeness in diversity a reality. Teachers committed to the realization of this dream must be gifted with a passion for social justice, genuine depth of knowledge, and a sense of humor that facilitates collaboration and coalition building.

SUGGESTED READINGS


THE POINT OF THE STORY

by

Joan Livingston-Webber

In 1983, I was teaching writing and reading to high-risk, first-year students at Indiana University. There were fifteen students and two teachers who met for six hours a week. In this class was a young African American man. He came to class faithfully and turned in his work on time. His writing was imaginative and imagistic, but it never showed even the germ of the structure of an academic paper. I too was faithful and prompt, but I was frustrated with him during class time. He got an “F” in the course, and he may very well have left school. I had done what I could.

Later I was in the library browsing through journals and ran across an article about African American ghettos. I don’t remember the journal or the author. I was struck by one bit of information only. In the ghetto, the article said, to look someone in the eye is to issue a challenge. To keep your eyes down is to show respect. I revised the narrative of my interactions with the student. The revisionist narrative has to include a finer level of detail about habitual practices. It goes like this:

I would return papers in class and sit down in a student desk to discuss the papers with each student. *Original version: This young African American man never paid attention.* Revised version: *This young man didn’t make any eye contact.* I wanted to help him. He clearly wanted to pass the course. *But he wouldn’t take advantage of the help I offered.* He respected me or my power enough to signal that respect by not looking at me. I had 14 other students who would use the time. I signaled to him that he wasn’t as worth giving help to as the other students. I don’t know why he kept being faithful and prompt all semester.

Narrative works its way through multicultural texts, from the anecdotes teachers swap to the stories in which students’ lives are embedded. Being multicultural, in part, means being able to recognize the intentions encoded in the stories we live by and tell each other, stories by which we make ourselves and our lives known. One part of university education is a press toward constructing certain commonalities in our storytelling. College graduates will meet somewhere and tell each other college stories, stories about fraternity brothers, student government power mongers, the teachers who used 20-year-old syllabi or whom we only appreciate now years later, all stock characters in the nation’s college story. Through these stories, former college students come to feel like they belong to at least one group in common, the group of people who share just these topics for stories.

As educators, we also want to see students using stories for purposes that match our own, for example, to exemplify abstract generalizations about human behavior or to illustrate a point made in an argument. We know how much the narrative that illustrates is part of getting the point, of understanding a communication. Students from all cultures will complete college, then, with stories about their lives that share some content and with a tendency to tell some of their stories for the same purposes—to exemplify or to illustrate a larger point.

This description of the role of narrative in university life is obviously simplistic. I want to complicate the circumstances of narrative and college that I have just invoked.
I want to describe ways that the multicultural classroom problematizes narrative, intending to imply that there are many more ways I could have chosen to present narrative as problematic. Then I want to suggest that an appropriate, teacherly response—a response, not a solution—is to adopt an anthropological turn of mind, to understand our feelings as something other than an unmediated reflection of reality.

Narrative varies along cultural lines and may do so in the functions it serves and in the forms it takes. For example, stories appear to have a functional role in the development of women’s intellectuality that they apparently do not have in men’s. According to the work of Mary Belenky and her colleagues (1986), narrative plays a primary role in the intellectual functioning of some women, with no comparable role for men.

We have to examine for a moment what constitutes formal knowledge as it is most frequently understood. Formal or procedural knowledge is an intellectual perspective in which the concern is with the form of things. It relies on procedures, skills, techniques, and strategies—on methods whose steps can be specified in advance. The product of these methods is a knowledge of structure, of how a reality is shaped, of its form. Using the right method guarantees the validity and reliability of the results; method guarantees the knowledge and its truth. Form is, in this sense, more relevant to truth than content is (Belenky et al., 1986, p. 95; see also Perry, 1968). If a person has followed the proper formal procedures to a result, then that knowledge comes with a kind of guarantee. Generally, academics recognize scientific method as a right form, particularly in adopting an objective stance and an analytic framework.

Though otherwise displaying this familiar kind of objectivity, women may use an alternate method to arrive at formal knowledge, one that uses the form of personal and emotional experience to arrive at truth. A woman may project herself by empathy into the form or shape of another’s experience. Empathy leads her to “share [the] experience that has led a person to an idea” (Belenky et al., 1986, p. 113) rather than to follow the analytic steps that result in the idea as the logical conclusion in an argument structure. In other words, the most appropriate answer to the question “why” may be a narrative rather than a set of reasons. “Why” asks something like, “What was the experience that led you to this belief?” Our academic values may lead us to judge this responsive narrative as merely anecdotal. Simply repeating the question “why” more forcefully, though, is not likely to elicit a set of reasons rather than a narrative. And when we, in turn, answer this woman’s “why” with a set of reasons, she may feel that we are putting her off, keeping our distance, or refusing to answer her honestly.

Just as it is for formal analysis and objectivity, the focus of this kind of narrative knowledge is form and method: the form is narrative; the method is empathy. In a sense, connected knowers, these narrative-seeking women, are phenomenologists; they want to understand the structures of experience. Separate knowers and relativists, the reason-seeking academics, are more like epistemologists; they want to understand the structures of knowledge and language. A connected knowing will understand a text or a problem the way it understands people, seeking experiential structures; a separate knowing will understand people the way it understands texts and problems, seeking epistemological structures. We should not make this distinction absolute, between ways of knowing and between men and women. But we should wonder what is involved when a female student seems stuck in anecdotal responses to questions we believe ask for a set of reasons.
Some women some of the time, thus, use narrative for a purpose—explaining why—different from the purposes academics conventionally associate with narrative. Narrative may also take forms different from those we are accustomed to. Let me complicate the problematics of narrative further by explaining how some of the narratives of African Americans and European Americans observe different formal conventions, leading many, especially European Americans, to fail to understand the narratives of even our gender peers. For this part of my explanation, I want to rely on Courtney Cazden’s work (1988) with primary school students and Thomas Kochman’s work (1981) with community blacks.

Cazden (1988, pp. 8-27) compiles research done in California and New England schoolrooms on the sharing-time narratives of primary school children. She found that most black girls’ sharing-time narratives were formally different from their white classmates’ narratives in ways that left their teachers bewildered. White children’s stories were “topic-centered”; most black girls’ stories were “episodic” (p. 11). Topic-centered stories had one time, one setting, one event, and very few, perhaps three, characters. The topics of these stories were “publicly familiar scripts” (p. 22). Episodic stories, on the other hand, were longer and formally more complicated, with three to nine temporal shifts, changing scenes, and a larger cast of characters. The topics were often public scripts from a different (African American) culture (p. 22). Even with culturally shared topics (a puppy being put to sleep), teachers had a hard time understanding basic information (that the puppy was dead) (p. 15).

The examples of episodic stories that Cazden studies in her book seem to me to be organized in this way: Three or more incidents are told whose relationship to each other must be inferred. Sometimes, they seem to be instances of an overarching type of event which is not named. European Americans (like me) are not used to being expected to do this particular kind of inferential work with narratives, automatically filling in the conceptual links among episodes. Most European Americans cannot do so for episodic narratives; we expect at least a minimally explicit link verbalized by the teller, something on the order of “meanwhile back at the ranch” or “another time when.” An enculturated person fills in those links inferentially without conscious thought. Six-year-old black girls do not verbalize the properly implied links of their stories for their white teachers, and they end up with bewildered and frustrated teachers. The girls themselves must also feel bewildered and frustrated. Cazden’s work with five black and seven white Harvard graduate students in education suggests that this negative response derives from the white teachers’ inability to understand the episodic narrative form (p. 17).

Of course, children who never tell topic-centered stories probably won’t make it into our college classrooms. Even so, for some of our students, telling narratives in the form we like them told will be a more carefully learned and less natural competence. For example, African Americans (and some other cultural groups like Greeks and Jews) may feel they have terribly belabored a story, ruined it, if they explicitly state the point or name the overarching type that the episodes are exemplars for (see Tannen, 1984; see also Kochman, 1981). Some especially sensitive individuals might indeed be willing to ruin their narratives to accommodate the thick-headedness of their listeners, if they perceive these listeners aren’t getting it. Most European Americans, especially midwesterners, expect narratives to be topic-centered with the point explicitly stated.
(see Johnstone, 1990). They will wonder what the point is when told an episodic story or sometimes even a topic-centered one with the point implicit. A common European American response would be, “So what?” or “What’s the point?” or “I don’t get it.”

Midwestern, European American narratives are not participatory in the sense that the teller is held responsible for making the narrative intention explicit, stated in so many words. It is almost as though some sentence must always begin with an implicit, “And the moral of the story is.” African American stories may demand the participation of the listener to construct the narrative intentions inferentially. Basically, very different elements go without saying in episodic and topic-centered narratives. African American culture finds episodic narratives well-formed whose intentions go without saying.

When an African American student in my class—or any student for that matter—seems to be going on and I don’t get it, when I can’t find the storyline, I have to ask if my competence is sufficient to the task. I have to ask if one plot-driven story “line” carries the significance of the narrative, if it is the structural key to getting it. Do I know how to hear the narrative? When I read Gloria Naylor’s novel, *Mama Day* (1989), and do not realize until the end that one of the main characters has been dead for a long time, I have to wonder if I am reading the book the way that European American teachers listen to the sharing-time stories of six-year-old African American girls—with inappropriate structural expectations. When one student interrupts another student mid-narrative, I want to say, “Wait. Let her finish.”—even when I’m not sure that I understand myself what’s going on with the narrative.

What we’ve seen so far are cultural differences surfacing in the forms and functions of narrative for mainstream men and women and for African Americans and European Americans, particularly those European Americans in the midwestern states. We should assume differences will show up as well between other cultural groups and our own. For example, Native Americans certainly tell stories differently shaped from those we academics have been trained to understand and validate. Some Native American cultures tell stories that have no endings as mainstream U. S. culture would recognize an ending. We do not get the sense of closure we require to recognize an ending (Cazden, 1988, p. 12). Athabaskans elaborate what appear to be lengthy digressions in their stories when their listeners provide inappropriate responses, since listener responses always influence the organization of Athabaskan stories in formally specifiable ways (Scollon & Scollon, 1981, p. 114). Vietnamese students writing stories in English elaborate on setting and on the reflective mental processes of characters while their native-speaker peers are writing clearly forward-moving plot lines (Söter, 1988, pp. 188, 195, & 198).

Narratives don’t come in uniform shapes nor do they serve one purpose only, and we tend to feel bewildered by or impatient and frustrated with tellers whose stories have a shape or purpose that we do not intuitively understand. Even if I, as a woman, intuitively understand the narratives of intellectual import that North American women tell, it’s clear that I cannot presume that I will automatically understand all of the stories told by African American women—or African American men or Vietnamese Americans or Native Americans.
Students will always tell stories to their teachers. Even if I'm not asking students for narratives about course content, I may be heard as asking for them. Students and teachers use narratives to exemplify concepts and to illustrate abstract points. We also use stories to interact with each other. Students use narrative to explain absences and to get extensions. These stories will irritate us if we believe that excusing is not an appropriate function for student-teacher narrative, although the functions of narrative vary culturally just as the forms do. We ourselves may use narrative to explain to the class why the tests aren't done or, one-on-one, to explain why the student failed the oral report or excelled in the lab component.

The possible meanings of narrative become decidedly complicated in our multicultural classrooms—far too complicated for each of us to respond by analyzing every student narrative for its form and function. We don't have the skills. We don't have the time. Such a comprehensive analysis is in fact, an impossible task even for the most committed sociolinguist. But I believe, anyway, that it is less important that we understand every story on our own than that we recognize when we're not getting it and take remedial action.

I suggest that a multicultural teacher must develop an anthropological attitude about herself. In fact, I implore that we do so. This attitude is a means for identifying when we're just not getting it. We must adopt an anthropologist's approach to our feelings and judgments. We must learn a kind of detachment from our own feelings, a kind of objectivity in which our negative feelings, of confusion as well as of anger, are clues to the existence of cultural difference. Practicing what Deborah Tannen has called "a rhetoric of good intentions" (1990), a rhetoric in which we judge people's intentions or people themselves negatively only as a last resort and never as a first recourse.

The forms and functions of narrative, how we tell stories and why we tell them, are such a basic part of our cultural makeup that we have to really slow down our responding process even to notice that someone else's narrative is rubbing us wrong because of its form or function. We may only be aware that the story seems out of place or doesn't seem like a real story. I want to borrow the first ingredient of Raymonde Carroll's "recipe" for avoiding cultural misunderstanding (1988, p. 5) to explain an appropriate way, an anthropological way, to use those judgments. What is this anthropological attitude and how do we practice it?

An anthropological attitude sees our negative feelings and value judgments as signals that we may be encountering cultural variation (Carroll, 1988, p. 6). We might simply feel dislike for the person who is talking or we may have stronger negative feelings of anger or fear. We may be making judgments about the teller: that he or she is rude, an airhead, stuck in orality, from a deficient culture, childish, arrogant, and so on. A reorientation regarding these feelings and judgments is crucial. We don't deny them; they are valuable clues. What we do is reorient ourselves to them. This reorientation requires that we deal with our own emotional responses and judgments not as truths about other people and their intentions, but as data, as clues that can lead us to insight about truths of our multicultural circumstances.

I want to stress the difficulty and importance of this shift in our relationship to our own feelings. Carroll (1988) says that this sort of effort "can be more painful than psychoanalysis" (p. 11). It requires careful self-monitoring and a detachment toward our inner selves that few, if any of us, come to in the general course of things. Regarding
our automatic feelings and judgments in this way forces us to trust them for different information than we are accustomed to. In a homogeneous culture, I can trust that my natural (that is, cultural) responses are valid, that they reflect the reality of what’s happening around me. In a multicultural setting, I simply cannot trust them in the same way.

For example, when I am interacting with a European American female student and she is telling me stories about herself, I can trust my gut feelings to know, with good assurance, how to respond appropriately and need to give little thought to how I have come to that response. I am even fairly confident of trusting my immediate responses to the stories of self told me by a midwestern European American male student. I am not and ought not be so sure of my judgments, however, when a student of another culture tells me stories about herself or himself. I may not comprehend the form of the narratives or their function. Narratives of self between the sexes and between student and teacher function for purposes other than they do for my European American cultural self.

As teachers, what should we do? As teachers, we may feel our authority challenged by someone who means no challenge. Eye contact and physical proximity may signal conventional cultural meanings quite different from the ones we understand when we rely on our own unanalyzed judgments to interpret reality. As teachers, we may also make incorrect judgments about the meaning of a student’s silence when we expect narrative. (“She’s shy.” “He’s aloof.”) We often judge narratives that we do not understand as a kind of acting up, and we often judge the absence of a narrative we expect as a refusal to participate, as withholding the self. We must begin to see these kinds of judgments as data for further processing and not as necessarily correct interpretations of another’s meaning.

A teacher’s judgments are part of the context in which students work and easily affect the performance of both students and their teachers. Each of the judgments we make about a student is in a sense, the point to a story that we have composed about that student. The point of my original story about the young African American student in my reading and writing class was that he defied my attempts to help him learn to write for college. He was defiant. The point of my revised story, though, is more about me than about him. The point of my revised story is that I missed the point, that I misinterpreted his body language and wrote him into a story which absolved me of my misinterpretation. I need to remember that I am the teacher. I am the one who, if I do not know, should at least be able to recognize that I do not know. The only way I have found to do so is not to mistake my feelings and judgments for literal reflections of reality but to take them as clues about a more complex reality than my acculturated emotional responses would allow.

I have since learned many specific ways that my automatic interpretations of students’ stories may be wrong. I have learned even to enjoy some forms of narrative that I couldn’t have recognized five or ten years ago. But even with this knowledge and ability, I am far from being able to understand correctly all of the narratives that get told around my classroom at the moment they are being told. I have learned to ask, to say that I am bewildered, to share my frustrated interpretations as conceptual drafts that need correcting. This process can slow down a class. But this process is one that my students need to have modeled and that I need to practice. Going through this process.
is integral to my identity as a multicultural teacher. It is crucial for navigating in the multicultural society of the classroom.

NOTE

'Let me add one note on terminology. Both Cazden (1988) and Kochman (1981) use the terms black and white to talk about features of culture. This usage is a function of their publication dates. Where I am drawing on their work, I maintain their language. Cultural features, as we know, are aspects of culture not of race (whatever "race" may mean). Where I am not misrepresenting someone else's language, I have mostly chosen ethnic labels rather than color ones. Someday, perhaps, our cultures will correlate with something other than ethnicity. I would have very mixed feelings about that day. In any case, I have selected what I believe is acceptable usage.
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Resilience is the ability to thrive, mature, and increase competence in the face of adverse circumstances. These circumstances may include biological abnormalities or environmental obstacles. They may be chronic and consistent or severe and infrequent. In order to thrive, mature, and increase competence a person must draw upon all of their resources: biological, psychological, and environmental. (Gordon, 1993, p. 2)

Introduction

The teachers of tomorrow will face a great challenge. The students they and we will encounter will be even more ethnically and culturally diverse than the students of today. These students will have a variety of learning and communication styles. They will also bring a host of social problems with them into the classroom since they are more likely to come from broken families, impoverished homes, and violent neighborhoods than today’s students. This stark reality may make some students hesitant to follow their chosen path to a career in teaching. It may also produce cynicism in some current teachers or teacher preparers. This essay offers some lessons from the resiliency and motivational literature in psychology to assist college professors charged with preparing tomorrow’s educators to meet the inevitable challenges they will face.

Lessons Learned From the Resiliency Literature

“Resilience is not a fixed attribute, but vulnerability or protective mechanisms that modify the individual’s response to the risk situation and operate at critical turning points during one’s life.” (Winfield, 1991, p. 7)

Resilience is a combination of personal and environmental protective factors that operate during a person’s life. Across ethnic groups, personal factors such as temperament, intelligence, social skills, and personality determine whether or not a person displays resilience (Gordon, 1993). Environmental factors such as conflict level, discipline policies, friendliness, and physical maintenance also influence whether or not a person displays resilience. Introducing these concepts to undergraduate education majors only enhances their education.

Personal Characteristics

The personal characteristics of resilient people are evident very early in their lives. As infants they are full of energy, easy-going, and socially engaging (Werner & Smith, 1982). Some researchers believe they are born with a neurochemistry that helps them control their impulses and regulate their own feeding (IMHI, 1991; Murphy & Moriaty, 1976). As toddlers they are friendly, responsive, independent, and autonomous. At times they may try to reverse socially defined roles by exerting control over the adults in their lives (Murphy & Moriaty, 1976). They also begin to display androgynous ten-
dencies in that resilient male toddlers are more sociable and affectively expressive while resilient female toddlers are less timid and more interested in environmental exploration (Murphy & Moriarity, 1976).

During preadolescence or the middle childhood years, resilient individuals continue their friendly social nature and androgynous tendencies. They also continue to exhibit a lot of energy and an internal locus of control (Murphy & Moriarity, 1976; Werner & Smith, 1982). When compared with non-resilient students, they display cognitive superiority and higher academic achievement, which is partially the result of mastery-oriented, help-seeking behavior; that is, they mediate their own learning by questioning, suggesting, observing, and imitating (Nelson-LeGall & Jones, 1991).

Resilient adolescents are still more friendly and interpersonally sensitive than their non-resilient counterparts. They are androgynous, cooperative, and conscientious, with inner control, positive self-concepts, and the ability to perform well academically. They also exhibit better problem-solving abilities and a more reflective cognitive style. As adolescents in the high school context, resilient youths seek out help from trusted others in their environment (Gordon, 1993), using that help to gain mastery of some specific skill or content area. They place a high value on obtaining help while also providing help to others, as social responsibility (fulfillment of tasks of required helpfulness) is a characteristic that keeps them resilient (Gordon, 1993).

**Ethnic and Gender Variations**

The characteristics of resilient people described above are similar across ethnic groups. Some ethnic and gender variation in resiliency characteristics does exist though. For example, when compared to peers in their own ethnic groups, resilient European American males exhibit more social presence than their non-resilient counterparts (Mason, 1967). Both resilient female and male Hispanic students have more intellectual efficiency, resourcefulness, and social maturity than those who are not resilient. Resilient Hispanic students are more likely to achieve via conformance and independent behavior than non-resilient peers within their ethnic groups (Gill & Spika, 1962). In other words these students effectively function across cultures, understanding when to adopt the values or behaviors of the majority culture and when to respond to the directives of their primary culture. Their ability to bridge cultures allows them to conform or to show independence in ways that assure their acceptance in both cultures. In addition, resilient Hispanics are more likely to be socially responsible, tolerant, and intellectually efficient (Mason, 1967). Both resilient male and female Hispanic students are more likely to come from families that strongly identify with their heritage, speak their native tongue, and visit their homeland often (Gandara, 1979).

Resilient African American males are more intellectually efficient and have a greater sense of well-being than their non-resilient African American peers. In addition, both African American males and females are more responsible and socialized. They believe more in communality and, like resilient Hispanic students, are more likely to achieve via conformance (Benjamin, 1970).

As for Asian Americans, resilient males and females are also more responsible and socialized than their non-resilient ethnic peers. They are more responsive, socially perceptive, and sensitive. They also believe more in communality and are more likely to achieve via conformance (Werner & Smith, 1982). In addition, Asian American fe-
males, in a direct comparison to corresponding non-resilient students, are more dominant, sociable, and intellectually efficient. They are also more likely to achieve via independence. They have a greater sense of well-being and a greater capacity for status (Werner & Smith, 1982).

In addition to ethnic variations and gender variations within ethnic groups, some general gender differences exist. Resilient males are more likely than non-resilient males to have emotional support (Gandara, 1982) and encouragement to express emotions (Werner, 1990). They are also more likely to come from families with lots of structure, rules, and positive role models. Resilient females are more likely to have emotional support and aspirational encouragement (Gandara, 1982; Werner, 1990).

**Fostering Resilience: Responding to Individuals**

Although some initial behavior patterns and attitudes are already established, educators can still have a profound impact—either negative or positive—on the academic achievement and amount of resiliency displayed by their students. As teachers we can aid students by praising and highlighting their strengths. This is particularly important for students who have low academic self-esteem or find it difficult to become part of the classroom community.

Recognizing the strengths of resilient students—friendliness and social competence, cognitive superiority, androgyny, autonomy, independence, conscientiousness, emotional expressiveness, and mastery oriented help-seeking—can lead us to successfully match specific classroom tasks with these characteristics. We can have students work together to create a friendly environment as well as a congenial social atmosphere. For education majors working in secondary schools, this can mean, for example, having students decorate the classroom together. In addition, teachers can promote a sense of responsibility by regularly assigning homework and other duties, such as serving as time monitors, that require helpfulness within the classroom. We can also make sure we interact with all our students and foster an inquisitive attitude by suggesting that they question, observe, and imitate.

For teachers working with Native, African, Hispanic, or Asian American children it is especially important to help them enhance their personal strengths and cultivate positive personality characteristics. Within academic contexts these children often suffer from low self-esteem, a characteristic that impedes resilience. It may be necessary for us to create special tasks at which such students can succeed in order to boost their self confidence. Since they may exhibit more negative or antagonistic emotions than other students, we must be positive and show ourselves trustworthy. This includes treating each student as an individual and showing each respect. Being mindful of the personal resilience characteristics linked to specific ethnic groups can help guide our responses.

**Institutional Characteristics**

Schools are important socializing agents for all students. They often play an integral role in the lives of Native, African, Hispanic, and Asian American children or children from impoverished or stressed homes. The influence of schools begins in the early elementary grades or even preschool (Taylor, 1991; Werner, 1990) and can be strong.
and lasting not only in determining a student’s career options but also in defining his/her general life path (Werner, 1989; Winfield, 1991).

Global institutional policies are critical in creating a climate fostering resiliency. High academic standards (Garmezy & Rutter, 1983; Rutter, 1985; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, & Ouston, with Smith, 1979) and consistent group disciplinary policies, are among the most important. For instance, GPA restrictions must apply to cheerleaders and musicians as well as athletes (Rutter, et al., 1979), and clothing restrictions must apply to everyone, not just gang members. Policies that involve teachers in the management and curricular decision-making process (Rutter, 1979) are also important. For instance, teachers can give important insight into decisions concerning textbook choices and the development of the school calendar.

“Family-friendly” policies concerning students and families are also crucial. Holding P.T.A. meetings at convenient times and in convenient community locations, for example, is “family-friendly.” Having an adult literacy center and a health clinic on campus is also “family-friendly.” Indeed, the more positive, friendly, and conflict-free the entire social climate, the more likely students will be resilient.

Teachers are critical agents in the resiliency equation. Our actions can either undermine or facilitate the amount of resilience students display. We must manage classrooms well by starting on time and promptly attending to undesirable behavior (Rutter, et al., 1979); we must also emphasize and communicate the high expectations and academic standards of our schools (Rutter, 1985; Rutter, et al., 1979; Winfield, 1991). In addition, we must respond consistently and appropriately to students’ work, praising work that reaches academic standards and providing corrective feedback for work that does not.

It is important that we support each student by providing information about school policies and opportunities to excel, especially in communities in which parents are not familiar with them (Rutter, et al.; Winfield, 1991). We can also provide support by creating the trust necessary for the students who may want to confide in us about personal issues such as family difficulties or, in the case of ESL students, problems with language (Alva, 1989; Winfield, 1991). To be effective and encourage resiliency we must work to understand and accept students’ communication styles while interacting with them. This is particularly important for students with low academic self-esteem.

Fostering Resilience: Institutional Responses

Within the school environment students must take initiative to ensure their own resiliency by cooperating with school personnel, completing their homework, spending time in the library, participating in extra-curricular activities, and assuming other responsibilities when that is appropriate. The school must provide a good library with reasonable hours, teachers must assign challenging and meaningful homework on a regular basis, and a wide range of extra-curricular activities must be offered (Gordon, 1993; Rutter, et al., 1979; Winfield, 1991). However, the school must also encourage students to foster their own resilience and to participate in appropriate supportive activities. In multicultural classrooms, helping students understand each other’s cultures, especially recognizing and appreciating how the majority European American culture impacts i.e cultures of Native, African, Hispanic, and Asian Americans and vice versa, is an important aspect of this encouragement and support.
Lessons Learned From the Motivational Literature

“Motivation is at the heart of many of society’s most pervasive problems, both as a developmental outcome of demotivating social environments and as a developmental influence on behavior and personality” (Ford, 1992, p. 201).

When fostering resilience in students, motivation is important. A multifaceted characteristic of the person and the environment, motivation serves as both a protective and mediating variable. Motivation is protective in that it buffers students from stress and obstacles. It is mediating because it interacts with both the obstacles in a student’s life and the optimum achievement of the student. In other words, motivation comes between obstacles and achievement and acts in such a way that academic achievement is actually possible.

Motivation is a somewhat illusive concept for psychologists and lay people alike. What exactly is motivation? How can one tell if someone has it? How can one give it to someone who does not have it, or at least help a person acquire it?

Defining Motivation

Motivation is a complex phenomena that psychologists have tried to define over the years. It involves several different personal processes and factors. Bandura (1977; 1982) thinks that people are mostly motivated by their beliefs about their own abilities and the expected outcomes of their own behavior. He suggests that emotions and environmental factors are secondary to beliefs about abilities. He also gives some credence to goals that a person may have.

Ford (1992) defines motivation in a more complete manner. He states that motivation is the patterning of a person’s goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs (beliefs about abilities and beliefs about environmental facilitation). He gives each motivational component equal status and weight. Ford believes that a person’s goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs create intricate and unique patterns that vary by situation and life domain. A change in any one of the motivational components results in a very different motivational pattern.

Motivational Strategies

When working with students in a class, it is best to maintain certain goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs and to weaken or eliminate others. For instance, academic achievement and good behavior are goals to be fostered or strengthened continuously, no matter what the ethnicity of one’s students. Happiness, contentment, and some sort of connectedness with others in school are emotions to be maintained (Winfield, 1991). It is also important for students to discover their strengths, believe in their own ability, and believe in the supportiveness of the people in their academic environment. On the other hand, watching T.V. excessively and “getting high” are goals to weaken or eliminate. Anger, frustration, fear, and anxiety are emotions to undermine or overcome. Poor self-concepts and unrealistic beliefs about one’s abilities are to be countered just as negative and antagonistic beliefs about the people in one’s academic environment are to be challenged.
Ford (1992) offers several principles to keep in mind when trying to motivate someone. Some of them are compelling in their directness and apparent simplicity and are relevant enough to list here.

* [We] are always dealing with a whole person [not just a person’s brain] who is bringing a personality and developmental history to a context. (p. 204)

* All three motivational components [goals, emotions, personal agency beliefs] must ultimately be influenced to “motivate” someone successfully. (p. 203)

* The strongest motivational patterns are those anchored by multiple goals. (p. 208)

* [Sometimes one has to] do whatever it takes [that is reasonable and responsible] to get the person to do something, . . . anything that is likely to facilitate activation of their competent [behavior]. (p. 216)

* A variety of pathways will ultimately lead to the desired outcome. (p. 218)

* [Students] are thinking, feeling, and self-directed human beings . . . [that] must be treated with respect and care. . . . (p. 218)

These six principles represent the most compelling of the 17 Ford proposes and the most applicable to the resiliency equation. The principles are tools teachers can use in appropriate situations. Although they may seem simple and obvious, in reality they encompass intricate and complex behaviors and plans. In order to effectively use them we must have a sound and clear understanding of our students, the particular situation we are in at the time, and a realistic appraisal of the end goal.

Hints from Other Motivational Theories

When discussing motivation, Covington (1984) de-emphasizes innate intellectual ability and emphasizes noncompetitive learning structures that reduce anxiety while also highlighting the role of effort. He also suggests contracts that allow the student and teacher jointly to develop plans, goals, and assessments. Because teaching a student to ask questions and to use problem-solving strategies effectively is more intrinsically motivating than asking them to memorize a multitude of facts. Covington advocates teaching students how to learn rather than asking them to memorize facts.

Dweck (1986) also promotes noncompetitive learning, with individuals seeking to increase their competence without concern for judgments. She thinks we should foster learning goals (the increase of competence) in our students. She suggests ways to emphasize gaining competence within the classroom while deemphasizing performance or competition. Devising an individual reward structure, breaking down a large task into smaller steps, allowing some time to practice, and presenting the task with “game-like” instructions are all strategies for helping students seek increased competence without feeling threatened.

Schunk (1984) thinks that setting immediate as well as long-term goals is an effective way of motivating students. He suggests giving feedback that acknowledges past efforts and links them to present performance. In contrast to the theorists mentioned above, he argues in favor of praising a student’s ability and linking it to their performance. In fact, his studies show that children who receive praise linked to their ability demonstrate stronger beliefs in their ability and better skill attainment. The best motivational package, according to Schunk, is a combination of goals, praise, and non-threatening comparative information. Giving students information that allows them
to rate their progress in relation to other similar students enhances motivation and skill attainment.

Though the motivational strategies mentioned in this section are appropriate for any student, when applying them to Native, African, Hispanic, or Asian American students, it is important to use the strategies that complement their backgrounds and individual personalities, to use motivators that are truly rewarding for the student, and to set goals they actually want to reach.

Summary

Summarizing the motivational literature is no small task; nor is gleaning from this literature the most important information for fostering resilience. However, after surveying and assessing what has been written on resilience and motivation, one can conclude that a pleasant, warm, supportive classroom atmosphere is most likely to promote both motivation and resilience. Making certain students do not feel threatened or forced to perform and helping them develop positive emotions and self-concepts are part of our responsibilities as teachers. Praising good work, good effort, and true accomplishments, working with students to set reasonable goals, and most importantly, treating them with respect will help us meet these responsibilities.

Final Comments

Modeling and imitation are still among the best ways for students to learn. Therefore, as we pass this information on to our education majors and encourage them to incorporate it into their teaching, we can incorporate the principles into our own classrooms. If we value promptness we must start on time. If we ask our students to respect us, we must respect them. If we want our future teachers to understand the importance of experiencing community within their classrooms, we must create a sense of community in our own for all of our students, no matter what their background. Using the techniques and strategies we suggest to others and promoting the policies mentioned above will help foster resilience in our own classrooms.

As indicated above, much of the information in this essay is applicable to all ethnic groups. Some of it, however, explicitly reflects the cultural values of one ethnic group or another, but no recipe for fostering resilience will work for every student in a particular ethnic group. We as teachers must take the information given to us and apply it at the appropriate time within a specific context. Individuals from various ethnic groups may have customs, beliefs, communication styles, and learning styles that differ from those of the dominant culture in the United States. Respecting and responding to those differences in positive ways will take us a long way in our efforts to reach the culturally diverse students we will be called upon to motivate and teach.
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CONFLICT AND RESISTANCE IN THE
MULTICULTURAL CLASSROOM

by

Linda Dittmar

For all my twenty five years of teaching at an urban university which serves a diverse, commuting, working-class and lower middle-class student population, and for all my long-standing commitment to consider multicultural issues in all my courses, I still find it hard to come up with any broadly applicable generalizations about multicultural teaching. Faculty may design programs and plan courses that address a variety of multicultural concerns, but what actually happens in the classroom depends on the individual teachers and students engaged in this process and on the context within which such teaching occurs. The one sure lesson I have learned in this regard is that I cannot approach a new class feeling assured that my carefully thought out syllabus and pedagogy will prove successful.

Last year, for example, I redesigned my section of Freshman Composition around a multicultural reader, Across Cultures (Gillespie & Singleton, 1991), which includes a variety of short pieces concerning diverse cultural identities and cross-cultural encounters within but also outside the United States. For two consecutive semesters students read, discussed, and wrote about the same selection of essays, and for two semesters I facilitated this work by teaching in a similarly informal, friendly, and supportive manner. Still, while on their face these two courses were identical, the actual classroom experiences were vastly different. The first offering was so successful that it left the class community buoyed by a feeling that a multicultural perspective is ideally suited for freshman composition courses, especially at an urban university such as the University of Massachusetts—Boston (UMB). The second offering was so labored and strained that it left us, students and teacher alike, wondering whether a multicultural infrastructure can truly sustain this course.

In the first instance the readings sparked stimulating discussions of difference, identity, social inscription, and social change. Students’ essays became progressively more thoughtful, complex, and honest. The class gradually turned into a community, and some students would adjourn to the campus coffee shop after class to continue their discussions. In the second instance students resisted the material, finding it too repetitive (even though, with one exception, no two writers came from the same cultural community) and not particularly engaging or relevant to their experience. They were relatively silent in class, trudging in their essays, and happy to disperse as soon as class ended. There were more absences, more late papers, and fewer efforts at optional assignments and revisions in this class than in the preceding one. By the end of the first semester I thought that I had finally landed on an engaging and empowering model for teaching this course; by the end of the second I became skeptical again.

What, then, made such a difference? To my mind the key was the substantial difference in students and therefore in the character of each class as a whole. This difference emerged during the second week of the semester when we went around the room (we were sitting in a circle) and introduced ourselves. In keeping with the supportive, friendly tone I was trying to establish right away, these introductions occurred through
the protective mediation of people interviewing and introducing one another around questions generated by the class and included me as an equal participant. The first class represented an array of backgrounds, ages, and life experiences. We had among us a cultural diversity that far exceeded what one might have guessed by simply looking at our faces. Among us were Greek as well as Vietnamese immigrants, a female karate teacher and a Russian high school senior, an Israeli armed services veteran (male) studying alternative Chinese medicine, a U.S. armed services veteran (female), an ex-Marine who saw action in Kurdish Iraq, a French Canadian woman who spent a year in an Egyptian village, a young African American Moslem mother, an Irish American engaged to a Salvadoran, and a small cluster of recent high school graduates of diverse ethnicities. No one age group or ethnicity prevailed. The second class had a more visible racial diversity, but the mix proved more lopsided. This class included five African Caribbean students from different islands, as well as students from other diverse cultural backgrounds, but about half the class consisted of young high school graduates, all European American graduates of parochial schools, and mostly of one ethnicity. This group was shy and quiet, while the more mature students who normally would have compensated for this resistance happened to be unusually beleaguered by external crises at home and at work. All but one of the Caribbean students belonged to this second group, as did a Vietnam veteran who was on drugs and on the verge of homelessness, a Turkish immigrant, and a later-day “hippie” and Grateful Dead follower.

It is easy enough to blame the defensive silence and apparent disinterest of that second class on the immaturity of some and on the personal travail of others. At our university such a student population is not uncommon. However, when it comes to teaching a course that includes analysis of multicultural dynamics, the tension which attaches to this subject matter works itself out differently depending on the composition of each class. In this respect the first class I described displayed the riches of diversity and was energized by the optimism of people using their education as a positive new step in their lives. The second class appeared to be somewhat paralyzed, partly by the anxieties of teenagers whose trust in education was tenuous to begin with, and partly by the struggles of adults trying to keep a foothold in the academy even as they experienced increasing personal, social, and economic marginality. In so far as the first class believed it had a chance of living “the American dream,” it was learning about multiculturalism while moving from marginality toward the mainstream. In contrast, students in the second class, even though their presence at the university suggested they maintained some belief in the dream, some hope that education would better their situation, seemed to be a living laboratory of the injuries of difference that get played out in the United States.

Overall, my experience teaching and team-teaching at UMB suggests that it is easier to teach about multiculturalism to students who feel less implicated in the social strife the concept sometimes entails than to students who relate this subject matter to their own social and economic positions. Students who feel empowered by multicultural understanding will be more open to it than those whose anxieties are aggravated by such knowledge. For me, such teaching is easier in advanced and graduate courses, where a winnowing process leaves us with relatively goal oriented students who are freed by their emergent strength to appreciate multiculturalism without feeling implicated in the inequities our society rationalizes as a function of difference. In my experience a multicultural focus has more often elicited defensiveness, resistance, or out-
right antagonism in lower-division and introductory courses, where a student’s sense of personal strength and collective enrichment has been particularly vulnerable.

Questions of multiculturalism, however, belong most urgently in the lower division courses. After all, to the extent that introductory courses, core programs, and other distribution and general education requirements are the gateway to higher education, they should raise questions concerning the social use of the academic enterprise, including its relation to our increasingly multicultural society. Yet students entering such courses and programs are not always prepared to embrace them. How they are “not prepared” may vary across different colleges and universities, but at a school like UMB this lack of preparation includes a sense that education and its attendant benefits cannot be taken for granted. Many view education very pragmatically, as offering the necessary training to secure a job rather than a place to discuss ideas or examine one’s nature or world views.

At work here are the injuries of class inflected through diverse cultural disenfranchisements (Sennet & Cobb, 1973). The problem with teaching this particular student body about multiculturalism is that it can aggravate their awareness of their own disempowerment and their own uncertain futures. This observation is born out by a review of difficult teaching situations where a given session or an entire course was steeped in pain. Examples include the occasion when an African American student chose to speak out in support of Affirmative Action and collapsed in an asthmatic attack under the stress of confronting racist classmates. On another occasion a working-class Italian woman who was just beginning to participate in class discussions was initially panicked at the thought of having to discuss the virulently anti-Italian stance of the 1932 gangster film, Scarface (Hawks, 1932). In another situation a male student of an unspecified sexual orientation found himself shakily reminding a largely female Women’s Studies class that gay bashing occurs alongside violence against women, and in another offering of this same course a young male, near tears, shared his difficulties as a single father. In none of these cases was multiculturalism the subject of detached academic contemplation. In each instance cultural specificity invoked awareness of hegemonies and disenfranchisements. Moreover, at each turn it was a member of a hurt group who bore witness to injuries incurred in the name of difference.

On each of these occasions, teacher support to the courageous student proved essential, but it did not always guarantee that fellow students would come around. The debate on Affirmative Action was not resolved; students have been known to complain about the “predominance” of African American materials in literature courses where such materials amounted to less than half the course; and mention of sexual orientation stirs homophobic tensions. In the situations described above, individuals felt able to speak up because preceding sessions made the class seem relatively safe, but in each case such venturing forth nonetheless took courage. However supportive the teacher and however respectful the class community, one cannot guarantee a positive reception. Inevitably such discussions uncover conflicts and pain that countermand the neutral notion of education as the impartial pursuit of pure knowledge. Rather, individuals who feel vulnerable to begin with find themselves bearing the undue burden of enlightening others whom they see as the majority and in power. My own response is to acknowledge openly the courage and difficulty of the situation and to share an analogous pain,
for instance, acknowledging some relevant aspect of my own social position, supporting fellow students who do likewise, and not pressuring those who remain silent.

As these examples suggest, multicultural education is likely to uncover the inequities bound up in difference. It foregrounds the uniqueness of cultures, but as a comparative project, it also foregrounds the assessment of differences across cultures, including the injustices and conflicts such differences entail. "Culture," in this respect, includes much more than modes of representation, understanding, and articulation. Cultures function ideologically: they participate in the construction of identities that directly affect people's positions within economic, political, and other social relations, i.e., within power relations. Thus "race" turns out to concern much more than genetics: It is a social and cultural construct that has material and ideological consequences. In the case of race, ethnicity, gender, region, age, religion, sexual orientation, nationality, physical ability, and the like, identity repeatedly proves to be tied to the distribution of social goods— to jobs, income, and housing, for instance, but also to such crucial intangibles as dignity, respect, freedom, and mobility. When our students struggle either to break through the barriers of silence or to keep them in place, they are reacting to their sense that multicultural relations implicate each of us directly in the consequences of our cultures.

In short, the resistance and conflict that can surface when our courses address multicultural issues are neither abstract nor impersonal. The pedagogy such teaching requires involves finding ways to reduce anxieties, to encourage openness, and to foster hope that this undertaking can actually lead to personal and collective amelioration. Some of this pedagogy is hard to describe. To the extent that it is up to individual instructors, it involves their own modeling of the qualities they hope such courses will foster in their students: openness, tolerance, respect, generosity, understanding, compassion, and optimism, for instance. The class itself is a community that can work with or against the values presupposed by multicultural education. Faculty can inscribe these values across the daily operations of their courses in various ways: having students collaborate in dyads or small groups on in-class projects as well as outside assignments, sitting in a circle, team-teaching, working collectively with the chalkboard, having everyone interact on a first name basis, making a point of validating individual viewpoints and identities, role playing, holding conferences or group tutorials, and setting aside time to enjoy the class interaction by sharing a snack, celebrating a particular accomplishment, or recognizing someone's national holiday, for example. These and similar steps diffuse the insularity of individuals and encourage students to act on the ideals of cross-cultural awareness and mutual respect.

The improvisation and intuition that go into this approach to teaching strain one's memory and energy. One is not simply transmitting information. This is not what Paolo Freire (1970) calls "the banking model of education," where faculty deposit nuggets of knowledge into the supposedly empty minds of learners. To acknowledge students' particularities and incorporate them into the course work, we must pay attention to each individual in ways that exceed the standard delivery of services our job descriptions imply. To remember enough of each student's interests, in-class comments, or writing to refer to it weeks later is indeed taxing, and great concentration is needed to turn the chalkboard into a repository of the class's collective thinking. If anything, to expect any of us constantly to juggle all of the above is unrealistic, but awareness of these options, coupled with experimentation, opens up fresh possibilities for us.
In my experience, joint chalkboard work is particularly and consistently engaging and useful. While I act as scribe, we use this work not just to solicit and record contributions, but as a means of organizing these contributions and developing ideas in a more sustained way. Anything can send us to the chalkboard: some concept or word in need of definition, a topic in search of a thesis, or a thesis ready for explication. Culling ideas from the entire class, we record concepts, note synonyms and antonyms, generate lists, debate digressions, or diagram contrasts and parallels. Once such raw materials are visibly in place, we use the eraser and chalk to reorganize them into sequences, clusters, or other units that allow us to reconceptualize the issue at hand. Key here are the shared processes of generating and shaping thought and knowledge, the evident adaptability of ideas that this process demonstrates, the recognition that each person’s contributions acquire meanings in relation to others’ contributions, and the critical awareness fostered by all of these.

Such teaching tools are not inherently multicultural, of course. What makes them useful in the resistant classroom, and symbolically resonant in the multicultural classroom specifically, is their collective nature. Beyond providing fresh opportunities for insight, the techniques I describe above are valuable as models of social well-being. Creating a situation where just about everybody has something to contribute to an accumulating body of ideas, and where no one person needs to worry about being singled out, this pedagogy affirms that many minds are better than one, and that knowledge is perpetually open to redefinition. Key here is a democratic, egalitarian approach that decenters ownership of knowledge and values collaboration and exchange. The idea is not to promote an uncritical acceptance of any and all views, but to treat all ideas with respect, to be aware that on different occasions different views may emerge as compelling, and to understand that this deserves critical attention. The inclusiveness implicit in the concept of multiculturalism gets enacted in class, but so do its comparative and evaluative implications. On the one hand, our pedagogy supports the investment of multicultural education in the coexistence of the many. On the other, it uncovers the existence of differences and the necessity of working productively within that reality.

It takes considerable honesty to allow the conflictual aspects of multiculturalism to surface. For me as a teacher—that is, as a person invested in planning and guiding my students’ discussions, not just facilitating them—some challenging moments have occurred when students took the discussion in unexpected directions that nonetheless opened up for us new perspectives on the issue of multiculturalism. One such incident occurred when a Puerto Rican student called me on my use of “America” to mean the United States. Her point was well taken, of course, but for a brief moment I hesitated between feeling put out about my own hegemonic practice and the problem of whether to take the time out of a totally different topic to pursue this apparent digression. On another occasion an African American woman, angry with one of Hollywood’s predictably racist representations of an African American “mammy,” interrupted the discussion of some other aspect of the film and had us address the issue of racism right then and there. My own plan was to lay the groundwork gradually and build up to this climax later in the hour. I was miffed at having my neatly laid plan jostled, but I was also aware that the student did not trust me, a white instructor, to address the film’s racism adequately. In another situation, an outspoken gay student acted similarly; ever
alert to the possibility of erasure, his refocusing us on “queer” issues exceeded my plans and tried some students’ patience.

In each of these instances, students who are particularly impacted by the inegalitarian consequences of cultural difference opened up for us new and unanticipated topics, and in each case I had to decide on the spur of the moment whether or not to let this new agenda work its way through our class time. Though sometimes I was rattled by such sudden developments, including students’ evident expectation that, left to my own devices, I would not give their concern due consideration, I was not ultimately worried about my authority in class or about my being unable to address the issue. Of course such situations are unsettling. They challenge a teacher’s ability to reshape the focus of a given hour without getting too far off track. They make the most seasoned, self-aware teachers, let alone less experienced ones, face the reality of students’ divergent agendas, discomfort, and occasional distrust, but the classroom management skills they summon are ones we can develop.

For me personally, the first step has been to consider empathetically students’ stake in redirecting the discussion. Ultimately, I do not see it as disruptive, even if it impedes my original plans. My choice is usually to go with the students, and when in doubt I consult them. For example, when a racist representation drew fire on the first day of class one semester, I explained that though I had planned to address it differently I thought the matter important enough and student involvement strong enough for us to suspend a business-as-usual approach. We ended up skipping another topic altogether, but we felt good about redirecting our discussion to the more immediate concern. I do recognize that teachers less experienced or less sure of their own pedagogy or politics may not feel confident about navigating such situations. An alternate option might be to acknowledge the urgency of the issue, to promise to return to it at a specified point in the near future, and to keep that promise generously.

My own flexibility is backed up with assertiveness and an ability to guide a discussion authoritatively, the result of much experience, including several disasters. To this day my surehandedness is also tenuous. Thinking of the students’ stake in a question, however out of step with me or fellow students’ it may be, I have learned to suspend concern over how I come across to acknowledge the need behind such interruptions, and to go on to consider the practical question of how to use our precious class time. In practice, their points have often been substantive, discussing them has been informative to the class as a whole, and their courage in risking a critique of our joint work deserves support, especially given their personal vulnerability as people who share in the cultural oppression they are protesting. In a classroom that attempts to model collaborative learning such openness is extremely important.

A reshuffling of lesson plans can occur not only on a particular day but may extend across an entire course. I have learned, after several miscalculations, that to downplay sensitive cultural issues is to create new problems while solving none. Euphemisms for the politics of hate (using “racial” or “race” where “racism” is more accurate), for example, or postponing attention to homophobia until the class is “ready” for it, are evasions, not instances of diplomacy. Years ago I made the mistake of downplaying lesbianism in a course on women and film. Our sole treatment of this subject was Queen Christina (Mamoulian, 1932), where the Greta Garbo character’s lesbianism is so toned down that at least one student insisted that she wore pants only because they were a
comfortable riding habit. Students who found the film's equivocation on sexual orientation frustrating ended up repossessing *Ramparts of Clay* (Bertucelli, 1972) as speaking to this issue, even though this film's marginalized female protagonist is not a lesbian. Set in a remote Tunisian village, the woman's opposition to patriarchy proved a model of strength and resistance they needed. Subsequently, I moved *Queen Christina* to an earlier point in the syllabus and countered it with the lesbian-positive, anti-militaristic *Maedchen in Uniform* (Sagan, 1931). In this example not only the choice of materials, but also their place in the syllabus, is important. Focusing on this potentially controversial material fairly early in the term helped me integrate it into my course as a legitimate topic for discussion and set a respectful tone for this discussion as our ground rule.

As I suggest elsewhere in detail (Dittmar, 1985) our challenge is to find ways to avoid ghettoizing, marginalizing, or being defensive about multicultural concepts and materials. In courses where a multicultural perspective is not an announced goal (e.g., in my courses “Narrative Art in the Novel and Film,” “Literature and the Political Imagination,” “Women’s Image on Film,” and “Women Film Directors”), including multicultural materials early helps to legitimize them and to establish a receptive atmosphere. In situations where postponement is nonetheless advisable, one can assume a perspective that is friendly to multicultural analyses from the start. For example, in my American Studies course “America on Film,” I am able to delay an extended unit on race and racism because the preceding weeks prepare for it. As we view a chronologically ordered sequence of films, we learn to ferret out instances of ethnocentricity, class bias, sexism, racism, and homophobia across an array of genres—the western, the gangster film, film noir, and the like. Following this overview, the five weeks' duration of a unit on race and racism, supported by extensive readings, affirms the need to focus in depth on this topic. Though a 14-week course designed primarily to survey mainstream U.S. cinema cannot accommodate several such units, we do discuss the need for similar in-depth attention to other facets of cultural identity. Noting the potential to use the African American experience as a token for cultural diversity and difference, I stress the dangers of this aspect of our study as well as its benefits.

The decisions we make about how much time to allocate to certain topics and when to discuss them, whether within a single hour or across an entire semester, involve more than curricular considerations. Addressing multicultural topics involves pedagogical questions that concern students' intellectual and personal investments in the learning process. I have found flexibility and responsiveness to students particularly helpful in our discussions of cultural difference. I found it hard to be responsive in the problematic section of Freshman Composition I described, where the quietness of some and the crises of others effectively precluded collaborative learning. But in most situations I have found students cooperative and their input of great value. Your situation may differ greatly. You may have a different student body; you may prefer to rein in your classes and not worry about risking chaos; you may be too new to multicultural teaching to feel comfortable about improvising on short notice. The confidence I feel about such teaching is partly the product of experience and partly the result of including in class discussion attention to the curricular and pedagogical choices guiding my work. I have occasionally found it helpful to share with students a critical assessment of our work together. When my intentions get derailed, when students chafe or pull in other direc-
tions, or simply when a review of our work may prove fruitful, we discuss our progress and its implications. I have also asked students to complete anonymous mid-term course evaluations and have then discussed them with the class.

Critiquing our work helps students understand how we plan their education and encourages them to take active responsibility for it. Much like our use of the chalkboard, shared attention to overall course organization and to the emphases and relationships implicit in the way we cluster and sequence our materials, allows students to assess their work and envision alternatives to it. Demystifying the process of learning and showing knowledge to be a construct, a product of choices, this approach complements my efforts to demystify and to explore cultural construction. In English and film courses, where the construction of representation is the subject matter, understanding our own cultural identities and interrelations as constructed representations complements our subject matter directly.

While awareness of the choices that go into course design is useful under all circumstances, in multicultural education that awareness can be particularly beneficial. To the extent that multicultural education aims at fostering knowledge and respect for other cultures, such pedagogy reflects in practice what it teaches in theory. Dispersing authority and decentralizing the management of ideas, at least for the brief duration of a given course, lets students experience the possibility of collaborative exchange—not necessarily harmonious exchange, and certainly not a bland melding of cultures so as to drain multiculturalism of the struggles it entails, but at least a dialogue that reflects the dynamic existence of diverse cultures, cultures that connect and diverge again and again.

NOTES

'Numerous other multicultural readers are now available. Bearing titles such as American Mosaic (1991), American Voices (1993), Connections (1993), Encountering Cultures (1992), Side by Side (1993), and One World, Many Voices (1992), their rapid accumulation on my shelves testifies to a growing concern about introducing multicultural perspectives into the curriculum.

'For a critique of the use of the concept “race,” see B. P. Allen and J. Q. Adams (1991), “Why “race” has no place in multicultural education.” Though I agree with the authors’ view that our “notions of ‘race’ are confused, inconsistent, and scientifically unsound” (48), I nonetheless believe that this ambiguous and unstable concept has a functional existence and virulent effects that require that we keep this label as long as it has practical consequences.
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OPENING CLASSROOM CLOSETS: TEACHING ABOUT GAYS AND LESBIANS IN A MULTICULTURAL CONTEXT

by
R. Jovita Baber

Family, the mass media, and formal education are probably the most powerful institutions influencing and maintaining our present culture. The family in the United States has undergone dramatic change in the last century. The media reflects the changes, while education is caught in a political battle over its role in teaching about those changes. Among the most contested changes are those related to the place of lesbians and gays within our society. Educational institutions need to teach tolerance of gays and lesbians since they are members of our pluralist society but are subject to discrimination and harassment based on their sexual identity.

In the early sixties and seventies, the traditional nuclear, heterosexual family came under critical examination with the women's liberation movement (Tavris & Wade, 1984). The release of Betty Friedan's book The Feminine Mystique (1963)—in which she wrote about “the problem that has no name”—sparked a change in attitudes. Instead of asking: “What's wrong with women who can’t adjust to marriage?” people started to ask, “What is wrong with marriage that so many women can’t adjust to it?” Thereafter, many studies of marriage placed the traditional nuclear family under close scrutiny (Tavris & Wade, 1984).

Our society's ideas about what defines a family, and the roles of men and women in families, have been revolutionized since the early sixties. The rate of divorce has steadily increased—nine times higher than a century ago, recently stabilizing to 50% of all marriages ending in divorce (Doherty, 1992; Magnet, 1992; Wallis, 1992). Only one in three children are raised in a two parent family (Bates, 1992). “The country has 10.1 million single mothers and 56% of all women have jobs outside the home” (Buchsbbaum, 1992). “The number of children born out of wedlock increased from under 4% in 1950 to 27% in 1989 (Magnet, 1992). An estimated 6 million to 14 million children are being raised in approximately 4 million gay or lesbian households (Goleman, 1992). The “ideal” family, with the father working and the mother taking care of the children, accounts for only 10% of the current families in the United States (Bates, 1992). Educational institutions need to acknowledge these changes in their policies and their curriculum.

Many of these changes are related to changing ideas about sexuality. We have inherited many of our sexual mores from the Victorian Era, when sex was considered “dirty, dangerous and disgusting” (Tavris & Wade, 1984). A Victorian female was expected to save herself for her husband. Since the 1960s, several studies on sexual behavior revealed that the number of women having pre-marital sex was increasing (Tavris & Wade, 1984). The women that were having sex before marriage usually had the one, maybe two, men they loved as partners while men were more likely to have pre-marital sex with multiple partners. The studies show that people's attitudes and behaviors about sex have become more liberal and imply that the perception of sex as something dirty has changed to something one does with a person one loves.
At the beginning of the century, the idea of contraceptives was a radical notion. Presently, most people do not question an adult’s right to use contraceptives. Contraceptives and their acceptance allowed people to separate sex as a pleasurable intimate activity and sex as a reproductive activity. When people began to perceive sexuality widely as an intimate interaction based on mutual attraction rather than primarily as a reproductive act, gay and lesbian relationships began to have a more logical place in the society’s changing definition of sexuality.

Within the context of society’s changing attitudes around family and sexuality, the most recent gay and lesbian movement emerged. Those who oppose equal protection for gays and lesbians generally want to maintain the traditional nuclear family and sexual mores. The Reverend Pat Robertson charged that laws that limit discrimination against gays and lesbians would legitimize their lifestyle and “would destroy the American family.” This argument is often part of a larger philosophy that equates the erosion of the traditional family with the demise of our society: “this revolution [the result of an epidemic of divorce, remarriage, redivorce, illegitimacy, and new strains within intact families] . . . has deeply troubling implications for the American social order” (Magnet, 1992). The increasing visibility and power of gays and lesbians reflects and is interconnected with a larger social transformation that threatens the future of traditional families and sexual mores.

People who are more accepting of the changes in the family are generally more receptive to gays and lesbians. They generally see the family as a flexible institution that has constantly changed, that will weather the tumultuous changes of the last two decades, and that will be reconceived as the “Pluralistic Family.” Doherty (1992) describes the Pluralistic Family as:

no single family arrangement . . . [but] a plethora of family types . . . including dual career families, never-married families, post-divorce families, step families, and gay and lesbian families. Legislative bodies and courts are beginning to codify the Pluralistic Family by redefining the terms to include arrangements considered deviant, non-family forms in the past. Tolerance and diversity, rather than a single family ideal, characterizes the Pluralistic Family. (p. 35)

These new family arrangements have already become embedded in our perceptions of family.

Doherty acknowledges that the plethora of family arrangements has left our society feeling very ambivalent. “Surveys indicate that most Americans still believe in the traditional family values . . . that the stable two-parent family is the best environment for raising children.” Then, she cites family sociologist Dennis Orthner, who points out that there is a difference between our family “values” and family “norms.” He notes that while our values or ideals have remained traditional, our norms or expectations have changed remarkably (as indicated by the earlier statistics on families in the U.S.).

Similar ambivalence is felt toward acknowledging gay and lesbian relationships. According to a U.S. News Poll, 65% of the respondents say that gays should receive equal rights, but 60% oppose recognizing legal partnerships for homosexuals (Shapiro, 1993). Although people want to ensure the ideal of equality for all, they are not ready to give up the belief that nuclear families are better than other family arrangements. They will not “endorse homosexuality as equal to heterosexuality” (Shapiro, 1993). The conflict that arises when schools want to teach about gays and lesbians is embed-
ded in the differences between family "values" and family "norms," and sexual "val-
ues" and sexual "norms."

Social trends indicate that our society will probably not return to the traditional nu-
clear family as the dominant family arrangement (Wallis, 1992). Doherty (1992) writes:
"The forces of gender equality, diversity, and personal freedom may never again per-
mit a single ideal family structure...." Doherty further states that the "Pluralistic Fam-
ily has redefined our notions about relationships, parenthood, and homelife. Increased
tolerance for multi-racial and single-sex couples who are raising children will be nec-
essary as this type of family is here to stay for an indefinite future." Schools need to
come active in enabling tolerance for multi-racial and single-sex couples.

Mass media are actively reflecting and transforming the culture's ideas about sex-
uality and family. Gays and lesbians are becoming more visible in current events. For
example, gays and lesbians were the cover story in the August 1992 edition of U.S.A.
Catholic, a June 1993 edition of Newswave, the July 5, 1993 edition of U.S. News &
World Report, and the July 19, 1993 edition of Christianity Today. The media aired the
confirmation hearings of Roberta Achtenberg, the first open lesbian to be confirmed by
the U.S. Senate to a political office, and covered the controversies over the gay and les-
bian component in New York's "Children of Rainbow" Curriculum, Colorado's Amend-
ment 2, and Oregon's Referendum Number 9. When the press reported the murder of
Allen Schindler by two shipmates because of his sexuality, it basically portrayed Allen
Schindler as a healthy young man with a caring Midwestern mother (Lavin, 1992). Un-
doubtedly, part of the reason the story received so much coverage was because of its
relevance to the national debate about the military ban on gays and lesbians. Nonethe-
less, these stories would not be as newsworthy if gays and lesbians were not becoming
more accepted.

Human sexuality, in its many forms, is presented on television, at the movies, and
in advertisements. Dan Quayle noted, with displeasure, that the media were no longer
portraying families as in "Father Knows Best" or "Leave It to Beaver" when Murphy
Brown chose to have a child outside of marriage. An increasing number of gay and les-
bian characters are appearing on television in daytime soaps, as well as such television
shows as L. A. Law, Roseanne, and The Golden Girls. Plays being produced with pos-
itive gay characters are multiplying and are "unlike those of the past, [in that] recent
works deal in total frankness" (Anderson, 1993). The movies, such as Silence of the
Lamb, JFK, and Basic Instinct, have more—though not necessarily realistic—gay and
lesbian characters.

Historically, the few gay and lesbian personalities in entertainment media were typ-
ically characterized negatively. More recently, they are included because their sexual-
ity is key to the storyline: "the story focuses on their sexuality rather than their day-to-
day nonsexual lives" (Herek, 1992). While the images of gays and lesbians are
increasing and are less negative, they are seldom portrayed as compassionate, whole—
sexual and nonsexual—people. The mass media affect how people perceive gays and
lesbians. In a U. S. News Poll, 56% of voters worry that media portrayals of gays have
had a negative influence on society (Shapiro, 1993). Schools need to balance the lim-
ited portrayals of lesbians and gays in the media with more realistic representations.

Teaching about gays and lesbians is riddled with the political controversies about
the changing family and sexual morality. Schools throughout the nation are cautious-
ly beginning to question when and where to teach children about gays and lesbians (Lacayo, 1992). One of the most heated debates erupted in New York when the “Children of the Rainbow” curriculum suggested that first graders read the gay/lesbian-positive books, Daddy's Roommate, Heather Has Two Mommies, and Gloria Goes to Gay Pride. Half of the 32 local boards balked. The borough of Queens had an outright revolt as sexual morality and traditional family values became the focus of debate (Tucker, 1993).

Other places have avoided the political battle by introducing gays and lesbians into the curriculum at a later grade level and by consulting community leaders in developing the curriculum (Celis, 1993; Ribadeneira, 1992; Tucker, 1993). California and Massachusetts are debating statewide guidelines on how homosexuality should be discussed in the classroom, while a Georgia state advisory panel is encouraging Georgia Schools to include gay and lesbian families in the curriculum (White, 1992). Most of the change is happening on the city or county level: Fairfax County in Virginia, Broward County in Florida, Houston, San Francisco, and Seattle have begun to include gays and lesbians in various areas of their curriculums (Celis, 1993; Tucker, 1993).

At the college level, Georgia State University has had an experimental course for sociology students called “Gays and Lesbians in Society” with the purpose of exploring the basis of fears and prejudice that divide homosexuals and heterosexuals (Morris, 1992). The West Hollywood Institute of Gay and Lesbian Education, the first independent college-level institution devoted to gay issues, offers eight classes in gay and lesbian studies (Elias, 1992) while numerous other colleges and universities are quietly integrating gays and lesbians into their curriculum. Why are so many schools integrating gays and lesbians into their curriculum when their inclusion sparks political controversy regarding the family and sexual morality?

The Importance of Integrating Gays and Lesbians into the Curriculum

The primary reason for including gays and lesbians in the curriculum is because they are members of our pluralist society. Some people argue that 10% of the population is gay or lesbian, citing the Kinsey studies (Kinsey et al., 1948; Kinsey et al., 1953). More recently, a survey released by the Alan Guttmacher Institute found that only 1% of males were exclusively gay. These findings were in line with surveys in Britain, France, and Denmark with percentages ranging between one to three (Barringer, 1993). The exact number of gays and lesbians that exist in our society is difficult to assess, as people tend to underreport behavior that might be considered anti-social and overreport behavior that is socially sanctioned (Barringer, 1993). Whether gays and lesbians make up 1% of the population or 10% of the population, they are members of our society and should receive the same benefits, rights, and respect granted to any citizen of the United States.

There is mounting research and evidence that homosexuality is natural, although different from heterosexuality. In a pluralist society such as the United States, we must teach the tolerance of difference. One can see the results of social intolerance today by observing the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, the neo-Nazi attacks on Turkish people in Germany, the Iraqi treatment of the Kurds, and other international situations (Breslau, 1992; Lief, 1992; Lane & Breslau, 1992). Similar violence created by social intolerance is seen within our own country. In 1991, 4,558 hate-crime incidents were reported by the law-enforcement agencies of only 32 states. Time reports in its January 18,
1993 issue. The number of incidents is actually much higher as only 3,000 of 16,000 law-enforcement agencies elected to participate in the report. Racial bias accounts for six of ten incidents, religious bias two of ten, and ethnic and sexual-orientation bias one of ten each.

Only recently have groups begun to collect statistics on hate crimes against gays and lesbians. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) shows that 2,042 anti-gay incidents were reported in 1985. That number increased to 7,031 in 1989. The 1993 annual NGLTF survey shows that there has been a 4% increase in anti-gay violence since 1992. A study of 900 gays and lesbians in Los Angeles reveals that a quarter of them have been physically abused (Boxall, 1993). The increase is partially due to the fact that lesbians and gays are becoming more comfortable with reporting such crimes and partially due to a true increase in the number of crimes committed against lesbians and gays. A pluralist society such as ours cannot afford to permit the intolerance indicated by hate crimes.

Because of their power to influence society, educational institutions can help limit the number of hate crimes committed by teaching tolerance. The majority of these crimes are committed by youth and young adults. The general profile of the "gay-basher" is a young male acting alone or with other young males. One study indicated that 54% of the assailants were under 21 years of age, and 92% were male (Herek & Berrill, 1992). A report by the Governor's Task Force revealed that high school students were more prejudiced against gays than any other group. They perceived violent attacks on lesbians and gays as acceptable, were "openly vicious," and "threatened violence against gays" (qtd in Herek & Berrill, 1992). Educators must attempt to reduce the fears, intolerance, and ignorance behind violent attitudes such as these by teaching about difference. In the pluralist U. S. democracy, opposing opinions—even hatred—are and should be admissible by the First Amendment. But violent acts that stem from intolerance cannot be permitted.

Either lack of policies or the lax enforcement of policies has permitted much of the harassment and hate crimes against gays and lesbians to happen in our educational institutions. A report released by NGLTF found that, nationally 45% of males and 25% of lesbians had been victims of verbal or physical assaults in high school (cited in Ribadeneira, 1992). Herek and Berrill (1992) report that harassment, threats, and/or violence were experienced by 33% to 49% of the high school and junior high school respondents conducted in Pennsylvania (Gross et al., 1988). Maine (Steinman & Aurand, 1985), Wisconsin (Wisconsin Governor's Council, 1985), Philadelphia (Aurand et al., 1985), and eight U. S. cities (NGLTF, 1984).

The same intolerance is found on college and university campuses. In 1989 alone, a total of 1,329 anti-gay episodes were reported to NGLTF by gay and lesbian students on just 40 campuses nationwide. In Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men, Herek and Berrill write:

In studies of anti-gay violence and harassment at Yale (Herek, 1986). Rutgers (Cavin, 1987), Pennsylvania State (D'Augelli, 1989), and Oberlin (Norris, 1990), between 3% and 5% of the respondents had been punched, hit, kicked, or beaten at some point in their college careers: 16% to 26% had been threatened with physical violence and 40% to 76% had been verbally harassed. Similar rates of victimization have been documented on other campuses. (pp. 33-34)
The other campuses include the University of Massachusetts (Yeskel, 1985), University of Illinois (O'Shaughnessy, 1987), and the University of Oregon (Task Force on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1990), where 61% feared for their personal safety. An environment in which 61% of a group of people fear for their personal safety does not nurture tolerance, pluralism, or democratic ideals. Educational institutions need to encourage the exploration of new and opposing ideas, while punishing violent and bigoted behavior. Policies that clearly state a punishment for harassing or victimizing a person because of their minority status should be implemented and enforced.

A second reason for schools to integrate gays and lesbians into the curriculum is because they are likely to have students, including lesbians and gays, who are struggling with their sexuality. Lesbian and gay youth often internalize the hatred that is directed at them through harassment. They internalize the rejection they receive from peers and family and find few role models available to them to assist them in developing positive self images. These factors put gay and lesbian youth in a high risk group for dropping out of school, committing suicide, and abusing drugs and alcohol (Uribe & Harbeck, 1992; U. S. Department of Health & Human Services, 1989).

The U. S. Department of Health & Human Services' "Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide" (1989) states that “gay youth are 2 to 3 times more likely to attempt suicide than other young people. They may comprise up to 30 percent of completed suicides annually.” Later, the report indicates that adult gays and lesbians show a similar trend in the rate of suicide. According to a study by Bell and Weinberg, “gay males were 6 times more likely to make an attempt than heterosexual men. Lesbians were more than twice as likely to try committing suicide than heterosexual women in the study” (qtd in U. S. Department of Health & Human Services, 1989).

Self-destructive behavior and unhealthy coping skills are also seen in the level of alcohol and drug abuse among gay and lesbian persons, as estimates suggest that one in three gays and lesbians are addicted to drugs or alcohol. In one study of gay male youth, 58% were classified as substance abusers (U. S. Department of Health & Human Services, 1989). The messages of our society have distorted some gays’ and lesbians’ perceptions of themselves. Educators at all levels of academia are in a position to provide information and support that can reverse this trend. “We have a moral obligation to combat a devastating trend.” says Gerald Newberry, coordinator of the Fairfax County’s family-life education programs. “We need to communicate to our kids [and young adults] that people are different. and that we don’t choose our sexual feelings—they choose us” (qtd in Lacayo, 1992).

Lastly, schools need to integrate gays and lesbians into the curriculum because an increasing number of children are being raised by gay and lesbian parents. Research has shown that there are no disadvantages to being raised by a same-sex couple: no impact on gender identity, self-esteem, self-concept or sexual orientation (Goleman, 1992). Dr. Casper, a developmental psychologist, says that school is probably the most difficult arena for children raised by same-sex parents, as peers and staff retain traditional ideas about family arrangements and sex role models. Dr. Casper and her co-authors argue that teachers and administrators should acknowledge that some children [and young adults] have gay or lesbian parents (cited in Goleman, 1992). To do this effectively not only should the curriculum be integrated to teach students tolerance, but staff development needs to include tolerance education for teachers.
There are many humanitarian reasons for teaching about gays and lesbians in academia, yet the process of integrating them into the curriculum will be neither easy nor quick. The U. S. News Poll (Shapiro, 1993) indicates that 52% of respondents oppose teaching about gays and lesbians in the public schools while 44% favor it. Lesbians and gays may be more visible but opposition and ignorance about their lifestyles still exist among the general public. Frances Kunreuther, executive director of the Hetrick Martin Institute, says, “This is not the first issue this country has faced that has been emotional. I expect it to be painful. But fortunately in this country, we just don’t protect the majority” (qtd in Ribadeneira, 1992).

Including Gays and Lesbians in the Classroom

Lesbians and gays should be included in multicultural education. While the lesbian and gay community is extremely diverse and critiques say that the only commonality is attraction to the same sex, gays and lesbians share a history of being oppressed as members of a sexual minority. This common experience pulls lesbians and gays together throughout the world, as seen by the emerging international gay and lesbian organizations. While internal rifts due to differences exist, gays and lesbians have learned to celebrate their commonality by creating a community and a culture that includes community newspapers, music, literature, networks of social and political support, business networks, vacation spots, private codes of communication, and most recently a cable television program called “In the Life.” The history and cultures of gays and lesbians should be integrated into multicultural studies.

Lesbians and gays together constitute a cultural group that can be identified and studied, but the perception of same sex affection and sexuality changes according to one’s gender, ethnicity, race, religion, class, or age. While the United States government has recently appointed its first out lesbian, in several Native American societies such as the Navajo, Lakota, Creek, Crow, Zuni, Kutenai, Mohae, and Hopi, gay men have held powerful roles as shamans, oracles, and high priests. Lesbians often have held roles as female warriors and occasionally as powerful shamans and healers as well (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1992). While some see same-sex couples as threatening to the nuclear family, gays and lesbians enjoy the same rights as heterosexual couples in Sweden. In a study by C. S. Ford and F. A. Beach of 76 cultures, 28 of the cultures condemned homosexuality with punishments ranging from mild sanctions to death. In the remaining 49 cultures, “homosexual activities ... are considered normal and socially acceptable for certain members of the society” (qtd in Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1992). Since one’s perception of homosexuality is highly culturally bound and often linked to how family and sexuality are defined within the culture, a full discussion of gays and lesbians is appropriate in the context of studying cultural groups.

James Banks (1989) defines four distinct levels at which teachers can integrate multicultural perspectives and information into the curriculum: contributions, additive, transformation, and decision making and social action. When applying Banks’ theory to gays and lesbians, one should not necessarily assume that one level of curriculum integration is inherently better than another. The approach an educator uses should be carefully selected after considering the political environment in which the curriculum will be taught, the educator’s level of comfort with discussions of sexuality, sexual iden-
tity, and family, and the educator's security in his/her own sexual identity. These factors will play a role in the level of success attained.

The contributions level does not alter the traditional curriculum a great deal, but rather systematically inserts underrepresented cultures into the course. As gays and lesbians are and always have been everywhere, every field of study has famous gay and lesbian persons already within it. If an English professor traditionally gives biographical sketches about the authors being read, the teacher should include the information that numerous famous authors, such as Gertrude Stein, Walt Whitman, Willa Cather, Herman Melville, Virginia Wolf, and Henry David Thoreau (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1992), had relationships and/or strong intimate connections with persons of the same sex.

In art history classes one might mention that artists such as Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci had same sex relationships, if biography is an important aspect of the course. Or in political science or history courses the same sex relations of leaders such as Alexander the Great, Julius Ceasar, King Richard II, Pope Julius III, Queen Christina, King James I, and Montezuma II can be discussed (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1992).

Including gays and lesbians in the curriculum through a contributions approach allows one to identify famous lesbians, gays, and bisexuals and possibly to learn a little about the individuals. This approach does little to break down stereotypes and myths about these persons, however, since one may merely be acknowledging the gay and lesbian relationships of persons who are presently included in the curriculum. To take a more proactive stance, a teacher could adopt Banks' additive approach. This approach would modify the traditional curriculum slightly since the educator would consciously select pieces that represent the gay and lesbian community and the concepts and themes unique to the community. In a discussion of the literary and historical figures mentioned above, one could spend time discussing the effect their sexual identity had on their lives and their work. If the class had discussed women's ongoing struggle for reproductive freedom, one could integrate a reading on the legal battles lesbians have fought in order to conceive and to keep their children. In a unit on civil rights movements in the United States, one could present material on the gay and lesbian political movement for equal rights.

The additive approach allows teachers to introduce their students to gay and lesbian issues without making waves in a mainstream community. The approach is limited in that it reinforces the idea that gay and lesbian history is not an integral part of U. S. history, as people are viewing gays and lesbians from a heterosexual point of view. Further, it does little to explain the tensions, relationships, and connections among gays and lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals. An approach that does critique stereotypes and myths is the transformation approach.

In a transformation approach, students are forced to question why we take for granted what we take for granted. They begin to see how concepts of sexuality, family, and gender have shaped our society and to explore their heterosexual assumptions, as they are presented with material from gay and lesbian world views. A direct application of James Banks' (1989) transformation approach could, however, be unsuccessful as a mainstream community might rebel if an educator presented only a gay/lesbian point of view. Exposing students to both sides of any argument would be important. Heterosexually identified students would be faced with the dilemma of resolving the in-
ternal conflict that arises out of simultaneously presented, potentially contradictory world views. If students truly take on the challenge of resolving the conflict that arises, they can recognize their own world views and realize they do not represent absolute truth. Gay and lesbian students would be empowered by having their world view validated.

In an adaptation of Banks' transformation approach, the educator could pose difficult questions such as whether the United States should punish or protect lesbians and gays. When the question is posed, the teacher must be very careful to provide the students with sufficient information from both sides to force critical thinking about the issue. For background material, the teacher should present the students with information arguing that homosexuality is an immoral decision that will destroy the nuclear family and information arguing that homosexuality is an orientation, not a choice, and a legitimate alternate family arrangement. Then students should be shown the contradictions within our own legal system that reflect the various attitudes toward homosexuality. The 14th Amendment says that no state can deny any person equal protection of the law. However, Michigan retains a law stating a person committing homosexual acts can be punished with up to 15 years in prison, while Wisconsin law protects gay and lesbian persons against discrimination. How is it that in one country, two states can have totally different interpretations of how the 14th Amendment should be applied or not applied to humans?

In order for the transformation approach to work, an environment must be established in which students are able to honestly explore their beliefs, feelings, and reactions to the material. Finding and creating materials that represent gay or lesbian perspectives and making sure that points of view are evenly represented is more time consuming than adopting a contributions or additive approach, especially if one considers the need for ongoing staff development to make the approach truly effective. Banks (1989) suggests that ongoing staff development be institutionalized, which is costly as well as time consuming.

The last level Banks (1989) mentions is the decision making and social action level of curriculum integration. This approach is organized around the students' identifying an important social problem, learning about the problem, and taking action. There are many advantages to this approach. The students obviously interact with the information presented in the process of developing their thinking, research, decision making, and social action skills. Students also would be called upon to analyze their own values and to improve their cooperation skills as they work together on a final project. One of the drawbacks to the decision making and social action method when applied to gays and lesbians is the extent of controversy that could erupt. The students may learn that they do not have political efficacy, for example, if the status quo is too threatened by the action the students decide to take.

The students in a class organized around a decision making and social action agenda could study homophobia and then decide to start a project to raise awareness and limit the number of homophobic incidents on campus. The students could study the extent of discrimination and anti-gay related incidents on campus and work to have sexual orientation included in the school's no-discrimination clause or sexual harassment policy.
Educators need to examine their situation carefully and to create a curriculum that can be effectively and successfully implemented within their own classrooms and local institution. As educators and administrators, we need to examine our own attitudes and our institutions for the ways we are maintaining the ignorance and hatred that have oppressed gays, lesbians, and other persons in underrepresented groups. We need to work toward a time when we stop discussing multiculturalism and talking about integrating underrepresented groups into the curriculum, and actually teach students, as a matter of course, about the increasingly complex and pluralistic society in which we live. As key persons in institutions that have the power to influence society, we have a responsibility to educate our students about our shared humanity.

REFERENCES


63


Section II: Curriculum Issues in Multicultural Education
MULTICULTURALISM IN U.S. SOCIETY AND EDUCATION: WHY AN IRRITANT AND A PARADOX?

by

Carlos J. Ovando and Luise Prior McCarty

Society in the United States is becoming increasingly diverse ethnically, racially, linguistically, and economically. With this growing diversity, there is a renewed public debate regarding the best way to induct minority groups into the sociocultural fabric. Some argue that unless diversity is harnessed into some sort of common culture and language, the country will become divided into myriad ethnic enclaves with very particular agendas that could threaten the unity and future of the nation. The influential American historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in his controversial book entitled The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society (1992), echoes this concern:

Instead of a transformative nation with an identity all its own, America increasingly sees itself in this new light as preservative of diverse alien identities. Instead of a nation composed of individuals making their own unhindered choices, America increasingly sees itself as composed of groups more or less ineradicable in their ethnic character . . . (p. 16) Will the center hold? or will the melting pot give way to the Tower of Babel?" (p. 18)

Others, however, suggest that it is not only possible but essential to maintain cultural and linguistic roots while concurrently sharing a set of pluralistic democratic principles, especially through the school curriculum. The latter hold that the inclusion of diversity in the content and process of democratic schooling gives society its vibrancy and sociocultural coherence (Banks & Banks, 1989; Nieto, 1992). Such a view, however, has the potential for creating irritation and a strong backlash. This is so because multicultural education

. . . entails a direct challenge to the societal power structure that has historically subordinated certain groups and rationalized the educational failure of children from these groups as being the result of their inherent deficiencies. Multicultural education . . . challenges all educators to make the schools a force for social justice in our society. (Cummins, 1992. p. xviii)

The above debate, however, does not help teachers address the pressing cultural and linguistic issues in today's classrooms. Frequently missing from the political debate on diversity and multicultural education are resolutions to the following more immediate concerns:

Will diversity polarize our school constituents or unite us?: Will academic standards be sacrificed?: If the school takes a strong stand on diversity, will these values and lessons find support at home?: If a multicultural curriculum demands more time and energy, where will it fit in an already over-extended teaching load? (Carter, 1991. p. 1)

In this paper we contend that the idea of multiculturalism is an irritant because it challenges us to rethink not only our conception of a just society (cf. Cummins, 1992) but our conceptions of identity—of who we are and what gives us our particularity. We
also contend that multicultural education is a difficult task because it challenges us to rethink our ideas of what constitutes teaching: Is a teacher a transmitter of consensual values or by default a cultural change agent? We suggest that a focus on cultural dialogue—as opposed to a focus on mainstream versus “other” cultures—will help teachers put a more constructive vision of multiculturalism to work in their classrooms.

As a way of affirming the importance of cultural dialogue, we propose to examine the above issues through a conversation between two educators from different disciplines and also from very different cultural backgrounds. Initially, Luise McCarty, in her preparatory remarks for a potential dialogue about the political debate on multiculturalism, sets forth her thesis that much of the source of irritancy and paradox associated with multiculturalism stems from two flawed images of culture. Two of these incorrect images are that culture is an isolation chamber with no connecting points to other cultures, and that cultural knowledge, as packaged in textbooks, is subject to manipulation and is teachable. Drawing from hermeneutic philosophy, she suggests a more complex, multidimensional and interconnected paradigm as a more promising approach to understanding multiculturalism in U.S. society. Ovando then responds to and builds on the points raised by McCarty’s philosophical perspective on culture after each one of her sections. We conclude the paper with two caveats we hope can provide alternatives for global interdependence and survival as a multicultural society.

A Philosophical Perspective on Conceptions of Culture
—Luise Prior McCarty

A goodly part of what we call “the problem of multiculturalism” is not a problem with the demographic or the pedagogical facts of multiculturalism. It is a problem in our ways of viewing those facts. I believe that unfortunate conceptions of culture, ways of picturing culture, give rise to the emotional and intellectual irritation that often accompanies discussions of multiculturalism. My hope is that, by leaving faulty images of culture behind or by putting them into perspective, some of the irritation can be left behind as well. I find two images particular obstacles to a clear understanding. The first I call “culture as isolation chamber”; the second “culture as a disposable.” I want to look at them one at a time and, in each case, I hope to suggest other, less irritating, images of culture to put in their place. My alternative images are drawn from hermeneutic philosophy. The first comes from Hegel’s (1977) discussion of “the alien” within objective spirit and the second from Hans-Georg Gadamer’s (1990) reconstrual of the old notion of Takt.

Out of Isolation: How to Picture Cultural Diversity

There is the temptation, when comparing non-European with European cultures—say, the culture of the Hopi with that of Manhattan stockbrokers—to think of the two cultures as thoroughly isolated, almost as if they were quarantined within medical isolation chambers. Each culture is conceived of as an enclosed bubble, a region in space separated from the other by a constant cultural distance, completely enclosed within a wall-like cultural barrier. We think of the thoughts, feelings, plans, and desires—the entire mental lives—of the members from each group as wholly surrounded by the barrier-like culture and incapable of extending outside it. When we think of culture in this way, the actions and reactions of one group are thought to make sense and work effec-
tively only within its own cultural enclosure and as either partially or wholly ineffect-
ive within the confines of the other, isolated culture. Here, we are imagining cultural
differences between two groups as if they were bounded regions in a space, regions sep-
arated by sizeable linear distances. In this way, the separation of cultures turns unno-
ticed into total disjointedness, a cultural isolation enforced by circumferential cultural
walls.

Certainly, there are felt difficulties in intellection and acclimation to be faced when
we enter into alternative cultures. It is natural to respond to these feelings by speaking
of a “distance between cultures” and “cultural barriers.” But these forms of speech—
and the forms of imaging that go with them—are not the products merely of untutored
imagination or of popular turns of phrase. They begin much higher and run much deeper
than that. They may be born and raised in the speaking and writing of professional
anthropologists. Well known anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1989) writes as follows
of his experiences on the Atoll of Truk: “In addition, I felt it my duty to do what I could
to bridge the gap between my own culture and that of the Trukese” [emphasis added]
(p. 37). In its extreme form, the language of isolation likens cultural difference not sim-
ply to separated portions of a single ambient space but to wholly separate worlds, as if
the cultures with which we share the one Earth had their origins on the planet Uranus.
I quote again from Hall (1989):

In sharp contrast, high context peoples like the Pueblo, many of Africa’s indigenous
cultures, the Japanese, and apparently the Russians . . . inhabit a “sea of informa-
tion” that is widely shared. . . . The “sea of information” group lives in a unified,
very high context world [emphasis added] in which all or most of the parts inter-
relate. (p. 39)

Communication—or meaningful interaction of any kind—between cultures con-
ceived as isolation chambers looks, at best, like a serious problem. At worst, it becomes
a near impossibility. If everything I do gets real meaning only within the strict, isolat-
ed confines of my own culture, then the prospect for true communication, which re-
quires shared meanings, becomes nil. Just think of us trapped within actual isolation
chambers. If our cultural prisons stand only small distances apart, we can signal, mute-
ly, out of the window of one bubble and toward another. Perhaps select and attenuat-
ed messages, devoid of any rich meaning, can be passed between, as if telegraph wires
had been strung from our isolation bubble. (But in which language are we to send the
telegrams?) Or perhaps we can construct ex nihilo means of communication or inter-
faces between cultures. Hall (1989) again speaks of cultural interfaces to be built at
the boundary walls of cultures (p. 41).

If images such as these reflect our thinking, the prospects for multiculturalism are
grim indeed. We face a series of unnecessary questions: “How are we to break out of
our little bubble so as to find a common understanding with the inhabitants of anoth-
er?” “Are we even able to do so?” “If we do break out of our bubble, haven’t we left
our own cherished culture behind?” “Would we not have to break down the barriers
that guarantee our culture its integrity?” I often wonder whether it might not be such
worries, ones tied to the “isolation chamber” model of culture, that do most to aid and
abet a deadening uniculturalism. The kind of uniculturalism I have in mind demands
that there be, for each group, only a single culture and that any accommodation of “alien
culture” can only affect the dissipation of the “home culture.” The spatial isolation pic-
ture of culture lends to these untoward ideas an unfortunate integrity. If alternative cul-
tures are properly understood by comparison with relatively isolated places, then we
must grant credence to this uniculturalism. It is true that we can only occupy one of
two or more distinct spots at a time and that, if we leave one place and move to anoth-
er, we must leave our original place behind, possibly for good.

I am not so naive as to think that spatial metaphors, so deeply hewn into the ground
of thought, can be left behind when we think about cultural difference. It is natural,
even inevitable, to draw difference as a map of quasi-spatial distance. But there is no
necessity to think always in terms of everyday distance, of inflexible linear displace-
ment. The picture of our intercultural geometry is not a landscape of thoroughly closed
regions isolated within a single flat space. Its real geometry is open and non-Euclidean.
First, cultures are not walled-in regions in space cut off by fixed distances. Think of
them not as enclosed but as open. Not as finite but as endless, as reaching over a hori-
zon. Heidegger (n.d.) thought of the culture of philosophy as a pathway and so should
we think of our culture as a whole. Imagine cultures as pathways running with vari-
able distances in between. As I move along a pathway, some other paths I see draw
closer while others diverge. In this way, I can move toward rapprochement with an-
other culture, another path, without leaving the confines of my own. Think of the way
paths intersect in the woods.

Second, if paths can intersect, they may even share segments relatively often—trav-
eling together for a time and then moving apart. It is natural to think of any path as con-
taining elements from other paths. In fact, there are geometric models for paths on
which no two paths are ever completely disjoint but share a number of intersections. I
will describe one in a moment. Anyone who has been lost in the woods can tell you
that it is, at times, difficult to locate an intersection or common segment in paths, but
they are there all the same.

Third, we can picture each culture as a path identified among all paths only by per-
spective, that is, only in relation to the other paths. Indeed, it may be that, in isolation
from others, I can’t even see my own path very well. Perhaps I can only learn to study
my path’s course by watching others moving along paths of their own.

By drawing a geometrical comparison, you can see why and how all this can be so.
I think of the paths that are cultures as marked out by lines drawn on the surface of a
huge sphere. The sphere is, in certain respects, like the surface of the earth, except that
I am thinking of it as featureless. (It is featureless apart from the lines forming the edges
of the paths.) To be definite, think of the sphere as uniformly white and paths as black.
Imagine now that the black paths run along the great circle lines of the sphere, lines
similar to the equator or to any of the meridians on the earth. As navigators will tell
you, the great circles always represent the shortest distance between any two places on
the earth; transatlantic flights follow the great circle routes. A little spherical geo-
metry will show that any two distinct great circles will intersect in at least two places—
think of the equator and Greenwich meridian. Moreover, there is no fixed distance be-
tween any two of these curved lines; as I move along any one path or great circle, my
distance to another changes in tandem. If the cultures are these paths, cultures are open
not closed; in fact, they are “too big” to fit into any delimited barrier. Moreover, each
culture contains elements of every other.
The converse is also true. As with more familiar “linear” forms of line, our paths on the sphere are made up of many points and, given any point, it is the common intersection of an indefinite number of other paths. Every segment of a path becomes a place-in-common between two or more distinct paths. Therefore, every culture, in the analogy, becomes a patchwork of similarities and borrowings from many others. Lastly, since the surface of the sphere is itself featureless—other than the paths—there are no absolute landmarks—other than alternate paths—against which to measure position or motion. In fact, I can only distinguish one path from another by reference to the course of yet further paths. If I draw the analogy to culture, this will mean that cultures are not isolated but are necessarily interactive, so much so that, for one culture to have a self-conscious identity, a direction as a path, it must fix that direction with respect to other cultures.

Now it is my contention that this is a way of addressing cultural alternatives less open to a stultifying uniculturalism and to allied irritations of thought. No culture stands in total conceptual isolation from others: no culture is an ideological region that is self-enclosed. Each culture today is an accumulation of the cultural remains from the alternative cultures that form its own past. As the philosopher Bachelard (1984) has emphasized, each of our contemporary concepts is a quilt-like patchwork of conceptual artifacts from earlier eras. He wrote, “Science is like a half-renovated city, wherein the new . . . stands side by side with the old” (1984, p. 7). No culture is devoid of the trappings and borrowings from others ubiquitous in European cultures. Think of the vast lexical borrowings that compose the “English” language. And words rarely travel from one language to another without a conceptual, technical, and administrative entourage.

Just as the spherical paths can draw near and come to intersect, alternative cultures are located, at times, within the clear view of one another. I may have to travel intellectually and morally to find places of intersection with another, but I am sure they do exist. In fact, if Hegel was right about culture, then they must exist. And this way of conceiving culture seems not just casually more attractive than the other, but absolutely required by the very idea of self-conscious culture. Hegel (1977) had this to say, as paraphrased by Gadamer (1990):

To recognize one’s own in the alien, to become at home in it, is the basic movement of spirit, whose being consists only in returning to itself from what is other. Hence all theoretical edification, even acquiring foreign languages and conceptual worlds, is merely the continuation of a process of edification that begins much earlier. (p. 14)

I must emphasize that, in the last line, the words “much earlier” mark not mere temporal but full metaphysical priority. The process which Gadamer, and Hegel, thought to begin “much earlier” is not so much a psychological as a philosophical prerequisite for the “basic movement of the spirit.”

Hegel draws a number of conclusions simultaneously, ones to make us turn from the isolationist and toward our path-like model of culture. First, Hegel claims that one only comes to recognize and to appreciate a culture—even a “home culture”—by reflection in and upon other cultures. Nowadays, this may count as an anthropological truism, yet it is a truism often forgotten in heated debates over multiculturalism. But, in Hegel, the meetings between cultures that are required for the self-consciousness of culture are not any movements of the spirit, say, one from a wholly familiar sphere into
one wholly alien, the kind of movement we would think of on the isolationist model. In Hegel, as on the path model, one moves and yet never leaves the place which is "one's own." Hegel wrote that, rather than moving into a completely separate sphere, one must, in grasping a new culture, "recognize one's own in the alien" and "become at home in it." Hegel is here adverting to what I called "intersections of paths" in the picture I just sketched. We are to enter alternative cultures by finding homes there—in that new culture—and by returning to ourselves in those alternative homes.

Second, and importantly, the possibility for self-recognition within the home of another is not something incidental for Hegel, a matter that "it would be nice to have but we can do without." In Hegel, our being "consists only in returning to itself from what is other." In each of the world's cultures, there is a home for us; I believe that Hegel understands this fact as critical for a common, thoughtful humanity. As in the path picture, there are no other landmarks by which to locate the course of our own path except by reflection upon other converging and diverging paths.

Finally, there is the matter of the last line of the quotation and the issue of the "edification that begins much earlier." Hegelian cultural self-consciousness is not a process into which I enter when I first learn foreign languages or art in school. It is a process I am always in, from the time at which I learned my first word. For, as we have seen, to wield a word is already to wield a cultural history, one that picks out intersections and contains common elements from a great number of other paths.

Ovando's Response to McCarty's Perspective on Culture

McCarty has made a strong case for the need to affirm the web-like, complex, and intertwined characteristics of cultural processes. I am especially intrigued by the role that she ascribes to dialogues as necessary means for creating cultural meaning through intersecting pathways. Equally cogent is her proposition, as reflected in Hegel and Gadamer, that we can all find a home in each of the world's cultures if we accept the notion of "the alien" within objective spirit.

Yet, in order to understand why multiculturalism is an irritant, we must also understand how different conceptions of culture are translated, ultimately, into different conceptions of ourselves, of our identities as individuals, affiliated with or disengaged from a variety of cultural groups. For example, wanting to communicate with members of another culture may stem from a desire to transmit one's values to the other side but not to make oneself vulnerable to their values. The fear or desire to connect with other cultures may likewise be linked to apprehensions of having to give up something from one's culture in order to obtain something else from the other one: a zero-sum game in which one robs Peter to pay Paul culturally and metaphorically speaking. In my own case, what price have I had to pay for becoming a bilingual-bicultural individual affiliated concurrently with the Hispanic cultural ethos and with the Anglo-Saxon cultural ethos? How do I deal with the psychological ambivalence that often surrounds individuals straddling two cultures?

Another way to understand the dynamics of multiculturalism is to examine the acculturation and/or assimilation ideology of students who are newcomers to U. S. society. Depending on the level of sociocultural approval of the student's heritage by the larger and more powerful mainstream society, students will tend to make their adjustments in one of three directions: (1) the student will undergo an ethnocultural revital-
ization phenomenon that manifests itself in a strong affirmation or reaffirmation of her or his heritage; (2) the student will reject his or her cultural and linguistic heritage and try to blend in as inconspicuously as possible with the mainstream culture; or (3) the student will develop a creative and eclectic synthesis of both the mainstream and the home culture (Ovando, 1990, p. 295).

If multiculturalism is viewed as a political idea, as a "we" and "they" contest, the zero-sum game metaphor is appropriate. Irritancy then becomes a natural outcome of attempts to communicate cross-culturally. This is so, of course, because in a zero-sum game there is always a winner and a loser. In this framework, the third option for our hypothetical student above, the "eclectic synthesis" is not possible. If, however, we see many cultures as being potential nesting grounds for each one of us, then it is possible to strike a creative cross-cultural balance in our lives.

McCarty does not ascribe much importance to changing demographics or to multicultural education as a source of the negative image of multiculturalism. Her view that, "it is a problem in our ways of viewing those facts," while powerful, does not explain fully why this topic has become so vitriolic. I believe the identity crisis felt by many in the United States today is exacerbated because of specific demographic and political events that have taken place during the last few decades. Until recently we have not had to rethink our isolationist chamber model of culture. However, the demographic shift that has taken place in the United States since the 1970s has raised pointed questions about the nation's cultural and educational agenda. Such diaspora is revealed in the following data.

Between 1970 and 1980, U.S. society became increasingly multiracial, multicultural, and multilingual. The demographic trend shows that in these ten years the total population of the United States grew by 11.6%. But when separated ethnically and racially, there emerges a demographic picture of minority groups galloping ahead of the rest of the European American and non-Hispanic population. During that decade, Hispanics increased by 61%, Native Americans by 71% (Cortes, 1986, pp. 8-9) and Asian-Americans by 141% (Banks, 1987, p. 412).

Between 1980 and 1990, the total U.S. population grew by 9.8%. Whites only grew by 6.0%, while African Americans grew by 13.2%. American Indians (including Eskimo and Aleut) by 37.9%, Asian and Pacific Islanders by 107.8%. Hispanic Americans by 53% and "Others" by 45.1% (NABE, n.d., p. 1). Increased immigration from both Latin America and Asia as well as high fertility rates within these populations are the major factors contributing to this recent demographic shift.

California, with its large language minority population, has become the Ellis Island of the 1980s. By the year 2000, the state is projected to have a minority population between 40 and 50% (Cortes, 1986, p. 9). If these figures are examined in relation to school-age populations, it is projected that in the year 2000, 52% of students in California will be ethnic minorities. This is not surprising, considering that as recently as 1985 California's minorities represented "47 percent of the 4.15 million students, including more than one-half million limited English proficient students" (Cortes, 1986, p. 10).

The 1990 Census indicated a total resident U.S. population of 248.7 million. Broken down ethnically, there were 30 million African Americans (12%), 9.7 million Asian Americans (3%), 2.0 million American Indians (0.8%), 22.4 million Hispanic Ameri-
cans (9%), and 9.8 million “Others” (3.9%) (Barringer, 1991, 1). Moreover, according to Banks et al. (1991),

... the 1990 Census revealed that one out of every four people who live in the United States is a person of color and that one out of every three will be a person of color by the turn of the century. Likewise, the ethnic and racial make-up of the nation’s classrooms is changing significantly. Students of color constitute a majority in twenty-five of the nation’s largest school districts. They ... will make up nearly half (46%) of the nation’s school-age youth by 2020, and about 27% of those students will be victims of poverty. (p. 1)

Again, the educational challenge of this demographic shift is captured in the following statement by Banks, et al. (1991):

One important implication of these demographic trends is that education in the 21st century must help low-income students and students of color to develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to participate in the workforce and in society. This goal is not possible without restructuring schools, colleges, and universities and institutionalizing new goals and ideals within them. As currently conceptualized and organized, schools today are unable to help most low-income students and students of color attain these goals.

Another important implication of the demographic imperative is that students from all social groups, i.e., class, racial, ethnic, cultural, and gender groups, must attain the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary to participate in public discourse and civic action with people who differ from them in significant ways. People are socialized within families and in communities where they learn the values, perspectives, attitudes, and behaviors of their primordial cultures. Community culture enables people to survive. It also, however, restricts their freedom and ability to make critical choices and to reform their society. (p. 1)

Suggestions such as those proposed by Banks and others to conceptualize and implement more culturally compatible classroom practices have often drawn swift and strong reactions from individuals who interpret such goals as being politically motivated and divisive. Short (1988), for example, in his article “‘Diversity’ and ‘Breaking the Disciplines’: Two New Assaults on the Curriculum,” suggests that

... there is the familiar charge that the traditional curriculum unjustly neglects the contributions of women, black Americans, and other ethnic groups. This charge is much weakened by the current celebration of inferior works chosen simply on the basis of the race or sex of their authors. Better works by women and blacks have long been included in the traditional curriculum. However, the real error lies in the inference that is drawn. The alleged neglect of the contributions of women and blacks does not entail charges that the traditional curriculum represents a culture peculiar to white men. (p. 10)

Educators who, based on research findings in cognitive psychology and linguistics, have advocated bilingual education for limited English proficient students have likewise drawn very negative reactions to their proposals. Again, Schlesinger (1992) echoes in a strident tone his feelings toward the role that bilingual education, as part of multicultural schooling, plays in the potential decomposition of the United States:

Alas, bilingualism has not worked out as planned: rather the contrary. Testimony is mixed, but indications are that bilingual education retards rather than expedites
the movement of Hispanic children into the English-speaking world and that it promotes segregation more than it does integration. Bilingualism shuts doors. It nourishes self-ghettoization, and ghettoization nourishes racial antagonism. Bilingualism "encourages concentrations of Hispanics to stay together and not be integrated," says Alfredo Mathew, Jr., a Hispanic civic leader, and it may well foster "a type of apartheid that will generate animosities with others, such as Blacks in the competition for scarce resources, and further alienate the Hispanic from the larger society."

Using some language other than English dooms people to second-class citizenship in American society. (p. 108)

Unlike McCarthy's holistic and intertwined view of culture, Short's and Schlesinger's critiques of multiculturalism as being politically motivated and divisive, reveal in bold relief a paradox associated with the "we" and "they" notion of multiculturalism. That is, they proclaim that national unity can be achieved only if history and culture are not used by minorities for political, therapeutic, and cheerleading aims. For all their good intentions the "we" and "they" view of culture ipso facto creates tension and irritancy among both sides—something that neither Short nor Schlesinger wants. Conversely, McCarty's web-like notion of culture, in which the many (pluribus) and the one (unum) are mutually dependent entities, is much more inclusive.

Disposable Culture and a Paradox of Disposability: Luise Prior McCarty

I am also concerned that a good deal of our musings about culture are made more difficult by conceiving of culture as itself a form of information or as something fully encodable in such a form. I am thinking of forms of information so as to include words, sentences, theories, pictures, anything fully transmittable from a source to a receiver. I am afraid that, in our desire to encourage multicultural education, we are tempted to think that what is called "cultural knowledge" can be fully represented in textbooks or as museum displays or as videotapes or, perhaps, as all of these together. This is natural since it is through information-bearing media that we first strive to acquaint our children with other cultures. Once again, anthropologist E. T. Hall affords a good example of the tendency to an "informational" reading of culture. He wrote, "The principal point to remember concerning high and low context communication is that a considerable part of the [cultural] message is already encoded in the receiver" (Hall, 1989, p. 38).

I am worried by this because a notion of culture to which informational ideas are attached, an idea I call "culture as disposable" is, at best faulty and, at worst, inconsistent or paradoxical. By "disposable" in this sentence, I do not necessarily mean "treatable as refuse." Rather, when culture is conceived as disposable, it is seen as subject to our dispositions, subject to manipulation, shaping, and displacement under individual or bureaucratic control. This is the way the word "disposable" works in the expression "disposable income." The Latin root of the word, the verb "disponere" already points in the right semantic direction: "disponere" means "to arrange or to alter in place." It speaks already about a thing of limited permanence, open to transmission, bearing no intrinsic relation to a particular location. (The story of "disponere" is, by the way, a fine example of one of Hegel's cultural intersections. With this word, I find myself "a home within the alien.") So, if culture is completely representable as infor-
mation—as messages to be sent or stored—then it is obvious that culture is disposable, is subject to group or to individual whim, to the enhancements, reinterpretations, corruptions to which all information, all messaging, is subject.

But, as the spatial metaphors surrounding culture rightly reflect, something is badly amiss in the mere suggestion that culture be disposable. Again, there is a cross-cultural clue to what I mean waiting in the word “culture” itself and in its historical relation to “agriculture” and “horticulture.” “Culture,” in the Latin “cultura” and “cultus,” names what comes from the care of the soil in a place. Culture is, therefore, connected intrinsically with place. But here I do not mean simple physical or geographic place. I refer as well to linguistic, technological, and ideological mastery of place: as in Gadamer’s paraphrase of Hegel, culture is the means of getting around in a place, of making it one’s very own. To make a home in the alien is to exercise a mastery there. And this mastery, these techniques for “getting around” in a place, are not wholly representable in textbook accounts, in travelogues, or in museum displays. They are not information for me to dispose.

It may not be obvious that “ways of making a place one’s own” are not translatable completely into forms of information. You may be tempted to object that one can always draw maps of new places. One can even take pictures. In response, I remind you that maps and drawings and accounts and pictures are not culturally neutral entities. They are themselves cultural artifacts. We must know how to read them and how to apply them and that, too, is part of “getting around in a place.” You should notice, also, that the ability to read a picture is not just an ability to see the picture. One has to see the important things in the picture. Think, in this case, of meteorological charts or medieval maps, wherein—to our eyes—decoration and geography are thoroughly mixed. Can we always see what is important in these? You cannot respond, now, by saying, “Well, I will just include instructions on reading the maps and pictures and charts.” These are themselves more items to be read, themselves no more transparent or self-intimating than the original maps and drawings and the means to read these: to “find our way around in them,” is no more informational than they are. To every culture there is, therefore, something noninformational, something to be conceived as an intrinsic, nontransmittable orientation to a place.

This insight, if unheeded, has the effect of making certain approaches to multiculturalism seem paradoxical. I might even say that, if we think of culture completely on the disposable model, as something available transparently through textbooks, through schools as institutions of discursive learning, through pieces of information transmitted to students, then the more we succeed in putting cultures across to our students, the more we falsify and obscure those cultures. The more we succeed in encoding cultures, even European cultures, as forms of information, as sets of beliefs to be inculcated, the more we proveunfaithful to the very cultures we hope to convey. This is because of the essentially non-informational, orientative aspect of every culture. I am afraid, then, that the effort made to squeeze a culture into a textbook is in effect, sending this metames sage to the student: “This is all there is to culture, what you see in this book. Multiculturalism is a course like mathematics or accounting. It is another batch of information to be “taken in” and “processed.” But culture is, in itself, not disposable and to treat it in this way is to corrupt it.
This raises our final questions, "If I am not to reduce a knowledge of culture to texts, to artifacts, to images to be put before my students, then what am I to do in the classroom? How are alternative cultures to be taught?" In answer, I refer to an idea of Helmholtz, one also taken up by Gadamer, the idea of Takt. In its original form, the idea of Takt in Helmholtz was applied to the understanding of historical periods relatively distant in time from our own, but its extension to contemporary alternative cultures is immediate. I must caution you not to conflate Takt with its English cognate, tact. Tact, in the latter sense, is that by which we navigate the waters of privileged conversation and matters diplomatic. Takt in Gadamer is the development of that non-subjective potential in all of us by which we can obey Hegel’s command, find our own homes in the alien and return to ourselves in those homes. Takt, then, is a geographic facility, a way of looking around. It is not uninformed looking or openmouthed gaping. It draws aid from information, from maps and guides, but cannot be replaced by them. Gadamer (1990) writes of Takt "as keeping oneself open to what is other—to other, more universal points of view. It embraces a sense of proportion and distance in relation to itself, and hence consists in rising above itself to universality" (p. 17).

The architectural coloring of Gadamer’s remark is no accident. The education of Takt is the construction in oneself of an aesthetic discernment. And a technical knowledge (of art) is surely relevant to the learning of discernment. But that is not all. For Takt, one’s eyes must be fully open and one must also be, as Gadamer wrote, “open to what is other.”

But this openness is as much a moral virtue as a cognitive attainment. To repeat, I have compared a culture to a particular mastery of a place and, to attain that mastery, I must develop a sense of local direction. That is, I have to be able to learn the right way to travel thereabouts. And, for Gadamer as for Hegel, Takt is not just a way to get around in strange places. I quote from Gadamer (1990) again:

For the Takt which functions in the human sciences is not simply a feeling and unconscious, but is at the same time a mode of knowing and mode of being. . . . What Helmholtz calls Takt includes edification and is a function of both aesthetic and historical learning. (pp. 16-17)

Thus, Gadamer’s Takt will include proper edification and, so, will take formal education as a proper part. This is to say that, if we understand education in the right way—as a looking across to other paths and a turning around to see what lies behind on our own path—then all education will be multicultural.

Ovando’s Response to McCarty’s Discussion of Disposable Culture and Takt

McCarty’s discussion of the flawed concept of disposable culture embodies for me a similar zero-sum notion as the isolation chamber metaphor. The disposable image of culture prompts teachers to ask questions such as “What should I leave out of the existing curriculum in order to teach multiculturalism?” When such questions are asked, they suggest a view of culture as being transmitted piecemeal and that transmitting one thing means leaving something else out. What McCarty suggests to me is that teaching students about cultures—and about different cultures—does not mean that at all. It means cultivating in students a certain meta-awareness of the complexities of cultural differences. By “meta-awareness” I mean giving students a chance to experience the deeper meanings of cultural practices—to be able to stand back and reflect not only on
what culture is but how cultural tendencies fit into the larger web or webs. It is giving
the students a mountain-top view of their culture but also of the surrounding valleys,
mountains, rivers, streams, clouds, and trees. As such the learning of cultural details
(such as festivities, eating habits, and discourse patterns) becomes incidental to the fun-
damental goal of giving students a chance to experience the deeper meanings of cul-
tural processes. Such a deep and complex view of culture is captured by Geertz (1973)
when he says:

Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of signifi-
cance he himself has spun. I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to
be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in
search of meaning.

Cultural analysis is intrinsically incomplete. And, worse than that, the more
deeply it goes the less complete it is. It is a strange science whose most telling as-
sertions are its most tremulously based, in which to get somewhere with the matter
at hand is to intensify suspicion, both your own and that of others, that you are not
quite getting it right . . . . Anthropology, or at least interpretive anthropology, is a
science whose progress is marked less by a perfection of consensus than by a re-
finement of debate. What gets better is the precision with which we vex each oth-
er. (pp. 5, 29)

Viewing culture this way also means that making students aware of differences is
tantamount to teaching them about themselves. Exposing a student from a small rural
community in the American Midwest to information about the subsistence lifestyles of
Athapaskan Indians in Nulato, Alaska is also enabling the student to learn about her-
self and her place in the human web of paths. Seen in this way it is difficult to see what
is being “sacrificed”—what of ourselves is being lost—when we learn about others.
From a teacher’s point of view, this non-disposable, the Takt, view of culture would
mean emphasizing the interactions of humans with their environment. The folklorist,
Henry Glassie (1992), captures the opposite of our view of culture. He believes that
culture is constructed completely from experience, whereas we believe that we are born
into a culture. (For instance, a person could not construct a language alone even if she
or he wanted to do so).

A person is not born into a culture, a person is born into a room and in that room
that person begins to assemble little hints, bright sights, warm touches and out of
those hints. out of those experiences, this little person becomes a big person and
that big person has accumulated more of those experiences and out of those expe-
riences that person has accumulated a thing we can call culture, because that per-
son will share it with other persons who have gone through a similar series of ex-
periences. (p. 12)

Sharing common experiences with kindred spirits, however, is only part of the cul-
tural iceberg. Meaningful and creative cultural dialogue also requires a certain amount
of existential dissonance. I believe that it is when similarities and dissimilarities are
shared in the spirit of transmitting and receiving that cross-cultural communication is
at its best. In essence, then, cultural transmission, analysis, and acceptance are com-
plex processes that entail being culture-bearers and culture-makers. In U. S. society
this means identifying and understanding how fundamental core values serve as the nu-
clei around which a galaxy of contested micro values shape the macro culture.
Contested Core Values in U. S. Society

Dialogue is possible because we have shared and nonshared experiences and values that make the conversation potentially interesting, rich, and desirable. Dialogue, moreover, requires openness and vulnerability to other cultures and lives. Dialogues at their best are not instruments of colonization or domestication. This, for me, is what McCarty means by the ubiquitous nature of intersecting paths. It is possible through dialogue to find niches, if not homes, in other cultures. On the point of needing shared and dissimilar points of view in order to create dialogue, the Spindlers (1990) have identified a set of contested core values in U. S. society around which a good portion of cultural dialogue in this country can take place. George and Louise Spindler, educational anthropologists, have spent a lifetime examining the complex role that formal schooling plays in the transmission of cultural values in multicultural contexts. The Spindlers describe the dynamic process of contested core values as follows:

The cultural mainstream is defined by the American cultural dialogue. This dialogue pivots around independence, freedom, conformity, success, community, optimism, idealism, materialism, technology, nature, work, and other value orientations and their permutations and oppositions. This dialogue goes on and has gone on since the Revolution. Immigrants and those rising from lower socioeconomic ranks assimilate, appropriate, and acquire this dialogue as they become mainstream. This assimilative process will go on, for it is the American ethos, the central process of American culture and society. Ethnicity is not lost but participation is gained. However, ethnicity is reshaped. (pp. x-xii)

... The balancing of assimilation and preservation of identity is constant and full of conflict. This is part of the American dialogue and it has always been a part of this dialogue. It is the nature of cultural dialogues that they rationalize, deny, defend, protest, and exhibit. (p. xii)

In 1963 George Spindler wrote an article titled “Education in a Transforming America.” There he examined the challenges to the core values by “several hundred students enrolled in professional education courses representing lower-middle-class to upper-middle-class socioeconomic status in the early 1960s” (Pai, 1990, p. 27). Based on the findings of this study, Spindler concluded that the traditional core values were in fact being questioned and modified to reflect the changing nature of U. S. society (Pai, 1990, p. 27). According to Pai’s interpretation of the study by Spindler,

... the core values of college students had shifted considerably from those of their parents. Unlike their parents, the subjects held as their core values (1) sociability, (2) a relativistic moral attitude, (3) consideration for others, (4) a hedonistic present-time orientation, and (5) conformity to the group. (p. 27)

The fluid and shifting-sand characterization of U. S. cultural values that George Spindler documented in the 1960s has been further documented by other social scientists. Such research covering the periods from the mid-1960s to early 1980s is summarized by Pai (1990, pp. 28-32). The gist of these studies is that change in cultural values is a constant in U. S. society and that schools do play an important role in the transmission of such values. This change, in turn, is catalyzed by such variables as social stratification, politics, religious values, technology, demographics, economics, and ideology. For example, as noted earlier, demographic trends continue to change dramatically the character of the society. As the United States becomes more pluralistic,
the debate as to what it means to be an American intensifies. Nunis (1981), for instance, states that

For the first time in American experience, some concerned observers have pointed out, a large immigrant group may be electing to bypass the processes of acculturation and assimilation that turned previous immigrant groups into English-speaking Americans. (p. 24)

Likewise, Glazer (1981) points out that

... most American parents liked what the public schools were offering. Most had come to this country not to maintain a foreign language and culture but with the intention, in the days when the trip to the United States was long and expensive, to become Americans as fast as possible, and this meant English language and American culture. They sought the induction to new language and culture that the public schools provided—as do many present-day immigrants, too—and while they often found, as time went on, that they regretted what they and their children had lost, this was their choice, rather than an imposed choice. And every choice involves regret for the path not taken. (pp. 61-62)

This tension between those who wish to assimilate and those who wish to acculturate into the mainstream culture is further illustrated by the changing use of metaphors. Thus, for example, the melting pot metaphor, so valued rhetorically in the past, is in disrepute because of its highly discriminatory track record toward racially and linguistically stigmatized groups. As Jessie Jackson, one of the leading African American political figures in the United States, has said, “Blacks were stuck on the side of the pot and never melted.” Today, instead, many ethnic and racial minorities feel that it is possible and desirable to maintain contact with one’s ancestral cultural and linguistic roots while adhering to shared democratic practices in the society. Havighurst (1978) refers to this process as “constructive pluralism” and defines it as follows:

a. Mutual appreciation and understanding of every subculture by the other ones;
b. Freedom for each subculture to practice its culture and socialize its children;
c. Sharing by each group in the economic and civic life of the society;
d. Peaceful coexistence of diverse life styles, folkways, manners, language patterns, religious beliefs and practices, and family structures. (p. 13)

Today the “American mosaic” and the “salad bowl” metaphors have emerged as contenders for the subtractive and zero-sum game notion associated with the “melting pot” metaphor. To date, the contest between these opposing metaphors has produced much ideological irritancy in the society. Yet, a basic point remains as documented by the Spindlers: schools continue to be paramount instruments of cultural transmission regardless of what the cultural mix is.

My own position is that schooling processes that allow all children (minority and non-minority) to become successful participants in the educational process can help mend social and economic tears in the national fabric. For a democratic, pluralistic, and complex society to function true to its underlying premises, its members need an awareness of their responsibilities as citizens, and they need skills to carry out these responsibilities. Learning to get along in a multicultural society should be an imperative of the schooling process, not a neglected option. Of course, carrying out the above is not easy even when there is the desire for cultural dialogue. For example, an existing paradox of multicultural education centers around the desire to produce cultural knowl-
edge that can be transmitted to others. The assumption is that through provision of cultural information, cross-cultural communication can be enhanced. But when cultural knowledge is transmitted it can become a source of stereotypical frameworks that discredit the truly fluid, complex, and three-dimensional nature of culture. Still, I believe it is possible for non-mainstream students to achieve integrative acculturation—a creative and eclectic synthesis of both the mainstream and the home culture—if we accept conceptually the path-like view of culture proposed by McCarty.

In all this, I believe that teachers play a key role in contextualizing children's identity formation. The role of multicultural teachers then becomes one in which they are creators of situations in which students can have meaningful experiences and conversations with others representing different cultures: between students and students; students and teachers; students and texts or authors; and students and people in the community. However, because most of us are used to associating predominantly with culturally kindred spirits, moving away from this cultural comfort zone will not be easy. There will often be more than just ethnic, linguistic, or racial barriers—there are, for example, potential social, political, gender, regional, and age barriers. Such barriers do tend to inhibit the desire for participation in culturally mediated negotiations. Yet, as the following examples will help illustrate, this type of instruction is possible and pedagogically defensible.

Let us say that a teacher is developing a set of lessons on the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus's voyage to America. If the teacher is interested in enabling students to visualize cultures in a more dynamic, complex, and path-like manner, just what could she do? In the culture-as-isolation chamber/culture-as-disposable-model, a teacher in the 1990s might teach students that white Anglo-Saxon Protestants have one interpretation of what happened; indigenous groups, another; the Spaniards, another; the British, another, and so on. The learning objective might be that students know how these different groups have viewed that event.

But in culture-as-intersecting paths/culture-as-Takt, the teacher would have a slightly different agenda. The teacher would want the students to learn and think about the ways these groups communicated with each other (or did not) and how this dialogue continues today. Nearly 500 years later, in 1990, what has led 300 American Indians from North, South, and Central America to gather in Ecuador to participate in the First Continental Conference of Indigenous Peoples? What did these indigenous persons have to say about the impact that Columbus' legacy had on their cultures, their human rights, and their environment? Why have the Lakotas of South Dakota decided to celebrate October 12 as “Indian Day” instead of “Columbus Day”? The video, Columbus Didn't Discover Us, could provide students with some American Indian perspectives on the above questions. There are many questions here, but questions are crucial to dialogue, and with such related questions about the past and the present, for example, teachers can reduce the breakdown of cross-cultural communication among contemporary groups.

Having suggested the above pedagogical strategy as a way to start a meaningful cultural conversation, a caveat is in order. A truly multicultural education about Columbus is not achieved by one or another rearrangement of supposed “information.” A truly multicultural education requires that the student gain an appreciation of cultural details. This kind of appreciation, however, is not engendered by books and lesson
plans alone. Both teachers and students must be authentic culture-bearers and culture-makers of a specific kind. As such, teachers and students can be seen as gift-giving embodiments to each other of cultural processes.

McCarty and I would like to end this paper with another caveat taken from Mexican author Carlos Fuentes’ article, “The mirror of the other.” In it he captures for us beautifully the life-giving and interdependent characteristics of cultural processes when he writes: People and their cultures perish in isolation, but they are born or reborn in contact with other men and women” (1992, p. 410). Multiculturalism in U. S. society and in its schools can become a source of life and vibrancy rather than a nagging irritant or paradox. To ignore such a possibility is not only to miss a life-giving opportunity but to court disaster.

NOTES

'This paper was first presented at the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction. Seventh Triennial World Conference, held at Mena House Oberoi, Cairo, Egypt, from July 25 to August 2, 1992.

'I wish to credit the useful suggestions and insightful comments of Amy Andrews, a graduate student in the School of Education at Indiana University. Bloomington.
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Race continues to be one of the most compelling issues in the pursuit of the democratic ideals of the United States of America. Always a critical factor in the social relationships of people in this country, it becomes even more critical when we consider the continually changing mosaic of our nation's population. Because of these changes the demand on colleges and universities to develop courses dealing with this and other issues associated with a multicultural society are increasing.

This chapter will deal with some of the complexities involved in teaching about race and racism in this country. It is divided into four sections and reflects the experiences of my 20 years of teaching courses and presenting workshops on this topic.

I. Course Preparation

Serious consideration must be given to the scope, sequence, and placement of this course within the university's curriculum. Much thought should also be given to who will teach this course, the materials to be used, the number of students per class, the location of the classroom, and the level at which the course will be taught.

A. One of the first things an instructor should do in teaching a class of this nature is to take some time for personal introspection. The instructor should ask him/herself: Why am I teaching this class? What are my qualifications? Have I examined my strengths and weaknesses in relation to the course content and the classroom dynamics the course is likely to generate? Do I have any hidden agendas? If I have content weaknesses, what can I do to turn them into strengths? Do I have a contingency plan for dealing with the unexpected?

B. Probably the most important class of the semester for a course of this nature is the first class. It is critical because it will set the tone for the rest of the semester. Each student should receive a syllabus and ample time should be allotted to discuss it in detail. The syllabus should contain the standard components, including the instructor's office hours, course description, materials, test and assignment information, as well as the grading scale. In addition to this and any other information you feel is necessary, there should be a section that specifically discusses class conduct. This is essential, given the sensitive nature of the course content. Students should be informed that some of the material in this class may evoke intense feelings, in themselves and among their classmates, but that the discussion and debate of the issues are an essential part of the learning process. At the same time it should be made crystal clear the class will be conducted with respect for a variety of opinions, a tolerance for difference, and openness to cooperation in order to achieve the common goal of a greater understanding of how race functions in our society.
II. Curriculum Issues

Obviously innumerable approaches to designing a course about race in the U. S. A. are possible, but a few fundamental ideas and historical cases demand to be included in any fair approach to this issue. In the following sections some of these concepts and cases will be identified and discussed.

A. Global and national demographics are critical to understanding the tremendous changes taking place in this country and around the world. Students of color easily see themselves as minorities in this country while European American students see themselves in the majority. Our emphasis on a European-centered curriculum reinforces those perceptions. Therefore, it is critical for students to learn—as far as this is possible given the slipperiness of the term race—the actual racial composition of the world’s population as well as the current racial composition of our own country. This can be a powerful learning experience for students and a beginning stage for changing some of their existing paradigms about race.

The instructor should also be conscious of generalizations that can be drawn from this kind of information. It is not uncommon for some European American students to feel that the race with which they identify is in trouble because it is so outnumbered by people of color and that this will render them vulnerable in some way in the 21st century. Students of color may find this situation very empowering and demonstrate a kind of pan-colorism that some European American students may find threatening and inappropriate. If either or both of these situations occur they can be turned into excellent learning examples that demonstrate the impact majority/minority relationships can generate in a cultural scene such as the classroom.


B. In order to discuss race, we must be able to define it. This is by no means an easy task, but the concept must be dealt with on at least two levels of understanding. The first involves the scientific understanding and use of the term. Students should be knowledgeable about the morphology and genetics of race. In addition they should know of the different classification systems developed to describe human beings in race-related terms (Garn, 1971; Coon, 1962; Baker, 1974).

Secondly, the students should have some knowledge of the sociological view of race and its implications in contemporary society. This should encompass both the negative and positive connotations of the concept (Montagu, 1974; Jensen, 1973; Simpson & Yinger, 1985). Most students do not have a clear understanding of either meaning of race and, therefore, tend to misrepresent themselves whenever they are using the term. By the end of the class each student should be able to demonstrate a clear understanding of this concept in either context.

Many students have well developed belief systems about race even though they may be faulty in their construction or based on unexamined assumptions. An instructor should not be surprised to find students quoting religious justifications to support the differences they perceive in races. It is important to tread lightly here but at the same time present the students with factual material that allows them to explore their beliefs and to make up their own minds without becoming stuck in an “I am Right, you are Wrong” kind of dynamic.
C. This course is about race relations in the U. S. A. In order to understand present conditions it is imperative to understand what has taken place in the past. Students seem to express almost universal disdain for studying history, especially when it deals with race. Students will often make statements such as, "Why do we have to study about slavery? I wasn't there. I didn't have anything to do with it. Black people just need to get over it." If comments like these are made in a class, students might polarize and undo any progress made. African American students may react in a variety of ways as well. Some may feel a certain degree of shame, anger, and even a desire for revenge. Others may view the occasion as an opportunity to exercise their racial pride and a time to state the case of African American resiliency, of their ability to survive against tremendous odds. The well-prepared instructor may want to remind students of the conduct clause in the syllabus and stress the importance of each student's right to his/her own position. Encouraging students to continue to be brave enough to speak their minds is also very important, because the only way the instructor can insure that the students learn as individuals and the class learns as a whole is to have them continue asking questions and seeking understanding.

Since each class has time restraints it is impossible to provide a comprehensive discussion of all the important historical events that have shaped race relations in this country. The instructor has to choose wisely. What follows is a list and a discussion of several landmark cases and decisions that teachers can draw upon. Paula S. Rothenberg's Race, Class, & Gender in the United States (1992) is a recent text well worth exploring for additional sources of inquiry and discussion. She includes a very thorough section entitled "How it Happened: Race and Gender Issues in U. S. Law" that contains 24 significant cases.

1. The United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 2.

   The Three-Fifths Compromise. The Three-Fifths Compromise is a great starting place for students trying to understand the issue of race at the beginning of this American Republic. A review of the debates between the architects of the most important doctrine of our nation reveals the battle over whether or not slavery should exist in this new nation. The compromise that is reached sets forth a precedent that would continue until the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment. The rhetoric used by both sides in the debate reveals the flavor of the justifications and rationalizations for slavery as well as the ardent arguments against it. It might be effective to have students study some of these arguments and reenact them in class. Instructors who like this kind of group interaction could assign students to various roles like colonial delegates, members of the press, and various special interest groups, i.e., Negro freedmen, Native Americans, Southern plantation owners, and other relevant participants of the time. A good source of information for such a project is Adler's The Annals of America (1968).

2. The U. S. Census

   One of the richest sources of information, past and present, is the United States Census Bureau, an almost inexhaustible source of possibilities when it comes to understanding the unique diversity of people in this country. For example, consider this analysis, researched by J. T. Lott (1993), President of Tamayo Lott Associates in Silver Spring, Maryland, of the changing identification systems used by the Census Bureau to classify people:

   The first census of 1790 classified the population in terms of free white males, free
white females, other persons (such as American Indians eligible for taxation, free
blacks and persons of other races), and slaves. These categories divide the black
population by civil status (slave or free). In 1820, the term “free colored persons”
was introduced. The instruction for the 1860 Census stated: “Under heading 5, en-
titled ‘Color’ insert in all cases, when the slave is black, the letter B; when he or
she is a mulatto, insert ‘M.’ The color of all slaves should be noted.” The 1890
Census item stated: “Whether white, black, mulatto, quadroon, octoroon, Chinese,
Japanese, or Indian.” (Mulatto indicated one black parent; quadroon, one black
grandparent; octoroon, one black great-grandparent.) In the 1900 Census the term
race was added to color: “White, Black (Negro descent), Chinese, Japanese and In-
dian.” In the 1950 Census, race replaced the term color, while neither term was
used in 1960. In 1960, the item was: “Was this person White, Negro, American
Indian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Aleut, Eskimo . . . .” The 1970 Cen-
sus provided detailed categorization for race (White, Negro or Black, American In-
dian, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Korean and Other) and also asked about
Hispanic “origin or descent.” It was only in 1980 that the census used the term “eth-
nic origin.”

This summary of census categories is helpful in understanding at least one aspect
of our nation’s changing opinion about race. Obviously the issue of slavery and mixed
race individuals was a critical factor in the categorization of the U. S. population in the
18th and 19th centuries. The addition of the mulatto category under Blacks on the 1860
census forms indicates the numerical significance of mixed race individuals in the coun-
try at that time. The 1890 census form expands this division to include not only mu-
lattoes, but quadroons and octoroons to meet the needs of an expanding “colored” pop-
ulation. In 1900 the census categories changed again dropping the degrees of blackness
or whiteness while adding the term race as a modifier to the term color. This addition
should not be surprising, given the social sentiments of that time. If further informa-
tion is needed on the thinking of the time, students can research Social Darwinism, the
Nativistic Movement, eugenics, and the Dillingham Commission Reports.

3. Dred Scott v. Sanford, 1857

In 1857 the Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court wrote, in the Court’s opinion,
that:

They (the Negro) had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an
inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social
or political relations: and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man
was bound to respect: and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to
slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold, and treated as an ordinary article
of merchandise and traffic, whenever a profit could be made by it. This opinion was
at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race.

It is quite clear from this that many people in the United States, i.e., Dred Scott or
any other African Americans, did not enjoy the same Constitutional rights as European
Americans.

Chief Justice Taney goes on to argue that.

. . . there are two clauses in the Constitution which point out directly and specifi-
cally to the negro race as a separate class of persons and show clearly that they were
regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the Government then formed.
He is, of course, referring to the specifications that permitted the states to import slaves until 1808 if they so desired and the agreement among the states to respect the property (in this case the human chattel of slavery) of each state and to deliver this property up to appropriate authorities if found within their territories.

This is another powerful interpretation of the Constitution by the highest court of the land that clearly states the second-class status of African Americans. The instructor may want to explore with students the impact of this decision on both the Abolitionist movement during the time as well as the movement of some Southern states toward secession. The opening segment of the award winning teledocumentary series, the Civil War, is one source that demonstrates this point vividly. Another reliable source on these issues is From Slavery to Freedom by John Hope Franklyn and Alfred Moss, Jr. now in its sixth edition (1988).


These amendments are extremely important to cover because of the changes they set forth in the treatment of African Americans by European Americans. Numerous works deal with the legal ramifications of these amendments, but one of the best is The Constitution and Race by D. E. Lively (1992). It provides clear summaries of the many cases citing these amendments as well as other pertinent legal issues related to race in the U. S. A.

5. Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896

The timing of the Plessy v. Ferguson decision makes it one of the most important cases of the post-Civil War era. Its significance at the end of the 19th century is that it set the stage for race relations throughout more than half of the 20th century. While most students may be vaguely aware of its significance, few will have examined the actual opinion or savored the court’s thinking. and in a sense, society’s thinking at that time. This case upheld the “separate but equal” doctrine and thus became the legal precedent for Jim Crow laws.

Part of Plessy’s defense was an argument that his rights under the Fourteenth Amendment were violated as a result of a Louisiana statue that stated “... all railway companies carrying passengers ... in this state shall provide separate but equal accommodation: for the white and colored races” (Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896). The Supreme Court supported this law and offered the following opinion.

The object of the amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law, but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color, or to enforce social, as distinguished from political equality, or a commingling of the two races upon terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting, and even requiring, their separation in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and have generally, if not universally, been recognized as within the competency of the state legislatures in the exercise of their police power.” (Plessy v Ferguson, 1896)

This interpretation clearly supports the states’ right to distinguish between individuals on the basis of skin color in social situations, ranging from schooling to employment. The Louisiana statute goes on to say: “The power to assign to a particular coach
obviously implies the power to determine to which race the passenger belongs, as well as the power to determine who, under the laws of the particular state, is to be deemed a white and who a colored person . . . ." (Plessy v Ferguson, 1896)

Therefore, the state has the power not only to make decisions based on skin color but can also decide the race of an individual. The implications of this case are well documented in the segregation and discrimination of African Americans throughout the history of the 20th century. The Eyes on the Prize (Blackside, 1986) video documentary series can provide a rich source of vivid personal accounts of the struggle of African Americans against the institutionalization of the Jim Crow laws in the South.

An interesting example of the Federal government’s right to name a person’s race takes place every time a buyer in the U.S. fills out an application for a mortgage. The form one fills out for the loan requires the borrower to state race/national origin under a section referred to as “Information For Government Monitoring Purposes.” The instructions for this section state:

The following information is requested by the Federal Government for certain types of loans related to a dwelling, in order to monitor the Lender’s compliance with equal credit opportunity, fair housing and home mortgage disclosure laws. You are not required to furnish this information but are encouraged to do so. The law provides that a Lender neither discriminate on the basis of this information, nor on whether you choose to furnish it. However, if you choose not to furnish the above information, under Federal regulations, this Lender is required to note race and sex on the basis of visual observation or surname. If you do not wish to furnish the above information, please check the box below. (Lender must review the above material to assure that the disclosures satisfy all requirements to which the Lender is subject under applicable state law for the particular type of loan applied for. (Universal Residential Loan Application, 1992).

It would seem from this statement that mortgage lenders must either have been trained to distinguish the racial characteristics of borrowers or that they possess some innate ability that will allow them to accurately make these determinations. If they have not been trained, they are probably relying on stereotypes to make their decisions. A person’s surname is certainly not a valid indicator of race nor is one’s color. While this issue is not life threatening, it emphatically characterizes the ongoing race issue in this country.

Thus, in a nation of diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds, we must continue to ask: Who has the right to name or define a person? Who should determine what a person should be labeled or called? If, in fact, a person traces his/her heritage through the European lines of the Irish, the African lines of West Africa, and the Native American lines of the Cherokee, what race should he/she be called? Often, when this question is raised in classrooms or workshops, the response is silence. Nobody wants to make the first move, yet almost everybody knows what the socially acceptable answer is in the United States of America.

The answer is, of course, AFRICAN AMERICAN. But why is this the correct or at least the socially acceptable answer? How did we learn it? The answer is certainly not based on any biological or genetic fact. It is based on a social definition derived by some form of agreement, legal or otherwise, by the people of the U.S.A. A person is African American, not necessarily because he/she chooses to be, but because the soci-
ety demands it. If this person chooses to carry him/herself as a Native American but does not have legal documentation, he/she cannot enjoy the status of that heritage, but an African American needs no such documentation to be African American. Physical characteristics are enough. The person, if he/she chooses, can carry him/herself as an Irish American, but in all likelihood the only people who will believe this will be the individual’s closest friends and family. It isn’t that this triple heritage doesn’t exist within this individual or millions of others in our country. It does. However, some lines of heritage are obviously more potent than others.

III. The Consequences of Racial Prejudice and Discrimination

Race has become an acceptable liability in U.S.A. life. The advantages of being European American here can be validated by numerous social indicators, including life expectancy, income per family or individual, and educational attainment, as well as by who is more likely to go to jail or to become a victim of a crime. The advantages of being European American, i.e., white, are so pervasive that most white people fail to even realize that they enjoy any advantage over the rest of the population in the country. Such is the power of socialization and the status-quo. One of the most comprehensive texts available on the disparities within our society is Simpson and Yinger’s Racial and Cultural Minorities: An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination (1985). Easy to read and well organized, the book contains a wealth of information teachers can incorporate into a study of racial prejudice and discrimination.

A. Dr. Moleti Asante of Temple University provides an example of the consequences of racism when he discusses children’s need to be centered in an educational experience that provides a context in which they see themselves as whole, contributing persons. European American children experience this everyday. They are centered in an ocean of reminders about the greatness of Western Civilization, Europe, and the U.S.A. When one visits our great cities and travels their many streets and boulevards named after our Presidents and heroes or stands in front of their impressive buildings, statues, and monuments, little notice is given to the absence of African, Asian, Hispanic, or Native Americans who contributed to this country’s greatness. In this macrocosm, what is there to center Native, African, Hispanic, and Asian American children? In their micro-world experiences, i.e., in school, what does a child see? Who is the school named after? What pictures hang on the wall? What artifacts are present in the building? In essence, whose culture is being celebrated? Whose culture is forgotten? Which children are being centered? The absence of a centering context for children of color is compounded through a curriculum that revels in Eurocentric accomplishments.

As Asante asserts, it is no wonder that European American children have higher self-esteem in these contexts than other children. If cultural scenes of importance reflect Eurocentric context cues, those individuals socialized to receive those cues will do so in a manner that gives them an advantage over other groups whose center is not reflected in the same manner. If history is being presented in ways that start your group in slavery and end it on welfare, or start your group as heathens and end it on reservations, or start your group as invited laborers and end up excluding it for almost 75 years after that labor is no longer needed, your group might have a problem understanding whether or not it can ever contribute in a meaningful way to this “white” society that
obviously doesn't value "non-whites" as it does itself. (See Molefi Kete Asante's Afro-centricity [1991] for further information on these ideas).

B. Students often find it difficult to understand the pervasiveness of socialization in either their own lives or the lives of others. We are often blinded by our own ethnocentrism, making it hard for students to know what it's like to walk in another person's shoes. Socialization or enculturation provides the recipes or scripts that individuals have for interpreting and presenting the appropriate forms of behavior for any given situation. These scripts or recipes are learned by individuals throughout their lifetime (Adams, 1991), but the initial imprinting a person receives in childhood helps set the foundation for how that individual sees him/herself as well as how they think they are perceived by others in society. In a society that values the ethnic-racial culture of some groups over others, learning this difference begins early and is reinforced consistently through socialization.

A wonderful film adaptation of satirist Mark Twain's novel, Pudd'nhead Wilson, demonstrates the power of racial socialization. In the story, which takes place during the slave era, a mulatto nanny exchanges her child for the child of the plantation owner. The slave woman's child is, of course, more than half white, an octoroon, and his skin is as fair as the white child's skin. Consequently, the white child is raised as a slave while the black child is raised as the heir of a plantation owner. As you might expect, the black child grows up bright, articulate, and intelligent. He goes to college but later returns to his home and encounters his childhood friend with whom his mother had exchanged him at birth. This "boy" displays all the characteristics of the classic illiterate slave of the era. Through another twist of fate, the actions of the nanny are brought to light, and the roles of the two young men are reversed, with the African American being sold down river and the European American former fieldhand restored to the status of a Southern gentleman. However, the years of indoctrination are not easily reversed and the story ends with the latter character still being encumbered by the subordinate scripts he has learned so well. The story should provide plenty of discussion material as students explore its many implications.

IV. Using Current Research

A. Analyzing current research like the ethnographic case study can be a very exciting method through which students explore racial issues. My research on Southeast Asian adolescent refugees (Adams, 1989) can provide some interesting examples on acculturation that can help students understand some of the difficulties of acculturation in the U.S.A. Many refugee students end up feeling "lost" or "isolated" in the early stages of their adaptation. This happens more frequently when they make heavy investments in trying to act "white." They often find that a "glass ceiling" limits just how much their peers and society will allow them to assimilate. Part of my study involved a series of interviews with a female Laotian high school student who made this kind of social investment. I will not forget the first time I met her. Her physical appearance was striking, with her trendy clothes, radical looking hair style, and her "down and cool" language. It would be hard to imagine a more acculturated first-generation Laotian adolescent. I looked forward to developing her as an ethnographic informant for my study because her English skills were so advanced.
As the months went by, she began to change. She was having trouble with the European American boys she dated because they seemed only to be interested in her physically. Her biggest disappointment came right before prom when her date for this event left her for a European American girl. This event, combined with other related social problems, including rejection by her Laotian peer group, who thought she was “acting too American,” eventually led her to attempt suicide. The last time I saw her, she showed me the scars on her wrists. I suspect those physical scars have healed by now; the scars on her psyche are another matter.

B. Research by Ogbu (1978, 1987), Fordham (1980, 1988), Gibson (1988), and others suggests there exists a kind of social hierarchy of race-ethnicity in this country that places African American and other people of color in a castelike condition. Ogbu and others have discussed this phenomenon in detail and trace it to the decision to treat African Americans as chattel in the commerce of slavery. This condition and the subsequent rationalization and justification systems developed to support it have not lost their influence on how European Americans see themselves or the way they see any other group of people. All the players in this drama have learned their roles and play the game of superiority and subordination. Charles Lyons (1978) in a provocative article, entitled the “Colonial Mentality,” discusses some of the rationalization and justification arguments.

C. Carlos Cortes, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley who is a frequent keynote speaker and consultant, defines the Societal Curriculum as that, “...massive, ongoing, informal curriculum of family, peer groups, neighborhoods, churches, organizations, occupations, mass media, and other socializing forces that ‘educate’ all of us throughout our lives. Much of this informal education concerns ethnicity and ethnic groups” (1981, pp. 24-25). The pervasiveness of this curriculum reinforces and maintains the superordination of European Americans over Native, African, Asian, and Hispanic Americans through their day-to-day interactions in this country.

A good example of this societal curriculum of superordination-subordination was the prohibition against interracial marriage and the struggle necessary to end it. At one time or another 41 states had miscegenation laws. In the 1940s more than 30 states still prohibited interracial marriage. The final definitive decision was handed down in the Supreme Court case of Loving vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia. In 1992 this case celebrated its 25th anniversary. In an article that appeared in The New York Times, Mrs. Mildred J. Loving was interviewed about this landmark case by David Margolick (1992). He recounts

In the wee hours of one morning in July 1958, the quiet life that Mrs. Loving and her husband, Richard, enjoyed in this remote hamlet was shattered when three law officers opened the unlocked door of their bedroom and shined a flashlight on the couple. What they saw confirmed what they had been told: Mrs. Loving was black and Mr. Loving white, making their marriage illegal in Virginia. “What are you doing in bed with this lady?” Sheriff R. Garnett Brooks of Caroline County asked. Mr. Loving pointed to the wall where the couple had hung their marriage certificate, which was issued in the District of Columbia. “That’s no good here.” Sheriff Brooks replied. He charged the couple with unlawful cohabitation, carried them into nearby Bowling Green and threw them into the county jail. The county circuit judge, Leon M. Bazile sentenced the Lovings to a year in prison, telling them.
“Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, Malay, and red, and he placed them on separate continents and but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages.” But the judge offered the Lovings a deal: they go free as long as they promised to steer clear of Virginia, at least as man and wife, for the next 25 years.

Over the next few years the Lovings exiled themselves to Washington D.C., but finally they made up their minds to fight the injustice the state of Virginia had imposed on them. It would take a long strenuous effort to resolve this issue at each level of the Virginia legal system all the way to the Virginia Supreme Court which upheld the lower courts’ decisions. The issue was finally resolved in favor of the Lovings by the U.S. Supreme Court in June of 1967. At the time of the decision, 17 other states still enforced similar laws.

Conclusion

In this chapter I sought to provide instructors taking on the challenge of teaching about race some practical suggestions on strategies and issues. I am by no means providing exhaustive coverage of this complex and difficult subject. However, I do want to suggest the impact this issue has on U.S.A. society. As we prepare students for the 21st century, how we face the issue of race is likely to affect the quality of life, not only for our country but the world as well. Humankind will either learn to live in equality and equity or perish in our ethnocentrism. As educators we cannot let fear stop us from acting; that is exactly what has allowed the insidious nature of race to wreak havoc in our lives in the past and now. The question that must be asked and finally studied and answered by all teachers is: “What am I doing about it?”
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UNDERSTANDING ASIAN AMERICANS: A NEW PERSPECTIVE

by
Shin Kim

Introduction

Due to the historical pattern of restricting Asian immigration to the United States, Asian Americans were kept to a small number in the past. Until 1960, the number of Asian Americans did not ever reach a million and Asian Americans generally meant only three ethnic groups, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos (Barringer, Gardner, & Levin, 1993). The number and ethnic composition of Asian Americans have been, however, changed greatly by the revision of the U.S. immigration law in 1965. This revision abolished the racially biased immigration quota and widely opened immigration opportunity from the “Third World,” Latin American, and Asian countries. Since then, the number of Asian Americans has rapidly increased and they are now more ethnically diversified. According to the 1980 census, the number of Asian Americans had reached 3.3 million, 1.5% of the total U.S. population. The 1990 census showed their number had jumped to 7 million or 2.8% of the total population in the United States (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988, 1992). In the next century, Asian Americans are projected to become approximately 10% of the total U.S. population (Bouvier & Davis, 1982). In keeping with such a historical change, Asian Americans are increasingly more visible and active in various aspects of U.S. life. So far, however, Asian American life experiences have received very little attention, and attempts to understand those experiences have been limited. With such an increase in numbers, though, it is urgent that more people make an effort to understand Asian Americans based on the new reality of their growing presence and life experiences.

Stereotyped Images

Despite being a racially and culturally distinct group, Asian Americans were ignored for a long period of time in the U.S. literature on racial-ethnic relations. As a result, the public knows very little about the reality of Asian Americans. It seems to think it knows the life experiences of Asian Americans even though its knowledge is based on stereotyped images. Stereotyped images of Asian Americans have guided United States attitudes and behavior toward Asian Americans. Remarkably, unlike any other racial group in the United States, the stereotyped image of Asian Americans is, in recent years, drastically changing from a negative image to a positive one. Whether positive or negative, however, stereotypes are limited and misleading.

From the mid-19th to the mid-20th century, the public image of Asian Americans in the United States was extremely negative. They were depicted as “unassimilable,” “inscrutable,” “cunning,” “filthy” and so on (Chan, 1991; Fugita & O’Brien, 1991; Hurh & Kim, 1990). With such a negative prejudice, the U.S. response to Asian immigrants in the past was simple: “there would be discriminatory legislation prohibiting further immigration and for those already here, barriers to equal participation” (Kitano & Daniels, 1988, p. 5). Under such a political climate, the federal government passed the
Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. This was the only federal law ever enacted in the United States to exclude any voluntary immigrant group from immigration to the United States. Additionally, in the western states, many anti-Asian laws were adopted at the state and local levels, similar to those aimed at African Americans in the South (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988). Asian Americans were not allowed to obtain U. S. citizenship until 1952. As aliens ineligible for citizenship, they could not legally own land for farming. Segregation of public facilities, including schools, was common until World War II (Chan, 1991; Kitano & Daniels, 1988). The general prejudice against Asian Americans eventually led to a massive internment of Japanese Americans at the beginning of World War II in sharp contrast to U. S. treatment of German and Italian Americans (Fugita & O'Brien, 1991).

Since the 1960s, however, a new stereotyped image of Asian Americans has emerged from mass media and scholarly works. They are now characterized as a successful model ethnic group that works hard but quietly, aspires to achieve the United States middle-class dream, and abides by the law (Hurh & Kim, 1990). Such a positive image may boost the psychic ego of Asian Americans, but the positive image of Asian Americans is harmful to Asian Americans almost as much as was the negative image. Since Asian Americans are perceived as a successful group, they are excluded from numerous public and private programs designed to benefit protected classes. Thus with the success image, “they do not have equal access to a number of public services, including police protection, health care, and the court system” (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1992, p. 1) This suggests that in many cases they are no longer treated as a “protected ethnic group.” Yet the public perception of Asian Americans in the United States is contrary to what has happened to Asian Americans in reality and includes a false idea that Asian Americans receive special favors in the United States. The following observation empirically demonstrates this point:

In the spring of 1991, the Wall Street Journal and NBC News conducted a national poll of voters' opinions. The poll revealed that the majority of U. S. voters believe that Asian Americans are not discriminated against in the United States. Some even believe that Asian Americans receive too many special advantages. The poll shows plainly that the general public is largely unaware of the problems Asian Americans confront. (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1992, p. 1)

The positive image disguises or ignores Asian Americans' past and current experiences of discrimination in the United States and unfortunately turns attention away from various social problems, such as poverty and school dropout rates, that currently affect many Asian Americans (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1992, p. 24). These misperceptions also erroneously carry the message that this country is a land of opportunity open equally to any racial-ethnic group. It is also highly divisive for protected ethnic groups. For example, the attitude expressed in “if Asian Americans can make it, why can’t African Americans make it?” (Hurh & Kim, 1990), blames African Americans (victims) for their current deprived life conditions. At the same time, the Asian American success image arouses envy or jealousy that further aggravates the hostility or hatred of African Americans and others toward Asian Americans and results in “Asian bashing” (Kitano & Daniels, 1988).

Whether positive or negative, the stereotyped image conveys a simplistic and distorted picture of Asian Americans devoid of realistic understanding of their life expe-
riences in the United States. A new curriculum on Asian Americans for United States teachers and students based on the historical facts and empirical findings about Asian Americans is, therefore, urgently needed. The development of a new curriculum requires the refinement of the theoretical and conceptual framework of racial-ethnic study and a broadening of the scope of study that goes beyond the traditional bi-racial bias of racial-ethnic studies in the United States.

For a long period of time, study of racial-ethnic relations has been heavily concentrated on the analysis of: (1) life experiences of European immigrants and their descendants; (2) slavery and the discriminatory experiences of African Americans; and (3) the relationship between European Americans and African Americans. Experiences of other racial-ethnic groups such as Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Latino Americans have been grossly neglected. The task of developing a new curriculum on Asian Americans should be, therefore, considered as a part of efforts to examine the structural positions and life experiences of the neglected racial-ethnic groups and their inter-group relationships in the United States, including inter-minority group contact.

The urgency of this task is well demonstrated by the recent racial unrest in Los Angeles after the police trial related to the Rodney King incident. The original event was a confrontation between European American policemen and an African American. But African Americans' protest against the trial verdict turned out to victimize Korean immigrants by burning and/or looting about 2,400 Korean-owned small businesses. This case painfully demonstrates the multiracial nature of United States society and calls for a comprehensive approach to the study of various types of relationships existing between the dominant ethnic group and subordinate ethnic groups and the inter-group relationships among various ethnic groups (Kim, 1991). Without understanding the multiracial nature of United States society, it is extremely difficult to grasp adequately the real life experiences of Asian Americans or any other racial-ethnic group.

**Development of a New Curriculum**

To develop a new curriculum that focuses on the life experiences of Asian Americans and their structural position in the United States, the following six points must be seriously considered: immigration patterns, ethnic diversity among Asian groups, socioeconomic diversity within groups, high educational achievement, experiences of discrimination and civil rights violations, and the complexity of family life.

First, Asian immigration patterns differ from those of other groups. Asian immigration to the United States occurred in two distinct historical stages. In the first stage, from the mid-19th century to the early part of the 20th century, various Asian immigrant groups came to the United States in a sequential order. Chinese immigrants were the first; they came from the mid-19th century until the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882. As Chinese immigration ended, Japanese laborers immigrated to the United States until their immigration was also stopped, this time by the 1907 Gentlemen's Agreement between the Japanese and United States governments. Just prior to this, between 1902 and 1905, approximately 7,000 Korean immigrants arrived at the Hawaiian shore. Then, after the Japanese immigration flow stopped, Filipino workers started to move to the United States until the Great Depression which slowed down the whole immigration flow (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988). This sequential pattern of Asian immigration is a result of conflicts of interest among members of the
dominant group: European American business owners' desire to obtain cheap and reliable labor forces from Asian countries versus intensive prejudice of European American populations against Asian immigrants and the economic interests of European American labor unions (Chan, 1991). From the 1920s to 1965 very little immigration from Asian countries was observed except for a limited number of Filipino workers.

As previously noted, the revision of the U.S. immigration law in 1965 has changed the whole outlook on immigration. Since that revision, the immigration flow has been dominated by people from Asian and Latin American countries, ending the historical pattern of numerical dominance by European immigrants. Like the past European immigrants, almost all of the old and some of the new Asian immigrants are driven by poverty or various types of oppression in their native countries. However, since the revised immigration law gives preferential treatment to professional or skilled workers and family reunion, a high proportion of the current Asian immigrants are professional or skilled workers as shown by the following observation:

Indeed, close to 90 percent of working Indian entrants during the years 1966 through 1975 reported professional backgrounds. Close to 50 percent or more of the working immigrants in the other Asian groups reported professional occupations in the post-1965 period; only small percentages reported laborer as their occupational background.

In recent years, the percentage of high-skilled immigrants in most Asian groups has declined and the percentage of low-skilled immigrants has increased. The change reflects a shift toward a greater admission of relatives, as the population base of foreign-born Asian Americans has grown. Yet, recent Asian entrants remain highly skilled. (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988, p. 2)

We may thus characterize the recent Asian immigration as a middle-class immigration. This is a new phenomenon in the long history of immigration to the United States with the exception of the 1960s Cuban immigration.

Second, Asian Americans are highly diversified ethnically. We need, therefore, to stress the heterogeneity of the current Asian American population (intergroup difference). In addition to several small ethnic groups such as Laotians, Cambodians, Thai, and Hmongs, the six major ethnic groups identified among Asian Americans are the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, South Asians, Filipinos, and Vietnamese. They differ from each other in their immigration history and sociocultural backgrounds. These intergroup variances imply a considerable dissimilarity in their current structural positions in the United States. Since immigration from Japan has been stopped for some time, most of the Japanese Americans in 1990 (71.6%) are native-born. In contrast, nearly 70% or more of those in other Asian ethnic groups are foreign-born. Most of these foreign born came to the United States after 1965 (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988, 1992).

Culturally, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Vietnamese came from the countries where Confucianism and Buddhism have traditionally dominated. Yet a high proportion of the current Koreans and Vietnamese are Christians. Koreans being mostly Protestant and the Vietnamese, Catholics. Japanese immigrants also came to the United States with their native religion, Shintoism (Fugita & O'Brien, 1991). Filipinos are heavily Catholic, while South Asians are Hindu (Chan, 1991). As immigrants, Koreans, South Asians, Chinese, and Vietnamese are very active in self-employed small businesses, but
Filipinos are hardly involved in such businesses. Japanese immigrants were once entrepreneurially very active, but their descendants are currently heavily employed in professional or other white-collar occupations (Fugita & O'Brien, 1991; Kim, Hurh, & Fernandez, 1989; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988).

Third, it should be stressed that members in each of the above ethnic groups are also internally highly differentiated in their socioeconomic status (intragroup difference). Members of the same Asian ethnic group also differ widely in education, from those who have completed college or post-collegiate education to those who have hardly any formal education. Such different educational backgrounds and post-industrial occupational opportunities in the United States result in a high degree of intragroup occupational differentiation. Consequently, members of each Asian ethnic group are distributed among various occupational categories including professional/technical occupations, self-employed small businesses, and low-skilled service or manual occupations (Kim, Hurh, & Fernandez, 1989; Kitano & Daniels, 1988; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988).

Due to such diverse experiences, no single theory of labor market behavior or sociocultural adaptation can possibly explain the experiences of Asian Americans in the United States. As Kitano and Daniels observe, "no one model can encompass the experience of all Asian groups" (1988, p. 7) or all members of any group. Therefore, we need a creative application of the existing theories and development of many new theories for the understanding of the complex life experiences of Asian Americans. In this sense, a study of Asian American experiences offers a rich experimental opportunity to test the adequacy of various existing or new theories of racial-ethnic relations.

Fourth, as mentioned above, Asian Americans currently include a high proportion of those who are well educated. Proportionally more native-born Japanese and Chinese Americans have completed a college education than their European American counterparts in the United States (Hurv & Kim, 1990; Kitano & Daniels, 1988; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988). Also, an unusually high proportion of Asian immigrants had completed college educations in their native countries prior to emigration (Kim, Hurh, & Fernandez, 1989; Strand & Jones, 1985; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988). This illustrates that a large number of Asian Americans possess rich educational and other human capital resources. In their current occupations, however, Asian Americans generally encounter various kinds of subtle discrimination or difficulty such as peripherization, underutilization of personal resources, and the glass ceiling (Hurv & Kim, 1990; U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988, 1992). For example, a recent report summarizes the problems that highly-educated native-born Asian males experience in the U. S. labor market as follows:

For all groups that were studied, American-born Asian men are less likely to be in management positions than their non-Hispanic counterparts. Furthermore, adjusting for occupation and industry, highly educated American-born Asian men in all groups were found to earn less than similarly qualified non-Hispanic white men. These findings raise the possibility that men in all Asian groups face labor market discrimination at the top. (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1988, p.7)

In the U. S. literature of racial-ethnic relations, protected ethnic groups are generally associated with poor human capital resources. Their poor human resources are then identified as a major source of their problems. It is argued that if they overcome their
deficiency in human capital, they will definitely improve their socioeconomic position in the United States. The Asian experience demonstrates that this is not necessarily true. What it shows is that many problems that Asians, Native Americans, African Americans, and Latinos experience currently in the U.S. labor market are due to their subordinate status, not the lack of human capital. As Louis Wirth (1945) argues, such people are singled out for exclusion from full participation in the various aspects of mainstream U.S. life due to their racial or cultural characteristics.

It should be noted that the general perception that protected ethnic groups are poor in human capital resources provides the conceptual base from which the success image of Asian Americans emerges. Based on such a conceptual framework, when Asian Americans are found to be rich in human capital resources, the mainstream mass media and scholars hastily take it as a sign of success. Asian and African Americans are currently engaged in an interesting struggle in responding to the mainstream mass media's portrayal of their respective life conditions. Since the publication of the Moynihan report which blames a "pathological" family system for their current deprived life conditions, African American scholars have been engaged in a long debate, arguing that the family-kinship system of African Americans is not as bad as suggested (McAdoo, 1988; Willie, 1983). In response to the success image of Asian Americans, Asian scholars generally argue that the social-economic position of Asian Americans is not as good as the mainstream mass media report. African and Asian Americans are responding in opposite ways depending on how the mainstream mass media depict them.

Fifth, ignorance of Asian Americans and the pervasive negative and/or positive images of Asian Americans in the United States call our attention to Asian Americans' common experiences of mistreatment and victimization that grossly violate their civil rights. A recent study of Asian Americans stresses that "Asian Americans are frequently victims of racially motivated bigotry and violence" (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1992, p.1). We can illustrate a few such cases. Due to their general ignorance and also perhaps insensitivity, for example, to most people in the United States, Asian Americans look alike. Such an unfortunate perception creates numerous serious problems for Asian Americans. Vietnamese students are placed in Spanish or Filipino bilingual programs. Asian students from various language backgrounds—Chinese, Vietnamese, Laotians, and Samoans—are placed together in one class so that the language of instruction has to be English (Chung, 1988).

The Asian American experience of victimization is tragically demonstrated in the case of Vincent Chin's death in 1982. He was a second generation Chinese American. On the eve of his marriage, he was brutally murdered in Detroit by an unemployed European American auto worker. The auto worker blamed the Japanese auto industry for the loss of his job. As an expression of his resentment against Japan, he happened to locate Vincent Chin at a bar where Chin was having a bachelor party and later killed him. The murderer did not realize that the Chinese and Japanese are ethnically different groups and that Vincent Chin was not Japanese. He apparently associated all Asian Americans with Japan's economic success and resented them. More distressing is the trial verdict. The murderer was convicted in the second trial but very lightly sentenced (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1992). The murderer's act was an expression of individual discrimination against Asian Americans. The trial verdict could be and was read by Asian Americans as an expression of the deep-down institutional racism in
America. In some respects, this verdict closely parallels the first verdict arrived at in the Rodney King-police brutality case.

Though a high proportion of the current Asian Americans, with an exception of the Japanese, are foreign-born, there are nevertheless many native-born Asian Americans in the United States. Furthermore, the number of the native-born is rapidly increasing as children and grandchildren of the Asian immigrants increase in number. But people in the United States generally tend to treat all Asian Americans as foreigners. Curious European, African, or Latino Americans frequently ask Asian Americans, “Where are you from?” When the native-born Asian Americans mention their home state, people are usually not satisfied with the answer and keep asking until they hear the native country of the Asian Americans’ ancestors. This kind of conversation, though perhaps unwittingly, carries a subtle message that Asian Americans do not belong to this country and are basically foreigners no matter how many generations they have lived in the United States.

Sixth, the family life of Asian Americans is much more complicated than is generally assumed. In addition to the usual generation gap, there are language and cultural gaps among different generations in Asian American families because of their different exposure to U.S. society and culture. These multiple gaps are observed in intergenerational relationships between young children and their parents as well as between adult children and their elderly parents. This situation naturally complicates family-kinship relations in Asian immigrant communities since their traditional family-kinship systems are undergoing drastic changes. Yet, the new type of family-kinship system emerging from their life in the United States is not well understood. As the family-kinship system changes, so do the traditional expectations of filial piety and other traditional norms of family-kinship relations (Kim, Kim, & Hurh, 1991). All these situations create numerous types of adjustment problems in Asian immigrant families. Unfortunately, the native-born Asian Americans inherit these complicated family-kinship relations and problems. In addition, they are often burdened by a subtle psychological resentment toward ancestors because of the U.S. public’s treatment of Asian Americans that was mentioned previously.

Conclusion

Asian Americans can no longer be ignored in U.S. society. Their number is increasing rapidly and their activities are becoming more visible. So far, the general public’s perception of Asian Americans is far from reality and often is based on erroneous stereotypes. The treatment, private and public, Asian Americans receive originates from these incorrect perceptions. For a correct understanding of Asian Americans, a reality-based picture of Asian American experience in the United States must be taught.

A new perspective for the correct understanding of Asian Americans must include the six points discussed above with three specific emphases. First, the diversity among Asian Americans must be stressed. Each group differs in terms of immigration history, culture, language, and experiences (intergroup difference). Second, members of a single ethnic group differ in terms of education, occupation, and other socioeconomic experiences, reflecting high intragroup variance. These inter- and intragroup differences call for the development of new theories and curriculums to understand Asian Americans properly. Third, despite this diversity, all Asian Americans are treated as
subordinate, often without benefit of anti-discriminatory programs. As long as they remain racially distinctive, Asian Americans are likely to encounter various discriminations in their lives and to experience additional problems in their family-kinship life.

A curriculum that reflects U.S. society properly must include Asian Americans. Developing such a curriculum is a complicated yet exciting endeavor and calls for innovative and intellectually stimulating approaches if Asian Americans' unique experiences are to be understood and appreciated.
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The United States: Divided and Changing

America is fast becoming a divided nation. The haunting question posed by Rodney King "Can we all get along?" is one that everyone must seriously consider. The rising tide of hate crimes sweeping the country suggests the deep divisions among us. These divisions are affecting interpersonal relationships at work, at school, and at home. This situation will not immediately get better. According to the Hudson Institute's Workforce 2000 report, new workers in the year 2000 will be 85% immigrants, women, and minorities (Johnston, 1987). How prepared are we to integrate effectively these new workers into the workplace? What changes are needed to take advantage of diversity as a competitive strength? Most everyone agrees that to "get along," we must honor cultural diversity, and reject racism, sexism, and classism in all parts of society.

The New Global Economy and Workplace Diversity Skills

The impact of widening race, gender, and class divisions must be addressed if our nation is going to compete successfully in the new global economy of the 21st century. Other nations with more homogeneous populations are able to draw upon common values and norms to mold a competitive work force. The ability to compete in a global marketplace requires that "everyone get along." The ability to cooperate in teams to accomplish predetermined goals is one of the major skills required. To develop this skill in our changing demographic environment means that we must learn to tolerate differences and to appreciate cultural diversity. Though many of today's workers have not been educated to work in diverse environments, corporations in the United States are responding to this challenge with diversity training for frontline workers and managers.

What the Literature Says

A SCANS (Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills) Report for America 2000 lists "Works with Cultural Diversity" (SCANS 1992b, p. 19) as a foundational skill and competency for students and workers who want to succeed in the workplace. Specifically the report specifies that one must work well with men and women, who have a variety of ethnic, social, and educational backgrounds. Demonstrating competence in working with cultural diversity involves understanding one's own culture, those of others, and how they differ; respecting the rights of others, making one's own cultural adjustments and helping others do the same when necessary; basing impressions on individual performance, not on stereotypes; and understanding concerns of members of other ethnic and gender groups (pp. 2-6).

In a related report, the Department of Labor's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills defined the ability to "work well with people from culturally diverse backgrounds" (SCANS, 1992a, p. xiv) as a workplace competency needed for solid job per-
formance. The report reveals that already “one-third of the new entrants into the American labor force are members of minority groups” (p. xvi). Michigan’s Employability Skills Task Force, in developing a model for preparing high school students for a multicultural workplace, listed the ability to “[w]ork in changing settings and with people of differing backgrounds” (Stemmer, 1992, p. 33) as an employability skill.

As more diverse individuals enter the work force, new management skills must also be learned since traditional management techniques are not as effective with culturally diverse work groups as with homogeneous groups (Coleman, 1990). A recent study reveals that 74% of 645 companies polled now consider cultural diversity a corporate concern, and nearly 30% said cultural diversity has begun to affect management (Wilcox, 1991). Former New York state senator and corporate vice president, Linda Winikow, declared: “Our challenge is not only to accommodate diversity, but to actually use it to bring new and richer perspectives to our jobs, to our customers and to our whole social climate” (Winikow, 1991, p. 242).

With the cultural face of our work force changing so significantly, the challenge for managers is to manage in such a way as to achieve maximum productivity from a new “dominant heterogeneous culture” (Thomas, 1990, p. 107), a workplace defined by a composite of many cultures. To be truly competitive the manager of the future must be concerned not with “controlling or containing diversity but . . . enabling every member of the work force to perform to his or her potential” (Thomas, 1990, p. 112).

As a result of the American Disabilities Act the diversity facing managers and workers of the future involves not only diverse ethnic and gender groups, but also many persons with disabilities who previously “were thought to be unemployable” (Ramsey, 1993, p. 11). To negotiate successfully the range of diversity—ethnic, gender, ability—defining the workplace for both managers and workers now and in the future requires education:

Education provides a framework for actions such as developing a business rationale for a diversity program, defining issues, developing consistent terminology, and discussing the nature and origin of biases that interfere with our ability to perceive other people clearly. (Delatte & Baytos, 1993, p. 56)

How are we going to change the way we educate our children and youth to have the “get along” and technical skills necessary for the 21st century? One possible answer being tried nationwide is Tech Prep.

Tech Prep: An Educational Change Agenda

Tech Prep is a major new educational change agenda that educators across the nation are participating in. This educational change movement seeks to develop partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions and the business community that focus on “average students” to prepare them more effectively for the world of work in our changing and diverse technological society. Tech Prep is a federally funded program that works with state education agencies through the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) defines Tech Prep as “an educational path that integrates college preparatory course-work with a rigorous technical education concentration” (ISBE, 1991, p. iii).

Tech Prep “prepares students with the skills and competencies necessary to meet employers’ performance standards not only for entry-level jobs, but also for career ad-
vancement” (ISBE, 1991, p. 3). An Oregon Tech Prep/Associate Degree Program describes its model as an “alternative curriculum to the college prep/baccalaureate degree course of study, that prepares the student for highly skilled occupations that allow either direct entry into the workplace as a qualified technician or continuation of further education” (Oregon, 1992, p. 2). A national position paper prepared by the National Tech Prep Network (NTPN) states “that Tech Prep will ‘prepare better educated workers with advanced skills and ability to transfer skills as technology changes’” (1992, p. 2). All of the state models aim to prepare secondary and post-secondary students for the workplace of tomorrow.

Tech Prep is seen as the training path for skilled labor to compete in tomorrow’s market. The programs are aimed at an integration of technical and academic curriculum in order to meet the needs of employers in the new world economy (ISBE, 1991). The programs call for business/industry and education partnerships (ISBE, 1991: NTPN, 1992; Oregon, 1992). If these partnerships are to be successful Tech Prep must give students the skills that employers require, skills that include working productively in multicultural environments.

While some diversity education is currently taking place in the work environment, employers are expressing a need for future workers who can be part of self-directed teams composed of workers with diverse cultural backgrounds. If Tech Prep is truly interested in preparing students for the challenges of such a work environment, diversity education and training must be an essential part of its program.

**Tech Prep: Preparation for Work Force Diversity?**

We are concerned that the emphasis on technical skills is overshadowing the need for problem solving and interpersonal skills that are essential in a diverse workplace. Workers need both kinds of skills. A D acum Matrix of Occupational Competencies developed for one Tech Prep initiative in Illinois listed various skills to be developed (Black Hawk College, 1990). While general interpersonal skills, appropriate social behavior, teamwork, and leadership skills were identified, the matrix did not point out the need for students to possess the ability to understand and work in a culturally diverse work force. While Tech Prep programs concentrate on the need to integrate math, science, and communication skills into our technical training of students, little attention seems to be given to training students to appreciate and understand diversity. In reviewing the agendas from several past national Tech Prep conferences, only a few topics could be considered to be dealing directly with preparing for work force diversity.

We suggest that an essential part of any Tech Prep program is an introduction to and training in the area of cultural diversity. Specific course work can be designed to address the changing face and challenges of the workplace. Issues that should be addressed include gender relations, ethnic differences, and working with individuals with disabilities. Workers of tomorrow will find themselves side by side with women and men from many cultures and countries, some with disabilities. The strength of the work force in this country will depend on the ability of these diverse individuals to build cohesive teams.

Moreover, as workers advance in their technical field they will find themselves supervising men and women, members of different ethnic groups and persons with disabilities. Linda Winikow clearly states that “... corporate managers must respect these...
cultural differences. If we don’t respect them, who will? If we don’t value differences, can we expect harmony among others? (1991, p. 243). To be effective, Tech Prep must include preparation for interaction with co-workers from culturally diverse backgrounds.

Lessons Learned from Corporate Diversity Training

Diversity training must go beyond awareness if we are to make a difference in combating cross-cultural misunderstanding. Awareness workshops are helpful up to a point, yet they are not a substitute for an integrated diversity skill based program. In fact, some awareness programs do more harm than good. Diversity training tends to fall into one of two areas: 1) programs that concentrate on policy issues related to the workplace, and 2) programs that stress developing an understanding of diversity. The first are usually geared to administrators and inform them of legal issues, such as equal opportunity questions. The second attempt to heighten individual awareness of cultural differences and focus on what it’s like to be discriminated against, misunderstood, and stereotyped (Karp & Sutton, 1993).

Often diversity training programs emphasize the European American majority as the only problem. All problems of minorities in the United States are blamed on 200 years of racism. Such a historical approach tends to try to change behavior based on guilt. European American males are targeted as the primary problem, in most need of diversity training (Karp & Sutton, 1993). While they certainly do need training, everyone in the workplace needs skills in diversity. “It’s just as important that a black female manager be aware of how she may be affecting a white male subordinate as it is for the white male to be aware of the impact of his behavior on her” (Karp & Sutton, 1993, p. 32). Training should involve everyone and include the opportunity for all participants to explore and celebrate their own culture and roots.

Diversity Programs in Schools

Human relations programs in secondary and post-secondary schools do not do an adequate job of preparing students for the diverse multi-ethnic world. Much more needs to be done. Conflict in schools between students of different ethnic backgrounds is an ongoing problem. The existing human relations programs tend to be targeted towards gifted and college prep students, not the noncollege-bound middle 50% of students likely to be in Tech Prep. Schools need to revise their curriculum and teaching methods to develop essential cross-cultural coping skills. Staff development for teachers and administrators in multicultural education provides an excellent opportunity to start an awareness program. We suggest that diversity training move beyond awareness (changing attitudes) to skill building (changing behavior). As the literature we cite below clearly shows, more than a change in attitude is necessary in a heterogeneous workplace. Appropriate skills must be developed to work effectively with individuals from diverse cultures.

If new models are to be successful for Tech Prep, lessons from corporate diversity training programs must be taken seriously. Educators need to be exposed to workplace issues like diversity management so they can make these issues part of their teaching agenda. Such a real world orientation is part of the Tech Prep philosophy even though little has been done so far to make the reality of our pluralist society a part of Tech Prep.
programs. An increased emphasis on cultural diversity is needed if those programs are really going to prepare our youth for today's and tomorrow's workplace.

Societal Curriculum and Education

The strength of the societal curriculum is so strong that young people are being exposed to and are often absorbing thousands of stereotyped messages every day from movies, advertisements, radio, TV, magazines, the family, and neighborhood peers that counter rather than support cross-cultural communication. The schools have failed to adequately combat this societal curriculum and mitigate its impact on students. Schools need to have diversity training that allow young people to understand and to develop skills not only so they can identify the stereotyped messages of the societal curriculum, but also so they can make intelligent decisions concerning the biases they engender.

Cross-Cultural Communication and Conflict Resolution: Essential Components of a Diversity Training Program

According to Sybil Evans, a consultant in the field of workplace diversity, the following three areas are essential for a successful school diversity training program: 1) cross-cultural communication, 2) the ability to deal effectively with differences, and 3) conflict resolution in cross-cultural contexts (1993). Cross-cultural communication skills are necessary to resolve conflicts in organizational work settings. Understanding how to solve conflicts is made more difficult by cultural differences, including different communication styles and cultural values that affect interaction and understanding between people. Evans suggests several cross-cultural management skills that are needed during the conflict resolution process:

1) Distinguishing between individual personality differences and cultural differences,
2) Developing sensitivity in gathering and using information about cultural assumptions,
3) Accepting that one's own knowledge and perceptions are relative. (1993, p. 3)

These skills enable individuals to communicate unencumbered by biases and predispositions and to avoid actions that block cross-cultural interaction.

Evans (1993) goes on to suggest five steps to resolve conflict, providing a model teachers may want to adopt or adapt to Tech Prep (and other) diversity training that emphasizes conflict resolution and cross-cultural communication.
Evans' approach stresses step-by-step movement that avoids confrontation while promoting communication and leading to positive solutions to the issue at hand.

Conclusion

The work force in the United States is no longer the "... homogeneous white, male oriented workforce it once was" (Winikow, 1991, p. 242). If we are to prepare the workers of tomorrow to excel in the workplace we must prepare them for a new multicultural environment. Understanding of and respect for diversity must be inculcated into tomorrow's labor force and its leaders. Tech Prep is in the forefront of giving students the skills they will need to succeed in this new U. S. workplace. Since being comfortable with diversity is one of those essential skills, if students are to develop the necessary life skill of "getting along with others," renewed emphasis on cross-cultural communication and conflict resolution is needed. Tech Prep can offer some new approaches to prepare our youth for the diverse workplace if schools, community colleges, and business leaders make successful interaction across cultures a priority.
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There is an urgent need for the issues, problems, successes, and failures important to the implementation of education that is multicultural to be objectively and systematically analyzed and discussed. (Grant, 1992, pp. 436-437)

Over the last thirty years, education at the primary and secondary levels increasingly has reflected and promoted a multicultural perspective. This perspective, compared to earlier, "Anglo-conformity" models (Gordon, 1964), strives to enhance students' understanding of diversity and their knowledge of groups whose contributions to society generally have been ignored.

Comparable changes have occurred at the college and university level, where attempts to integrate multicultural perspectives are frequently termed "curriculum transformation." Noting the proliferation of curriculum transformation projects implemented in the past decade (Andersen, 1987), authors have commented in particular on the great variety characterizing these efforts (Mahlstedt & Bloom, 1992), which range from the modification of a single course (Whitten, 1993) to the transformation of academic majors (Koester & Lustig, 1991) and of the core curriculum (Francis, 1991). Similarly, there is no common philosophy underlying these efforts, although they do assume that education traditionally has stressed dominant group experiences and excluded those of subordinate groups. Therefore, one goal of all curriculum transformation efforts is to challenge this exclusionary approach and produce a "reconstructed curriculum based on knowledge that refuses to privilege one group's experiences over another" (Collins, 1991, p. 368).

The present chapter reviews published assessment information from multicultural curriculum initiatives in our nation's colleges. A wide range of measures are included in order to assist readers interested in evaluating their own multicultural courses or programs. One basic premise of the chapter is that, to this point, faculty involved in curriculum transformation have not tested adequately the effectiveness of this important work. As a result, while it is common for these individuals to report positive outcomes, evidence used to support this claim is often anecdotal. Another premise is that the assessment of multicultural curriculum initiatives need not be an overwhelming task. In fact, educators can build evaluation into these initiatives with relative ease, by attending carefully from the outset to project objectives, strategies for meeting those objectives, and ways of measuring outcomes. By so doing, those engaged in curriculum transformation can prove what is already self-evident to them: This work significantly improves the college curriculum as well as contributes positively to the campus climate overall.
The Assessment of Multicultural Curriculum Initiatives in Higher Education: Current Status

Almost ten years ago Tetreault (1985), commenting on projects to integrate gender issues into the college curriculum, observed that virtually all available information was descriptive, not evaluative. Today, while more evaluative data exist, many authors still fail to report on the outcomes of their curriculum transformation efforts (Bohmer & Briggs, 1991; Lee, 1993, Whitten, 1993).

Of course, this situation reflects a general trend in higher education, where assessment has only recently become a mainstream issue on college campuses (Astin, 1991). As Musil (1992) suggests, however, multicultural educators would be wise to contribute significantly to higher education’s current “climate of accountability” (p. 4). That is, at a time when critics freely distort multiculturalism as political correctness (Cheney, 1992), curriculum transformation efforts that are not evaluated systematically may become increasingly more difficult for colleges to support. In short, assessment provides an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the value of these efforts to a liberal arts education and thus ensure their continued place in the curriculum.

The present section reviews available assessment information on curriculum transformation attempts, at both the course and program levels. While this review is not exhaustive, selected articles are representative of the transformation literature and were included because they describe a wide range of measures—both quantitative and qualitative—used in the evaluation of multicultural curriculum initiatives. Generally, these measures have focused on course or program content, student and faculty attitudes, changes in students’ personal and skill development, and pedagogical strategies.

Course Assessment

Although hundreds of articles published in the past ten years describe attempts to integrate multicultural content into individual college courses, few report non-anecdotal evaluation outcomes. Capu/za (1992), reporting on an effort to integrate gender, race and class issues into a communications studies course, found that students answered correctly a higher percentage of exam questions related to these issues compared to items pertaining to more traditional course topics. Also, almost 25% of the students chose to do their term papers on gender, race, and class. Capuzza interpreted these results as indicating high student interest in these issues.

Student reactions to multicultural course content have also been evaluated, typically through the use of class journals and questionnaires. Keliermeier (1992), describing attempts to rewrite problems in a Statistics course to reflect cultural diversity, found that most students responded very positively, citing the relevance of the new problems compared to traditional questions. Matlin (1989) reported that students in Psychology of Women courses expressed strong emotional reactions—both positive and negative—to these courses, especially when taught by female professors.

In a more extensive study of student attitudes, Hartung (1990) compared reactions to required ethnic studies and women’s studies courses with their reactions to other required general education courses. The data showed that, overall, ethnic studies and women’s studies courses received the second most positive ranking. Instructors in these courses, however, received a relatively high proportion of personalized, negative comments (e.g., “man-hater,” “reverse racist”). On this basis, Hartung suggested that eth-
nic studies and women's studies instructors are evaluated on dimensions other than teaching ability.

A final aspect of students' attitudes toward multicultural courses involves their reaction to class format and climate. Matlin (1989) reported in her survey of 230 Psychology of Women courses that students responded positively to the class dynamics typifying those courses. More specifically, Capuzza (1992), in evaluating her communications studies course which integrated gender, race, and class issues, found that students enjoyed in particular the course's atmosphere of tolerance and the opportunity to discuss personal experiences. Research on faculty members' attitudes toward teaching these kinds of courses reveals similar findings. Almost all of the Psychology of Women instructors in Matlin's (1989) study said that they enjoyed teaching this class more than their other courses. Faculty at all-female colleges reported particularly high levels of satisfaction.

Substantial interest has been shown in changes in students' personal development as a result of enrollment in multicultural courses with much of this information provided from evaluations of gender studies courses. Generally these studies have relied on standardized tests such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974), a self-descriptive measure of subjects' masculinity and femininity, and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence & Helmreich, 1972), which evaluates subjects' feelings about women's roles. Vedovato and Vaughter (1980), using the BSRI and AWS, found that women enrolled in a Psychology of Women course exhibited a shift from a feminine to an androgynous self-description as well as more liberal attitudes about women's roles at the end of the course while male students showed no change.

Bargad and Hyde (1991) developed the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS) to assess individuals' conceptions of feminism and of themselves as feminists, and administered it to female students enrolled in women's studies courses. Compared to control subjects, these students reported more positive attitudes toward feminism and were more likely to view themselves as feminists after taking these courses. Taking a different approach, Pence (1992) developed the Attitudes Toward Men Scale (AMS) and administered it to women enrolled in women's studies courses using a pre- and post-test design. These females showed a significant increase in their acceptance of nontraditional masculine behaviors in men as well as in positive attitudes toward men generally. According to Pence, these results dispel the idea that women's studies courses promote negative attitudes toward men, an argument that is used often to marginalize these classes. Finally, Stake and Gerner (1987) reported that enrollment in women's studies courses affect the personal growth of both women and men, as assessed by the Performance Self Esteem Scale (PSES) (Stake, 1979) and qualitative measures of educational and job certainty and motivation. Compared to students enrolled in non-women's studies classes, both males and females in the women's studies courses showed significant positive changes in self-esteem scores as well as higher job motivation and certainty.

In explaining their findings, Stake and Gerner (1987) suggest that students in women's studies courses benefit in particular from the more process oriented techniques (e.g., student participation, egalitarian faculty-student relationships) that these instructors tend to use, a suggestion that is corroborated by evaluations of faculty who teach these courses. For example, in Matlin's (1989) study of Psychology of Women cours-
es, she found that these instructors were much more likely to see class discussions and films as opposed to lectures. Similarly, Brown (1992) surveyed over 200 women's studies instructors and found that they attempted to provide a more democratic classroom atmosphere, grant more authority to students, encourage class participation, and lecture less in these classes. These findings support the notion that courses that infuse multicultural content are likely to be characterized by somewhat specialized pedagogical approaches compared to more traditional classes (Lee, 1993; Maher, 1985).

To conclude, a wide range of measures has been used in attempts to demonstrate the effectiveness of multicultural curriculum initiatives at the course level. Neglected areas include student interaction and skill development, although several authors have offered suggestions for developing such measures. Williams (1991), for example, describes several success indicators (e.g., decreases in ethnic slurs and stereotypes, increases in inter-ethnic contact outside the class) in his work on cooperative learning in culturally diverse classrooms. Also, Hood (1991) offers alternative methods for assessing academic progress, particularly for ethnically diverse students.

**Program Assessment**

Since the early 1980s, numerous curriculum projects have been implemented in an effort to integrate multicultural issues at the program level. Unfortunately, as with individual courses, non-anecdotal assessment information is the exception rather than the rule. Also, much of this work has been conducted in the area of gender studies, although all of the reviewed projects have also attempted to infuse other issues (e.g., race, ethnicity, social class, sexual orientation) into the curriculum.

In one early report, Schmitz (1984) described measures used in evaluating a gender integration project at Montana State University as well as the Northern Rockies Program on Women in the Curriculum, a consortium project. These measures included pre- and post-tests of students' perceptions of course content on women's issues, attitude changes in participating faculty compared to controls (using the AWS), classroom behaviors (e.g., modifications in language), self-reported increases in consciousness by faculty, and increased research activity by faculty on women's and gender issues. One year later, Schmitz, Dinnerstein and Mairs (1985) reported evaluative information obtained from these projects as well as from a transformation project at the University of Arizona. According to Schmitz et al., students reported an increase in content on women in target courses as well as a decrease in misconceptions about women. Further, faculty project participants demonstrated significant positive changes in AWS scores compared to controls, communication between faculty and administrators interested in women's scholarship increased, and faculty members became more aware of gender bias in higher education.

Beck, Greer, Jackson, and Schmitz (1990) described a project at the University of Maryland at College Park to transform the curriculum through the incorporation of ethnic studies and women's studies. This project's assessment plan appears quite comprehensive, including measures of faculty-student interactions, faculty perceptions, and course-teacher evaluations. In addition, broader assessments of the campus's multicultural climate are planned. In the 1990 report, however, project evaluation was only in the preliminary stages.
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To date, the most comprehensive assessment of curriculum transformation efforts has occurred through a FIPSE-supported project entitled “The Courage to Question: Women’s Studies and Student Learning” (Musil, 1992a, 1992b). This project, which involved seven women’s studies programs across a three-year period, was unique in that it was based on non-traditional notions of assessment. These ideas have best been presented by Shapiro (1988), who argues that traditional assessment is insufficiently eclectic and too inflexible to be useful in evaluating multicultural curricula. She notes that traditional assessment erroneously assumes that evaluation is a neutral process, is often based on exclusionary sampling techniques, and relies excessively on quantitative data. Instead, Shapiro proposes a system of “participatory” evaluation, in which evaluators make an effort to establish trust with those being evaluated, to include anyone who wants to provide feedback, and to use a mixture of quantitative and qualitative techniques.

The assessment procedures utilized in the “Courage to Question” project are summarized in Musil (1992b), while its results can be found in Musil (1992a). It is far beyond the scope of this chapter to summarize these reports, but it should be noted that a thorough mix of assessment procedures was used. Qualitative data were collected through ethnographic techniques, transcripts and observations of class discussion, textual analysis, portfolios, and student/faculty interviews, while quantitative procedures were utilized in collecting information such as course/program enrollments and students’ course-teacher evaluations. Also, while results varied across campuses, the evaluations showed generally that the women’s studies programs were contributing significantly and positively to the participating campuses.

Finally, several colleges have attempted to transform their general education program through the infusion of multiculturalism. Pryse (1992) described such an effort at SUNY College at Plattsburgh, in which all general education instructors—except for those in the sciences—were required to include women and ethnic minorities in their course syllabi and teaching materials. Pryse reported that approximately one-third of the entire faculty participated in this project: no other evaluative information was provided.

Another attempt to transform the general education curriculum has occurred here at SUNY College at Cortland, where beginning in Fall 1988 freshmen were required to take one of several courses in a general education category on prejudice and discrimination. According to category objectives, these courses should cover the following topics: the causes of prejudice and discrimination; prejudice and discrimination at the individual and institutional levels; prejudice and discrimination in the United States and other societies; the relationship between prejudice and discrimination and the oppression of subordinate groups; prejudice and discrimination in both historical and contemporary contexts; and students’ own behaviors and beliefs regarding prejudice and discrimination. Further, these courses are expected to cover prejudice and discrimination from multiple perspectives: while they are to emphasize racism and sexism, they should also incorporate other forms of oppression.

To this point, two waves of assessment data on the category have been analyzed. In Spring 1991 and Spring 1992 a questionnaire was administered to students assessing the degree to which category objectives were being met. A scale from 1 to 5 was used, with higher ratings indicating more emphasis on a particular objective. Overall data
from both administrations revealed that all content objectives were being met. Specifically, all mean ratings exceeded the midpoint of 3, with most ratings approaching or exceeding a 4 rating. Students also reported that these courses were approaching prejudice and discrimination from a number of perspectives (e.g., psychological, sociological, moral, economic, and political), suggesting that these courses are meeting the desired criterion of interdisciplinarity. Finally, in Spring 1992, questions were added to assess students’ attitudes toward the prejudice and discrimination category, using a scale ranging from 1 to 5 with higher scores reflecting more affirmative reactions. Results were overwhelmingly positive, with students indicating that they felt comfortable expressing their views in these classes (M = 3.63), that the issues of prejudice and discrimination were important to address in the college curriculum (M = 3.97), and that Cortland College was correct to require its students to take such a course (M = 3.85).

In summary, existing data suggest that attempts to infuse academic programs with more pluralistic perspectives have been relatively successful, although the paucity of that data is a concern. There are a number of excellent theoretical discussions of multicultural program evaluation, especially with respect to the formation of clear goals and objectives (Penelton, 1991). Also, the reader is referred to Tolpin (1984) and Hyers (1992) for comprehensive listings of possible assessment measures when evaluating these programs.

Conclusions

The preceding review reveals that, almost ten years after Tetreault’s (1985) observations, the assessment of multicultural curriculum initiatives remains more descriptive than evaluative. Further, much of the evaluative information has come from work in gender studies. The appropriateness of generalizing these findings to other types of transformation efforts, such as those that infuse issues related to race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, is not clear. Using these efforts in women’s studies as a beginning point in the evaluation of other projects, however, would appear to make a great deal of sense.

Despite the deficiencies in this area of evaluation, it is important to acknowledge that progress has been made toward demonstrating the effectiveness of multicultural education in our colleges and universities. Specifically, educators have utilized a wide range of measures in their evaluation efforts and, in most cases, positive results have been reported. Further, the potential effects of curriculum transformation appear to go beyond student learning in the classroom. Rather, evidence suggests that the infusion of multiculturalism has positive implications for students’ and faculty members’ attitudes and interpersonal development, pedagogical strategies, and more institution-wide concerns such as faculty-administrator communication. Perhaps most significant, these infusion efforts seem to be resulting in reconceptualizations in the curriculum evaluation process itself, as exemplified by the work of Shapiro (1988) and Tetreault (1985), among others. These alternative assessment tools, together with the empirical studies described in the present review, provide an excellent foundation for those interested in evaluating their own multicultural curriculum initiatives. In short, we know these initiatives improve the college curriculum. Now all we have to do is prove it!
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Section III: 
Creating the Climate for Change
A serious shortage of engineers and other technically trained professionals has been projected to occur in the United States prior to the turn of the century. Yet, there has been a recent decline in the number of engineering degrees awarded in the United States (Ellis, 1992). Moreover, while 53% of students in college are female and 14% are African American, Native American, or Hispanic, in the field of engineering, only 16% of graduates are female and 8% are from the aforementioned minority groups. If this disparity alone were eliminated, i.e., these groups entered and completed engineering degrees at the same rate European American males did, significant progress would be made toward addressing the projected shortfall in technical professionals. Eliminating this disparity between the numbers of European American males and others interested in engineering will become even more important as the proportion of college students who are female and minority grows relative to the proportion who are European American males. A recent study by Ellis (1992), the Director of Manpower Studies for American Association of Engineering Societies, shows that in fact slight increases in the proportion of females and minorities pursuing engineering degrees has occurred over the past two years.

Engineering schools around the country are trying to figure out how to attract and keep even more students in engineering, particularly minority and female students. A key factor in both retention and recruiting is the campus climate. "Campus climate embraces the culture, habits, decisions, practices, and policies that make up campus life. It is the sum total of the daily environment, and central to the 'comfort factor' that minority students, faculty, staff and administrators experience on campus" (American Council on Education, 1989, p. 113). A good climate can facilitate success. A poor climate can lead to difficulty attracting and retaining new students from diverse backgrounds. In fact, a poor climate can diminish the learning of all students. Moreover, intense racial conflict, triggered by relatively minor incidents, is more likely to occur on campuses with a poor climate.

This paper summarizes a study of the campus climate at a midwestern technological university. Beyond determining the climate, another key objective of this study was to educate the greater campus community in a nonthreatening and persuasive way about the experience of minority students, staff, and faculty who come from ethnically diverse backgrounds. A committee conducted the study. This approach had advantages in gaining participation in the study and acceptance of the results and recommendations. The methodology is outlined below so that it might be considered for implementation elsewhere. The results are also summarized at length so they might contribute to our understanding of the experience of ethnically diverse students at traditionally white institutions. They reveal divergent perceptions of the climate by students based on their ethnicity. They converge with other studies pointing to the critical role faculty play in the retention of minority engineering students, particularly African American students.
Objectives

In 1988, the University of Missouri-Rolla (UMR) Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Advisory Committee (AAAC), with the strong support of the Chancellor, undertook a study of the campus climate for minorities. A campus-level committee reporting to the Chancellor and comprised of key vice chancellors and directors, eight students and five faculty members, the AAAC is chaired by the Affirmative Action Officer. The objectives of the committee’s study were to “1) assess the climate for minorities; 2) increase the campus awareness of, sensitivity to, and discussion of, the climate for minorities; 3) identify changes that should be made to improve the climate; and 4) suggest means of accomplishing those changes.”

Student Demographics

During the time the climate study was conducted, there were just over 4800 students on campus, 86% of them enrolled as undergraduates. UMR is like many engineering schools: a traditionally white male institution. During the time of the study, no other group comprised more than 5% of the student body.

During the 1988-89 academic year, plans were made for the study, and selected individuals were interviewed by the committee concerning their experiences as minorities on the UMR campus. Plans for the second year were to conduct a survey of African American alumni and coordinate a series of open forums on campus for the discussion of the campus climate. The third year was for committee deliberation and the formulation of recommendations. The final report (Riordan, 1991) was circulated widely on campus and in the university system and was mailed to interested groups of UMR alumni. The focus of this report is the results of our data-gathering activities—a series of campus forums and an alumni survey to assess the climate for minority students.

Forums on Campus Climate for Minorities

Open forums were scheduled for afternoons and were open to all staff, students, faculty, and administrators. They were widely advertised; printed publicity mentioned the opportunity to submit questions anonymously beforehand in boxes placed around campus. Each forum began with a structured presentation, led by student, faculty, or staff facilitators, followed by an open discussion. Introductory presentations dealt with topics like: what it is like to be different; what if offices dealing with minority students became “mini universities” handling virtually all functions relative to minority students; and what were individuals’ earliest experiences of racism. Ground rules for the discussions were outlined: speakers had to be recognized by a moderator before speaking, and individuals not present were not to be criticized by name.

Classroom Climate

With respect to the climate in classrooms, a number of themes emerged. First, some minority students seemed hesitant to approach professors because they questioned the support faculty members would extend to minority students. Students also mentioned some professors being inhospitable to them during their office hours. Students perceived this as possible evidence of racism. Some faculty and administrators in attendance suggested that those faculty members might be treating all students that way.
A common complaint by minority students was that faculty had low expectations for their performance. Students felt this was revealed when a faculty member was quick to jump to the conclusion a minority student had cheated; seemed too surprised when the minority student performed well; or was very curious about where the student had gone to high school as if somehow he or she was better prepared academically than the faculty member had expected. Some students felt faculty members were unwilling to answer their questions in class and assumed the professors didn’t have the confidence minority students could understand the material with a quick explanation. A number of students reported feeling professors—and other students—were more closely scrutinizing their behavior which made them feel uneasy.

Some students spoke about how they coped with these perceptions. They felt they needed to do better than other students in order to be accepted and to disconfirm instructors’ low expectancy for their academic performance. Moreover, a number of students seemed to feel a need to prove they could succeed without any help: they could make it on their own and didn’t need anyone else’s help, especially that of a teacher who doubted their ability.

Being the only African American (or female) in a class or lab was raised as a concern a number of times. Students in this situation reported feeling conspicuous and isolated. They had difficulty forming relationships with other students and even knowing where to sit in such classes.

Climate Outside the Classroom

With respect to the overall climate on campus, the issues of racial polarization and the realities of “feeling different” arose. Reactions to racial polarization and segregation differed roughly along racial lines. Minority students saw obstacles and non-minority students saw few real problems.

A number of white students voiced their opinion that many of the concerns being raised by the black students were exaggerated and might be only in their minds. For example, they told a black female who felt uncomfortable when visiting her lab partner in his white fraternity house that everyone felt uncomfortable going into a fraternity house unless they were a member of, or frequently visited, that fraternity. Often, they said, the discomfort is in the mind of the person, not the result of how others are treating them.

There seemed to be an underlying feeling among many white students that simply acknowledging or talking about differences could not better race relations. “If you think you are different then you are doomed to be by yourself or with your own little group. I think that is your own problem. I don’t think it is all the majority’s fault. I don’t think they should breed more minorities so you will have more friends and kill off all the majorities so that it is even.”

A number of comments by white students said the minorities needed to become more like the majority. Others felt that the people in the room were not the ones with the problem: it was people not in attendance. This was countered with, “The people who are here do need to be here because they are learning and then they can help someone else understand.”

Another concern raised had to do with campus programming and student organizations. A number of students complained that programming by the student groups did
not target interests of the minority community. Furthermore, they felt most student organizations and campus functions were largely segregated.

Finally, there was also a discussion of Affirmative Action. A student in attendance eloquently clarified some of its history and purposes. Other comments clearly reflected the backlash against Affirmative Action: “Once you get on the defensive, you can’t get anything accomplished for a better cause. A lot of laws today are making people get on the defensive.”

**Summary of the Findings**

The predominantly white faculty, staff, and student body, as well as experiences gained with segregation and discrimination in the larger society, fostered doubt in the minority students’ minds that made them ready to interpret even ambiguous situations as evidence of prejudice. Additionally they reported feeling instructors’ perceptions of their ability were low and some minority students reported adopting avoidance or over-compensation as strategies to deal with the perceived prejudice.

A salient impression was the divergence along racial lines of the perceptions of the climate and desirable remedies. Minorities thought the climate was chillier for them than did non-minorities. Minorities saw discussion and action as remedies while many non-minorities felt such an approach would only heighten tensions.

**Survey of African American Alumni**

**Methodology**

The purpose of the survey was to assess African American alumni perceptions of the social and academic climate during the time they attended college and their current reflections on those years given the benefit of their broader range of experience. African Americans were selected because there had been more African American graduates than other minority graduates, yet they were still the most underrepresented group. Three hundred surveys were bulk-mailed in May 1989. A second mailing in June yielded an overall return rate of 38% which was considered adequate. A randomly selected comparison group of non-minority alumni, matched by major and year of graduation, was obtained and a similar survey mailed. Responses for most of the survey items can be seen in Figure 1. Items with an asterisk are ones for which differences between African Americans and non-minorities differed significantly according to an analysis of variance.
### Academic Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel academically isolated at UMR?</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel the course work at UMR was</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnecessarily difficult?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel academically prepared?</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your instructors doubt your ability to</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>succeed at UMR?*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Support and Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared to your present work environment, how would you rate the social</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment at UMR?*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to other universities, how would you rate the social environment</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at UMR?**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel socially isolated at UMR?*</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on your experiences at UMR, how would you rate the social</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment?**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How supportive were the faculty at UMR?*</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How supportive were the staff at UMR?*</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Long-Range Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What effect did UMR have on your self-confidence?</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you recommend UMR to young people as a good place to go?*</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Evaluation of Campus

When alumni gave their general reactions to the campus, their views were very positive. Alumni felt that overall their college experience had had a somewhat positive effect on their self-confidence; this was equally true for African American and non-minority alumni. Comments throughout the surveys suggested alumni felt proud of their success in having met the challenges—particularly the academic challenges. This may be the factor that produced the positive impact on their self-confidence they attribute to their college experience.

When asked whether they recommend this university to young people as a good place to go to school, the response was also quite positive. African American alumni, who were less likely to recommend it, still were more likely to say they would recommend it than not.

Specific Evaluations

In general, African American alumni views of the campus were not as positive as those of the non-minority alumni, although, some of these differences were not large enough to be considered statistically reliable. One large difference was African American alumni perceived that instructors doubted their ability more than the ability of majority students in their classes. Also, African American students themselves felt they were less well prepared academically than other students.

Alumni did not see the faculty and staff as a whole as being particularly supportive or unsupportive. African American alumni perceived faculty had been significantly less supportive than did non-minority alumni. Comments from the forums and written comments from the surveys suggest that many African American students had had bad experiences with one or two faculty, and possibly no very good relationships to balance those out.

Although alumni rated various aspects of the social environment fairly low, we have been told by some consultants our students' views of the social environment are actually quite positive according to national standards (Dehne, 1990). Nevertheless, African American alumni's responses were significantly lower on each dimension than were those of non-minorities. They felt more socially isolated and felt their current work environments and environments at other universities were more supportive of minorities.

What Makes a Good Professor

Respondents also described the important characteristics of a really good professor. Their answers dealt largely with professor characteristics that would foster the development of relationships with students rather than particular teaching styles or activities. Over half of the comments (53%) mentioned a sensitive, caring attitude on the part of the instructor. Also mentioned were knowledge of the subject taught and its real world applications (34%), fairness and a lack of prejudice (29%), availability outside of class (27%), good communication skills (21%), enthusiasm or dedication (21%), providing a challenge for students (8%), and being organized (7%). Responses given by non-minority alumni focused almost exclusively on content knowledge (67%) and organization (42%) as traits making a good professor.
Advice for Current Students

When asked to give a few bits of unsolicited advice to current African American students at UMR, alumni emphasized the importance of studying hard (40%) and being persistent (38%). Some alumni also recommended getting involved in a number of campus organizations or activities—especially non-minority activities—to learn interpersonal skills important for the working world (19%). With equal frequency (18%), current students were advised to get involved in study groups and to help support each other. Eighteen percent of the respondents told students that they would have to endure a tough time because of the social environment in Rolla. Finally, students were advised to seek help when they needed it, to be persistent in getting it, and not to stand for rebuffs.

Advice for Faculty and Administration

Alumni were also asked to give a few bits of unsolicited advice to faculty and administrators. Over half of the comments (51%) asked faculty and administrators to stop discriminatory treatment of one kind or another. They wanted all students to be treated fairly, equally, the same, or without regard to color. One alum said, “Don’t assume all black students are lazy because you had one ten years ago. You would not lump white students together like that.”

Forty-three percent asked faculty and administrators to take a more active role in encouraging and helping minority students. A few of the specific recommendations offered were developing personal relationships with minority students, showing concern, talking to minority students, and involving them in classroom discussions and leadership roles. Sixteen percent of the responses mentioned improving the social environment and making it supportive of a diverse student body. Only nine percent of the responses mentioned the need to diversify the faculty.

Summary of the Findings

When we looked at the study results, we were somewhat reassured that the problems minority students were facing at this university were no worse than ones minorities often report at traditionally European American institutions (Altbach, 1990; Astin & Cross, 1981; McBay, 1986). In fact, there were fewer incidents of overt racism on the UMR campus than on many other campuses (Racism on Campus, 1989).

On the other hand, the study revealed many areas where there was significant room for improvement. Faculty-student relationships were not as strong as we would like them to be. These relationships are essential to reducing attrition which is at alarming levels among African Americans in engineering programs across the country. Our study suggested three reasons why faculty-student relations may be poor. First, the problem with low expectancies among some faculty is very salient to students. Having had a few experiences with poorly performing minorities in the past and generalizing those to all minorities and assuming that African American students have attended inner city schools, and that those schools are all of inferior quality, seem to be the key contributors to low expectancies. If faculty members had closer relationships with minority students, they could learn the abilities and backgrounds of minority students as individuals. This would help to minimize racially biased expectancies.
A second feature leading to poor faculty-student relationships may be the minority student being insecure about his or her chances for success because there are not enough examples of minorities who have succeeded at this university—either as graduates, faculty, or staff. This insecurity may lead minority students to exaggerate the negativity of certain interactions, attribute the cause to racism, or even worse, start to doubt their own ability (Hewitt & Seymour, 1992). They may withdraw because there is little one can do to “cure” a racist, or if they have begun to doubt their own ability, they may withdraw in an attempt to hide suspected inadequacies. Many examples of this withdrawal came out during the forums. Students described faculty members who were rude or hostile when students stopped by their offices. There are many nonracial reasons for this type of behavior on the part of faculty members. However, minority students may not ever learn what these are. The pattern of withdrawing and developing an “I’ll show you attitude” makes it unlikely they would ever get an apology, learn the reason for the rudeness, or get to know the professors better so the outburst is seen as a fluke. In this way relations with that professor may never improve. Because the students carry the persistent worry that a professor acted rudely out of prejudice, the withdrawal may generalize to interactions with other professors.

The final aspect of faculty-student relationships contributing to minority students’ perceptions that faculty are less supportive of them may be that minority alumni in our study placed much more importance on socio-emotional qualities (sensitivity, fairness) of the professors than did non-minority alumni. Non-minorities were more likely to evaluate faculty on content-related features (knowledge, organization). Given these divergent preferences, it may mean that minority students have higher standards for the nature of the relationships they want to have with their professors. Other studies of minorities at traditionally European American institutions have shown that minority students are less likely to have close relationships with faculty: they wanted closer relationships, yet they were less likely to have them.

Committee Recommendations

Recommendations for how to improve the climate clearly emerged from the study. This made deliberation by the committee fairly easy. The recommendations made to the campus are summarized in Table 1. The committee also made plans for the actions it should take the next year. Many of the recommendations were already being implemented by the time the final report of this study was made because individuals responsible for those activities were committee members and had been convinced of the need for action as a result of participating in the study. Recommendations implemented most quickly were those that could be “added on” to an ongoing activity: adding diversity to new student and staff training, assigning minority students to classes in a different way, diversifying campus programming. New activities, like bringing off-campus experts to run full-day diversity workshops, have not been widely implemented.
Table 1. Recommendations and Plans Based on Results of Climate Study

**Recommendations to the Campus**

—Cluster Minority Students in Freshmen Classes

—Educate on Diversity

—Encourage Mentoring of Minority and Female Faculty and Staff

—Further Diversify Participation in Student Activities

—Improve Efforts to Recruit and Retain Minority Faculty and Staff

—Continue Implementation of Retention Committee Report

**AAAC Committee’s Plans for Follow-up**

—Disseminate Information Acquired Through Forums

—Host Monthly Luncheon Series Focusing on Ethnicity and Gender

—Conduct Study of Images the Campus is Communicating to Campus Visitors

—Contribute Articles and Letters to the Student Newsletter

—Nominate Individuals for Standing Campus Awards Based on Their Contributions to Diversity

**Evaluation**

Overall, we felt this study was useful primarily because it helped to educate the campus community about diverging perceptions of the climate. Minority students and alumni clearly told us there were aspects of campus climate that were impeding their success and making them uncomfortable. Recommendations were made and adopted. Whether actions will have any significant impact on faculty-student relationships and student retention has yet to be seen. The results of our study indicate faculty play a key role in minority students’ perceptions of the climate and that there is room for improvement. The faculty who participated in the campus forums and the AAAC now have a better understanding of the importance of their relationships with students and how relationships with faculty can go awry.

Unfortunately, not all faculty participated. Some senior faculty members in particular were very threatened by the complaints of students and the actions recommended by the committee. However, these senior faculty members, in the process of voicing their concerns drew in other faculty who had not previously been part of the discussion of the divergent perceptions and how faculty-student relationships might be improved. Thus, while these senior faculty members were not supporters of the committee’s ac-
tions, they were part of the change process. Overall, the AAAC has laid the groundwork by identifying perceptions of the climate and building a broad-based consensus for change. We hope this will make subsequent efforts to address concerns of minority students easier and more fruitful.

NOTES
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I want to thank the editors of this volume for their wisdom and advice.

Preparation of this report was supported in part by a Missouri Youth Initiative Fellowship sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation.

In conceptualizing and carrying out the study, the term “minority” was used. I have continued to use the term throughout this report for a number of reasons. The primary purpose of the study was to make the campus aware that students, whose backgrounds were demographically different from those of the majority of the faculty and student body, had perceptions of the climate that differed from those of the majority. In this sense, the study focused on “non-white” students, i.e., students defined not by their individual characteristics or the particular ethnic group with which they identified, but by the fact that they were not members of the majority group.

In reality the minority population of this university is largely African American and Asian. However, we did not distinguish between ethnic groups during the course of the study. Consequently, another reason I chose to use the term minority, with all of its limitations, is that it most accurately reflects the terminology, the perspective, and the understanding we had at the time of the study.

We could have used different terminology when conducting the study. However, to further our objective of letting most people on the campus hear first hand that students of color often have perspectives on the climate that are very different from their own, we needed to help those students feel comfortable sharing their perspectives. This university is like most other predominantly engineering schools—there are relatively few African Americans. Native Americans and Hispanics. We were convinced in planning this study that students asked to share their perspectives would feel more comfortable if they perceived a “safety in numbers.” This fact was borne out during the open forums in which it was not until persons of color constituted the majority of participants that many felt comfortable being frank about their experiences. Dividing these students into smaller groups could have eliminated the safety they felt.

The author was Affirmative Action Officer during the time of the study.
'Copies of a longer report of this study, including specifics of the methodology can be obtained from Catherine A. Riordan, Management Systems, University of Missouri-Rolla, Rolla, MO 65401.
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MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVES IN COUNSELING

by

Edward Johnson and Linda S. Aguilar

The concept of multicultural counseling, though not new by any means, was given a formal beginning in this country almost 30 years ago when the American Personnel and Guidance Association (now called the American Counseling Association [ACA]) formed its Human Rights Commission in 1965 (Burn, 1992). In the midst of a decade focusing on civil rights for minority groups and a growing effort on the part of those groups to maintain their cultural identities, it was decided by this professional counseling organization that the needs of all individuals should be considered and assessed. In 1973 ethical guidelines for the profession were endorsed by the American Psychological Association (APA) (Casas, et al., 1986). Although many saw these beginnings as more rhetoric than action, recently the momentum supporting the validity and necessity of multiculturalizing the mental health field has increased. Indeed, the future will force the issue.

The population is changing, shifting away from a single dominant group. This country is fast becoming more pluralistic, and the sheer numbers of minorities are growing too large to ignore (Sue, et al., 1992; Ibrahim, 1991). Attempts to address this issue are already in place. The professional organizations (such as APA and ACA) have set ethical standards and guidelines concerning the treatment of all individuals with regard to diversity as a way of influencing their members and the profession as a whole (Burn, 1992). Affiliate organizations specializing in multicultural concerns, development, and professional growth have blossomed in the past 20 years. Accrediting boards have mandated that counselor training programs include coursework in this area (Midgette & Meggert, 1991), and the number of studies on various aspects of multicultural counseling has increased significantly, accompanied by a growing body of literature to provide awareness and ongoing opportunities for therapists already in the field to learn more (Ibrahim, 1991; Sue, et al., 1992; Burn, 1992).

Several important developments in the movement toward multiculturalizing the field of counseling have occurred. Initially, there was a real need for people to become aware of the influence of culture on thought processes and behavior since most counseling theories were based on European American, middle-class values and beliefs. Therapists did not take into account that these theories were often foreign and discriminatory toward clients who were of low socioeconomic status or who came from other cultural groups (Sue, 1981). Scholars and concerned professionals in the field began to publish articles calling on their colleagues to recognize, respect, and value the fact that not all people are the same. In response, courses were designed to educate both new and experienced counselors about people from other cultures. A lot of attention was given to describing various characteristics of certain groups and how to “handle” them. Though these courses had the altruistic goal of increasing awareness and sensitivity to others, they often resulted in stereotyping the very groups they were intending to help (Speight, et al., 1991).
Increasing the counselor's awareness of the differences in clients of other cultures is an important first step, but awareness alone is not enough. Much of the criticism aimed at the early attempts of helping professionals to be more concerned with the cross-cultural implications of counseling was that they focused on "exotic" groups and acted as if only certain clients had ethnicity or a specific culture, while ignoring the obvious cultural bias of the counselor (Jackson & Meadows, 1991). It was as though the European model of therapy was an absolute, administered by a values free/culture free therapist. Client differences were seen as deficiencies that needed to be changed, corrected, and brought into line with "normal" people living in this country. Small wonder then that many studies found that minorities underused available counseling services, either not seeking professional help at all or terminating early (Pedersen, 1987).

After recognizing the need for awareness and information about cultural differences, attention was focused on discovering the critical elements of multicultural counseling. At the top of the list was the competence of the counselor. Pedersen (1988) identified three important factors that are indicative of competence: awareness, knowledge, and skill development. These areas correspond with those recommended in the literature as being significant in the training of effective cross-cultural counselors (Midgette & Meggert, 1991). To elaborate, awareness includes not only recognition of differences and of the influences of and between cultures, but also self-awareness. The therapist must be sensitive to and comfortable with his/her own culture, attitudes, values, beliefs, and biases and the role they play in any interaction with the client. Knowledge is a crucial part of competence and is broadly interpreted here. Facts and information about other cultures, the history and sociology of the people, and awareness of institutional barriers for minorities are combined with knowledge of counseling theories and techniques in general. Skill development is a process learned through application and leads to more effective communication and the ability to interact with those from other cultures. It includes being able to accurately and appropriately send and receive nonverbal signals as well as interpreting verbal messages (Midgette & Meggert, 1991; McRae & Johnson, 1991).

Because developing this type of multicultural competence might be a formidable task for the average practitioner, researchers postulated that clients were better served when they were matched with a culturally similar counselor (Dillard, 1983). Several studies mentioned by Sue (1981) conducted primarily with African American subjects indicated that this may be true. However, he also cited contrasting reports that concluded other factors such as belief similarity, counselor style, experience, sex, and type of problems may be equally important. In a similar literature review, Pedersen (1988) expanded on these findings. Some of the criticisms of the previous studies were that they did not take into consideration variables such as socioeconomic status, a more likely predictor of a person's ability or desire to seek professional help. Further, members of certain ethnic groups or people of low socioeconomic status are referred less often or referred to less competent therapists. Then too, the counselor may have a bias toward certain types of clients that affects the relationship or degree of satisfaction felt by the client.

Other factors that may negatively impact the success of a culturally matched counselor-client alliance are the lack of respect shown to therapists from some ethnic groups; the perception that the therapist has forsaken his/her own culture and now is too iden-
tified with the dominant culture and its institutions, therefore creating a lack of trust; jealousy of what the therapist has achieved; or reluctance on the part of the therapist to identify effectively with the client because he or she is a reminder of the therapist's own past. Yet another argument against the idea of cultural matching is that people cannot be neatly categorized into one group or another (Speight, et al., 1991). Although the debate continues over whether or not counseling is more effective when the cultures of those involved are similar, Pedersen (1988) suggests an interesting compromise: "introduce two counselors, one similar and one dissimilar to the client's culture." He cited several sources that describe situations where another professional has worked collaboratively in the counseling process to achieve successful outcomes.

Another controversy in the literature is whether to interpret the concept of multiculturalism broadly and apply it to all groups, or to keep a more traditional definition of culture. It is currently popular for courses on diversity to deal with a wide range and scope of differences including, along with ethnicity, other variables such as age, gender, sexual orientation, ability, and social class (Adams, 1993). If that approach is used, "the construct multicultural becomes generic to all counseling relationships" (Pedersen, 1991). Every experience with another person will include a variety of differences because all humans have unique characteristics that stem from their individual backgrounds (Adams, 1991; Speight, et al., 1991). However, most authors, after acknowledging the broad definition of culture, choose to limit their study to the narrower interpretation. Pedersen (1991) cited the work of R. W. Brislin, who described seven indicators that separate cultural from individual differences: (1) cultural aspects are part of a group of people's way of life; (2) they include ideas passed from one generation to the next; (3) the group's common experiences instill values in the children; (4) children are socialized into adults through a cultural process; (5) beliefs and practices are consistently maintained; (6) traditions and practices are stable even though everything doesn't always go right; (7) people feel disoriented, helpless, and out of control when cultural patterns are changed.

From this frame of reference much attention has been given to studying specific racial and ethnic groups as a way of understanding their culture (Sue, 1981; Dillard, 1983; Samuda & Wolfgang, 1985; Axelton, 1985; Pedersen, 1987; Speight, et al., 1991; Adams, 1993). Inherent in this study, though, is the criticism mentioned earlier that learning about a culture is not always sufficient. Another problem is the difficulty or impossibility of learning about all the cultures of all the clients one might encounter. Lee (1991) suggests that an operational definition of multicultural counseling is "an intervention process that places equal emphasis on the racial and ethnic impressions of both counselor and client." This definition seems to bridge the gap between looking at culture as a specific entity, separate for each group, and the more universal emphasis.

A fourth area of attention in the literature is the type of counseling theory that works best in a multicultural context. Vontress (in Samuda & Wolfgang, 1985) proposed four criteria to evaluate a theory's usefulness in multicultural counseling. One must first consider its assumptions about human nature. Are people free agents? Are they "blank slates" at birth, influenced by genetics or the environment? Are people predetermined to be one way or another? What shapes the person? Next, a theory must address the significance of culture on a person's thoughts and behaviors. Do universal behaviors and ways of thinking exist? How much does nationality influence behavior? Is affiliation...
ation with a subgroup more influential than nationality? Are individual differences more significant than cultural differences? A third area to consider is the concept of normal or abnormal behavior. Is the cultural context the determinant of acceptable behaviors? What happens when a person moves to another country? Finally, one must consider the methodology of therapy using a particular theory. How does a counselor intervene with a culturally different client?

The major theories have been categorized by Vontress as psychoanalytical, rational, behavioristic, humanistic, and existential. Each was rated according to the four criteria listed above. Psychoanalytical approaches did not fare well in their adaptability for use in multicultural settings. So much of the methodology consists of the therapist interpreting the client's unconscious or subconscious motivations and conflicts, it would be almost impossible for a therapist not to impose his/her own cultural biases onto the client. Rational approaches rely on the idea that the individual is responsible for his/her own thoughts, beliefs, and such and, therefore, can change behaviors by intellectually deciding to do so. Counseling interventions are highly cognitive and stress a person's ability to take charge of his/her life. This, of course, is a Western oriented philosophy that is incompatible with many other cultures.

Behaviorism rests on the foundation that all behavior is shaped by societal forces that reward or punish, thereby reinforcing a behavior or extinguishing it. In a multicultural setting it would have to be determined what changes were needed or wanted, according to which set of standards. The humanistic approaches rely on the counselor-client alliance to help the client activate his/her inner resources. A competent, highly skilled counselor could perhaps form the type of genuine empathic relationship this theory proposes is necessary to effect change; however, the lack of directiveness could be interpreted by clients of another culture as indifference. Also, a client from an oppressed minority may not have access to the same type of resources as a majority counselor and may desire more than empathy.

Existentialism is a philosophy more than a counseling theory in that it contains no specific techniques. It views humans in a holistic way that stresses people's commonalities over their differences and focuses on the counselor-client alliance to explore the client's inner needs and to discover ways to fulfill them. Since existentialists believe that all of life is filled with struggles, tensions, and conflict, they do not look for the cause of maladaptive behaviors or try to say what constitutes mental illness. Instead, they strive for harmony with nature, self, and others, a philosophy compatible with multiculturalism (Samuda & Wolfgang, 1985).

Of natural concern to those in the profession is the training processes for new counselors: What approaches will help them develop the skills necessary to work with people in a society growing more diverse every year? Currently, most students entering the field have exposure to the concepts of pluralism through a course on the subject. Added to their regular curriculum, this is a convenient and cost effective way for university programs to fulfill their certification requirements (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991). However, it does not facilitate acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills recommended for competence. McRae and Johnson (1991) suggest counselor education programs should emphasize the following four areas: the students' self-awareness and ability to recognize his/her own cultures; his/her ability to relate to individuals from other cultures; the student's knowledge and ability to perceive accurately other cultures
in themselves as well as in the larger society; and finally, the student's overall ability to perform in multicultural Counseling situations.

Training programs that include exposure to and actual experience working with clients from a variety of cultural backgrounds are generally preferred over those using the course-alone approach. Even role playing helps to increase awareness of the student counselor's own culture as well as his/her sensitivity to other cultures (McRae & Johnson, 1991). Another important element in any training program is the level of competence and multicultural expertise of those doing the training. In their article challenging counselor educators, Midgette and Meggert (1991) focus on the attitudes and beliefs of faculty. Many professors in colleges and universities are themselves products of racist and monocultural educational systems. The authors suggest that the entire faculty needs to address the issue of multicultural awareness.

People in leadership and teaching positions need to assess their own openness to change and their practices to ensure that they are, indeed, practicing what they preach. In order to truly educate new counselors in a multicultural way, a systematic change that permeates the entire training program is needed. Elements of such a program include the infusion of multicultural content into every course and the hiring of faculty members from a variety of cultures to provide mentors and role models as well as to present different views. Clinical experiences that give students a wide range of exposure to clients of diverse backgrounds, an emphasis on research that includes multicultural perspectives, ongoing staff development for current faculty, and advanced course work to help students achieve a greater level of comfort in a variety of counseling tasks with members of other groups are also foundational in this systematic change (Midgette & Meggert, 1991).

Multiculturalism's total impact on the next generation of counselors will be determined largely as a result of current shifts in thinking. Those who believe multiculturalism is inclusive, a part of every counseling theory, suggest that to be effective, counselors must naturally take into consideration all forms of individual difference. Pedersen (1990) gives examples of ten counseling behaviors that are part of various theories, placing a multicultural perspective on each to show how this approach can be used regardless of the counselor's theoretical background. Existentialists emphasize what people have in common as human beings and suggest focusing too significantly on cultural differences leaves out the element of personality (Speight, et al., 1991). Ibrahim (1991) agrees that all counseling is essentially a cross-cultural exchange because no two people will have the exact same background, and he warns against falling into the trap of stereotyping when separating people into distinct groups. Adherents to this view of multicultural counseling would like to see its concepts infused into the presentation and practice of all theories.

Another major thrust of current thinking about multicultural counseling is that this focus will become a whole new paradigm, a new "fourth force" that will shape the field in the same way behaviorism and humanism have (Pedersen, 1988, 1991; Midgette & Meggert, 1991). This conceptual shift brings with it a complete change in the philosophy of the nature and purpose of counseling and necessitates a new worldview. Worldview, defined as the assumptions one holds about the world or the individual's perceptions about his/her relationship to the rest of the world (Ibrahim, 1991), is a very culture-bound concept that affects the way people behave, make decisions, solve prob-
lems, and relate (Jackson & Meadows, 1991). However, "[T]he traditional counselor role has been founded on what can be described as a psychological worldview," (Cottone, 1991) the basis of which is the study of the individual.

The assumption that everything exists within the individual is the common thread that links current counseling theories. Other shared assumptions include: linear thinking, such as A causes B; subject-object dualism or the separation between the observer and what is being observed; determinism, i.e., everything has a cause; and absolutism, or the thinking that a reality exists outside the subjective realm (Cottone, 1991). Other aspects of a Western worldview posited by traditional counselors are the belief that acquiring objects has the highest value; knowledge is external and is based on counting and measuring; logic is linear; and self worth and identity are based on things that exist outside of the person, for example, possessions, status, appearance (Jackson & Meadows, 1991). Although these views have dominated the field in the past, they are being challenged by other emerging worldviews.

Cottone (1991) summarized the systematic worldview and its implications for counseling. The fundamental premises include: (1) relationships form the basis of study; (2) relationships isolated for study are to be understood as relative to the observer and his/her frame of reference; (3) circular causality exists only within the context of the system; and (4) social relations form the basis for therapeutic change. With this view the counselor does not look at the individual to find the problem, but rather, sees the larger context of the entire system. The role of the counselor becomes one of helping the client assess which relationships will have positive impact and which will not. The counselor becomes a facilitator to help the client access the system that will be most beneficial to the client. To do this effectively the counselor must be knowledgeable about the cultural system he/she represents as well as the cultural system of the client. Lee (1991) saw a similar role for the counselor as an advocate for clients, helping them to empower themselves to break down social and institutional barriers that keep them from achieving their highest goals.

One final area of interest within the multicultural counseling literature is the discussion of identity development models. Sue’s (1981) well known theory of cultural development is based on his research of worldviews. Within his model, identity is defined in terms of a person’s perception of how much control he/she can exert over his/her environment and how much a person can make real changes in life. Other identity development models that serve cultural or ethnic minorities include Bank’s five stages, Atkinson’s Minority Identity Development Model, and Cross’s Black Identity Model. They all include a process in which individuals from an oppressed group go through a series of stages. Beginning with lack of awareness or denial of oppression, they move on to question their culture, becoming immersed in it and identifying only with it, then recognizing the devalued sense of self and limitations of identifying only with oppression, and finally reaching some type of integration (Myers, et al., 1991). Critics of these models point out that they are an outgrowth of a particular period, such as the civil rights movement or the women’s movement, and may represent characteristics of a specific time rather than a universal process. They also do not address the identity development of persons (such as a disabled, African American female) with more than one kind of oppression or biracial individuals who have more than one cultural orientation (Myers, et al., 1991).
Myers et al. (1991) present an interesting model of spiritual and identity development based on an African conceptual system. This system differs from the European worldview discussed earlier in its emphasis on the spiritual as well as material. In this belief system interpersonal relationships are primary, and knowledge is based on self-knowledge. Human and spiritual networks are interrelated and the union of opposites is the basis for logic. Identity and self-worth come from within (Jackson & Meadows, 1991). Individual’s spiritual dimension has been basically ignored by western psychologies, but is recognized by other cultures as the very core of the person. In such cultures the development of a person’s spiritual awareness is an essential part of identity and of a person’s knowing him/herself more fully.

Myers et al. (1991) reviewed the stages of faith identified by Fowler and subsequently combined them with their research into optimal theory, which offers a holistic view of individuals (Speight, et al., 1991). The process of knowing oneself includes all aspects of being, such as age, gender, ethnicity, size, and it does not necessitate gaining more information as much as gaining a deeper, truer understanding of oneself. With this in mind Myers et al. (1991) developed a model called Optimal Theory Applied to Identity Development (OTAID). Like other models this has stages of development, but rather than a linear sequence, the authors perceive these stages as forming an upward, expanding spiral. People are continuously evolving as they interact with others in the society around and increase their self-knowledge. At times they may be on a parallel level, although progress has been made toward the next stage. They may never go through all of the stages, nor is there a prescribed amount of time that should be spent at any one stage. The person is on a journey of self-discovery that leads from a narrow perspective of seeing life in segments to being able to perceive one’s life as a total entity.

The journey begins with Phase 0, or an “Absence of Conscious Awareness.” This is the stage of an infant who does not yet perceive him/herself as a separate individual and accepts life just as it is without judgment or concern. Phase 1 is “Individuation.” The person in this stage views him/herself from one perspective, usually based on values and beliefs held by his/her family. The individual does not reflect on how he/she is perceived by others or believe it is any different than the way he/she sees him/herself. Egocentric and ethnocentric describe someone in this stage.

Phase 2 is a state of “Dissonance.” The person here begins to reflect on who he/she is while developing an awareness that not everyone is valued equally in society. Experiences with prejudice and discrimination cause a negative self-image that clashes with the original concept of self and leads to feelings of anger, confusion, insecurity, and isolation.

During Phase 3, “Immersion,” the individual begins to identify totally with people of a similar culture or group and experiences a strong bond and sense of belonging with the group. Learning more about the history, contributions, and culture of the group becomes exciting and results in an increase of self-awareness and appreciation for aspects of oneself that may have been devalued before. A lack of trust, anger, and other negative feelings are expressed toward the larger society and an “us-them” attitude may be prevalent.

In Phase 4, “Internalization,” the person accepts him/herself fully and can be more tolerant of others who do not pose a threat to his/her well-being. This person is confi-
dent and comfortable with people from other groups because of a sense of security within.

Phase 5 is "Integration," during which the person begins to make a conceptual shift to a more universal worldview. Being fully comfortable with themselves, people in this stage can make the transition to valuing others not on external criteria, but because they are a part of humanity. They are able to see others as individuals who can be oppressed in a variety of ways regardless of their culture or ethnicity. People in this phase may form friendships and alliances with those representing many groups.

Phase 6 is the "Transformation" stage. The person has integrated all aspects of the cycle of life. Everything is interrelated and interdependent and a spiritual awareness allows one to move beyond external circumstances to see that everyone has value and contributes something to the world. People in this stage have learned to accept those who lack knowledge and to believe that most people are doing the best they can, given their level of awareness and understanding. People in this stage see that good can even come from negative experiences (Myers, et al., 1991).

The most intriguing aspect of this theory is the way the authors apply it to a real life problem. They show how the stages can be used in counseling situations with crime victims, discuss the way victimization is perceived using current suboptimal worldviews, and contrast that with the optimal worldview. The current way of thinking directly links victimization and shame. Often victims are even blamed, as though some deficiency on their part made them capable of being victimized. Because being a victim shows a lack of power, the person is further devalued. If a person's self-worth is a product of other people's perceptions and based on external criteria, as it is in Western oriented thinking, the victim is not highly esteemed.

From the optimal perspective, victims can use the negative experience to learn and become stronger. Their sense of self-worth is never in question: rather the perpetrator is seen as being at a lower state of development. People in phases 1 to 4 will often view the crime and their own victimization in a suboptimal way. For example, if victims are in the individuation phase, the crime may be attributed to some personal limitation. They may take the blame for doing or not doing something. Persons in the dissonance phase might see the crime as an act of discrimination or believe negative things will happen because they belong to a certain group. They may feel anger or depression as a result. In the immersion phase victims will often blame the system for creating the circumstances that led to the crime and will react with extreme anger, using the crime to show how discriminated against and oppressed they are. Victims in the internalization phase may blame societal factors, but will also see the crime as being perpetrated by an individual. They will focus more on seeing the perpetrator punished for the crime.

For those who have reached the integration stage, acts of violence are not viewed as displays of power. Victims feel no blame or shame, nor do they differentiate their responses based on what group the perpetrator is from. At the final stage, transformation victims, while experiencing natural feelings of pain and outrage, will not be oppressed by the crime. They will try to find something to be learned from the experience (Myers, et al., 1991). Using this model, the counselor must be aware of his/her own stage of identity development as well as that of the client. Helping a person grow toward greater understanding is the goal, one that must be an ongoing process for both members of the cross-cultural exchange.
Because "[C]ulture will influence a client whether the counselor chooses to be aware of it or not" (Pedersen, 1988), the counselor must give due consideration to the importance of culture in the counseling process. Since the facilitation of constructive change or gain in client behavior is a major goal in counseling theory, the fully functional counselor will need to develop and employ creative ways of applying counseling methodology. While all scientific counseling theories are useful, all have unique limitations in a multicultural context. The counselor must develop a broad framework and integrate ideas and approaches from a variety of sources. For counselors who work in the schools this has never been more critical than now.

The 1990 U.S. Census revealed some very radical demographic changes in the population. Counselors and teachers are encountering these changes in their schools throughout the country. In California, for example, the number of students classified as "white, non-Hispanic" has already dropped below 50% enrollment. Last year, one in every four students in California lived in a home in which English was not spoken as a first language and one in every six students was foreign born (Sue, 1992). Increasingly, working with students from different cultural backgrounds will become the norm rather than the exception. Projections for the year 2010 (fewer than 20 years from now) indicate that racial and ethnic minorities will become a numerical majority (Sue, 1992). Educational institutions are most likely to be the first affected by the shifts in student populations. However, most of the education in the United States is based on European philosophies that are highly individualistic and have a very competitive structure for evaluation. Many ethnic group members value cooperation rather than competition and the needs of the group rather than the needs of the individual. Thus, the inherent value structure of many ethnic students is in direct conflict with the basic structure of education in the U.S. To illustrate this point consider the following case studies.

Case 1

Maria, 19 years old, a Mexican American student at a community college is experiencing a major crisis in her life. Her mother and father were divorced several years ago. Her mother returned to Mexico, and her father remarried. Maria lives with her father, stepmother and two younger stepbrothers. She drives 32 miles to work each day and works more than 40 hours a week. She is a full time night student, carrying 14 semester hours. Her major is computer science. Although she has a 3.35 G.P.A., Maria is considering dropping out of school. She has come into the college counseling center to talk with her counselor.

Counselor: Well Maria, how have you been?
Maria: Fine.
Counselor: What may I help you with?
Maria: I'm going to have to drop out of school.
Counselor: Are you having difficulty with your classes?
Maria: No, I love all of my classes, but my instructors in two classes are upset with me and told me that my priorities in relation to school and other responsibilities are not in order.
Counselor: Can you tell me exactly what prompted them to tell you this?
Maria: (Starting to cry). Well, my computer class meets for four hours on
Tuesday night. Midway through class we have a 15 minute break. I was so tired I dozed off and I was 14 minutes late returning to class. Toward the end of class I started to nod. I am so embarrassed to tell you this Mr. ____ All of this really is my fault. I don’t know what else to do. I shouldn’t be bothering you with all of this; there is nothing else to do.

Counselor: I know this is difficult for you and that you feel quite disappointed in yourself for allowing things that are important to you to begin to unravel, but I get the feeling that there is much more to this than we have covered so far. For instance, you claim that you love your classes—so how are you doing in them?

Maria: (Slight smile between sobs). Well, right now I have two As and two Bs going but I’m sure I can get both Bs up to As.

Note: Her classes this semester are Calculus, Computer Science, English II and Economics.

Counselor: Maria, you seem to be having no difficulty at all with your classes. Can we discuss some of the other issues that perhaps are not being managed as well?

Maria: Well, my father doesn’t understand. You see, I have to work. He has been laid off from his job for almost a year. My stepmother doesn’t like me at all. She works fulltime, so I am expected to take care of her children, and they are brats (smile). I am responsible for all of the cleaning and cooking and errands to be done. I leave for work every morning at seven o’clock. I don’t return until 10 or 10:30 at night. Yet I still have to do everything. I’ve been doing this for a year. It’s not fair. I can’t continue. I have no social life, period. Whenever a boy shows interest in me my father says he doesn’t care about me, he only wants one thing. I haven’t had a date since I don’t know when. I’ve worked at this supermarket for over a year. I love my job. Besides, we need the money. I can get all of the overtime that I want. When I get home tonight I will have to wash dishes, clean the kitchen, and do my homework before going to bed.

Counselor: Is your father supportive of the idea of you attending college?

Maria: Oh Yes! He knows I am a good student; he wants me to go to college.

Counselor: And your mother?

Maria: My mother and I are very close. We talk all the time. I go to Mexico almost every year to visit her. When my father is upset with me he always says that I’m just like my mother (Big Smile) and he is right. But I don’t want to live in Mexico.

Counselor: Maria, there is no easy answer to this very complex situation, but have you considered moving into your own place?

Maria: Oh, I could never do that Mr. ____ I love my father. I respect him very much. I could never do anything to dishonor him.

Summary: Here we see that an awareness of Mexican American cultural orientation—emphasis on the strong male image, rigid sex roles, cooper-
ation and interdependence, deference to authority figures, and strong extended family relationships—would help toward avoiding some common pitfalls in the counseling process.

This counseling session ended with an agreement that Maria would continue in school. Discussion ensued as to how much longer it would take to complete her requirements prior to transferring. We talked about the cost, application procedures, and financial aid possibilities that would enable her to continue her education at a state university after she received her Associates Degree. Concrete plans of action with specific steps, time frames and dates seemed to revitalize and give Maria more determination to achieve her goals.

This excerpt illustrates vividly how the dominant society’s views toward individualism can influence the counseling process. What is suggested here about society’s views on gender and race issues? Even the culturally aware counselor may be in an intense inner struggle to check his/her own biases when his/her values obviously clash with the client’s. Yet this experience can be enriching. It offers opportunities to develop greater sensitivity to, and appreciation of, differences and to learn from the best of what other cultures have to offer.

Another case study illustrates a different dimension of the multicultural counselor’s role in the schools. Often the faculty, administrators, and staff members need to learn the same kinds of awareness and understanding of differences that counselors strive to achieve. Counselors are usually the ones called upon to intervene in cross-cultural situations involving teachers and students. Helping colleagues develop more effective ways to communicate with and teach culturally different students is also an important task.

Case II

Bill is an African American counselor at a college. Chuck is a European American faculty member at the same college. Chuck is nearing retirement; he has a total of 26 years teaching experience including five years in a high school, 16 years at the community college, and five years at a senior university. He wonders about the academic preparedness and commitment of all African American students. This exchange takes place at a chance meeting in a hallway of the college.

Chuck: Bill, do you have a minute. I’ve been wanting to talk to you about something.

Bill: Sure, Chuck. what’s going on?

Chuck: What is the problem with black students? I have never had a serious black student in my classes. They are all unprepared and unwilling to do the work.

Bill: (Exasperated). Exactly what happens to black students in your classes?

Chuck: Now don’t get me wrong (defensively). I treat all students the same whether they are black, white, green, or polka dot. I am not a racist. They just won’t do the work.
Bill: (Curiously, and wanting to explore this problem further). Chuck, I'm wondering what your experience with, let's say, Mexican American students has been.

Chuck: Well, they haven't been much better. Though I did have one student about two years ago who was one of the best students I've ever had.

Bill: In the final analysis exactly what happens to these students?
Chuck: A few will fail, but most just drop my classes after a few weeks. Usually there will be six to eight students who are black out of thirty-five total. Believe me, I have tried everything to motivate them. Nothing seems to work.

Bill: What methods do you use to motivate ethnic students?
Chuck: My teaching method is straight lecture, but when we have discussions of current issues like race relations, the welfare system, abortion, or political issues, I sense that their attitudes change. Are there certain things that we should not discuss with ethnic students?

Summary: Is Chuck racist? Probably not. But his ethnic students obviously sense his arrogance and feeling of detachment that stems from the "great white father syndrome," the omnipotent, all-knowing role that he exhibits in his classes. Whether intended or not, racism and arrogance will have the same impact on African American students. Chuck needs to develop a multicultural perspective so that he can teach successfully and comfortably in a pluralistic society. The counselor and instructor need to learn how to acknowledge, account for, and reconstruct their own attitudes toward and assumptions about those from different cultures. In this case Chuck's feeble attempt to motivate and involve the ethnic student simply exposed his cultural bias, his arrogance, the inadequacy of his teaching methods, and his proclivity toward racial stereotypes.

Sometimes teachers or counselors who have been in the profession for many years see no reason to adjust their methods or attitudes in order to adopt a more multicultural perspective. This is especially true in communities with predominantly European American populations. The few students they encounter that come from another cultural or ethnic group may be fairly well assimilated into the common culture of the town. These instructors see no reason to fix something that isn't broken, so they use the same ways to educate students that they have used for years. The problem with such a philosophy is that the world around these communities is rapidly changing. It is unlikely that every one of their students will remain isolated in them. As the students move on and out they will be forced to deal with diversity. Will they have the skills to do so?

With the increase in technology bringing the world closer together and with the demographic trends in this country changing dramatically, educators can no longer avoid the issues of multiculturalism. One of the goals of education is to prepare students for the rest of their lives. How prepared are today's students to live and work with all the kinds of people they will encounter now and in the next century? How prepared are their counselors and teachers to show them the way? Counselors who wish to be effective may have to unlearn and relearn some concepts and consider different ways of viewing the world. Faculty and administrators in institutions of higher learning will
have to give more than lip service to the growing need to educate professionals who are truly equipped to work in a multicultural society.
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POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

by
Judith J. Smithson

On July 26, 1990 at 10:00 a.m. 3000 Disability Rights advocates gathered on the South Lawn of the White House to witness the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), making that day “Independence Day” for 43 million people in this country. Representative Norman Mineta (D-CA) who chaired the House Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, stated “ADA is first and foremost a matter of civil rights .... That's what this legislation is all about: creating a society where people are brought together—not set apart” (President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities, 1990. p. 19). Darryl Stingley, former wide receiver for the New England Patriots, said about ADA, “The passion of this Act equals what the Bill of Rights means to all Americans and what affirmative action means to all blacks in America. It will give people with disabilities a sense of hope that they will be allowed to contribute to our nation: after all, we are human, we are America.” (Chicago Community Trust, 1991, p. 11).

For too long many people have looked at others and made judgments about them based only on how they hear, see, walk, breathe, or accomplish a particular task instead of on who they are. The ADA puts the focus on the person or individual. The crucial phrase, Americans with places emphasis on the person and then indicates a descriptor, disabilities. This represents a major step forward in recognizing the personhood of individuals with disabilities and how they view themselves. With the focus on people, the emphasis of this Act is inclusion: full and equal participation in all aspects of the American life.

Background

Individuals with disabilities and their families, friends, and advocates have worked long and hard to see their civil rights recognized. People sometimes are surprised to learn that the Illinois Constitution of 1970 states, “All persons with a physical or mental handicap shall be free from discrimination in the sale or rental of property and shall be free from discrimination unrelated to ability in the hiring and promotion practices of any employer” (Bill of Rights, Art. I. Sec. 19). Even today most people are unaware this section exists and are unclear about the implications of the statement.

In 1973 the U.S. Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act and directed that rules and regulations be established for assuring nondiscrimination based on handicap. This directive resulted in the implementation, in 1977, of rules and regulations, Section 504. Two years after the Rehabilitation Act, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142, 1975) that required a free, appropriate public education for all handicapped children in the United States. In responding to its passage, Burton Black indicated that the original Bill of Rights of the United States had been misinterpreted because so many people concluded that persons with disabilities were exempted from the rights and opportunities enjoyed by other citizens and P.L. 94-142 was the instrument which established that all children have a right to a free appropri-
ate education, thus correcting errors of the past (Heinich, 1979). Though the Rehabilitation Act was passed in 1973, and the Education of All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, the rules and regulations (Section 504) for assuring nondiscrimination based on handicap were not promulgated and signed until April of 1977.

Section 504 requires that all recipients of federal financial assistance prohibit discrimination based on disabilities. It has six subparts: A) General Provisions, B) Employment Practices, C) Program Accessibility, D) Preschool, Elementary, and Secondary Education, E) Postsecondary, and F) Health, Welfare, and Social Services. Persons covered under Section 504 are referred to as handicapped persons and are defined as “any person who (i) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities, (ii) has a record of such an impairment, or (iii) is regarded as having such an impairment” (Sec. 104.3[i]). The ADA uses almost the same definition but changed handicapped person to read “the term ‘disability’ means, with respect to an individual . . . . ” Major life activities “means functions such as caring for one’s self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working” (104.3 [i] [2]). Section 504 then addresses the issue of qualification by defining qualified handicapped persons as meaning, “(3) with respect to postsecondary and vocational education services, a handicapped person who meets the academic and technical standards requisite to admission or participation in the recipient’s education program or activity” (104.3 [k]). Section 504 includes provisions for reasonable accommodations, auxiliary aids, and tests and examinations that are to be administered in such a manner that the results reflect the ability of people with disabilities rather than the impact of the disability on performance. Since each person is unique, the impact on his/her ability to perform specific tasks will vary even though the disabilities may appear to be similar.

Implications

Most postsecondary institutions are recipients of some form of federal financial assistance through grants, contracts, and/or student financial aid. The postsecondary institutions are required to make modifications to their academic requirements to ensure that discrimination or effects of discrimination based on disability do not occur. Modification may include such things as changes “in the length of time permitted for completion of degree requirements, substitution of specific courses required for the completion of degree in which specific courses are conducted” (Section 504, Subpart E 104.44). Additionally postsecondary institutions may not prohibit tape recorders in classrooms or dog guides in campus buildings, or impose other rules that would limit the participation of people with disabilities. Despite these rules and regulations, barriers still remained because Section 504 applied only to those receiving federal funds not to the general public arena or to the private sector. In building on Section 504, ADA expanded it to cover the entire population. Together Section 504 and ADA provide the framework for postsecondary education’s extension of full and equal participation for persons with disabilities.

Language

The language of Section 504 is the basis for much of the language of the ADA with one notable difference: ADA puts the person first and then the descriptor with disabil-
ities. The ADA requires case by case consideration for persons with disabilities, again emphasizing the person first. Today the word “handicap describes a condition or barrier caused by society or the environment” (Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services, 1990), i.e., as a person with a disability he is handicapped by stairs. This change reflects the fact that most people with disabilities want to participate in society, to be agents rather than victims or persons to be pitied. The change also indicates the importance of language.

Language used in the criminal justice system, (confined, electric chair) should not be used in reference to people with disabilities unless, of course, the person has been sentenced by a court of law and is confined to prison and sentenced to die in an electric chair. When indicating that a person with disabilities uses a wheelchair for mobility, saying he/she uses a power or motorized chair rather than he/she is confined to a wheelchair avoids the language of the criminal justice system and identifies the person as active. Similarly, people with deafness are not deaf and dumb but hearing and speech impaired. People with disabilities are not defective but simply have an impairment. Words can add to a person’s self-esteem, or they can be very demeaning. Current preferred language for persons with disabilities includes persons with a cognitive disability, not retardation; with neurofibromatosis, not Elephant Man’s disease; or with a behavior disorder, not emotionally disturbed (Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services, 1990). Language can reinforce old stereotypes, but language can also empower a person with disabilities to participate equally in all areas of our society. Using language that empowers a person is critical.

Resources and Institutional Responses

Postsecondary institutions have responded to Section 504 and ADA issues through several types of organizational structures that provide services and eliminate discrimination based on disability. Whether using a centralized system or decentralizing responsibility, each institution must designate a Section 504 Coordinator and an ADA Coordinator, who may actually be the same person, through whom questions or concerns can be addressed.

It is important to remember that Section 504 and the ADA require making reasonable accommodations, provisions for auxiliary aids, and equal access to programs and services. Some institutions have initiated comprehensive services for persons with disabilities while others offer only a bare minimum. No apparent pattern of which type of institution (large or small, public or private, community college or university) has comprehensive or expansive services has emerged (Sergent, et al., 1988; Bursuck, et al., 1989), but clearly many students with disabilities in postsecondary schools continue to experience barriers because of their disabilities (West, et al., 1993). Major contributors to those barriers appear to be lack of awareness and the prejudicial attitudes of persons who do not currently have disabilities (McCarthy & Campbell, 1993; Leyser, 1989; West, et al., 1993). One factor influencing attitudes of persons who are not currently disabled is the lack of personal experience or contact with persons with disabilities. Another factor is the lack of information about services and how to obtain or provide accommodations. Information and communication must become a focus for institutions.

HEATH, a national clearinghouse on postsecondary education and individuals with disabilities, provides information on resources, data, programs, and technology that can
prove useful. HEATH is a program of the American Council on Education (see Resources). Also comprehensive in its approach is the Association of Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD), a professional organization offering a journal, newsletter, consulting services, printed materials, kits and other materials (see Resources). Vocational Rehabilitation in the Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services can assist with workshops and with information on accommodation, as well as with other needs of persons with disabilities. Centers for Independent Living are community based organizations that provide information and referral, advocacy, peer support, and independent living skills training. The best resources of all are individuals with disabilities, especially those who are faculty, staff, students, and alumni of the institution. Involvement of persons with disabilities leads to an environment that fosters inclusion.

**Accommodation Issues**

Making reasonable accommodations based on a disability-related need often requires a common sense approach and creativity. For example, a student with a visual impairment who cannot read a chalkboard may be able to use copies of transparencies if the instructor uses an overhead. If the transparencies are prepared before class and photocopied, the student can have access to the information along with other members of the class. A student with mobility impairments that limit his/her hand and arm functions may need a typist in order to write a paper. Some postsecondary institutions provide typists through clerical support in the services office, some use paid student workers, and others use members of an organization such as Mortar Board, or other individual volunteers. The real task is to assure the student with a disability an equal opportunity to compete with his/her peers for grades, jobs, programs, and activities.

The student with a disability must make the decision whether he/she wishes the service office to notify professors of his/her disability and related needs. Faculty who are provided information in advance can request assistance with how best to meet the needs. Students with hearing impairments will appreciate printed materials, such as the syllabus, that give more information and detail than a simple outline. Course syllabi that include timeline with topics, assignments, and projected testing dates, information regarding office location, instructor availability, and grading criteria also assist students with specific learning disabilities or with attention deficit disorder (ADD).

Textbook selections need to be made in a timely manner for students who need books on tape since it often takes six to twelve weeks to receive them. Professors should choose closed captioned videotapes and films to insure access for persons with hearing impairments. During class, when the professor responds to a question, he/she needs to restate the question and then answer it so all students benefit including those with hearing impairments, L.D., and ADD. New assignments, due dates, and test dates should be given verbally and in written form. Again, it is important to note that each person and his/her needs must be determined on an individual basis. To be effective, teachers must respond to each person with his/her needs being individually determined; working with persons with disabilities can be an excellent reminder of this.

Environmental access is also critically important whether it is to buildings, rooms, sidewalks, parking spaces, signage, or telephones. Institutions should now be at least programmatically accessible. An example would be History 100 with multiple sections. One section may meet in an inaccessible room if all of the other sections meet in ac-
accessible rooms. Another example would be resident halls where each life style or type of offering is available on accessible floors, but not every floor in every hall is accessible. Separate facilities are not an acceptable solution under Section 504 or ADA.

Conclusion

The question for postsecondary education is, "Is the Welcome Mat out for persons with disabilities?" How the institution portrays its student body is a key to inclusion. Not everyone can use a telephone by listening and speaking, therefore TDD/TT (Telecommunicative Device for the Deaf, Text Telephone) numbers demonstrate a commitment to access and inclusion. College catalogs available in alternate media such as audio-cassette tape also suggest awareness and commitment. Statements regarding how to obtain accommodations for a disability need should be included in all information brochures, employment notices, directories, and catalogs. Persons with disabilities should be encouraged to apply for positions as faculty, staff, student workers, student assistants, and graduate assistants. Further evidence of a welcoming climate for persons with disabilities can be found in pictures of the campus community depicting inclusion in the educational program, activities, and employment. Involvement of persons with disabilities in programs, activities, employment, and research will assist in breaking down barriers and is perhaps the best evidence of a policy and practice of inclusion. The goal of persons with disabilities is equal opportunity and full participation in society and in the American dream.

On July 26, 1990, Senator Robert J. Dole stated "... working together, we can ensure that every American citizen will be provided the access and the opportunity to be a part of all that society offers. More importantly, by increasing public awareness through education, we can break down the attitudinal barriers that prevent full participation in the American mainstream" (President’s Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities, 1990, p. 20). Persons with disabilities and those who currently do not have disabilities must work together to achieve full inclusion. Former President George Bush said "...I now lift my pen to sign this Americans with Disabilities Act and say, let the shameful wall of exclusion finally come tumbling down" (President’s Committee, 1990, p. 11). Postsecondary institutions can provide a most effective means for achieving inclusion through the preparation of students and the employment of persons with disabilities. The real question for postsecondary institutions is: Is the Welcome Mat Out?

RESOURCES

ABLEDATA
426 W. Jefferson
Springfield, IL 62702
800/447-4221

A computerized listing of over 10,000 commercially available personal care, communications, ambulation, transportation, recreation, and home management aids and products. Also references to articles and research on rehabilitation, syndromes, diseases, and disabilities. A program of the Springfield Center for Independent Living funded by a grant from the Department of Rehabilitation Services.
AHEAD
P.O. Box 21192
Columbus, OH 43221-0192
614/488-4972 (V/TDD)

Coalition for Citizens of Disabilities in Illinois
401 East Adams
Springfield, IL 62701
800/433-8848

The Great Lakes Disability and Business Technical Assistance Center
University Affiliated Program in Developmental Disabilities
1640 West Roosevelt Road
Chicago, IL 60608
800/949-4232

HEATH Resource Center
One Dupont Circle
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-1193

Illinois Assistive Technology Project
411 East Adams Street
Springfield, IL 62701
800/852-5110 (Voice or TDD)

Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services
100 West Randolph and 623 East Adams
Suite 8-100 and Springfield, IL 62701
Chicago, IL 60601 and 217/785-7749 (TDD)

Illinois Relay Center
To telephone a person who uses a TDD from your regular voice phone, dial 1/800-526-0857 and a communications assistant (CA) will answer. Provide the phone number and the CA will dial the number using a TDD. The CA will type in your message and read to you the other person's response. For TDD users who need CA to voice for them, dial 1/800-526-0844. If you receive a call from the Relay Center, the CA will explain the procedure of the call.

Illinois Telecommunications Access Corporation (ITAC)
P.O. Box 64509
Chicago, IL 60664
312/419-4200
312/419-4211 (TDD)
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MOVING TOWARD JUSTICE, EQUITY, AND DIVERSITY AT WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

by

Janice R. Welsch

In February 1912, The English Journal published an editorial under the guise of “A New Fable of Bidpai” in which a sandpiper approaches a great forest where he hopes to learn nest building. Stopped by a woodpecker who questions him about his readiness for admission, the sandpiper quickly learns that he is not ready with the answers since the questions assume familiarity with the forest, an environment entirely new to him. Unsympathetic, the woodpecker dismisses him, refusing to examine him on what he knows about marshes, fens, and the sands where sandpipers build their nests. Fortunately, as he leaves, he consults a wise owl, who deftly teaches him the woodpecker’s examination repertoire, and the sandpiper, presenting himself to the woodpecker the next day, breezes through the admission exam.

We might wonder who the editor was targeting when he wrote this fable or we might be struck by the appropriateness of the fable over eighty years after its publication. When rebutting the sandpiper the woodpecker takes a disconcertingly familiar position, assuming whatever the sandpiper knows is inferior to what forest inhabitants know and refusing even to listen to him, much less learn from him. The woodpecker’s stance is remarkably similar to that of some traditionalists within the academy today who, assuming the superiority of the established curriculum, refuse to adjust their course content or their teaching methods to the changing student population of the 1990s. Isn’t the owl’s solution to the problem, however, questionable? Learning to play the game works in as much as it gains the sandpiper admission, but do we want learning reduced to a game? Who is fooling whom in the process? How much is gained and by whom? Obviously, answers to these questions will vary in individual cases, but given the increasingly diverse student populations entering college and the critical thinking that is one of the goals of education, recognizing and building on students’ strengths, even when this entails revising course content and adapting new teaching strategies, seems a more effective approach.

Expecting faculty to change what and how we teach in order to reach the diverse students in our classrooms and laboratories is not expecting too much: we are continually doing so. As James Schultz, writing for the Modern Language Association Committee on Academic Freedom, decisively stated in Profession 88 when addressing the issue of canons: “Values always change, knowledge is always in flux, and learning requires active engagement. . . . Both [standards of value and of knowledge] are subject to history” (p. 66). The kinds of change and the rapidity with which we are being asked to change as we exit the 20th century, however, may be daunting to some. The challenge is not exclusively a faculty challenge. College and university administrators must support faculty as we prepare for more culturally diverse course content and classes, and the entire campus community must share responsibility for insuring a climate that supports diversity.

Avenues of possible administrative support are numerous and have been explored in earlier volumes of Multicultural Education by Floyd and Thurmon. (1991).
Wadsworth (1991), Kayes (1992), Felder (1992), and Floyd and Batsche (1992). As several of these authors point out, Faculty Development is among the university offices that can link administration and faculty in an effective alliance to make the changes in curriculum and pedagogy a diverse student population demands (Wadsworth, 1991; Felder, 1992; Floyd & Batsche, 1992). I would like to expand on the potential of this alliance using the Western Illinois University (WIU) experience as an example.

As Felder has pointed out, “faculty must provide the major thrust for multicultural education [but] administration . . . must be supportive” (pp. 96-97). WIU administrators have been supportive in multiple ways. The President, for instance, has made “the development of diversity, equity, and justice in the campus community . . . an integral part of the university planning process” (Wagoner, 1989, p. 8) and has backed this commitment by action and advocacy. Besides frequently and unequivocally stressing to administrators, faculty, staff, and students the importance of fostering a hospitable environment that promotes the academic and social growth of all students (Planning Statement, 1990), he has facilitated the organization of a state multicultural conference and an on-campus diversity workshop for administrators. He has seen to the adoption of sexual harassment and racial and ethnic harassment policies and has supported Affirmative Action administrative internships, a doctoral scholars program, and the implementation of multicultural initiatives by student services personnel and by faculty.

Other WIU administrative offices, including those of the Provost and the Vice President of Student Services, and university committees, such as the Faculty Senate and the Council on Curricular Programs and Instruction (CCPI), have also endorsed multicultural activities and processes. For example, the Faculty Senate anu the Provost approved a recommendation that the University “provide faculty with the means and opportunity to extend their knowledge of multicultural contributions to [their] disciplines” and assist them “in . . . incorporating into the curriculum the body of knowledge available on multicultural . . . contributions to the . . . disciplines” (Faculty Senate Agenda, 1988). Faculty Development has helped implement this and other diversity programs, the President and the Provost having designated the unit one that should help faculty revise the curriculum to reflect multicultural perspectives. By appointing a multicultural curriculum associate, awarding mini-grants (up to $1200) for innovative course development and revision proposals, and funding seminars and workshops that focus on diversity issues, the administration has given Faculty Development the means to assist faculty. has in effect provided the seeds necessary for the growth of multicultural thinking and sensitivity on campus.

With the appointment of the first multicultural curriculum associate, a variety of specific programs began to take shape. Working with a small group of faculty already looking for ways to integrate multicultural perspectives into the curriculum, the associate asked deans and chairs to nominate individuals who could become the nucleus of a cultural diversity cadre. Other faculty who had indicated an interest in multicultural education were also invited to join the Cadre. Initially designated the Cultural Diversity Curriculum Development Cadre (CDCDC), the name was changed to the Cultural Diversity Cadre (CDC) when the group realized its membership and focus had grown beyond faculty and narrowly defined curricular issues. As it has evolved, Cadre membership has broadened to include academic support staff, civil service personnel, administrators, and students as well as faculty, while the Cadre’s concerns now encom-
pass campus climate and multicultural communication across the university as well as
course content and teacher/student interaction. New members continue to be recruited
at each CDC-sponsored event and are asked to help define the Cadre's focus and pri-
orities.

Its link with Faculty Development has been a critical aspect of the Cadre's success
since that office has supported the Cadre's programs via its funds, office staff, and
newsletter. Led by the multicultural associate, who is given reassigned time (the equiv-
alent of one course off) to facilitate Faculty Development's diversity programs, the
Cadre has been able to count on the associate, assisted by a secretary and student work-
ers, to coordinate and publicize its activities, including its series of presentations by na-
tional leaders in multicultural education; its in-house workshops, forums, and panel dis-
cussions; its annual two-day cultural diversity retreat, its course development initiatives,
and its let's-get-acquainted dinners. Besides funding the associate's reassigned time,
Faculty Development has provided money for speaker honorariums, for print and au-
dio-visual materials, for conference travel, and for program publicity. Through its
newsletters, the multicultural associate has been able to discuss CDC activities and pub-
lish its calendar of events.

The Faculty Development-Cadre link has allowed Faculty Development to reach
more of the campus community than it could with the multicultural associate working
alone. Several Cadre committees have been particularly effective. The Student Study
Group, for example, helped prepare the “Dealing with Differences” component of a
one-credit-hour orientation course for new students. Built around a short video, “Fac-
cing Difference: Living Together on Campus,” the package includes an outline, gloss-
sary, bibliography, set of discussion questions, and a variety of exercises and activities.
The Colloquia Committee has organized a number of programs including a video-dis-
cussion series on “Political Correctness: Trend or Mission?,” a forum on the addition
of a multicultural studies category to the General Education curriculum, and panels on
“American History from the Native American Perspective” and “South Central L.A.: One Year Later.” The Colloquia Committee has also led a series of panels and discus-
sions on intercultural communication for civil service employees.

A third CDC committee formed specifically to develop a multicultural course that
would focus on issues of ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, ableism, and age.
Group Diversity (University 210) is the result of the committee's cooperative effort.
The course is an important element of the newly approved Multicultural and Cross-cul-
tural Studies category of the revised General Education curriculum. Committee mem-
bers not only created the course; they also saw it through the approval process and be-
came major proponents of the new multicultural studies category, helping to define the
category and working with members of the Faculty Senate for its approval. Since its
approval, several Cadre members have been teaching the Group Diversity course or
making guest presentations on specific topics for those who do teach it.

Another curriculum related task addressed initially by Cadre members was the prepa-
ration of material to help faculty take into account multicultural scholarship and per-
spectives when developing new courses. Working with CCPI, members provided infor-
mation about James Banks' "Approaches for the Integration of Ethnic Content" and
for gender balance in courses (Banks & Banks, 1989) as well as criteria for evaluating
course texts to insure multicultural representation. The information is important to fac-
ulty since, when preparing new course requests, they are specifically asked what they have done to insure the “course has been developed with an awareness of the place and contributions of women and minorities within the discipline.”

Besides working through committees, individual members have contributed to the Cadre in a variety of ways: by compiling periodic multicultural bibliographies based on WIU library acquisitions; by organizing dinners—alternately pot luck and local restaurant—so CDC members from across campus can become better acquainted; by setting up a faculty collaborative learning support group; and by participating in or leading workshops and panels on campus as well as at state and national conferences. CDC members have met regularly to assess the work of the Cadre, to discuss relevant campus situations and issues, to share information, and to explore appropriate new initiatives. Cadre members have also met with nationally known multicultural educators (such as James Banks, author of numerous multicultural texts, Betty Schmitz, coordinator of curriculum transformation projects throughout the country, and Troy Duster, Director of the Institute for the Study of Social Change at the University of California-Berkeley) to discuss the multicultural challenges we face in our classrooms and offices.

Faculty Development and the Cadre have sponsored or co-sponsored (with Student Residential Programs, the Office of Multicultural and Special Services, the Women’s Center, and student groups including Hillel and Open Door) campus visits by a number of people versed in diversity issues. At times these speakers have made presentations to large general audiences on topics including “Ethnic Relations”: “Diversity in Higher Education: Can We Elevate the Dialogue and Address the Experience?”; and “Women and Politics: Past. Present. Future.” At other times educators were brought in to interact more specifically with CDC members (though invitations have always been extended to the entire campus community) and to focus on particular multicultural communication or curricular questions. Thus, in all-day or half-day workshops, we have focused on “The Pedagogy of Prejudice and Discrimination: Teaching vs. Preaching”; “Curricular Reform in General Education”; “The How-To’s of Student Success”; “Teaching Diversity through Literature and Writing”; and “Communicating Cross-Culturally.”

Several of these workshops have taken place during annual Cultural Diversity Cadre retreats. The retreats, in place now for three years, have been scheduled on the Tuesday and Wednesday immediately following the end of the Spring semester and have given Cadre members, other interested WIU faculty and staff, and Illinois Staff Curriculum Developers Association (ISCDAA) members, an opportunity to study multicultural issues from a variety of perspectives. In addition to the topics mentioned above, retreat workshops have included “Achieving Instructional Excellence While Enhancing Diversity”; “Discipline-specific Multicultural Course Development”; “Voluntary and Involuntary Immigration: Reverberations in Higher Education”; “Ethnic Identity: Developmental Stages”; and “Teaching the ‘Other.’” The retreats have offered all participants opportunities to increase their knowledge about multicultural education and to discuss questions about implementing multicultural goals within their office or classroom: they have also given CDC members a chance to propose strategies and activities for the next academic year.

Another focus of Faculty Development and the CDC has been multicultural instruction within specific departments. Initially members of the Cadre steering com-
mittee met with the chairs and program directors of various departments to determine how faculty were addressing multicultural issues in their course content and through their teaching methods. Among the departments visited were chemistry, physics, psychology, mathematics, and English and Journalism, but very quickly programs in the latter two departments were emphasized because they serve such a large number of students taking basic curriculum courses and because a narrower, more concentrated effort seemed more feasible than the broader approach.

With the support of the College of Arts and Sciences dean, meetings with the chairs and representative faculty were held to discuss the faculty’s multicultural awareness and commitment as well as specific initiatives the departments and individual faculty could take to strengthen both the multicultural content of their basic math and writing courses and the pedagogical strategies necessary to reach increasingly diverse classes. Subsequently, some CDC programs, including co-sponsored workshops on “Women in American Mathematics” and “Students at Risk in Mathematics,” as well as the 1991 retreat workshops, were planned specifically with the mathematics and writing faculties in mind. In addition, beginning-of-the-semester multicultural workshops for graduate students assigned as tutors to the Writing Center, the math help centers, and the Office of Academic Services (OAS) were begun with OAS.

While most of the Faculty Development and CDC multicultural activities have been funded by and directed toward WIU, one of the first was conceived as a collaborative effort with several other Illinois colleges and universities. Planned as a FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) project but not funded on that level, the proposal was rewritten and submitted to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) for a Higher Education Cooperation Act (HECA) grant. The project’s primary goal is clear from its title—Expanding Cultural Diversity in the Curriculum and in the Classroom—and includes: 1) the creation of greater “statewide recognition of the importance of diversity”; 2) the development of a handbook for college and university faculty and staff to help them implement multicultural curriculum and instructional initiatives; and 3) the preparation of a long-term, comprehensive plan for increasing the appreciation of diversity and improving the instruction of our diverse student populations (Planning and Status Determination Committee, 1991, p. 136). “Multicultural Education: A Rationale for Development and Implementation” lays out this plan and was completed and sent to the IBHE in 1991 (See Planning & Status, pp. 137-38). This book, two previous volumes of Multicultural Education, and an annotated bibliography of printed and audio-visual multicultural resources (reprinted in this volume) are the realization of the second objective, while the first has been advanced though the actions taken to meet the second and third goals as well as through the establishment of the Illinois Staff and Curriculum Developers Association.

Founded by faculty development and multicultural education advocates, the ISCD-A is an organization that reaches beyond WIU and the HECA cooperating institutions to continue and expand the work begun through the HECA grant. With that in mind it has approved an organizational structure, adopted a constitution, elected officers and an advisory board, and has sponsored an annual state conference with a threefold emphasis: instructional strategies, curriculum issues, and campus climate. In addition to the workshops and a keynote address by a nationally recognized leader in multicultu-
al education, the conferences facilitate networking among individuals and institutions committed to positive multicultural communication and interaction.

As indicated above, Expanding Cultural Diversity began with a statewide, rather than a WIU focus. One CDC initiative that was started specifically with the WIU curriculum in mind but that grew to include campus and systemwide components was the Group Diversity course members developed (see above). Work on Group Diversity led to a proposal for Dealing with Diversity, a teleclass variation of the course taught by a Cadre member, produced by the Board of Governors Universities through Governors State University, and distributed nationally by the Adult Satellite Service of PBS. Dealing with Diversity is a wonderful example of how the efforts of a few individuals can grow in unexpected, but rich and rewarding, ways. Effectively weaving graphics, interviews, documentary footage, and discussions into dynamic class presentations, the course has extended the work of the CDC as few members envisioned.

This review of WIU's Faculty Development multicultural activities affirms the university's—administration, faculty, staff, and students—commitment to diversity, but it can be misleading since condensing three-four year's work into this compact form and stressing action, events, and accomplishments erases or screens from view the hundreds of hours of work involved as well as the false starts, the frustrations, and the failures. The positive emphasis has been intentional, since the purpose has been to describe a multifaceted model that has been judged successful on many levels and that readers can develop, broaden, or adapt to their own circumstances. But to present a realistic model, unsolved problems and ongoing challenges must be acknowledged. One of the most constant is the disinterest or the resistance of many university personnel to multicultural education. While participation in the CDC has been significant, the programs have reached hundreds, and evaluations have been very positive, neither Faculty Development nor the Cadre has convinced the majority of individuals within the campus community that understanding and responding to our changing student population necessitates rethinking and broadening our cross-cultural communication skills, our course content, our instructional strategies, and our programming priorities.

Obviously, to be committed to multicultural education at WIU, one need not identify oneself to Faculty Development or the Cadre since other diversity initiatives are sponsored through WIU's student services offices and student residential programs; faculty and other personnel also have access to multicultural education via their own professional organizations and their own reading. Still, interaction between Cadre members and nonCadre members on both individual and committee levels indicates discomfort, disinterest, resistance, and even hostility do exist. Anecdotal evidence from students and colleagues support this assessment—as does the invariable question by one or more participants when evaluating a specific multicultural program: "How can we get colleagues who need to hear this to attend?"

Though we do have a tendency in our society to use numbers—attendance figures, scores, grades—to judge success even when they may not be the most appropriate measure, greater awareness of and commitment to multicultural education among members of the university community remains a goal. Even a small group of individuals may be able to effect substantial change, but relying on a limited number of active workers to meet continual, many-faceted challenges that require specific expenditures of time and energy risks fatigue and stress—burnout—for those supporters. Also at risk are pro-
grams. Without people to carry through, to plan the action, investigate the options and repercussions, make the phone calls, set up the meetings, write the proposals, programs do not get started, or if started, they are not sustained. The CDC interaction with the mathematics and writing programs, for example, has diminished considerably over the past year because the persons who initiated the contacts were busy with other programs. Relying on too few people can mean stretching those individuals beyond their ability to respond.

The stamina and impact of a small group of enthusiastic, committed persons, however, should not be underestimated. Whether in a classroom, an office, an auditorium, or a residence hall, whether discussing an issue of diversity or actually interacting across cultures, individuals can advance the understanding and respect necessary for positive communication and action. Hence the necessity to keep alive the enthusiasm of those who recognize and want to strengthen the values of diversity within our society. The Cadre has helped generate and sustain enthusiasm by bringing together individuals from across the university who share, and by sharing, reinforce, for each other their commitment to diversity. Crossing the lines that often separate administrators, faculty, students, and academic, civil, and student services personnel has been a valued aspect of this exchange since it has introduced participants to different perspectives and increased awareness of each unit’s contributions to the mission and goals of the university. Rather than adapting the Bidpai woodpecker’s attitude of exclusion and elitism or following the owl’s game-playing strategy, WIU’s Cultural Diversity Cadre has chosen inclusion and continuing grass roots work as it helps move the campus community toward justice, equity, and diversity.

NOTES

'I have Hallie Lemon to thank for locating and sharing this fable with me.
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APPENDIX I

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: VOICES OF THE NINETIES—
A SELECTIVE, ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF JOURNAL ARTICLES,
SPECIAL ISSUES, AND BOOKS

Prepared by
Katherine Dahl

Copyright 1992 by Illinois Staff and Curriculum Developers Association

Any part of this publication may be reproduced
providing the authors are properly cited.
Many of the current multicultural writers are practicing teachers, educators, and professors: they have taken the time to share, through the printed word, their experiences. Often they draw upon those who have led the way over the last two decades, resulting in in-depth, interesting, and useful bibliographies accompanying their articles, book chapters, and books. These can lead to further resources, but we also hope to update this bibliography periodically and would appreciate your input. If you have found a book or article particularly valuable and want to direct other ISCDA members to it, send your annotated bibliographic information to Katherine Dahl, Library, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455.

**JOURNAL ARTICLES—General Focus**


Ahlquist provides us with a close look at what transpired in this class at San Jose State University. She reflects on the responses of the students and offers her perspectives on the class. The resistance of some of the students is described, as are “pedagogical pitfalls” into which the author fell. Lessons learned by the author from her practice are given (e.g., “We must address student experience as a basis for critique and use this approach as a means to make students self-critically aware of their own and others’ heritages”).


One of multicultural education’s biggest names presents facts to be addressed by both “Western traditionalists and . . . multiculturalists.” He asserts that the traditionalists do not understand that “multiculturalists want to reformulate and transform the Western canon, not to purge the curriculum of the West.” He expresses his concern that “mainstream Americans often have an inability to function effectively within other American cultures.”


An “authentic multicultural classroom” is contrasted with one that is not. The authors assert that early childhood teachers who are committed to multiculturalism should visit the children’s homes (in order to “understand the ecological context from which the child views the world”). Such visits would be scheduled as part of a teacher’s work day. Ways of discovering cultural differences outside of the classroom are suggested. Anthropology and psychology are drawn upon.

This article focuses upon many aspects of educational "emancipation": "emancipatory formulation of multiculturality," "emancipatory narrative," an "emancipatory approach to curriculum," etc. The authors believe that the "historical, political, and social context" of literature constantly must be considered. They want students to "interrogate the text beyond the traditional narrative, thereby filling in the omitted information, voices, and accounts." No praise is heaped upon the "monovocal accounts that dominate textbook knowledge and classroom practice."


A basic, simple, sincere piece: no attempt is made to be "fancy."


The author believes that students who "find both distinctive and shared virtues ... may be less likely to participate in interracial or intercultural hatred." This is a call for "the study of the strengths and virtues of diverse cultures."


The author draws upon her ten years of experience in designing and teaching a course titled Cultural Diversity in American Society. Five specific strategies are expanded upon. Two of those strategies are to "state master stereotypes or polarizing issues explicitly and have students gather and analyze relevant data" and "use classic theories of prejudice and discrimination as a vehicle by which students analyze their own views and behavior."


The author stresses the importance of "cultural awareness programs" and "cultural consciousness raising programs." Focusing on the early years, he dramatically asserts that the "materials should be written about Black males specifically by Black males for Black males and there need be no reference to any other ethnic groups."


This is a basic article, which has this "zinger": "Sometimes children arrive in our program to find a culturally assaultive environment, and we don't even realize it." Such environments are described.

Employees of the Regional Staff Development Center in Kenosha, Wisconsin describe some of the multicultural education projects in which they have been involved. The most effective one was the Multicultural Education Target Schools Project because it was not “an ‘add on,’ but... an integrated part of the total school culture.” How to plan for implementing such a project is explained. Staff development outcomes are given.


Having lived in various parts of the world, the author is able to address “linguistic bigotry.” He says that we must understand that some world citizens “come from cultures that do not value the ‘accoutrements of the culture of power.’” He suggests that public service librarians are among those who “need to be especially aware of developing their skills as ‘cultural brokers’” (a cultural broker is “someone who can bridge the gap between the culture of power and the culturally different”).


This is a publication of the College and University Personnel Association. Henry provides us with a better understanding of the concept of cultural pluralism. He suggests that “a culturally plural environment is one whose participants make a conscious effort to develop a common, just agenda.” He believes that cultural pluralism “raises the possibility of expanding ethical discourse because ethics deals with the fundamental quality of our relations with each other.” He also suggests that “the ethical climate in institutions of higher education may be improved by the evolution of cultural pluralism.”


The author’s thesis is that the “primary goal of a pluralistic curriculum process is to present a truthful and meaningful rendition of the whole human experience [and that] [t]his is not a matter of ethnic quotas in the curriculum for ‘balance.’” He asserts that it is “a fact that no academic content is neutral nor is the specific cultural content of any ethnic group universal in and of itself.”


This is a publication of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Results of a survey of vice presidents of student affairs at almost 200 colleges in a particular region are given. Those administrators were asked to identify who should have responsibility for insuring cultural diversity. The bottom line was: “How the academy responds may be directly related to the readiness of its first-line administrators to recognize the legitimacy of diverse mores and language styles, to respect other traditions, and to be sensitive to the needs, timelines, and aspirations of a population that is not deficient, just different.”

The author compares and contrasts assimilationist and pluralist perspectives on education for the gifted. A focus is upon curriculum content and instructional processes. It is asserted that for gifted students the “infusion of multicultural content is additive.” Theoretical and philosophical frameworks are studied. More research in this area is called for.


The author relates some of her experiences teaching the undergraduate course, *Introduction to Teaching in a Multicultural Society*. Scores received by students on an assessment of their knowledge of civil rights/multicultural issues are analyzed. The author describes her efforts “to remediate the elite.” She asserts that multicultural education is not “a single strategy” and agrees with other writers in the field that “[w]ith few exceptions, multicultural . . . curriculum materials presume a value commitment and readiness for multicultural teaching that most students lack initially.”


Yes, the author believes “that the real aim of multiculturalism is unity and diversity.” She contends that “multiculturalism, as much an ideal as democracy, . . . is not a finished static condition. It is ever in a state of becoming.”


Recommendations which will help increase the level of cultural sensitivity of preservice teachers are given. Most memorable point is: “One course in multicultural education is not enough. An integration of multicultural education into the total teacher education program is essential.”


Larke supports the idea of “lead teachers”—individuals “trained to disseminate accurate and up-to-date research regarding the education of diverse student populations to their respective teachers and administrators.” Characteristics which effective multicultural teachers possess are highlighted. The Minority Mentorship Project at Texas A & M University, which focuses on preservice teachers and elementary minority students, is described. It is strongly suggested that most teacher training institutions will have to modify their current programs.

Specifics of a Human Relations course, a required component in the teacher education program at the University of Wisconsin at LaCrosse, are given. The course is state-mandated. This study was undertaken “to determine the impact of the ... course upon the attitudes of prospective teachers regarding issues of diversity with a specific focus upon race, class, and gender.” The attitude assessment instrument and research design are explained. The authors intend to conduct a follow-up study to assess “the behaviors of graduates of the ... course who are currently teaching, to assess the extent to which their present attitudes have remained consistent with earlier findings.”


This article relates the unfortunate experiences of a student who “has given up because his story has been appropriated by his teacher, because it is no longer his.”


This is the work of the Task Force on Ethnic Studies Curriculum Guidelines of the National Council for the Social Studies and a 1991 revision of the 1976 guidelines. It is divided into three parts: A Rationale for Ethnic Pluralism and Multicultural Education. Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education, and The Multicultural Education Program Evaluation Checklist. There are 23 guidelines (for example. Guideline 17.0 is. “The multicultural curriculum should help students to view and interpret events. situations. and conflict from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives and points of view”).


Program coordinators and peer tutors from the University of Washington’s Educational Opportunity Program Writing Center and California State University, Chico’s Writing Center discuss their experiences. Those centers look upon each person’s culture as “a valuable asset instead of a hindrance.” That “other styles of writing exist and are just as valid” as one’s own is asserted. Anyone connected with a writing center will want to read this article.


The author has taught a course at the University of California-Berkeley called Racial Inequality in America: A Comparative Historical Perspective. He believes that “the need to open the American mind to greater cultural diversity will not go away ... and [that] it offers colleges and universities a timely and exciting opportunity to revitalize the social sciences and humanities, giving both a new sense of purpose and a more inclusive definition of knowledge.”

Anderson, Director of the Curriculum and Pedagogy Collaborative at the Eugene Lang College of the New School for Social Research, explains the approaches and structures he uses in his mathematics classes. The first two sessions are "lecture-discussions on the historical, cultural, and sociopolitical implications of mathematics." He believes that his students have "a more positive, self-assured attitude about themselves successfully doing mathematics." He calls for "planting the seeds for more holistic, in-tune-with-nature, popular and egalitarian forms of learning." This is an article many have been looking for.


Possibly American social work educators face the same problems and challenges as British social work educators. We are reminded that social work of old "concentrated on individuals, in isolation from their environment." That social work education needs to stress adapting practice to meet the needs of clients from diverse backgrounds is asserted.


The value of all campuses of the California School of Professional Psychology having proficiency or emphasis training in Multicultural Education, Research and Intervention Training (MERIT), Cultural Psychology, Multicultural Community Clinical Psychology, and Ethnocultural Mental Health is explained. One of the provosts believes that "[t]he focus on multicultural issues is . . . a mandate to all psychologists."


A contention of this author is that we must "free . . . ourselves from the grip of a single aesthetic system." Challenges to the criteria that typify Western aesthetics are discussed. Kumaoni women’s ritual art is used to show that the underlying tenets of Western aesthetics do not apply to the art of every culture. We are asked to go down the road to aesthetic pluralism.


This is a classic example of qualitative research. Much is asked of teachers by this author: that they accommodate not just "individual learning styles, but cultural learning behaviors too," that they perceive cultural differences as not just equally valid, but as ways in which successful learning occurs, and that they change their pre-classroom planning and interactive strategies for greater multicultural teaching effectiveness."

Jay's lead-off sentence indicates clearly his position: “It is time to stop teaching ‘American’ literature.” A revisionist and a deconstructionist, he wants to get rid of “idealist paradigm[s].” Strongly criticizing an “Americanist pedagogy,” he calls for a “multicultural reconception of ‘Writing in the United States.’” He declares that “[t]eachers have the responsibility to empower previously marginalized texts and readers.”


This very practical article focuses on “techniques and topics” that can be used to bring information about ethnic and racial minorities into the various courses of a journalism program. The “sensitizing process” that students will have to undergo is described. Addresses of organizations of minority journalists are given.


Mullen suggests that foreign language programs, while sometimes not part of the multicultural discussion, have an important role to play in that discussion. He explains why courses like Afro-Hispanic Literature and Studies in Puerto Rican and Chicano Literature are “doubling enriching.” He supports the calls for “a reconnection of literature with its social context.” This is a publication of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages.


The author explains how she taught physics with her “student’s culture in mind” while on a Peace Corps assignment at a high school in Niger, West Africa. The center of gravity, for example, is different for an African carrying something on his or her head than it is for an American carrying something at his or her side.


The text of a statement formulated and endorsed by the Executive Board of the Organization of American Historians is given. Part of that statement is: “Students should . . . understand that history is not limited to the study of dominant political, social, and economic elites. It also encompasses the individual and collective quests of ordinary people for a meaningful place for themselves in their families, in their communities, and in the larger world.”

Twelve “shoulds” related to multicultural education for business educators are given by the Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education of the National Business Education Association.


Prevots discusses the value of a course she created, Dance and Society. In the course films and videos were supplemented with live presentations. Many communities were studied.


Dancers are probably ahead of some in our society: “[They] intuitively accepted that what is now called ‘multiculturalism’ was an important aspect of their art, that their language, the language of movement, was enriched by knowledge of other movement languages, that there is intrinsic value in the dance of other peoples.” It is pointed out that those “dances . . . do not merely entertain by nature of their ‘otherness’ but provide a means of understanding difference.”


The text of a document approved in April 1991 by the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development outlining the need and rationale for a multicultural perspective in counseling is reprinted in its entirety. A conceptual framework is outlined. A focus is upon beliefs and attitudes, knowledge, and skills.


The author asserts that it is time to include art from other cultures, such as African, Japanese, Pre-Columbian, Native American, and Black American, “as a regular part of the curriculum for art education.” She focuses on Native American art. She assures any doubters that “[e]ach of the four disciplines, aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production, is involved when exploring art works from a culture such as Native American.”


How “multicultural, interdisciplinary perspectives may be incorporated into the mathematics curriculum” is explained. The focus is upon elementary students. It can be done!
Zimmerman, E. (1990). Questions about multicultural and art education; or, 'I'll never forget the day M'Blawi stumbled on the work of the Post-Impressionists.' *Art Education*, 43(6), 8-24.

The views of cultural assimilationists and cultural pluralists are compared and contrasted. Reform efforts in art education are discussed. While not the strongest proponent of multicultural art education who ever lived, the author does believe that "it is possible for teachers to help students develop a penetrating look at relationships among art of some selected non-Western cultures, art of their own sub-cultures, and art of the 'mainstream' Anglo-European world." The author also asserts that culturally pluralistic art education can only be achieved if art teachers "[are] supported by local, state, national and community resources."

**JOURNAL SPECIAL ISSUES**


There are three sections to this book: Redefining the University, Its Cultures, and Its Research Methods; The Inclusive University: Making Cultural Diversity Happen; and Dialect University: How to Communicate and Share Knowledge in the Multicultural University. Among the articles are these: "Promoting Multicultural Dissertation Research in a Eurocentric University," "Mentoring and Cultural Diversity in Academic Settings," and "Public Speaking Instruction and Cultural Bias: The Future of the Basic Course."


This issue consists of eight essays, some of which are: "Cross-Cultural Literacy: An Anthropological Approach to Dealing with Diversity," "Organizing Cultural Diversity Through the Arts," "The Challenge of Diversity: Anthropological Perspectives on University Culture," and "Cultural Policy and Educational Change in the 1990s."


Over thirty articles are featured in this issue, which is divided into four sections: A Conceptual Framework, Education and Training, Research Opportunities, and Direct Service Delivery. This is probably a classic—and as good as or better than a book! Produced and published under the auspices of the American Association for Counseling and Development.

BOOKS


Educators from across the country (especially Illinois) who have been involved in various aspects of multicultural education are the contributors to this work. Their essays are grouped in three categories: Instructional Strategies for Diverse Student Populations, Curriculum Issues in Multicultural Education, and Creating the Climate for Change. Two of the appendices relate to multicultural curriculum and instructional initiatives undertaken by Illinois colleges and universities. (Also has subtitle. *A Rationale for Development and Implementation.*)


A companion to and continuation of volume 1, issued one year earlier: educators actively involved in multicultural activities at colleges and universities “offer suggestions, strategies, insights, and information” which may be used, adapted, and/or modified by educators about to embark upon multicultural journeys.


The nine recommendations of the NASBE (National Association of State Boards of Education) Study Group on Multicultural Education are presented and expanded upon: three relate to state board leadership, three to teacher training and staff development, and three to curriculum and school environment. How the recommendations can become realities is explained.


This is number 49 in the acclaimed series, New Directions for Teaching and Learning. Chapter titles include: “Cultural Inclusion in the American College Classroom,” “Acknowledging the Learning Styles of Diverse Student Populations: Implications for Instructional Design,” “Stirring It Up: The Inclusive Classroom,” “Ensuring Equitable Participation in College Classes,” “Creating Multicultural Classrooms: An Experience-
Derived Faculty Development Program,” and “Improving the Climate: Eight Universities Meet the Challenges of Diversity.”


A “sampler” by the chief academic officer of a college, this manual was designed to “form a basis for thinking through to one’s own position” and to provide a look at “some of the major programs and activities others have tried with considerable success.” Chapter 5 is devoted to “Faculty and Cultural Diversity Curricula;” Chapter 6 to “Professional Staff and Student Programs and Services.”


There are three parts to this book: Resolving Inequality, Developmental Needs, and Funding and Evaluating Cultural Pluralism Programming. Especially useful chapters are “Integrating Diversity into Traditional Resident Assistant Courses,” “Planning Programs for Cultural Pluralism: A Primer,” “Planning for Cultural Diversity: A Case Study,” and “Evaluating University Programming for Ethnic Minority Students.”


This is an “activist” work: transformation of pedagogy, the curriculum, and school culture are all called for. Intercultural interaction and communication across cultures are analyzed. The cultural context of achievement is presented. The distinction between cultural and political communities is discussed. Truly provides a comprehensive overview.


The author is a “follower” of Paulo Freire and Henry Giroux and incorporates much of their philosophy. “Bicultural” is used to connote “an enculturation process that is distinct from that of monocultural Anglo-American students.” The best chapters may be the last two, “Creating the Conditions for Cultural Democracy in the Classroom” and “Informing Practice: The Pacific Oaks College Bicultural Development Program.”


This work is divided into two parts: Concepts and Models and Strategies. How the models and strategies can actually be applied is described. Best “reads” are the latter chapters, which range from “Ethnocentrism: Causes, Consequences, Prescriptions” and “Cultural Education: Concepts and Methods” to “Classroom Management and Human Rights Strategies” and “A Synthesis of Pluralistic Teaching.”

There are three main parts to this work: The Marginalization of Multicultural Discourse; Conducting Multicultural Education Research; and The Special Impacts of Multiculturalism in Education.” Practicing educators will be especially interested in chapters 7 and 9. “Manifestation of Inequality: Overcoming Resistance in a Multicultural Foundations Course” and “Culturally Relevant Teaching: The Key to Making Multicultural Education Work.”


This is a creative book, full of activities, case studies, and collages. Cases include “A Practice Situation Involving Race” and “A Practice Situation Involving Ethnicity.” The book was written to help these particular professionals “recognize human differences, confront their own biases, identify their own deficits, and foster the development of awareness, sensitivity, knowledge, and skills required to provide affirmation of the diversity they encounter in their practice.” It should, to say the least, help improve “bedside manners.”


Not every book has a foreword by Paulo Freire; this one does. Chapter 4, “Cultural Literacy and Multicultural Education,” provides the best overview. The authors debate E. D. Hirsch, author of *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know.* The authors assert that cultural literacy is not just “old knowledge” but that it is “reseeing old knowledge” and “sharing knowledge” as well.


A concise work, whose chapters are: “Rationale for a New Paradigm of Citizenship,” “Reflecting and Planning,” “Principles into Policies and Processes,” “School and Classroom Practice,” and “Assessing and Evaluating.” Cognitive, affective, and connotative objectives are focused upon: systemic, institutional, and individual levels are dealt with.


This is the report that caused such a stir. The Executive Summary is masterfully done. Interrelated concerns of the committee are presented; recommendations are stated. Findings which should be addressed when revising social studies syllabi and developing new social studies materials are given.

Case studies accompany many of the chapters and enhance the book. Chapters are divided into two parts: Developing a Conceptual Framework: Multicultural Education in a Sociopolitical Context and Implications of Diversity for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society. The author minces no words, as a chapter subheading, Multicultural Education is Antiracist Education, makes clear. This is a very comprehensive and thorough work.


This is number 48 in the series, New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. Effective programs are described. Most relevant to colleges and universities is chapter 3, “Education, Democracy, and Cultural Pluralism: Continuing Higher Education in An Age of Diversity.


This is already becoming a much-cited work. It features 16 essays, one of which is written by James Banks: “A Curriculum for Empowerment. Action, and Change." Two of the essays are devoted to teacher education, for it is asserted that it is teachers who will have "the power to empower."


"How well do we know one another?" asks the author, a nurse and nursing educator. "There is much to be learned." she declares. The book was written "to open the door to the immense diversity that exists within . . . North American societies, to demonstrate various methods one can use to open one’s mind to the beliefs of others, to describe some of those beliefs, and to refer to some of the available resources." Chapters range from "Healing—Magico-Religious Traditions" to "The Use of Parteras in the Rio Grande Valley, Texas."
APPENDIX II

FILMS AND VIDEOS FOR THE MULTICULTURAL CLASSROOM

Prepared by
Janice R. Welsch

Copyright 1992 by Illinois Staff and Curriculum Developers Association

Any part of this publication may be reproduced providing the authors are properly cited.
The following list of films and videos is meant to suggest the rich array of multicultural audio-visual resources available to educators interested in incorporating such material into their classes. The films present a wide spectrum of diversity issues and can complement exploration of these issues in various disciplines. The list is suggestive. That it includes only a fraction of the media available may be frustrating, but as a sampling of work done and an indication of the wealth of resources accessible to multicultural educators, I hope it stimulates interest and enthusiasm, prompts increased use of appropriate media, and initiates additional searches for more such work.

Entries include the name of the director, the year of production, the title, format (16 mm or 1/2 inch VHS), rental price, length, color (versus black and white) and source. Many of the films and tapes are available for purchase as well as rental and at times prices can be negotiated, though given the difficulty independent film and video makers have in funding their projects, we and they have to balance questions of budgets and production costs with those of effectiveness and the desire to have the works widely seen and discussed. Prices are subject to change and are included to provide readers with approximate costs. Co-sponsoring screenings for use in several classes should be considered to maximize the benefit of a rental.

A distributor's guide is included to facilitate access not only to the films and videos mentioned, but also to other multicultural as well as cross-cultural media. You may want to contact the distributors to request their catalogs since most of them specialize in independently produced films and videos that reflect multicultural perspectives.

The categories I've used for this guide are somewhat arbitrary so I urge you to go beyond a single subject when looking for specific films or videos. Many of the works could fit into several categories: this is especially apparent when you notice gender has not been given a separate focus. Films and tapes by and about women are very much a part of the guide and appear in each of the categories. Additionally, under the heading "Multiple Focus Media," I've placed works addressing issues that transcend particular groups or involve several groups.

I have relied heavily on catalog blurbs and the comments of reviewers and critics when annotating even those works I have seen, focusing primarily on content descriptions but also commenting at times on the media techniques used. An element of chance is inevitable when renting a film or video one hasn't seen, however, since each of us perceives and responds differently to what we see and hear.

Previewing a work before screening it for a class is essential if we are to incorporate it appropriately and effectively given our particular needs and context. How we introduce and discuss it can often determine its value. Rarely does a film or tape do all we want it to do just as we want it done, but almost any work can be used effectively if we analyze the assumptions underlying it as well as its overt content.
The focus of this resource guide is almost exclusively short independently produced films and videos but feature fiction films and network sponsored documentaries should not be overlooked when considering media for multicultural education. If you have found specific works particularly relevant and useful when discussing diversity issues, whether those works are experimental, documentary, or fictional, commercial or independent, do let me know. The information could be included in a film and video resource guide update. Send your suggestions to Janice Welsch, Department of English and Journalism, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455.

AFRICAN AMERICAN


A mother’s recollections of childhood visits to the doctor, conveyed in voice-over narration, provide a compelling and revealing accompaniment to the challenge posed when she must venture into a white neighborhood to fill a prescription. Viewed with fear and suspicion or rendered invisible, the simple task of purchasing medicine, becomes an act of courage and concern. The film succinctly and effectively provides the basis for a discussion of the myriad ways racism pervades life in the U. S.


Perfect Image takes satiric aim at ideals of beauty. This docudrama features two black actresses, one light and one dark, who use “a lot of makeup” to draw attention to women’s obsession with beauty, acceptance, and the “perfect image.”


This filmed interview with novelist Toni Morrison conveys the novelist’s powerful vision and extraordinary talent for storytelling. She speaks of personal experience as the source for her strong African American women characters, of the events that led to her becoming a writer, and of the place of African American writers within the literary world.


This comparison of two African American couples, one living in the suburbs, the other in the inner city, examines the particular pressures of each environment on family relationships. Using dramatic scenes, interviews, and the observation of various forums for dialogue, including both women’s and men’s discussion groups, the filmmakers contrast the difficulties associated with buying into the “American Dream” and those identified with an economically strapped inner city.

In this fictional feature, Burnett portrays the life of Stan, a young African American employed in a Los Angeles slaughterhouse. The grimness of his workplace environment invades every aspect of his life. A vital but bittersweet depiction of working-class realities, *Killer of Sheep* offers viewers a story of individual hardship that reflects a more far-reaching social phenomenon. Through physical details, well chosen vignettes, and a multifaceted music track, the film captures a mood that reflects a harsh reality.


In a clever animated critique of the impossible ideal of beauty posed by society's fascination with long, flowing hair, Chenzira reinforces a self image for African American women that acknowledges the joys of "nappyheadedness." Along the way she gives a quick and comical review of relaxers, gels, and curlers before arriving at the beauty of Afros and cornrows.


Cokes explores the stereotyping of African Americans in mainstream film as a metaphor for the way dominant ideology colonizes contemporary issues of race, representation, and revolution.


A drama set in 1942 Hollywood, this film explores multiple illusions surrounding personal identity as well as motion pictures. Mignon Dupree, an African American studio executive who is perceived as white by her associates, is led to reconsider her identity and her position through an encounter with Ester Jeeter, an African American hired to dub the singing voice of a white actress. Though working with a limited budget, Dash is able to imaginatively pose a number of issues related to the position of African Americans: wartime service and achievement vs. peacetime job discrimination; competence recognized or unrecognized depending on the perception of one's roots and identity; and the cost of acknowledging either.


Animation and African-Haitian dance enliven this drama about African-identified Yasmine Allen, a writer and single mother, and saxophonist Craig Watkins, the Big Lug, as they move toward a relationship of intimacy and commitment. Humor and a self-reflexive nod to the realities of independent filmmaking keep the tone of this film light as Davis explores male-female relationships in terms of friendship and sexuality.

During her lifetime, Ida B. Wells was equal in stature to such well-known African American leaders as Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. DuBois. A journalist, activist, suffragist, and anti-lynching crusader of the post-Reconstructionist period, Wells proved herself to be one of the earliest heroes of civil rights movement. Interviews with historians, sociologists, and writers as well as photographs, paintings, and excerpts from Wells' memoir are interwoven to give a rich and illuminating individual portrait—one that can stimulate discussion of racism and sexism, women's rights, freedom of the press, and activism.


An African American cinema classic, this feature fiction film explores conflicts between Christian beliefs and African spirituality as well as concepts about men, Blackness, and sanity and survival. It does so through a traditional film genre, the vampire film. The pragmatic Ganja enters the complex obsessive world of the wealthy and reclusive Hess and discovers his curse, a curse from which Hess cannot extricate himself but which she, despite her roles as Hess's enemy and lover, escapes.


Jackson documents the history of domestic work in the U. S since slavery and explores the ambivalence African American women have felt towards it. Regarded as demeaning and involving long hours, work defined as menial and low pay, it was for decades one of few occupations open to African American women. Recently, white-owned, entrepreneurial maid services are redefining the work—and employing European Americans. The paradox of this development parallels similar redefinitions and reconfigurations within a workforce that is becoming increasingly diverse.


Produced by a women's collective and combining monologue, dance, and song, this extraordinary video chronicles the history of slavery through the eyes of Caribbean women and illuminates Black diasporic culture and heritage. Based on the poems of Guyanese British writer Grace Nichols, the dramatization conveys a young African woman's quest for survival as she moves from the abusive conditions of a sugar plantation through acts of defiance and rebellion to freedom.


Scholar Angela Davis, poet June Jordan, and novelist Alice Walker, all activists in the civil rights, Black power, and feminist movements, evaluate the contributions of women like Rosa Parks and Fannie Lou Hamer to U. S. society. Interviews, archival footage,
poetry, and music are interwoven in this analysis of racism, imperialism, liberation struggles, homophobia, and feminism.


The vibrance and energy of this video parallels that of the African American a capella singing group it documents. Sweet Honey in the Rock, founded by MacArthur grant recipient Bernice Reagon, sings “to end the oppression of Black people world wide” and embraces musical styles from blues to calypso and concerns from feminism to ecology, peace, and justice. Combining shots of the group in performance with portraits of the individual members and commentary by Angela Davis, Holly Near, and Alice Walker, this tape reflects Sweet Honey’s exuberance and commitment.


This two-part examination of the portrayal of African Americans on prime time television depicts over forty years of race relations in the U. S. Part I, Color Blind TV, covers 1948 to 1968 while Part II, Coloring the Dream, begins with the late 1960s and moves to the present. Riggs intercuts clips from various programs with interviews with actors such as Esther Rolle and Diahann Carroll, producers Norman Lear and David Wolper, and scholars Henry Louis Gates and Alvin Poussaint. The result is a perceptive and comprehensive portrait of African American television images.


A documentary focusing on the religious traditions of Africa as they are practiced in the U. S., this film challenges many of the myths that trivialize those ancient rituals and beliefs. The film includes interviews with priests and priestesses as well as scholars. It not only lets viewers witness an Egungun ancestral communion ceremony, but also explores the concepts behind that and other religious practices and explains the importance of such rituals in maintaining the cultural identity and viability of the worshippers.


Todd Gitlin, Director of the Mass Communications Program at the University of California, Berkeley, has described this video as “The most probing look at news coverage I have ever seen on videotape. It is lively, careful and professional in the best sense.” Through news footage and interviews with reporters, news directors, and community residents, Shulman shows how the news coverage of the riots following the 1980 acquittal of four Miami police officers charged with the murder of an African American community worker, was constructed. A critical analysis of broadcast journalism, the tape focuses on the news selection process, especially as it affects the coverage of racial conflict and domestic crisis.
ASIAN AMERICAN


Made in 1976, this film still has relevance. An overview of New York’s Chinatown, the film portrays a community becoming more fully aware of its identity and of the forces threatening that identity. Moving from early workers who labored on the transcontinental railway to garment factory employees who work in contemporary Manhattan, Choy provides the context out of which the community’s growing self-awareness and strength have emerged.


Using newsreel footage, interviews, animation, and poetry, the filmmakers chronicle the events leading up to and culminating in the 1977 confrontation between the Filipinos of San Francisco’s Manilatown and real estate interests intent on redeveloping the area. Personal portraits are intercut with Manong cultural history in this award-winning film focusing on racism, urban renewal and housing rights, and the Filipino American community.


Choy and Tajima raise questions about the increasing anti-Asian resentment evident in the U. S. by documenting the 1982 beating death of Vincent Chin by two auto workers in Detroit. The subsequent trial, the first federal civil rights trial involving discrimination toward an Asian American, resulted in sentences of three years probation and fines of $3,000 each. Moving beyond the trial, the filmmakers investigate the ensuing movement for justice in the case and depict the consequences for Chin’s mother.


Clips from Hollywood movies reveal decades of disparaging images of Asians and Asian Americans in this innovative documentary that contrasts the Hollywood images with portraits of the filmmakers own families: The Choys, an immigrant working-class family, and the Tajimas, a fourth-generation middle-class family.


Nominated for an Academy Award and honored by top prizes at several film festivals. *Sewing Woman* documents Dong’s mother’s life as a Chinese immigrant to the U.S. Dong, focusing on his mother’s efforts to create a new life after her arrival as a war bride, uses archival footage, home movies, family snapshots, and Zem Ping Dong’s own words to portray the strength and spirit of a woman who managed to bring her entire extended family to the U. S. despite tight immigration quotas.
Gee, D. *Slaying the dragon.* [Video $50]. 60 min. c. San Francisco: Cross Current Media.

*Slaying the Dragon* traces Hollywood’s depiction of Asian and Asian American women over the past sixty years. Using film clips as well as interviews with media critics and actresses, the tape shows the continuing dominance of one-dimensional, stereotypical images. Interviews with Asian American women reveal the impact of those images on their lives and on their self-identities.


A moving documentary exploration of the cultural schizophrenia experienced by Vasu, an Indian woman whose life reflects the Indian influences of her mother and grandmother as well as those of her New York-based husband and teenage sons. Torn between her traditional upbringing and her own personal and professional aspirations. Vasu mirrors the multifaceted experience of numerous immigrant women. Krishnan fuses photographs, cinema verite sequences, and experimental techniques to convey the dilemmas confronting these women.


A recent addition to coming-of-age films. Lew’s film presents a humorous and at times poignant story of a first generation Chinese American adolescent who is torn between his mother’s desire for him to find “a nice Chinese girl” and his own desire to assimilate.


Mitsuye Yameda and Nellie Wong share insights and poetry in this chronicle of Chinese and Japanese American history. Differences as well as the shared experiences of biculturism and generational tensions surface as the two poets discuss their experiences as Asian Americans and consider “the strengths and tragedies of two Asian American societies.”


This video clearly and comprehensively outlines the immigration of Asian women to the U. S. and documents the many contributions and sacrifices of Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Filipino women in U. S. history.


Documenting the lifestyles and religious practices of Hmong immigrants in northern Illinois. *Between Two Worlds* gives viewers the opportunity to witness shamanic ritu-
als and ceremonies that help the Hmong retain their cultural identity despite discrimination and efforts to convert them to Christian religions. Among the 60,000 Hmong refugees from mountain villages in northern Laos to settle in the U. S., the families reflect the pressures of straddling two very different worlds.


Like many other video artists confronting racism, Soe uses humor to depict her childhood experiences as a fourth-generation Chinese American. Coloring book characters convey her ambivalence toward her heritage while TV programs show the media images that foster anti-Asian prejudice.


Tajiri explores personal and cultural memory through the juxtaposition of Hollywood images of Japanese Americans and World War II propaganda with stories from her family. She blends interviews, memorabilia, a pilgrimage to the camp where her mother was interned, and the story of her father who had been drafted, into a moving testament of the Japanese American experience and a challenging study of the difficulty of representing the past.


Doris Chu, a recently divorced Chinese American, has plastic surgery to change the shape of her eyes and meets with the disapproval of Mei, her teenage daughter. Pointing to the generational differences and identity struggles that define a world of hybrid cultures, *Two Lies* uses a journey to the “Native American” tourist attraction and a desert resort as backdrops for her study.


A complex, multilayered and challenging documentary, this film incorporates dance, printed texts, folk poetry, the words and experiences of Vietnamese women in Vietnam (North and South) and the U.S., interviews, and verite footage to interrogate official depictions of Vietnamese culture. Through its theoretical approach and experimental form, the film explores the difficulty of translation and themes of dislocation and exile as it critiques traditional and postwar Vietnamese society and culture.

**HISPANICS/LATINAS/LATINOS**

Based on an 18-month strike by Mexican American zinc workers and produced by filmmakers blacklisted during the McCarthy era, this film provides an empowering vision of individuals coming together despite initial differences in focus and objectives. Faced with a court injunction prohibiting the miners from picketing, their wives organize and picket in their stead, educating their chauvinistic husbands about the hardships of living without running water and proper sanitation as well as about women's political understanding and strength. Produced on a minuscule budget and under most difficult conditions (including harassment of the filmmakers during every phase of the production and distribution process), the film is not a technically polished work, but it is an exceptionally insightful one.


Through interviews with Manuela and Ben Aparicio, this film examines the challenges of crossing cultures experienced by Mexican immigrants to this country. By focusing on the Aparicions, both school counselors, the film provides positive models for immigrants who want to claim a place within the multicultural society of the U.S. It also serves as a catalyst for discussion of questions about identity, adaptation, survival, and achievement within the U.S.


Through interviews with Mexican and Central American women migrant workers who harvest grapes, strawberries, and cherries in California and the Pacific Northwest, Genasci and Valesco analyze environmental and health issues, immigration policies, and child care concerns. Dolores Huerta, cofounder of the United Farm Workers Union is one of the women who address these issues.


As Anthony Quinn travels the country talking to people in Hispanic communities, he discusses the social and employment problems they face while also reflecting on his own experiences as a young Mexican American growing up in East Los Angeles. Rita Morena also shares her experiences as an Hispanic in the U.S. Produced for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the film’s emphasis is on job discrimination.


This tape weaves together the stories of three Latin American teens who entered the U.S. illegally. Using misinterpreted images and misplaced allegories to describe their initial expectations and the reality of their surroundings, the teens, now entering adulthood, see “the American Dream” (mal)functioning in their lives.
Mi Vida: The three worlds of Maria Gutierrez. [Film $90/Video $70]. 28 min. c. Santa Fe: OneWest Media.

Maria Gutierrez, the daughter of Hispanic migrant farmworkers, was at age 14 unable to read Spanish or to read or write English. Four years after she entered school for the first time she won a four-year scholarship to the University of California. Her story is one of hardship and ambition, of parental support and personal motivation and is told through visits with Maria to her grandparent’s home in rural Mexico, to the labor camp home of her parents, and to her campus where she reflects on her desire to excel. She becomes a dynamic role model and a source of encouragement not only for Hispanics but also for any young person intent on succeeding despite difficult odds.


Siegal shows how traditional Puerto Rican music is used as a source of resistance against cultural domination and a means by which Puerto Rican culture is at once maintained and transformed. He does so by exploring the evolution and performances of the Lexington Avenue Express, a group that grew out of a workshop sponsored by the Center for Puerto Rican Studies in New York City.

NATIVE AMERICANS


When discussing multicultural studies, the oft-repeated example of an inappropriate course for the category is “Basketweaving in China” (or wherever) but this film suggests the wealth of culture woven into the baskets of a people. An evocative portrait of basketweaver Nettie Jackson Kuneki, And Women Wove It in a Basket explores Klickitat river culture within a study of documentary practice and cultural preservation. A unique document woven from personal memory, reflection, and cultural collaboration, the film presents the Klickitat heritage through seasonal activities, Indian tales and legends, and basketweaving while it also questions ethnographic film practices.


This series consists of five documentaries about Native Americans in Canada and reflects a long, intense struggle for the recognition of basic human rights and cultural values. Documentary footage, interviews, archival film, and dramatic reenactments are intercut in each film of the series. The films are: L. Todd’s The Learning Path, a study of Native American education through the memories and insights of Edmonton elders and educators Ann Anderson, Eva Cardinal, and Olive Dickason; H. Brody’s Time Immemorial, a chronological of the Nisga tribe’s struggle for recognition of land rights; B. Richardson’s Flooding Job’s Garden, a study of the impact of the development of hydroelectric power on the James Bay Cree and the Cree’s international campaign for re-
sponsible development: G. Cardinal's Tickenagan, an exploration of the challenges faced by Native child welfare providers as seen through a revolutionary Native-run agency at Sioux Lookout in northwestern Ontario; and D. Poisey & W. Hansen's Starting Fire with Gunpowder, the story of the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation as told by Inuk filmmaker Ann Neekitjuk Hanson. The IBC reflects Hansen's realization "that the first thing that happens in a revolution is the take-over of the radio and television stations."


This documentary focuses on issues of cultural and religious sovereignty raised when the Karuk Indians go to court over the protection of ceremonial lands. Relying on the Freedom of Religion provision of the U. S. Constitution, the Indians win an initial victory that is later reversed by the Supreme Court. Despite this reversal, the Karuk realize an environmental victory and a greater sense of their own ability to control their lives and preserve their culture.


With the aid of rare film footage of early 20th-century Karuk life and the interaction of 76-year-old Karuk Lew Wilder with the younger Leaf Hillman, this tape shows how the artistic heritage of Karuk culture is being shared by one generation with the next. While Hillman learns to make drums and soapstone pipes, he also learns the history and philosophy of his people.


Through her choice of images of Hopi land and life, Ferrero visually affirms the Hopi commitment to a culture in balance with nature. A culture rooted in a deeply spiritual respect for all of life. This relation to nature and other aspects of Hopi life are explored and celebrated with guidance from several Hopi—a farmer, a spiritual leader, a grandmother, a painter, potter, and weaver.


Conversations with Mohawk leaders and residents of Akwesasne in New York State document not only the Mohawk determination to survive and solidify their nation, but also reveal a belief system and culture that have been powerful influences on other cultures within the U. S. Despite pressure to assimilate, the Mohawks show their commitment to the revitalization of their own culture.

One of several tapes about Native Americans produced by Native Americans, this video was first broadcast on the Learning Channel as part of the Spirit of Place series. Through Navajo matriarch Katherine Smith’s eyes and words the traumatic consequences of relocation are explored and experienced.


A penetrating look at the structure of tribal governments, this video shows how they fit into the state and federal systems. It explores the relationships of tribal governments to the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and examines the consequences of having no political advocate within this system. Specific attention is given to land and water rights and the recentered struggles surrounding those rights.


Filmed at the First Continental Conference of Indigenous Peoples, this tape features songs, dance, and interviews with people from Indian nations of North, South, and Central America. Moving testimony reveals the impact of the Columbus legacy on the lives of indigenous peoples as Native people speak about contemporary struggles over land and human rights, the importance of reviving spiritual traditions, and the need to alert the world to the environmental crises threatening the survival of the planet. The video is available in English and Spanish versions and sale and rental prices differ for institutions and community groups.


Focusing on Alestine Andre and her family, this film provides a rich mosaic of Loucheux life. Structured around the activities of their summer fishing camp, the film depicts Alestine instructing her niece in the Loucheux language and listening to the stories of her 93-year-old grandmother. Through these exchanges issues of cultural tradition, continuity, and change are explored.


A musical comedy about three sisters growing up in Brooklyn in the 1930s and 1940s, the film presents the customs and traditions of a Native American family. A blend of documentary (including home movies, scenes of family pow wows and traveling medicine shows), musical theatre (reenacting family and tribal stories), and personal memoir (of Lisa, Gloria, and Muriel Miguel and their large extended family), the film shifts between contrasting perspectives while weaving a “collective story” of one family. The Miguel sisters have performed this story professionally as Spiderwoman Theatre.

Ghost Dance commemorates the 100th anniversary of the December 29th, 1890 Wounded Knee Massacre of 300 Lakota by the U. S. Army. Described as a “wonderful blend of poetry and art and clear vision,” the film offers a sensitive portrait and new understanding of a sad, tragic event in U. S. history. The winner of numerous awards, it is an excellent vehicle for study and discussion.


Smith, a Lakota, provides insight into the traditional mediating roles of gays and lesbians within Native American tribes. She explains how their sexual orientation was viewed as giving them a unique perspective and sensitivity that allowed them to bridge diverse cultural worlds. Smith also examines the issue of homophobia among Native Americans as well as other people, especially since the identification and spread of AIDS. Interviews with activists and personal testimony reflect the painful as well as positive experiences of gay Native Americans.


Smith describes this short lyrical video as “a collaboration of urban Native and non-Native people from all over the continent: Abenaki, Yupik, Dakota, Lakota, Anishinabe, Maya and more [who] came together to share... stories and wisdom about healing, about death, about the future, about how to live.” Juxtaposing Native spirituality and the process of living with AIDS day-to-day, the emphasis is on the cyclical nature of the personal, strongly ethical journey involved in living with illness and its connections with political engagement.

PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES


The focus of this documentary is people of various ages who have facial disfigurements, one of the most psychologically difficult disabilities to deal with. Many of the individuals depicted have broken the cycle of low self-esteem and rejection often associated with disfigurement. Wives and mothers, career people, and outgoing young people show that it is possible not only to come to terms with their appearance, but also to live fully engaged lives.


Jeff Heath has not let paraplegia stop him from traveling to remote regions of the world. Wheeling Free takes viewers with him through Central America. Among the sites he visits are crowded Indian markets, the steep pyramids of Mayan ruins, teeming jungles, and breathtaking coral reefs. A journey taken not only to satisfy his curiosity, but also...
to meet with Latin American activists with disabilities, Heath learns how they are organizing despite civil war and economic uncertainty.


Filmed over four years, this tape documents an extraordinary family, a family set apart by the fact that two of the four children are severely disabled with cerebral palsy. Using wheelchairs to insure mobility, they participate in school, community, summer camp, and church activities, thanks particularly to their mother, whose tenacity and charm have assured the children of the educational and medical benefits they need. The film, narrated by Kathleen Turner, can provide insight for all viewers and support for those faced with similar challenges.


Integrating issues of gender and disability, *Positive Images* focuses on three strong and articulate women and offers role models for women and girls with disabilities. Education, employment and careers, sexuality, family life and parenting, and societal attitudes are among the issues discussed.


Focusing on three older adults who have chosen to take care of a disabled spouse or relative at home, *To Care* examines the difficult mix of needs and emotions, frustrations and rewards such a decision entails. The tape offers insight into the interaction between caregivers and persons with disabilities and can help stimulate discussion about the problems and solutions associated with such interaction.


Realistic and positive, this depiction of four women with disabilities focuses on the fulfilling relationships they have established. The women talk about their struggle for self-esteem, their search for love, and the challenge of finding sexual expression. Their disabilities include blindness, deafness, cerebral palsy, and a rare bone disease that prevented normal growth. Each has found love and each challenges stereotypical notions about the possibility of intimate relationships for persons with disabilities.


Daniel Day-Lewis captures the passion, humor, and zest for life of Christy Brown, who triumphed over cerebral palsy as well as poverty and lack of education to become one of Ireland’s outstanding literary figures. Based on Brown’s autobiography, the film portrays the supportive family in which he grew up. While it is ultimately a life affirming portrait, the film shows the full range of challenges and emotions associated with living with disability.

As a record of her mother’s battle with multiple sclerosis, Steinberg’s video captures the role reversals from parent/child to patient/care-giver that took place in her relationship with her mother when the illness began exacting its toll. Sadness, frustration, denial, humor, tenderness, and grief are part of the family’s attempts to cope with the declining health and then the death of one of its members.

**THE ELDERLY**


Described by one critic as “a beautifully evocative film which reminds me of the strength, beauty and wisdom of older women,” this impressionistic film gives us the faces and voices of Oklahoma women between the ages of 85 and 101. The African American, Native American, and European American women present an invaluable perspective on regional culture as they reveal the history and spirit that define them.


This film chronicles the experience of Pat Moore, a young reporter, when she disguised herself as a helpless 85-year-old woman and ventured out on the streets in over a hundred cities. Often ignored when she needed assistance, rendered helpless at times by the speed and noise of a youth oriented milieu, even attacked by a group of 13-year-olds, she found how difficult it can be to survive in a world designed for the young and fit.


Gurievitch addresses the highs and lows associated with the process of aging through depictions of six senior citizens. They share their feelings and attitudes about growing older as they interact with family and friends. Reflecting dignity and purpose, the lives of these seniors present a positive approach to retirement and old age.


An exploration of a program that brings inner city kids from New York schools into contact with nursing home residents, this tape shows some of the benefits such interaction generates. The older people respond to the vitality of the young people while the students find acceptance, love, and support.

From the opening shot of an elderly woman standing on her head, this documentary celebrates the benefits of an active lifestyle through the depiction of a Canadian-based seniors gymnastics team. Ranging in age from 55 to 77, the women and men represent a variety of lifestyles, experiences, and health constraints. Each team member pursues an individual fitness regime, but twice weekly they meet to coordinate and develop their performance routines. Turning cartwheels, climbing ropes, exercising on parallel bars, they prove that strength and agility can be maintained late in life.


Made in England, this documentary sensitively and informatively presents an oral history of 16 lesbians ranging in age from 50 to over 80. The women come from various backgrounds and together explore the experiences of women during WW II, butch/femme roles, the emergence of contemporary feminism, and coming out later in life to husbands and children. A vibrant, groundbreaking work, the tape provides moving portraits of a group rarely seen on film. In a 1991 sequel, Women Like That, eight Women Like Us participants discuss how their lives have changed since the earlier tape was broadcast in England. Homophobia, familial support, and the lack of housing available to elderly lesbians are among the concerns discussed.


Sensitive portraits of seven senior women who share their stories and reflections, this documentary invites viewers to rethink their ideas about growing older. Focusing on the hands and faces as well as the words of these culturally diverse women, Wiener provides an eloquent testament to their wisdom and beauty.


A docudrama that intercuts contemporary interviews with dramatized scenes, this tape covers the history of women's fight for social justice in Jamaica by chronicling the unlikely friendship of Amy Bailey, daughter of an eminent Black family and leader of the 1930s Jamaican women's movement, and May Farquharson, daughter of a wealthy plantation owner and a leader in the fight for women's reproductive rights and for reforms to benefit the elderly.

GAYS AND LESBIANS


A woman of courage and vision, Jan Griesinger is an ordained minister, a lesbian, and an active feminist who has been able to integrate her ministry, her politics, and her personal life in a way that has earned her the respect of many people. In this "well-craft-
ed and articulate narrative,” Alter presents a portrait not only of a strong individual but of feminism’s impact on institutions and lifestyles.


An experimental, textually multilayered examination of four traditional weddings, Friedrich accompanies her images with an ironic medley of love songs to suggest the emotional ambiguities of a cultural event everyone recognizes but from which many are excluded by virtue of their sexual orientation. Beautifully shot, culturally resonant, and structurally restrained, the film conveys “a very complicated range of emotions with incredible precision.”


A groundbreaking documentary, this video focuses on violence against lesbians. Interviews with many women reveal stories of unprovoked violence, physical and psychological harassment, and attempts at institutional ‘cures’.” Anti-gay clashes with gay and lesbian activists in various public settings and forums provide a backdrop for the interviews.


Profiling five lesbian and gay couples from diverse cultural backgrounds, this film portrays in non-threatening terms a revolutionary act that questions a traditional concept of family. Each couple tells the story of how they met, why they decided to marry, and how their family and friends responded. In turn funny, bittersweet, and triumphant, the stories validate the couples’ commitment to one another.


Described as “a rich, sensitive portrait of life in homosexual families with parents as committed to their children as any heterosexual parent.” *We Are Family* focuses on three families: gay foster parents and their 16-year-old son; lesbian mothers and their adopted 11-year-old son; and a gay father and his two biological daughters. The film emphasizes what these parents have to offer their children and suggests that good parenting is independent of sexual orientation.


Designed to break the silence surrounding adolescent homosexuality, this video examines the emotional strain placed on gay youth by the intense feelings of isolation created by their sexual orientation and society’s response to it. The isolation often leads to drug and alcohol abuse, violence, homelessness, and even suicide. By contrasting the suicide death of 20-year-old Bobby Griffith with the courageous straight-on approach to homophobia adopted by 17-year-old Gina Gutierrez, the tape shows that informa-
tion, acceptance, and support can make crucial differences in the lives of young people.


In this stereotype-shattering documentary, eleven lesbians discuss with honesty and candor their lives. They cover a wide range of issues including marriage, motherhood, discrimination, stereotypes, and female roles, in the process showing us that many lesbians have mainstream values and lead conventional lives. Women of color and older women are among those interviewed, as are the sisters and parents of several of the women.


This film chronicles the efforts of Karen Thompson to obtain the rights to see and care for her lover, Sharon Kowalski after she was critically injured and disabled in a car accident. Denied these rights by Sharon’s parents and the Minnesota courts despite Sharon’s and her commitment, Thompson has moved from a closeted lesbian to a leading activist for the rights of lesbian and gay couples and the disabled.

CLASS/THE POOR/WORK


Four women discuss how their lives changed when they stepped into the traditionally male world of skilled crafts. Iron-worker, welder, sprinklerfitter, and electrician, these women tell how they overcame physical and personal obstacles to meet the challenges of their trades and enjoy the greater financial power and sense of accomplishment of journeywomen.


Three families, each representing three generations of working mothers and each with a different ethnic background—African American, Eastern European, and Hispanic—tell their stories. Human strength, pride, accomplishment, and sadness are intertwined as the issues of class, ethnicity, and gender are explored through interviews, photographs, and archival film footage.


This PBS documentary explores poverty in America through the stories of six people and their families. Hunger, unemployment, the effectiveness of social services, the demographics of poverty, the history of federal anti-poverty programs and the emotional and psychological impact of poverty are the issues addressed.

Nurses present their view of the adverse relationship between quality patient care and the poor working conditions under which much nursing is carried out. The documentary dramatizes the efforts of nurses to organize for better conditions, more equitable salaries, and self respect. Like other media that focus on women’s place in the work world, this video links economic issues with issues of quality, the quality of the job experience and its impact on one’s self concept.


Hamada and Sinkler spent two years familiarizing themselves with the groups of homeless people they depict in this documentary about survival and dignity. Set in a shantytown on New York’s Lower East Side, the film portrays the struggles of these homeless people and, in doing so, provides a vehicle for understanding the many dimensions of poverty: psychological, social, and cultural.


The focus of this film is the May 1990 takeover of vacant houses by homeless people in Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, Tucson, Oakland, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Chicago. The conditions leading up to this action and its effects on the lives of those involved are explored through the stories individuals tell. Twelve crews in the eight cities, professionals as well as the homeless themselves, document the action of people who refuse to remain quiet or disappear. Described as “a stunning, hard-hitting and thought-provoking visual and verbal statement,” the film is a skillfully edited collage about the homeless organizing to effect change.

**MULTIPLE FOCUS MEDIA**


In this documentary profile of the way people across the U. S. talk, we are invited to a full range of accents and dialects as we listen in on conversations and interviews with Boston Brahmins, African American teenagers in Louisiana, New York professionals, an Ohio journalist, and many more individuals whose speech has been shaped by geography, education, and ethnicity. At once humorous and perceptive, the film explores the diversity within our nation from a refreshing perspective.


Incorporating footage shot at gatherings of U. S. radical right groups including the Ku Klux Klan, Aryan Nation, Posse Comitatus, and the European Alliance, this film pre-
sents the views of people whose agenda is racist, anti-Semitic, and extremely nationalistic. Booklist note: “There is no overriding judgmental commentary here, but the production’s editing of the gathering’s activities and interviews creates a candid, sometimes wry, and cumulatively chilling portrait: Threatened, disenfranchised citizens who boldly speak of sowing the seeds of violence to regain a sense of control and power.” As abhorrent as their philosophy is, it is to our advantage to understand it in order to avoid becoming victims or targets.


Upbeat and ironic, Cheang’s tape was originally conceived as a video installation for washing machines. Through the metaphor of “color wash,” she tackles the realities and myths of race assimilation in U.S. society. Challenging stereotypes, twelve writer/performers collaborate on four performance sequences: soak, wash, rinse, and extract. Spinning through the U.S. washload, the performers scheme to claim racial images that remain color vivid.


In this tape, children and teenagers, parents, social workers and community activists as well as abusers speak out against child abuse. Revealing the dynamics of such abuse within the context of race and class, Chenzira focuses on societal attitudes, legal processes, and the media’s promotion of erotic images of children. Powerful and chilling testimony of survivors is intercut with analyses of the problem and of the multileveled action necessary to combat it. Through creative images and dynamic cutting, Chenzira conveys the intensity of the violence inherent in child abuse while suggesting as well possibilities for prevention and for healing.


Framed against the realities of civil rights issues, labor politics, religion, and class in the Mississippi Delta, this documentary depicts the complex intersecting worlds of Chinese, African Americans, and European Americans in a small isolated community. Three production crews, each paralleling the ethnicity of the group they chronicled, participated in the videotaping. The result is a tapestry of historical and contemporary footage that reflects the daily lives of the Delta residents while raising issues of ethnicity, acculturation, racism, interracial cooperation, and community development.


*A Family to Me* moves beyond the myth of the traditional family (“Dad works. Mom stays home. There are two children.”) to present other positive and realistic family structures and roles. Among the depictions are brothers who discovered new identities as househusbands, an African American single parent with a philosophy of “going it
alone," a lesbian couple parenting twin boys, and a divorced Jewish couple who have created a joint custody arrangement in keeping with their values.


Blending humor and candor, thirteen women of varying age, ethnicity, and size talk about their bodies and how they do or do not measure up to the "perfect" body. Masks, mannequins, and 1930's beauty-contest footage reinforce the women's testimony and help portray the capriciousness of ideals of beauty. Through her critique, Krawitz invites women to defy the societal standards that undercut their confidence in their own bodies and individuality.


An exploration of the sociology of religion in a multicultural context, this series of 24 one-hour tapes focuses on a variety of religions and worldviews, including Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Indigenous American religions, and civil religions. Dr. John Simmons, an associate professor at Western Illinois University, and his guests provide insights into the mythic, ritualistic, doctrinal, ethical, and social dimensions of religions. Taken together, the tapes can help us become a religiously literate nation. "one where citizens have learned to respond to religious differences, not with fear and violence, but with interest and understanding."


Dr. J. Q. Adams, an associate professor at Western Illinois University, conducts this teleclass on diversity. Covering principles of social interaction, cross cultural communication, demographic trends, immigration policy, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, age, and ability issues, the 24 tapes aim to help viewers "develop an awareness that society is strengthened not from striving for uniformity but from a free and unfettered expression of individuality in all its diverse manifestations." Interviews with guests ranging from James Yellowbank, Coordinator of the Indian Treaty Rights Committee, and Dr. Molefi Asante, Chair of Afro-American Studies at Temple University, to Arthur Jones of the American First Committee, are integrated into Adams' presentations and class discussions.


Moss and Mack examine the background and political environment surrounding the production of *Sal. of the Earth,* a 1954 fictional account of an 18-month zinc mine strike by Mexican Americans begun in 1950. Made during the Cold War/McCarthy era by blacklisted Hollywood personnel in collaboration with the miners and their families, the film met with multiple attempts to thwart its production and release. Interviews with the actors and clips from the film together with newsclips and broadcasts from the


Set in a contemporary convalescent home, a mysterious patient with a penchant for Shakespeare reaffirms the *joie de vivre* despite the presence of old age and death. Regarded initially as senile, then as disruptive, the new patient proves there is method to his madness as he teaches both residents and staff that life, even in the shadow of death, can be enjoyed and lived richly. The film stars Mako and Esther Rolle.


An award winning study of children of mixed racial heritage. Onwurah's film documents the pain of racial harassment these children often face. At once lyrical and unsettling, starkly emotional and visually compelling, this semi-autobiographical work explores deeply internalized effects of racism and ongoing struggles for self-definition and pride. It provides a compelling catalyst for discussion.


This short video is intended to spark discussion about the deep-seated and insidious nature of the prejudice that results from continuing exposure to racism in our society. Friends and roommates, Ray, European American, and Will, African American, are forced to confront the issue when Ray stuns Will—and himself—by uttering a racial slur during a theatrical improvisation exercise.


Graphics, vintage photographs, and watercolor animation shape this depiction of a daughter of the 1940s struggling to find an identity within her African American and Native American heritages. She identified with her grandfather's Native American ancestry until the 1960s when she shed her feather for an Afro and dashiki. The winner of several festival prizes, the work is "A delightful, provocative film invoking a universal response to the search for identity" (Newark Black Film Festival).


Among the eight elderly gays and lesbians depicted in this documentary are a male couple who have loved and lived with each other 55 years, a feminist author/political activist, a former monk who in his eighties is comfortable being Catholic and gay, an African American great-grandmother, and a feisty ex-waitress from Chicago. They speak about their reclusive earlier lives and the satisfaction of being out, of the chal-
lenges to their self-esteem and survival in a “straight world,” and of their long-term deep-rooted commitments.


A satiric comedy that maintains a gutsy sense of humor in spite of its focus on slum living, battered women, and police bureaucracy. Set in New York’s Lower East Side, the action revolves around “a very peculiar death” and the chaos that ensues when four usually feuding neighbors attempt to dispose of the body before the police arrive.


Through drama, Yamazaki observes the psychological effects of racism on two children of Japanese women and American servicemen. Thirty-one year old Kate, the daughter of a Japanese/white marriage, visits her childhood friend, Ted, a Japanese/African American. Together they confront the memory of her mother’s tragic story and the racism of our society.


The Assiniboine/Sioux Indian Reservation in Montana, the Black Belt of Alabama, the Appalachian Mountains of Tennessee, and the South Bronx of New York are the focus of this documentary. Though the depictions are of poor U. S. communities, Yates’s emphasis is individuals whose lives have changed dramatically through participation in community-based education programs.


This work documents a bitter two-year strike led by African American women against a chicken processing plant in Laurel, Mississippi, by contrasting the efforts of union and civil rights supporters with the increased activity of the Ku Klux Klan and the American Nazi Party. The result is a disturbing film that demonstrates just how pervasive and persistent Klan and Nazi members are in their adherence to hate and terror.
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FAX: 212/808-4983

Film News Now Foundation
625 Broadway, Suite 904
New York, NY 10012
212/979-5671
FAX: 212/979-5792

Films Inc.
5547 N. Ravenswood Ave.
Chicago, IL 60640-1199
800/323-4222

First Run/Icarus Films
200 Park Avenue S., Suite 1319
New York, NY 10003
212/674-3375

Gina Lamb
1151 E. Hyde Park Blvd.
Inglewood, CA 90302
310/672-2357

Governors State University
Communications Services
University Park, IL 60466
708/534-4094
FAX: 708/534-8956

Mypheduh Films, Inc.
48 Q Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
202/529-0220

New Day Films
121 W. 27th Street, Suite 902
New York, NY 10001
212/645-8210
FAX: 212/645-8652

Onewest Media
P.O. Box 5766
Santa Fe, NM 87502-5766
505/983-8685

Pearl Banks
1518 Rossman S. E.
Grand Rapids, MI 49507
616/243-5855

Terra Nova Films, Inc.
9848 W. Winchester Ave.
Chicago, IL 60643
312/881-8491
Third World Newsreel
335 W. 38th Street, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10018
212/947-9277
FAX: 212/594-6217

Turning Tide Productions
P.O. Box 864
Wendell, MA 01379
508/544-8313

Unity Productions
7400 S.W. 70th Street
Aberdeen, SD 57401

Upstream Productions
420 1st Ave. West
Seattle, WA 98119
206/281-9177

William Greaves Productions
230 W. 55th Street, 26th Floor
New York, NY 10019
212/265-6150 or 800/874-8314
FAX: 212/315-0027

Women Make Movies
225 Lafayette Street, Suite 206
New York, NY 10012
212/925-0606
FAX: 212/925-2052
FURTHER AUDIO-VISUAL RESOURCES

Appleshop
Appalachian People and Issues
306 Madison Street
Whitesburg, KY 41858
606/633-0108
FAX: 606/633-1009

Asian Cinevision
32 East Broadway
New York, NY 10002
212/925-8685

Black Film Center/Archive
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
812/335-2684 or 812/335-3874

Black Filmmakers Foundation
Tribeca Film Center
375 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10013
212/941-3944
FAX: 212/941-4943

Cine Festival
Latino Media Information
1300 Guadalupe Street
San Antonio, TX 78207-5519
512/271-3151

Media Alternatives Project
Avery Teacher Center/NYU
70 Washington Sq. So., 2nd Flr.
New York, NY 10012

Media Network
39 W. 14th Street, Suite 403
New York, NY 10011
212/929-2663

Museum of the American Indian
3753 Broadway at 155th Street
New York, NY 10032
212/283-2420
FAX: 212/491-9302

National Black Programming Consortium
1266 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43205
614/252-0921

Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium
P.O. Box 8311
1800 North 33rd Street
Lincoln, NE 68501-1311
402/472-3522
FAX: 402/472-1785

National Latino Community Ctr.
4401 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
213/669-5083

Paper Tiger Television
339 Lafayette Street
New York, NY 10012
212/420-9045

Video Data Bank
School of the Art Institute
280 S. Columbus Drive
Chicago, IL 60603
312/443-3793