Education Faculty Works

School of Education

1997

# Sociocultural factors affecting school reform in culturally diverse settings

Magaly Lavadenz
*Loyola Marymount University*, mlavaden@lmu.edu

Mary K. McCullough
*Loyola Marymount University*, mary.mccullough@lmu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/education_fac

Part of the Education Commons

## Recommended Citation

Lavadenz, M.& Martin S. (1997). Educational responses to cultural diversity: A typology for teacher education. Proceedings of the 1996 National Association for Multicultural Education, 18-34.

**Chapter One**

# Educational Responses to Cultural Diversity

### By Magaly Lavadenz & Shane P. Martin
*Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, California*

## Introduction and Overview

Responding to cultural diversity in ways that are authentic and effective has been a major task of education, especially teacher education, for more than the past quarter century. Since the advent of models of multicultural education (Banks, 1992, 1993b, 1993c; Gibson, 1976/1984; Grant & Sleeter, 1985; Grant, Sleeter & Anderson, 1986; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1994), educators have been aware that there is diversity in approaches that respond to diversity. Although the many multiple perspectives and models of "multiculturalism" and education reveal a flexible and dynamic field of inquiry, there is also confusion, misunderstanding, and frustration on the part of some who are overwhelmed by a multiplicity of approaches and a lack of clarity regarding definitions and term usage for educational professionals. In this paper we discuss the need for a more holistic and integrative approach, and present a comprehensive and comprehensible typology of educational responses to cultural diversity.

### Historical Perspective for Addressing Cultural Diversity

The civil rights movement, the anti-war efforts and the various ethnicity-specific movements of the 1960s paved the way for major changes in the ways schools address the cultural and linguistic diversity reflected in the student population. These sociopolitical actions correlated directly with the demands that schools examine educational disparities between groups, especially the disparity in academic success between European American students and ethnic and linguistic minority groups. The demands for greater school accountability were further reflected in the different approaches and responses that U.S. schools adopted in efforts to address differential achievement rates.

One result of the social movements of the 1960s was that the phenomenon of differential achievement was highlighted in a new way. Although educational and structural inequalities have existed between and among groups in the United States since its inception, this time period marked the first time that the field of education and the related social science disciplines (anthropology, sociology, political science, history) examined school achievement in a systematic and in-depth manner.

As articulated in the educational literature (Banks, 1983a, 1983b; García, 1994; Martin, 1996; Ogbu, 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1994, Oliva, 1986; Sue & Padilla, 1986), differential achievement refers to the fact that certain ethnic and cultural minority groups, as groups, achieve considerably lower than members of the dominant majority in standardized tests, graduation rates, and academic persistence rates. Differential achievement is a serious problem for a democratic nation such as the United States, a nation that has historically claimed, beginning with the Constitution and Declaration of Independence, that all people should be afforded a fair and equal opportunity to achieve. Public education and the common school were seen as providing the opportunity to equalize differences among groups, albeit that the common school movement promoted equalization through assimilation (Miller, 1990).

The Americanization movements promoted assimilation of European immigrants, using schools as the primary vehicle (Miller, 1990). Although these movements were successful for European Americans to the extent that generations of Irish, Polish, Italian, German, and Slavic immigrants gradually moved into the dominant culture, the process of assimilation eliminated virtually all traces of their home languages and cultures (Ramírez, Yuen, Ramey & Pasta, 1991). An additional concern was that other groups who did not voluntarily emigrate (African Americans, Native American Indians, Mexican Americans) became more and more marginalized from the dominant culture in economic, sociopolitical, and educational arenas (Ogbu, 1992b). Therefore, the notion of schools as the great equalizer proved to be an inadequate premise because it only applied to certain groups. Thus, schools were challenged in the social movements of the 1960s to address the inequality and inaccessibility caused by the historical effects of marginalization (Banks, 1992, 1993a, 1993c).

### Discontinuity in The Nation's Teaching Force

The recent increases in diversity in the United States have challenged both school systems and teacher preparation programs to meet the needs of ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students. These trends in the student popula-

tion have not, however, led to changes in the teaching population. The national teaching force is approximately 90 percent European American, while roughly 33 percent of the nation's K-12 student population are ethnically and/or linguistically diverse. This "mismatch" between the ranks of teachers and the student population has contributed to the lack of academic success for many ethnic and linguistic minority students (Sue & Padilla, 1986). Nationally, schools of education have sought to redress these inequalities by reframing the content knowledge of teachers to include goals of "multiculturalism" and culturally responsive/sensitive pedagogy. Despite many promising practices towards the diversification of the teaching force, there does not appear to be a significant impact in the ethnic composition of the teaching force.

In order to remedy the cultural and linguistic discontinuity between teachers and students, teacher education professionals must adopt dual strategies. One strategy is the recruitment and retention of under-represented groups into the teaching ranks. The second strategy must be aggressive reform in teacher education to prepare culturally competent teachers (Cochran-Smith, 1993; McCullough, Lavadenz & Martin, 1996). Cultural competency includes: (1) understanding the dynamic, anthropological nature of culture; (2) understanding how one's own sociocultural frame of reference and social position impacts the educational process; (3) utilizing multiple strategies for effective instruction based upon actual and concrete contact with cultures other than one's own; and (4) mediating multiple frames of reference, including the ability to facilitate cross-cultural dialogue and conflict mediation. The purpose of our work is to provide teacher educators with a conceptual model that frames the goals and ideologies for preparing the nation's teaching force to meet the needs of culturally diverse students.

### Challenges in Meeting the Needs of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students

A central problem that is currently encountered in teacher education programs throughout the United States is the discourse surrounding cultural diversity. A phenomenon of the late 20th century, this problem is characterized by confusion concerning terminology, definitions, and models, especially as this confusion affects the preparation of teachers in meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Multicultural education, for example, is a generic umbrella term that is often used inaccurately to refer to bilingual education, ethnic studies, ethnocentric education, gender studies, critical pedagogy, cooperative learning, learning styles, or some combination of the above (Martin, 1993, 1995/1996).

Although previous research (Banks, 1992, 1993b, 1993c; Gibson, 1976/1984; Grant & Sleeter, 1985; Grant, Sleeter & Anderson, 1986; Sleeter, 1993; Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1994) has identified models and typologies of multicultural education, our work represents a synthesis and extension of the current body of knowledge through a meta-analysis of major theoretical perspectives and practical applications concerned with cultural diversity.

## Methodology

### Selection of Responses to Cultural Diversity

We analyzed and synthesized more than 300 references from the literature through a content analysis that determined common definitions, patterns, themes, and points of convergence and divergence concerning educational responses to cultural diversity. We then selected 18 educational responses to cultural diversity and developed a matrix (see Appendix A). Responses were identified using the following criteria: significance of the work in defining particular aspects of cultural diversity; expertise of the author; significance of the theme/subject matter; and significance of the work as a seminal publication. We critiqued and analyzed each through our matrix that examines responses through classifications which included: type, goals, strengths, and limitations. Thus, the theoretical foundation of our work includes a critique of *all* of the major approaches advocated as responses to cultural diversity, and analyzes their effectiveness in Teacher Education.

### Development of Matrix:
### A Framework for Analysis of Educational Responses to Cultural Diversity

The definitions for the categories used in the meta-analysis included the following:

- ◆ Type: based upon usage as a theory, policy, practice, or program. The typology delineates which responses are theoretical, which are practical and which contain both theoretical and practical aspects.
- ◆ Goals: the objective of the response and whether it pertains to the individual or group level.
- ◆ Strengths: the effectiveness and impact as an educational response to cultural diversity.
- ◆ Limitations: the potential of the response to explain the dynamics of cultural diversity in actual school settings. This category also includes the practical classroom implementation and application

The preceding framework served as the mechanism and structure through which we analyzed the 18 educational responses to cultural diversity.

## Findings: Educational Responses to Cultural Diversity

Following the initial phase and selection of the 18 educational responses to cultural diversity, we developed definitions that were comprehensible, particularly for use in teacher education programs. Our goal was to establish clear language which differentiated between the broadly used terminology in "multiculturalism," and especially to clarify areas of confusion.

## Affirmative Action

The phrase "affirmative action" was coined in 1961 and used to urge federal contractors to hire more minorities. Subsequently, the Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination in the workplace and later prompted an executive order which moved affirmative action efforts out of the White House and into the Labor Department. Women were added to the affirmative action agenda several years later in response to feminist concerns. Because employment opportunities are dependent upon education and academic success, affirmative action programs moved into universities and public schools as a way to provide greater access to the job market for ethnic minorities and women. Although the term is interpreted broadly, affirmative action "commonly refers to the use of goals, special recruitment efforts, set-asides, or quotas to increase educational and job opportunities for minorities and women" (Barton, 1995). Following the *Baake* decision, the use of quotas was prohibited and affirmative action programs focused on the use of goals and special recruitment efforts. The strength of this approach is that it strives to overcome the effects of past discrimination and provide opportunities to those who historically have been excluded. The limitations of affirmative action are that although there have been some gains, they have not been equitably achieved across all social, economic, and political levels of society. Additionally, wide-spread negative public opinion related to affirmative action is based on the perception that racial preferences discount authentic competencies.

## Anti-Racist/Bias Education

These are curricular programs which include units and lessons of study whose objectives are to create opportunities to identify instances and examples of prejudice within the school and classroom settings. The active identification of racism and bias within schools then becomes the basis for self-examination and confrontation of ethnocentric bias for each group that participates. The strength of this approach is that it seeks to reduce bias, prejudice, and racism through articulated strategies which are easily accessible to the classroom teacher (Lee, 1985). The limitation of this approach is that in order to be fully successful, it requires institutional support and commitment to change. If this is not forthcoming, then the individual practitioner of this approach can be isolated and less powerful. Additionally, in order to be effective, there is a need to extend anti-racist education beyond the classroom to include parents and community, which is often beyond the resources of the classroom teacher.

## Bilingual Education

The theoretical orientation for bilingual education provides the framework for understanding the relationships between first and second language learning and the transfer of skills between both (Cummins, 1996; Lambert, 1992). The goals of bilingual education include access to the curriculum, English language acquisition, and development of positive self-esteem for limited English proficient students (Crawford, 1996). Research also indicates that bilingualism in the United States is delivered through a variety of organizational models, which range from early exit, late exit, two-way developmental (which includes native English speaking students learning a non-English language). There are some federally funded programs that are commonly characterized as bilingual programs which utilize English as the sole medium of instruction. There have been many difficulties documented in the implementation of bilingual programs, especially those which are mis-characterized due to their exclusive use of English. These include: (1) the shortages of qualified and credentialed bilingual teachers; (2) the disparate implementation and definition of programs and models for target students; (3) the perception of bilingual education as a deficit model; and (4) the public controversy and misunderstandings that limit implementation.

## Constructivism

Based largely on the work of Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1978), this approach views all learning as social, in which expert learners mediate new learning experiences for the novice learner (Harris & Graham, 1994; Poplin, 1988). The theoretical framework has been most recently applied in educational settings through classroom strategies such as Instructional Conversations (IC) (Echevarria & McDonough, 1993; Goldenberg, 1991) and identifying learners' *zones of proximal development* (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Learning situations, curricula, and activities are "constructed" through a process of dialogue and mediation. The strength of this approach is that students are actively involved in the learning process and contribute to the construction of knowledge. The limitation is that there is no precise "formula" for knowledge construction and therefore the actual implementation of this approach needs to vary in different activity settings. This can be frustrating for classroom teachers who are not well grounded in its theory and methodology. Additionally, constructivism does not fit traditional modes of assessment.

## Cooperative Learning

Developed through the work of Kagan (1986) and Johnson, Johnson, and Johnson (1994), this approach emphasizes the need to create consensus and collaboration in order to increase equity and challenge individual competition as the sole orientation to learning and marketing. Cooperative learning also encourages accountability, positive interdependence through interaction, and the development of social skills. In its implementation, classrooms are organized into heterogeneous groups which are determined on a variety of criteria, including gender, ethnicity, language abilities, leadership, learning styles, and behavior. Group structures and activities range from formal to informal. The strengths of this approach are that it

encourages group participation, networking, consensus building, interdependence, and cooperation. These skills are important and necessary for success in a global marketplace. A difficulty in using this approach is that it has been applied to cultural diversity by some educational theorists who hold that cooperative learning is more culturally compatible with ethnic minority students, which can lead to over generalization of the methodology for all ethnic minority students. Additionally, it is a sophisticated methodology that requires substantial teacher preparation. Too many teachers use the cooperative approach without adequate training in the technique of cooperative learning and the results are often mixed.

### Critical Anthropology

Largely based on the re-analysis of the conceptual frameworks and premises through which anthropological research has been conducted, critical anthropology emerged in the 1960s with a heavily Marxist perspective in the discipline. This approach promotes self-inquiry and the examination of dominant cultural perspectives in the research concerning indigenous and marginalized peoples, including women. It questions the assumptions and underpinnings of traditional research methods and epistemology, which results in a radical transformation of the understanding of group and individual cultures (Gray, 1996; Jordan & Yeomans, 1995; Morse, 1994). Its strength is that it examines the influence of individual bias on the part of the researcher in formulating conclusions about "the other." The limitation is that this sub-discipline has begun to immerse itself in post-modernist terminology which can be difficult to apply in the practice of teacher education.

### Critical Pedagogy/Transformative Education

This methodology merges constructivism with the analysis of political realities in communities of learners. Brought to international attention through the works of Paulo Freire (1970, 1992; Gadotti, 1994), the goal is to develop a process for social change in which historically oppressed and marginalized groups form the curriculum through a "problem-posing" approach. A critique of the social structures and institutions that have contributed to oppression and marginalization is an integral part of this approach. The effect is the conscientization of peoples by way of dialogue to achieve political, economic, and social action (Darder, 1991, Wink, 1997). The strength of this approach is that it utilizes people's experience and *funds of knowledge* (Floyd-Tenery, González & Moll, 1993; González *et al*, 1993; Moll & Greenberg, 1990; Moll, Vélez-Ibáñez & González, 1992; Moll, Amanti, Neff & González, 1992; Vélez-Ibáñez, 1988; Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992). A challenge is that the process for implementing critical pedagogy in the classroom is not clearly identified.

### Cultural-Ecological Theory

This is a theory developed by John Ogbu (1987, 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1994;

Ogbu & Matute-Bianchi, 1986), who posits that ethnic and cultural minority groups disproportionately experience school failure when their historical and structural relationship with the dominant majority lead to evolution of survival strategies that form an alternative or oppositional cultural frame of reference. Ogbu and his associates distinguished three types of minority groups: (1) *autonomous*—those groups that "may be victims of prejudice, but not of subordination in a system of rigid stratification," such as the Amish, Jews, and Mormons in the United States; (2) *immigrant*—those groups that moved "more or less *voluntarily*," for economic, social, or political reasons to the United States, such as Cuban Americans, Chinese Americans, Japanese Americans, and West Indians; and (3) *castelike minorities*— those groups that "have become *incorporated* into a society more or less *involuntarily* through slavery, conquest, or colonization, and then relegated to menial status," such as Blacks, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans. Ogbu and his associates said that prejudice and discrimination by the dominate majority is experienced by all three groups but mainly affect castelike minorities because they develop a collective identity that is culturally inverted, or maintained in opposition to the dominate majority, in order to rationalize and explain the existing social order and their place in it. The strengths of cultural-ecological theory are that it makes distinctions among kinds of minority experience and also includes the importance of the historical context in cultural diversity. The limitations are that it is not clear if the categories *voluntary* and *involuntary* minorities are universal and cross-cultural, although Ogbu provides some evidence that they may be, and the focus on the macro-culture may not adequately consider the micro-culture.

### Culturally Responsive Pedagogy/Culturally Sensitive Instruction

These are instructional practices which seek to understand and respond to the various cultural realities that occur within each specific classroom setting (Au, 1993; Villegas, 1991). Framed largely by sociocultural theory and constructivism, these teaching methods promote strategies that help teachers understand the levels of variability on group or individual bases: gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation; physical, developmental or learning disabilities; race; language, culture, and ethnicity (Philips, 1972, 1983). The strength of this approach is that it encourages engagement on multiple levels. The difficulties of this approach are that it is a complex methodology that requires extensive teacher education, the research base is fairly recent, and it requires a reconstruction of teacher education programs.

### Ethnic Studies

This approach was a response to the social unrest of the 1960s. The purpose of ethnic studies is to provide information and education about ethnic minority groups in the United States concerning their history and culture (Banks, 1997; Hune, 1994). Usually these programs are located at colleges and universities and often consist of: African American Studies, Asian/Pacific Islander Studies, Latino/Chicano Studies,

and Native American Studies. The strengths of this approach are that it provides important information about ethnic minority groups that is often missing from the traditional curriculum and it also instills a sense of pride and belonging for ethnic minority students who can feel unconnected in school settings. The limitation of this approach is that ethnic studies generally do not influence the larger curriculum or the dominant majority of students and faculty.

### Ethnocentric Education
(Afrocentric education; Native American education, *et al*)

A more focused approach than ethnic studies or multicultural education, ethnocentric education creates a total ethnic minority school environment for a particular ethnic minority group. Afrocentric education (Asante, 1990; Viadero, 1996; Wiley, 1991), for example, would consist of schools with all African American faculties and students who would use a curriculum that presents an African American perspective (African American authors, stories, materials, philosophies, languages, etc.). This approach has also been used with great success with Native Americans (Gipp & Fox, 1991; McCarty, Wallace, Hadley Lynch & Benally, 1991). The strengths of this approach are that it can provide support and encouragement for ethnic minority students whose ethnic group has not generally succeeded in mainstream schools and it fosters maintenance of the native culture. The limitation is that it is not clear how well students from ethnocentric programs are prepared to work, learn, and function in multicultural settings.

### Global Education/International Education

This approach emphasizes awareness and understanding of global and international issues in the curriculum. International education can also provide for the active exchange of research, scholars, teachers, and students across national lines (Tye & Kneip, 1991; Wood, 1991). The strength of these approaches is that they are holistic and global in nature, connecting individuals and groups to the larger world community. The limitation of these approaches is that there are so many variations of global and international education that implementation is challenging and their effectiveness is difficult to assess.

### Learning Styles

These theories evolved from educational and cognitive psychology beginning in the 1960s. The application to teaching practice occurred in order to create a better "match" between learning style and instruction. The base theory is that learners rely primarily on one "mode" for understanding, drawn from styles such as visual, auditory, kinesthetic, as well as field dependent and field independent, and that the effect of each style is mutually exclusive (Ramírez, 1988). The strengths of this approach are that it recognizes diversity in learning styles and calls for sensitivity by the teacher regarding differences. The difficulty is that it often leads to

stereotyping and does not adequately take into account the influence of culture and context in learning. More recent discussion has centered on the role of cognition, and more specifically, situated cognition, which promotes the concept that all learners vary in "style," according to the context and situation.

### Monocultural Education

Monocultural education involves the promotion of the position that there is a central core of knowledge that students and educated persons must possess in order to be "civilized," capable, or learned. Conceptualized recently by Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy* (1987) and Bloom's *Closing of the American Mind* (1987), monocultural education posits the Western and European paradigm of teaching and learning, specifically by identifying literary and historical works and events, to the exclusion of other paradigms. This assimiliationist perspective on cultural diversity was the curricular basis in U.S. public schools through the late 1960s. Reaction to the limitations of this perspective has been an impetus in the shift towards a more inclusive/global and multicultural paradigm. Assimilationists cite a strength of this model as the unity of the American populace. However, a clear limitation of this approach is that in practice it typically favors a transmission model of learning and teaching and does not allow for cultural diversity.

### Multicultural Education/Cross-Cultural Education

This approach was developed in the late 1970s and 1980s as a way to bring the concerns of ethnic studies into the mainstream curriculum (Banks, 1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1994a, 1994b, 1996; Banks & McGee Banks, 1997; Bennett, 1995). Proponents hold that diversity in the curriculum will motivate ethnic minority students to learn, and will create an educational environment that is inclusive and supportive of all students. It began as a curricular reform movement, designed to bring other voices and perspectives into the curriculum. Subsequently, the term "multicultural education" has become a generic umbrella term for many educational approaches that seek to respond to cultural diversity (Martin, 1993). Presently there are many models of multicultural education (Gibson, 1976/1984; Grant & Sleeter, 1985; Grant, Sleeter, & Anderson, 1986; Sleeter, 1993, Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 1994). As a curricular reform movement, its strength is that is provides a needed perspective for the curriculum. Its limitations are that it does not necessarily respond to specific cultural or ethnic differences of students as represented in particular classrooms, it does not address learning issues, and because of multiple definitions and interpretations its effectiveness may be reduced and difficult to evaluate.

### Peace and Justice Education

Linked to religious education and theology, peace and justice education includes curricula that emphasize the basic human rights and dignity of all peoples.

The goal is to foster a new vision of interpersonal relationships based on the human dignity of all people (Reardon, 1988; Willis, 1995). The basic tenants are the promotion of equality, human dignity, freedom, non-violence, justice, and peace in a global context. The strength of this approach is that it incorporates values and a concern for human rights into the curriculum. The limitation is that it tends to refer to religious-based values that are not always directly transferable to the public sector.

### Sociocultural Theory

Although there is no absolute consensus on the terminology on which socio-cultural theory is based, we utilize the conceptual framework that Wertsch, Del Rio, and Alvarez (1995) set forth. In discussing terminology, Wertsch *et al* acknowledge the various terms for this approach, such as socio-psychological, cultural-historical, socio-cultural-historical, and sociohistorical, which all refer to the Vygotskian heritage. They argue, however, that the term *sociocultural* is the preferred term to describe the appropriation of that heritage. The primary aim of the sociocultural approach is to provide understandings as to the social and cultural factors which impact teaching and learning in school settings in order to improve educational outcomes for *all students*, especially for ethnic and linguistic minority students (Martin, 1996). This approach utilizes qualitative analysis to understand the various complex factors that affect school success and failure. Of particular importance is the way specific contexts affect learning. The strengths of this approach are that it is inclusive, recognizing culture as an important variable in learning, and is flexible and adaptable to individual contexts. The limitations of this approach are that it is sophisticated and requires both that educators rethink their basic philosophy of education and that changes be made in the structure and culture of the school.

### Urban Education

This is a broadly used term describing a variety of educational practices that respond to teaching and learning in urban settings (Thomas, 1994). Urban education utilizes several theoretical frameworks, including theories from sociology, anthropology, and bilingual education. Urban education often includes program evaluation and policy as they relate to urban schools (Grace, 1994). Additionally, urban education can include teacher preparation programs for inner city schools. The strength of this approach is that it seeks to respond to the unique needs of urban schools. The limitation is that it lacks specificity in the literature and a clearly articulated theoretical basis.

## Conclusion

The process of developing and refining commonly utilized terms which are broadly categorized as educational responses to cultural diversity has allowed us to question the theoretical, practical, and political underpinnings in "multicultural-ism." This analysis is the beginning of a long-range project which focuses on the preparation of teachers for the 21st century—teachers who can better meet the instructional needs of an increasingly diverse population. In our analysis we have not yet identified which responses are more appropriate than others. In our initial discussions, we agree that educational responses that utilize sociocultural and constructivist approaches are the most promising for education. Our future research agenda calls for discussion of the integration, implications, and implementations of these responses identified in this work.

## References

Asante, M.K. (1990). *Kemet, Afrocentricity, and knowledge.* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Au, K.H. (1993). *Literacy instruction in multicultural settings.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Banks, J.A. (1983a, April). Multiethnic education and the quest for equality. *Phi Delta Kappan, 64*(8), 582-585.

Banks, J.A. (1983b, April). Multiethnic education at the crossroads. *Phi Delta Kappan, 64*(8), 559.

Banks, J.A. (1992). History of multicultural education. In M.C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (6th ed., pp. 870-874). New York: Macmillian.

Banks, J.A. (1993a). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher, 22*(5), 4-14.

Banks, J.A. (1993b). Multicultural education: Development, dimensions, and challenges. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*(1), 22-28.

Banks, J.A. (1993c). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 19, pp. 3-50). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Banks, J.A. (1994a). *An introduction to multicultural education.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J.A. (1994b). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J.A. (1997). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J.A., & McGee Banks, C. (Eds.). (1997). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Barton, P. (1995, March 10). Affirmative action under attack from many directions. *Gannett News Service.*

Bennett, C.I. (1995). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1993). Color blindness and basketweaving are not enough: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture and language diversity in teacher education. Paper presented at the Seminar on Teachers for the 1990s and Beyond, Los Alamitos, CA.

Crawford, J. (1996). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice.* Trenton, NJ: Crane.

Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society.* Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for bicultural education.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Echeverria, J., & McDonough, R. (1993). *Instructional conversations in special education settings: Issues and accommodations.* Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Floyd-Tenery, M., González, N., & Moll, L.C. (1993, November). Funds of knowledge for teaching (FTK) project: A replication and update [On-line]. *The Electronic Bulletin Board.* (Available Gopher: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, 128.111.206.1, GSE Information and Resources).

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. (1992). *Pedagogy of hope.* New York: Continuum.

Gadotti, M. (1994). *Reading Paulo Freire: His life and work* (J. Milton, Trans.). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

García, E.E. (1994). *Understanding and meeting the challenge of student cultural diversity.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Gómez, L. (1992). The birth of the "Hispanic" generation: Attitudes of Mexican-American political elites toward the Hispanic label. *Latin American Perspectives, 19*(4), 45-58.

Gibson, M.A. (1984). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 15*(1), 94-119 (Reprinted from *Anthropological & Education Quarterly*, 1976, 7(4), pp. 7-18).

Gibson, M.A., & Ogbu, J.U. (Eds.). (1991). *Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigrant and involuntary minorities.* Reference books in international education, vol. 7. New York: Garland.

Gipp, G.E., & Fox, S.J. (1991). Making it the real hope for American Indians: Promoting cultural relevance in American Indian education. *Education Digest, 57*(3), 58-61.

Goldenberg, C. (1991). *Instructional conversations and their classroom application.* Educational Practice Rep. No. 2. Santa Cruz, CA & Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

González, N., Moll, L.C., Floyd-Tenery, M., Rivera, A., Rendón, P., Gonzales, R., & Amanti, C. (1993). *Teacher research on funds of knowledge: Learning from households.* (Educational Practice Report: 6). Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Grace, G. (1994). Urban education and the culture of contentment: The politics, culture, and economics of inner-city schooling. In N.P. Stromquist (Ed.), *Education in urban areas: Cross-national dimensions* (pp. 45-58). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Grant, C.A., & Sleeter, C.E. (1985). The literature on multicultural education: Review and analysis. *Educational Review, 37*(2), 97-118.

Grant, C.A., Sleeter, C.E., & Anderson, J.E. (1986). The literature on multicultural education: Review and analysis. *Educational Studies, 12*(1), 47-71.

Gray, P.J. (1996, November). Is the standard cross-cultural sample biased? *Cross-Cultural Research, 30,* 301-316.

Harris, K.R., & Graham, S. (1994). Constructivism: Principles, paradigms, and integration.

*Journal of Special Education, 28,* 233-248.

Hirsch, E.D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Hune, S. (1994, July). The role of Asian American studies: Opening the American mind and body. *Change, 26*(4), 44.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson Roger T., & Johnson, E.H. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom and school.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jordan, S., & Yeomans, D. (1995). Critical ethnography: Problems in contemporary theory and practice. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 16,* 389-409.

Kagan, S. (1986). Cooperative learning and sociocultural factors in schooling. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 231- 285). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Lambert, W.E. (1992). Pros, cons, and limits to quantitative approaches in foreign language research. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 321-337). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Lee, E. (1985). *Letters to Marcia: A teacher's guide to anti-racist education.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Toronto Cross-Cultural Communication Center.

Martin, S.P. (1993). The problem of multicultural education: Background, definitions and future agenda. *Multicultural Education Journal, 11*(1), 9-20.

Martin, S.P. (1996). *Cultural diversity in Catholic schools: Challenges and opportunities for Catholic educators.* Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association.

Martin, S.P. (1995/1996). The relationship of cultural diversity to Jesuit secondary education in the United States: A theoretical and case study analysis [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1995]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*(01), 79-A, DA9614047.

McCarty, T., Wallace, S., Hadley Lynch, R., & Benally, A. (1991). Classroom inquiry and Navajo learning styles: A call for reassessment. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22*(1), 42-58.

McCullough, M., Lavadenz, M., & Martin, S.P. (1996, November). *Sociocultural factors affecting school reform in culturally diverse settings.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education, St. Paul, MN.

Miller, R. (1990). *What are schools for? Holistic education in American culture.* Brandon, VT: Holistic Education Press.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Moll, L.C., & Greenberg, J.B. (1990). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education* (pp. 319-348). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, L.C., Vélez-Ibáñez, C., & González, N. (1992, September). Funds of knowledge for teaching. [On-line]. *The Electronic Bulletin Board.* (Available Gopher: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, 128.111.206.1, GSE Information and Resources).

Morse, J.M. (Ed.). (1994). *Critical issues in qualitative research methods.* Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage.

Ogbu, J.U. (1987). Variability in minority responses to schooling: Nonimmigrants vs. immigrants. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad* (pp. 255-280). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ogbu, J.U. (1992a). Adaptation to minority status and impact on school success. *Theory Into Practice, 31,* 287-295.

Ogbu, J.U. (1992b). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. *Educational Researcher, 21*(8), 5-14, 24.

Ogbu, J.U. (1993). Difference in cultural frame of reference. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 16,* 483-506.

Ogbu, J.U. (1994). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 17,* 355-383.

Ogbu, J.U., & Matute-Bianchi, M.E. (1986). Understanding sociocultural factors: Knowledge, identity and school adjustment. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 73-142). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Oliva, M. (1986). *Latino high school students.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Philips, S. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. John & D. & Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-394). New York: Teachers College Press.

Philips, S. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.* New York: Longman.

Poplin, M.S. (1988). Holistic/constructivist principles of the teaching/learning process; implications for the field of learning disabilities. *Journal of learning disabilities, 21,* 401-416.

Ramírez, D.J., Yuen, S.D., Ramey, D.R., & Pasta, D.J. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early exit and late exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children* [Technical Report]. Vol. 1. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Ramírez, M., III. (1988). Cognitive styles and cultural democracy in action. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward Multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 198-206). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Reardon, B.A. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C.E. (1993, March). Multicultural education: Five views. *The Education Digest,* pp. 53-57.

Sleeter, C.E., & Grant, C.A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(4), 421-444.

Sleeter, C.E., & Grant, C.A. (1994). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender* (2nd ed.). New York: Merrill.

Sue, S., & Padilla, A. (1986). Ethnic minority issues in the United States: Challenges for the educational system. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 35-72). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Tharp, R.G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and*

*schooling in social context.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, R.M. (1994). Defining urban in educational studies. In N. Stromquist (Ed.), *Education in urban areas: Cross-national dimensions* (pp. 11-28). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Tye, K.A., & Kniep, W.M. (1991). Global Education around the world. *Educational Leadership, 48*(7), 47-49.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C.G. (1988). Networks of exchange among Mexicans in the U.S. and Mexico: Local level mediating responses to national and international transformations. *Urban Anthropology, 17*(1), 27-51.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C.G., & Greenberg, J.B. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S.-Mexican households. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 24,* 313-335.

Viadero, D. (1996, October 16). A school of their own. *Education Week,* pp. 27-31.

Villegas, A.M. (1991, September). *Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990s and beyond.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V., Del Rio, P., & Alvarez, A. (Eds.). (1995). *Sociocultural studies of mind.* Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Wiley, E., III. (1991). Afrocentrism: Many things to many people. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 8*(17), 1, 20-21.

Willis, H. (1995). Equal and equitable: What's the difference? *Update On Law-Related Education, 19*(1), 22-24.

Wink, J. (1997). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Wood, R.J. (1991). Toward cultural empathy: A framework for global education. *Educational Record, 72*(4), 10-13.

## Appendix A

The "Educational Responses to Cultural Diversity: A Framework for Analysis" developed by Shane Martin and Magaly Lavadenz appears on the next page.

Appendix A: Educational Responses to Cultural Diversity: A Framework for Analysis
Shane Martin and Raghu Lavadero, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA

| Educational Response | Type | Goal | Strengths | Limitations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Affirmative Action | Policy/Program | seeks to overcome effects of past discrimination and provide opportunities; seeks to make institutions more representative of society | ethnic/racial/gender factors are included as variables to consider for university admission, and for hiring in school districts | gains not equitably achieved across all institutional levels; negative public opinion |
| Anti-Racist/Bias Education | Program/Practice | curricular strategies to reduce bias, racism and prejudice | proactive strategy that is easily accessible to the classroom teacher | requires institutional support and commitment; often does not include parents and community |
| Bilingual Education | Theory/Policy/Program/Practice | provides access to the curriculum, English language acquisition and positive self-esteem | when implemented appropriately, produces positive cognitive effects and biliteracy | disparate implementation of programs and definitions; shortages of bilingual teachers, perceived as a deficit model, controversy and misunderstandings limits implementation |
| Constructivism | Theory/Practice | to provide meaningful and authentic learning experiences | active involvement in the learning process through expert and novice mediation, | actual implementation varies greatly, making the model difficult to assess, does not fit traditional modes of assessment |
| Cooperative Learning | Theory/Practice | encourages group participation, networking, consensus building, interdependence and cooperation | challenges the transmission model of education and fosters more classroom interaction | requires substantial teacher preparation; without adequate teacher training the results are often mixed; does not fit traditional modes of assessment |
| Critical Anthropology | Theory | to promote self-inquiry in the examination of dominant cultural perspectives in educational research | examines the influence of individual bias on the part of the researcher in formulating conclusions about others | can be difficult to apply in the practice of teacher education; "jargon" can be difficult to understand |
| Critical Pedagogy/ Transformative Education | Theory/Practice | liberation of oppressed and marginalized peoples; conscientization of all | it utilizes people's experience | implementation in the classroom context is not clearly defined |
| Cultural-ecological Theory | Theory | to examine school success and failure through a historical and structural analysis of the relationship between dominant and subordinate groups | makes distinctions among kinds of minority experience and includes the importance of historical context | it is not clear if it is a universal and cross-cultural theory; focus on macro-culture may not adequately consider micro-culture |
| Culturally Responsive Pedagogy/ Culturally Sensitive Instruction | Practice | responds to various cultural realities that occur within each specific classroom context | encourages engagement on multiple levels; affirms and utilizes the positive value of all cultures in any classroom setting | complex methodology that requires extensive teacher education and a reconstruction of teacher education programs |
| Ethnic Studies | Program/Practice | provides important information about ethnic minority groups that is often missing from the traditional curriculum | instills a sense of pride, belonging and affirmation for ethnic minority students who may feel disconnected from school; augments the traditional Euro-centric curriculum. | generally does not influence the larger curriculum or the dominant majority of students and faculty |
| Ethnocentric Education | Theory/Practice | to provide supports for ethnic minority students; | fosters maintenance of the native culture through an integrated approach, including curriculum, personnel, school environment, and community involvement | it is not clear how well students from ethnocentric programs are prepared to work, learn and function in multicultural settings |
| Global Education International Education | Practice/Program | increases awareness and understanding of global and international issues, | holistic approach that connects individuals and groups to the larger world community | there are so many variations that implementation is challenging and effectiveness is difficult to assess |
| Learning Styles | Theory/Practice | to respond to differences in learning styles | calls for sensitivity by the teacher regarding differences in learning styles; recognizes diversity in learning styles | often leads to stereotyping and does not adequately account for the influence of culture and context in learning |
| Monocultural Education | Practice | sees its goal as the unification of the United States' prejudice | none identified | assimilationist; favors and transmission model of learning and teaching |
| Multicultural Education/ Cross-cultural Education | Practice | provides multiple perspectives in the curriculum; create an educational environment that is inclusive and supportive of all students | provides for multiple perspectives in schools; utilizes a models perspective; attempts to be more representative in the curriculum | does not necessarily respond to specific cultural or ethnic differences, or learning issues; has various meanings and interpretations in school settings |
| Peace and Justice Education | Practice | to foster a new vision of interpersonal relationship based on the human dignity of all people | incorporates values and a concern for human rights into the curriculum | tends to refer to religious-based values that do not always transfer to public sector |
| Sociocultural Theory | Theory/Practice | to understand how social and cultural factors impact teaching and learning in schools settings in order to improve educational outcomes for all students, especially for ethnic and linguistic minority students | it is an inclusive approach that recognizes social and cultural factors as important variables in learning; it is flexible and adaptable to individual contexts | requires educators to rethink basic philosophy of education; calls for a transformation of schools thus taking time and commitment |
| Urban Education | Practice | to respond to the unique needs of urban schools | calls attention to the special needs of urban and inner-city schools | lacks specificity in the literature and a clearly articulated theoretical basis |