

4 Multicultural Education and School Reform

(with Patty Bode)

Although the idea of multicultural education has been a mainstay in educational circles for more than two decades (and in academic circles for much longer), it has not been widely understood or systematically put into practice. In many schools, to have multicultural education means to set aside a particular time of year for special units or assembly programs about specific people or topics and/or to support extracurricular activities that center on ethnic diversity.

The following piece is a chapter from the fifth edition of the book *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*. My co-author, Patty Bode, and I provide an in-depth definition that challenges the conventional wisdom that multicultural education is simply a “feel-good” additive to the curriculum or a program to boost self-esteem for “minority” students. Instead, we frame multicultural education within a context of social justice and critical pedagogy that encompasses anti-racist and basic education for all students of all backgrounds. Throughout the chapter, we give examples of how this definition goes beyond the “heroes and holidays” approach to diversity, with various implications for our nation’s schools.

“We don’t need multicultural education here; most of our students are White.”

“I don’t see color. All my students are the same to me.”

“We shouldn’t talk about racism in school because it has nothing to do with learning. Besides, it’ll just make the kids feel bad.”

“Let’s not focus on negative things. Can’t we all just get along?”

In discussing multicultural education with teachers and other educators over many years, we have heard all these comments and other similar remarks. Statements such as these reflect a profound misconception of multicultural education.

When multicultural education is mentioned, many people first think of lessons in human relations and sensitivity training, units about ethnic holidays, education

in inner-city schools, or food festivals. If multicultural education is limited to these issues, the potential for substantive change in schools is severely diminished. Moreover, those who called for an end to multicultural education after September 11, 2001, missed the boat. Rather than eliminating it, we believe that 9/11 underscored the need to emphasize multicultural education more than ever. In fact, we believe that nothing is more divisive than a monocultural education, because such an education excludes so many people and perspectives from schools' curricula and pedagogy.

When broadly conceptualized, multicultural education can lead to more understanding and empathy. It can also help to address the four areas of potential conflict and inequity—namely, racism and discrimination, structural conditions in schools that may limit learning, the impact of culture on learning, and language diversity. However, it is necessary to stress that multicultural education is not a panacea for all educational ills. Because schools are part of our communities, they reflect the stratification and social inequities of the larger society. As long as this is the case, no school program alone, no matter how broadly conceptualized, can change things completely without addressing inequalities in the larger society. It will not cure underachievement, eliminate boring and irrelevant curriculum, or stop vandalism. It will not automatically motivate families to participate in schools, reinvigorate tired and dissatisfied teachers, or guarantee a lower dropout rate.

Despite these caveats, when multicultural education is conceptualized as broad-based school reform, it can offer hope for real change. Multicultural education in a sociopolitical context is both richer and more complex than simple lessons on getting along or units on ethnic festivals. By focusing on major conditions contributing to underachievement, a broadly conceptualized multicultural education permits educators to explore alternatives to a system that promotes failure for too many of its students. Such an exploration can lead to the creation of a richer and more productive school climate and a deeper awareness of the role of culture and language in learning. Seen in this comprehensive way, educational success for all students is a realistic goal rather than an impossible ideal.

This chapter proposes a definition of multicultural education based on such a broad context and it analyzes the seven primary characteristics included in the definition. These characteristics underscore the role that multicultural education can play in reforming schools and providing an equal and excellent education for all students. This definition of multicultural education emerges from the reality of persistent problems in our nation's schools, especially the lack of achievement among students of diverse backgrounds. A comprehensive definition emphasizes the context and process of education rather than viewing multicultural education as an add-on or luxury disconnected from the everyday lives of students.

In spite of some differences among major theorists, during the past 30 years there has been remarkable consistency in the educational field about the goals, purposes, and reasons for multicultural education.¹ But no definition of multicultural education can truly capture all its complexities. The definition we present here reflects one way of conceptualizing the issues; it is based on our many years of experience as students, teachers, researchers, and teacher educators. We hope

that it will serve to encourage further dialogue and reflection among readers. So, although we propose seven characteristics that we believe are essential in multicultural education, you might come up with just three, or with 15. The point is not to develop a definitive way to understand multicultural education but instead to start you thinking about the interplay of societal and school structures and contexts and how they influence learning.

What we believe *is* essential is an emphasis on the sociopolitical context of education and a rejection of the notion that multicultural education is either a superficial addition of content to the curriculum, or, alternatively, the magic pill that will do away with all educational problems. In the process of considering our definition of multicultural education, it is our hope that you will develop your own ideas, priorities, and perspective.

A Definition of Multicultural Education

We define multicultural education in a sociopolitical context as follows: Multicultural education is a process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students. It challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms the pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, and gender, among others) that students, their communities, and teachers reflect. Multicultural education permeates schools' curriculum and instructional strategies as well as the interactions among teachers, students, and families and the very way that schools conceptualize the nature of teaching and learning. Because it uses critical pedagogy as its underlying philosophy and focuses on knowledge, reflection, and action (praxis) as the basis for social change, multicultural education promotes democratic principles of social justice.

The seven basic characteristics of multicultural education in this definition are as follows:

- 1 Multicultural education is antiracist education.
- 2 Multicultural education is basic education.
- 3 Multicultural education is important for all students.
- 4 Multicultural education is pervasive.
- 5 Multicultural education is education for social justice.
- 6 Multicultural education is a process.
- 7 Multicultural education is critical pedagogy.

Multicultural Education Is Antiracist Education

Antiracism, indeed antidiscrimination in general, is at the very core of a multicultural perspective. It is essential to keep the antiracist nature of multicultural education in mind because, in many schools, even some that espouse a multicultural philosophy, only superficial aspects of multicultural education are apparent. Celebrations of ethnic festivals are the extent of multicultural education programs in some schools. In others, sincere attempts to decorate bulletin boards with what is thought to be a multicultural perspective end up perpetuat-

ing the worst kind of stereotypes. Even where there are serious attempts to develop a truly pluralistic environment, it is not unusual to find incongruencies. In some schools, for instance, the highest academic tracks are overwhelmingly White, the lowest are populated primarily by students of color, and girls are nonexistent or invisible in calculus and physics classes. These are examples of multicultural education without an explicitly antiracist and antidiscrimination perspective.

Because many people erroneously assume that a school's multicultural program automatically takes care of racism, we stress that multicultural education *must be consciously antiracist*. Writing about multicultural education over 25 years ago, when the field was fairly new, Meyer Weinberg asserted:

Most multicultural materials deal wholly with the cultural distinctiveness of various groups and little more. Almost never is there any sustained attention to the ugly realities of systematic discrimination against the same group that also happens to utilize quaint clothing, fascinating toys, delightful fairy tales, and delicious food. Responding to racist attacks and defamation is also part of the culture of the group under study.²

Being antiracist and antidiscriminatory means being mindful of how some students are favored over others in school policies and practices such as the curriculum, choice of materials, sorting policies, and teachers' interactions and relationships with students and their families. Consequently, to be inclusive and balanced, multicultural curricula must, by definition, be antiracist. Teaching does not become more honest and critical simply by becoming more inclusive, but this is an important first step in ensuring that students have access to a wide variety of viewpoints. Although the beautiful and heroic aspects of our history should be taught, so must the ugly and exclusionary. Rather than viewing the world through rose-colored glasses, antiracist multicultural education forces teachers and students to take a long, hard look at everything as it was and is, instead of just how we wish it were.

Too many schools avoid confronting in an honest and direct way the negative aspects of history, the arts, and science. Michelle Fine has called this the "fear of naming," and it is part of the system of silencing in public schools.³ To name might become too messy, or so the thinking goes. Teachers often refuse to engage their students in discussions about racism because it might "demoralize" them. Too dangerous a topic, it is often left untouched.

Related to the fear of naming is the insistence of schools on "sanitizing" the curriculum, or what Jonathon Kozol many years ago called "tailoring" important men and women for school use. Kozol described how schools manage to take the most exciting and memorable heroes and bleed the life and spirit completely out of them because it can be dangerous, he wrote, to teach a history "studded with so many bold, and revolutionary, and subversive, and exhilarating men and women." He described how, instead, schools drain these heroes of their passions, glaze them over with an implausible veneer, place them on lofty pedestals, and then tell "incredibly dull stories" about them.⁴ Although he wrote these words

many years ago, Kozol could just as well be writing about education in today's U.S. schools.

The process of sanitizing is nowhere more evident than in depictions of Martin Luther King, Jr. In attempting to make him palatable to the U.S. mainstream, schools have made King a milquetoast. The only thing most children know about him is that he kept "having a dream." School bulletin boards are full of ethereal pictures of Dr. King surrounded by clouds. If children get to read or hear any of his speeches at all, it is his "I Have a Dream" speech. As inspirational as this speech is, it is only one of his notable accomplishments. Rare indeed are allusions to his early and consistent opposition to the Vietnam War; his strong criticism of unbridled capitalism; and the connections he made near the end of his life among racism, capitalism, and war. This sanitization of Martin Luther King, a man full of passion and life, renders him an oversimplified, lifeless figure, thus making him a "safe hero."

Most of the heroes we present to our children are either those in the mainstream or those who have become safe through the process of what Kozol referred to as "tailoring." Others who have fought for social justice are often downplayed, maligned, or ignored. For example, although John Brown's actions in defense of the liberation of enslaved people are considered noble by many, in our history books he is presented, at best, as somewhat of a crazed idealist. Nat Turner is another example. The slave revolt that he led deserves a larger place in our history, if only to acknowledge that enslaved people fought against their own oppression and were not simply passive victims. However, Turner's name and role in U.S. history are usually overlooked, and Abraham Lincoln is presented as the Great Emancipator as if he single-handedly was responsible for the abolition of slavery (and with little acknowledgment of his own inconsistent ideas about race and equality). Nat Turner is not considered a safe hero; Abraham Lincoln is.

To be antiracist also means to work affirmatively to combat racism. It means making antiracism and antidiscrimination explicit parts of the curriculum and teaching young people skills in confronting racism. A school that is truly committed to a multicultural philosophy will closely examine both its policies and the attitudes and behaviors of its staff to determine how these might discriminate against some students. The focus on school policies and practices makes it evident that multicultural education is about more than the perceptions and beliefs of individual teachers and other educators. Multicultural education is antiracist because it exposes racist and discriminatory practices in schools.

Racism is seldom mentioned in school (it is bad, a dirty word) and, therefore, is not dealt with. Unfortunately, many teachers think that simply having lessons in getting along or celebrating Human Relations Week will make students nonracist or nondiscriminatory in general. But it is impossible to be untouched by racism, sexism, linguicism, heterosexism, ageism, anti-Semitism, classism, and ethnocentrism in a society characterized by all of them. To expect schools to be an oasis of sensitivity and understanding in the midst of this stratification is unrealistic. Therefore, part of the mission of the school becomes creating the environment and encouragement that legitimates talk about inequality and makes it a source of

dialogue. Teaching the missing or fragmented parts of our history is crucial to achieving this mission.

Although White students may be uncomfortable by discussions about race, Henry Giroux has suggested that bringing race and racism into full view can become a useful and positive pedagogical tool to help students locate themselves and their responsibilities concerning racism.⁵ In addition, Beverly Daniel Tatum's ground-breaking work on bringing discussions of race out of the closet proposes discussing race and racism within the framework of racial and cultural identity theory. Doing so, she contends, can help students and teachers focus on how racism negatively affects all people and can provide a sense of hope for positive changes.⁶

What about teachers? Because many teachers have had little experience with diversity, discussions of racism often threaten to disrupt their deeply held ideals of fair play and equality. Many teachers are uneasy with these topics, and therefore fruitful classroom discussions about discrimination rarely happen. If this continues to be the case, neither unfair individual behaviors nor institutional policies and practices in schools will change. Students of disempowered groups will continue to bear the brunt of these kinds of inequities. The dilemma is how to challenge the silence about race and racism so that teachers can enter into meaningful and constructive dialogue with their students. In speaking specifically about confronting this issue in teacher education, Marilyn Cochran-Smith writes, "To teach lessons about race and racism in teacher education is to struggle to unlearn racism itself—to interrogate the assumptions that are deeply embedded in the curriculum, to our own complicity in maintaining existing systems of privilege and oppression, and to grapple with our own failure."⁷

For example, in research with teachers from around the country, Karen McLean Donaldson found that many teachers were in denial about racism and its effects in schools. On the other hand, those who became active in antiracist projects broadened their understanding and were able to use their new skills in creating affirming learning environments for all their students.⁸

One of the reasons schools are reluctant to tackle racism and discrimination is that these are disturbing topics for those who have traditionally benefited by their race, gender, and social class, among other advantageous differences. Because instruction in, and discussion of, such topics place people in the role of either the victimizer or the victimized, an initial and logical reaction, for example, of European American teachers and students in discussing race, is to feel guilty. But being antiracist does not mean flailing about in guilt and remorse. Although this reaction may be understandable, remaining at this level is immobilizing. Teachers and students need to move beyond guilt to a state of invigorated awareness and informed confidence in which they take personal and group action for positive change rather than hide behind feelings of remorse.

The primary victims of racism and discrimination are those who suffer its immediate consequences, but racism and discrimination are destructive and demeaning to everyone. Keeping this in mind, it is easier for all teachers and students to face these issues. Although not everyone is directly guilty of racism and discrimination, we are all responsible for it. What does this mean? Primarily, it means that working actively for social justice is everyone's business. Yet it is

often the victims of racism and other kinds of discrimination who are left to act on their own. Everybody loses out when a particular group of students is scapegoated but confronting such scapegoating should be viewed as everyone's responsibility. Indeed, we will have come a long way when everybody feels this same obligation.

Multicultural Education Is Basic Education

Given the recurring concern for teaching the "basics," multicultural education must be understood as basic education. Multicultural literacy is just as indispensable for living in today's world as reading, writing, arithmetic, and computer literacy. When multicultural education is peripheral to the core curriculum, it is perceived as irrelevant to basic education. One of the major stumbling blocks to implementing a broadly conceptualized multicultural education is the ossification of the "canon" in our schools.

The canon, as understood in contemporary U.S. education, assumes that the knowledge that is most worthwhile is already in place. This notion explains the popularity of E. D. Hirsch's series *What Every [First, Second, Third . . .] Grader Needs to Know*.⁹ Geared primarily to parents, this series builds on the fear that their children simply will not measure up if they do not possess the core knowledge (usually in the form of facts) that they need to succeed in school. According to this rather narrow view, the basics have, in effect, already been defined, and the knowledge taught is inevitably European, male, and upper class in origin and conception. In a recent response to Hirsch's view of cultural literacy, Eugene Provenzo faults Hirsch for a limited and rigid understanding of cultural literacy that is ultimately impoverished, elitist, antidemocratic, and even un-American in that it excludes so much that is uniquely American.¹⁰

The idea that there is a static and sacred knowledge that must be mastered is especially evident in the arts and social sciences. For instance, art history classes rarely consider other countries besides France's, Italy's, and sometimes England's Great Masters, yet surely other nations besides Europe have had great masters. "Classical music" is another example. What is called "classical music" is actually European classical music. Africa, Asia, and Latin America define their classical music in different ways. This same ethnocentrism is found in our history books, which portray Europeans and European Americans as the "actors" and all others as the recipients, bystanders, or bit players of history. The canon, as it currently stands, however, is unrealistic and incomplete because history is never as one-sided as it appears in most of our schools' curricula. We need to expand the definition of *basic* education by opening up curricula to a variety of perspectives and experiences.

This is not to say that the concern that the canon tries to address is not a genuine one. Modern-day knowledge is so dispersed and compartmentalized that our young people learn very little about commonalities in our history and culture. There is little core knowledge to which they are exposed and this can be problematic, but proposing static curricula, almost exclusively with European and European American referents, does little to expand our actual common culture.

At the same time, it is unrealistic, for a number of reasons, to expect perfectly “equal treatment” about all groups of people in school curricula and instruction. A “force-fit,” which tries to equalize the number of African Americans, women, Jewish Americans, gays, and so on in the curriculum, is not what multicultural education is about. A great many groups have been denied access to participation in history. Thus, their role has not been equal, at least if we consider history in the traditional sense of great movers and shakers, monarchs and despots, and makers of war and peace. But, even within this somewhat narrow view of history, the participation of people of diverse backgrounds and social identities has nevertheless been appreciable. These heretofore ignored participants deserve to be included. The point is that those who have been important and/or prominent in the evolution of our history, arts, literature, and science, yet invisible, should be made visible. Recent literature anthologies are a good example of the inclusion of more voices and perspectives than ever before. Did these people become “great writers” overnight, or was it simply that they were “buried” for too long?

We are not recommending simply the “contributions” approach to history, literature, and the arts.¹¹ Such an approach can easily become patronizing by simply adding bits and pieces to a preconceived canon. Rather, missing from most curricula is a consideration of how generally excluded groups have made history and affected the arts, literature, geography, science, and philosophy on their own terms.

The alternative to multicultural education is monocultural education, which reflects only one reality and is biased toward the dominant group. Monocultural education is the order of the day in most of our schools. What students learn represents only a fraction of what is available knowledge, and those who decide what is most important make choices that are influenced by their own limited background, education, and experiences. Because the viewpoints of so many are left out, monocultural education is, at best, an incomplete education. It deprives all students of the diversity that is part of our world.

No school can consider that it is doing a proper or complete job unless its students develop multicultural literacy. What such a conception means in practice will no doubt differ from school to school, but at the very least, we should expect all students to be fluent in a language other than their own, aware of the literature and arts of many different peoples, and conversant with the history and geography not only of the United States but also of African, Asian, Latin American, and European countries. Through such an education, we should expect students to develop social and intellectual skills that help them understand and empathize with a wide diversity of people. Nothing can be more basic than this.

Multicultural Education Is Important for All Students

There is a widespread perception—or rather, misperception—that multicultural education is only for students of color, for urban students, or for so-called “disadvantaged” or “at-risk” students. This belief probably grew from the roots of multicultural education: the Civil Rights and Equal Education Movements of the 1960s. During that era, the primary objective of multicultural education was to address the needs of students who historically had been most neglected

or miseducated by the schools, especially students of color. Those who first promoted multicultural education firmly believed that attention needed to be given to developing curriculum and materials that reflected these students' histories, cultures, and experiences. This thinking was historically necessary and is understandable even today, given the great curricular imbalance that continues to exist in most schools.

More recently, a broader conceptualization of multicultural education has gained acceptance. It is that all students are miseducated to the extent that they receive only a partial and biased education. Although it is true that the primary victims of biased education are those who are invisible in the curriculum, everyone misses out when education is biased. Important female figures, for example, are still largely absent in curricula, except in special courses on women's history that are few and far between. Working-class history is also absent in virtually all U.S. curricula. The children of the working class are deprived not only of a more forthright education but, more important, of a place in history, and students of all social class backgrounds are deprived of a more honest and complete view of our past. Likewise, there is a pervasive and impenetrable silence concerning gays and lesbians in most schools, not just in the curriculum but also in extracurricular activities. The result is that gay and lesbian students are placed at risk in terms of social well-being and academic achievement.¹²

Teachers in primarily White schools might think that multicultural education is not meant for their students. They could not be more wrong. White students receive only a partial education, which helps to legitimate their cultural blindness. Seeing only themselves, they may believe that they are the norm and thus most important and everyone else is secondary and less important. A recent book that challenges this perception (*What If All the Kids Are White?*) provides excellent strategies and resources for teachers working in mostly White communities.¹³

Males also receive an incomplete education because they (not to mention their female peers) learn little about women in their schooling. The children of the wealthy learn that the wealthy and the powerful are the real makers of history, the ones who have left their mark on civilization. Heterosexual students receive the message that gay and lesbian students should be ostracized because they are deviant and immoral. Only the able-bodied are reflected in most curricula, save for exceptions such as Helen Keller, who are presented as either bigger than life or as sources of pity. The humanity of all students is jeopardized as a result.

Multicultural education is, by definition, *inclusive*. Because it is *about* all people, it is also *for* all people, regardless of their ethnicity, ability, social class, language, sexual orientation, religion, gender, race, or other difference. It can even be convincingly argued that students from the dominant culture need multicultural education more than others because they are generally the most miseducated or uneducated about diversity. For example, European American youths often think that they do not even have a culture, at least not in the same sense that easily culturally identifiable youths do. At the same time, they feel that their ways of living, doing things, believing, and acting are "normal." Anything else is "ethnic" and exotic.

Feeling as they do, young people from dominant groups are prone to develop

an unrealistic view of the world and of their place in it. These are the children who learn not to question, for example, the name of “flesh-colored” bandages, even though they are not the flesh color of 75 percent of the world’s population. They do not even have to think about the fact that everyone, Christian or not, gets holidays at Christmas and Easter and that the holidays of other religions are given little attention in our calendars and school schedules. They may automatically assume that all children are raised by heterosexual biological parents and may be surprised to learn that many children are instead raised by just one parent, adoptive parents, grandparents, or lesbian or gay parents. As a result, whereas children from dominated groups may develop feelings of inferiority, dominant group children may develop feelings of superiority. Both responses are based on incomplete and inaccurate information about the complexity and diversity of the world, and both are harmful.

In spite of this, multicultural education continues to be thought of by many educators as education for the “culturally different” or the “disadvantaged.” Teachers in predominantly European American schools, for example, may feel it is not important or necessary to teach their students anything about the Civil Rights Movement. Likewise, only in scattered bilingual programs in Mexican American communities are students exposed to literature by Mexican and Mexican American authors, and ethnic studies classes are often only offered at high schools with a high percentage of students of color. These are ethnocentric interpretations of multicultural education.

The thinking behind these actions is paternalistic as well as misinformed. Because anything remotely digressing from the “regular” (European American) curriculum is automatically considered soft by some educators, a traditional response to making a curriculum multicultural is to water it down. Poor pedagogical decisions are then based on the premise that so-called disadvantaged students need a watered-down version of the “real” curriculum, whereas more privileged children can handle the “regular” or more academically challenging curriculum. But, rather than dilute it, making a curriculum multicultural inevitably enriches it. All students would be enriched by reading the poetry of Langston Hughes or the stories of Gary Soto, by being fluent in a second language, or by understanding the history of Islam.

Multicultural Education Is Pervasive

Multicultural education is neither an activity that happens at a set period of the day nor another subject area to be covered. Having a “multicultural teacher” who goes from class to class in the same way as the music or art teacher is not what multicultural education should be about either. If this is a school’s concept of multicultural education, it is little wonder that teachers sometimes decide that it is a frill they cannot afford.

A true multicultural approach is pervasive. It permeates everything: the school climate, physical environment, curriculum, and relationships among teachers and students and community.¹⁴ It is apparent in every lesson, curriculum guide, unit, bulletin board, and letter that is sent home; it can be seen in the process by which

books and audiovisual aids are acquired for the library, in the games played during recess, and in the lunch that is served. *Multicultural education is a philosophy, a way of looking at the world*, not simply a program or a class or a teacher. In this comprehensive way, multicultural education helps us rethink school reform.

What might a multicultural philosophy mean in the way that schools are organized? For one, it would probably mean the end of rigid forms of ability tracking, which inevitably favors some students over others. It would also mean that the complexion of the school, both literally and figuratively, would change. That is, schools would be integrated rather than segregated along lines of race and social class as they are now. In addition, there would be an effort to have the entire school staff be more representative of our nation's diversity. Pervasiveness would be apparent in the great variety and creativity of instructional strategies, so that students from all cultural groups, and females as well as males, would benefit from methods other than the traditional. The curriculum would be completely overhauled and would include the histories, viewpoints, and insights of many different peoples and both males and females. Topics usually considered "dangerous" could be talked about in classes, and students would be encouraged to become critical thinkers. Textbooks and other instructional materials would also reflect a pluralistic perspective. Families and other community people would be visible in the schools because they offer a unique and helpful viewpoint. Teachers, families, and students would have the opportunity to work together to design motivating and multiculturally appropriate curricula.

In other less global but no less important ways, the multicultural school would probably look vastly different. For example, the lunchroom might offer a variety of international meals, not because they are exotic delights but because they are the foods people in the community eat daily. Sports and games from all over the world might be played, and not all would be competitive. Letters would be sent home in the languages that the particular child's family understands. Children would not be punished for speaking their native language. On the contrary, they would be encouraged to do so, and it would be used in their instruction as well. In summary, the school would be a learning environment in which curriculum, pedagogy, and outreach are all consistent with a broadly conceptualized multicultural philosophy.

Multicultural Education Is Education for Social Justice

All good education connects theory with reflection and action, which is what Brazilian educator Paulo Freire defined as *praxis*.¹⁵ Developing a multicultural perspective means learning how to think in more inclusive and expansive ways, reflecting on what is learned, and applying that learning to real situations. Nearly a century ago, educational philosopher John Dewey described what happens when education is not connected to reflection and action when he wrote "information severed from thoughtful action is dead, a mind-crushing load."¹⁶ Multicultural education invites students and teachers to put their learning into action for social justice (for a definition of social justice, see Chapter 1). Whether debating a difficult issue, developing a community newspaper, starting a

collaborative program at a local senior center, or organizing a petition for the removal of a potentially dangerous waste treatment plant in the neighborhood, students learn that they have power, collectively and individually, to make change.

This aspect of multicultural education fits in particularly well with the developmental level of young people who, starting in the middle elementary grades, are very conscious of what is fair and unfair. If their pronounced sense of justice is not channeled appropriately, the result can be anger, resentment, alienation, or dropping out of school physically or psychologically.

Preparing students for active membership in a democracy is also the basis of Deweyian philosophy and it has frequently been cited by schools as a major educational goal. But few schools serve as sites of apprenticeship for democracy. Policies and practices such as inflexible ability grouping, inequitable testing, monocultural curricula, and unimaginative pedagogy contradict this lofty aim. The result is that students in many schools perceive the claim of democracy to be a hollow and irrelevant issue. Henry Giroux, for example, has suggested that what he calls "the discourse of democracy" has been trivialized to mean such things as uncritical patriotism and mandatory pledges to the flag that the 9/11 disaster has exacerbated.¹⁷ In some schools, democratic practices are found only in textbooks and confined to discussions of the American Revolution, and the chance for students to practice day-to-day democracy is minimal.

The fact that controversial topics such as power and inequality are rarely discussed in schools should come as no surprise. As institutions, schools are charged with maintaining the status quo, and discussing such issues might seem to threaten the status quo. But schools are also expected to promote equality. Exposing the contradictions between democratic ideals and actual manifestations of inequality makes many people uncomfortable, including some educators. Still, such matters are at the heart of a broadly conceptualized multicultural perspective because the subject matter of schooling is society, with all its wrinkles and warts and contradictions. Ethics and the distribution of power, status, and rewards are basic societal concerns; education *must* address them.

Although the connection between multicultural education and students' rights and responsibilities in a democracy is unmistakable, many young people do not learn about these responsibilities, about the challenges of democracy, or about the central role of citizens in ensuring and maintaining the privileges of democracy. Results from a recent study about the First Amendment, in which over 112,000 high school students were surveyed, provide a chilling example of how little students understand about democracy. The project, which was funded by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, found that when the First Amendment was quoted to students, more than one-third of them felt that it went too far in the rights it guarantees. The report concluded that "It appears, in fact, that our nation's high schools are failing their students when it comes to instilling in them appreciation for the First Amendment."¹⁸ In this situation, social justice becomes an empty concept.

Multicultural education can have a great impact in helping to turn this situation around. A multicultural perspective presumes that classrooms should not simply allow discussions that focus on social justice, but also welcome them

and even plan actively for such discussions to take place. These discussions might center on issues that adversely and disproportionately affect disenfranchised communities—poverty, discrimination, war, the national budget—and what students can do to address these problems. Because all of these problems are pluralistic, education must be multicultural.

Multicultural Education Is a Process

Curriculum and materials represent the content of multicultural education, but multicultural education is, above all, a process, that is, it is ongoing and dynamic. No one ever stops becoming a multicultural person, and knowledge is never complete. This means that there is no established canon that is set in stone. Second, multicultural education is a process because it primarily involves relationships among people. The sensitivity and understanding teachers show their students are more crucial in promoting student learning than the facts and figures they may know about different ethnic and cultural groups. Also, multicultural education is a process because it concerns such intangibles as expectations of student achievement, learning environments, students' learning preferences, and other cultural variables that are absolutely essential for schools to understand if they are to become successful with all students.

The dimension of multicultural education as a process is too often relegated to a secondary position, because content is easier to handle and has speedier results. For instance, staging an assembly program on Black History Month is easier than eliminating tracking: The former involves adding extracurricular content, and, although this is important and necessary, it is not as decisive at challenging fundamental perceptions about ability, social class, and race through the elimination of tracking. Another example: Changing a basal reader is easier than developing higher expectations for all students. The former involves substituting one book for another; the latter involves changing perceptions, behaviors, and knowledge, not an easy task. As a result, the processes of multicultural education are generally more complex, more politically volatile, and even more threatening to vested interests than introducing "controversial" content.

Because multicultural education is a process, it must debunk simplistic and erroneous conventional wisdom as well as dismantle policies and practices that are disadvantageous for some students at the expense of others. Through their teacher education programs, future teachers need to develop an awareness of the influence of culture and language on learning, the persistence of racism and discrimination in schools and society, and instructional and curricular strategies that encourage learning among a wide variety of students. Teachers' roles in the school also need to be redefined, because empowered teachers help to create learning environments in which students are empowered. Also, the role of families needs to be expanded so that the insights and values of the community can be accurately reflected in the school. Nothing short of a complete restructuring of curricula and the organization of schools is required. The process is complex, problematic, controversial, and time-consuming, but it is one in which teachers and schools must engage to make their schools truly multicultural.

Multicultural Education Is Critical Pedagogy

Knowledge is neither neutral nor apolitical, yet it is generally treated by teachers and schools as if it were. Consequently, knowledge taught in our schools tends to reflect the lowest common denominator—that which is sure to offend the fewest (and the most powerful) and is least controversial. Students may leave school with the impression that all major conflicts have already been resolved, but history, including educational history, is still full of great debates, controversies, and ideological struggles. These controversies and conflicts are often left at the schoolhouse door.

Every educational decision made at any level, whether by a teacher or by an entire school system, reflects the political ideology and worldview of the decision maker. Decisions to dismantle tracking, discontinue standardized tests, lengthen the school day, use one reading program rather than another, study literature from the Harlem Renaissance or Elizabethan period (or both), or use learning centers rather than rows of chairs, all reflect a particular view of learners and of education.

All the decisions we, as educators, make, no matter how neutral they seem, may have an impact on the lives and experiences of our students. This is true of the curriculum, books, and other materials we provide for them. State and local guidelines and mandates may limit what particular schools and teachers choose to teach, and this too is a political decision. What is excluded is often as revealing as what is included. Much of the literature taught at the high school level, for instance, is still heavily male-oriented, European, and European American. The significance of women, people of color, and those who write in other languages (even if their work has been translated into English) is diminished, unintentionally or not.

A major problem with a monocultural curriculum is that it gives students only one way of seeing the world. When reality is presented as static, finished and flat, the underlying tensions, controversies, passions, and problems faced by people throughout history and today disappear. To be informed and active participants in a democratic society, students need to understand the complexity of the world and the many perspectives involved. Using a critical perspective, students learn that there is not just one way (or even two or three) of viewing issues.

To explain what we mean by “using a critical perspective,” we will be facetious and use the number 17 to explain it: Let’s say there are at least 17 ways of understanding reality, and, until we have learned all of them, we have only part of the truth. The point is that there are multiple perspectives on every issue, but most of us have learned only the “safe” or standard ways of interpreting events and issues.

Textbooks in all subject areas exclude information about unpopular perspectives or the perspectives of disempowered groups in our society. These are the “lies my teacher told me” to which James Loewen refers in his powerful critique of U.S. history textbooks.¹⁹ For instance, Thanksgiving is generally presented as an uncomplicated celebration in which Pilgrims and Indians shared the bounty of the harvest, but it is unlikely that the Wampanoags experienced Thanksgiving in this manner. One way to counter simplistic or one-sided views is to provide alternative or multiple views of the same topic. A good example is a book

published by the Boston Children's Museum that presents a multiplicity of perspectives on Thanksgiving, including the Wampanoag perspective.²⁰ Likewise, few U.S. history texts include the perspective of working-class people, although they were and continue to be the backbone of our country. To cite another example, the immigrant experience is generally treated as a romantic and successful odyssey rather than the traumatic, wrenching, and often less-than-idyllic situation it was (and still is) for so many. The experiences of non-European immigrants or those forcibly incorporated into the United States are usually presented as if they were identical to the experiences of Europeans, which they have not at all been. We can also be sure that, if the perspectives of women were taken seriously, the school curriculum would be altered dramatically. The historian Howard Zinn provides one of the few examples of such a multifaceted, multicultural, and complex history. In his classic, *A People's History of the United States* (most recently updated in 2005), we clearly see a history full of passion and conflict with voices rarely included in traditional history texts.²¹ All students need to understand these multiple perspectives and not only the viewpoints of dominant groups. Unless they do, students will continue to think of history as linear and fixed and to think of themselves as passive and unable to make changes in their communities and the larger society or even in their personal interactions.

According to James Banks, the main goal of a multicultural curriculum is to help students develop decision-making and social action skills.²² By doing so, students learn to view events and situations from a variety of perspectives. A multicultural approach values diversity and encourages critical thinking, reflection, and action. Through this process, students are empowered. This is the basis of critical pedagogy. Its opposite is what Paulo Freire called "domesticating education,"—education that emphasizes passivity, acceptance, and submissiveness. According to Freire, education for domestication is a process of "transferring knowledge," whereas education for liberation is one of "transforming action."²³ Education that is liberating encourages students to take risks, to be curious, and to question. Rather than expecting students to repeat teachers' words, it expects them to seek their own answers.

How are critical pedagogy and multicultural education connected? They are what Geneva Gay has called "mirror images."²⁴ That is, they work together, according to Christine Sleeter, as "a form of resistance to dominant modes of schooling."²⁵ Critical pedagogy acknowledges rather than suppresses cultural and linguistic diversity. It is not simply the transfer of knowledge from teacher to students, even though that knowledge may challenge what students previously learned. Critical literacy, which developed from critical pedagogy and focuses specifically on language, has a similar goal. According to educational researcher Barbara Comber, "When teachers and students are engaged in critical literacy, they will be asking complicated questions about language and power, about people and lifestyles, about morality and ethics, about who is advantaged by the way things are and who is disadvantaged."²⁶

A multicultural perspective does not simply operate on the principle of substituting one "truth" or perspective for another. Rather, it reflects on multiple and contradictory perspectives to understand reality more fully. The historian Ronald

Takaki expressed it best when he said, “The multiculturalism I have been seeking is a serious scholarship that includes all American peoples and challenges the traditional master narrative of American history.” He concludes that “[t]he intellectual purpose of multiculturalism is a more accurate understanding of who we are as Americans.”²⁷ This means that, in our pluralistic society, teachers and students need to learn to understand even those viewpoints with which they may disagree—not to practice “political correctness,” but to develop a critical perspective about what they hear, read, or see. Individuals with this kind of critical perspective can use the understanding gained from mindful reflection to act as catalysts for change.

Ira Shor has proposed that critical pedagogy is more difficult precisely because it moves beyond academic discourse: “Testing the limits by practicing theory and theorizing practice in a real context is harder and more risky than theorizing theory without a context.”²⁸ Yet the typical curriculum discourages students from thinking critically. In this sense, critical pedagogy takes courage. What does it mean to teach with courage? A few examples are in order. For teachers Darcy Ballentine and Lisa Hill, the purpose of teaching reading to their second, third, and fourth graders meant challenging the children to take up “brave books” that included what the teachers called “dangerous truths.” These books broached topics such as racism and inequality, issues generally avoided in children’s books (although certainly present in the lives of many children). Ballentine and Hill reflected on their experience in this way: “In the year that we taught these two texts, as well as many other brave books, our children’s voices—in discussion, in explanations of their art, and in their dramatic enactments—continually reminded us that the risks we were taking in our teaching made sense.”²⁹

More recently, teacher Vivian Vasquez, in her book *Negotiating Critical Literacies with Young Children*, documented her experiences in using a critical literacy approach with three- to five-year-olds. Among the many examples she cites, one concerns what happened when the children in her class realized that a classmate had not eaten at the annual school barbecue because he was a vegetarian and only hot dogs and hamburgers had been served. On their own initiative—but having learned to think critically about social action—the students drew up a petition about providing vegetarian alternatives and gave it to the event committee. The next year, vegetarian alternatives were provided. In her beautiful and hopeful book, Vasquez demonstrates that critical literacy is not about despair and anger but rather about joy and inclusion. She also affirms that even the youngest children can learn to think critically and positively about their ability to effect change through their actions.³⁰

History is generally written by the conquerors, not by the vanquished or by those who benefit least in society. The result is that history books are skewed in the direction of dominant groups in a society. When American Indian people write history books, they generally say that Columbus *invaded* rather than *discovered* this land, and that there was no heroic *westward expansion*, but rather an *eastern encroachment*. Mexican Americans often include references to Aztlán, the legendary land that was overrun by Europeans during this encroachment. Many Puerto Ricans remove the gratuitous word *granted* that appears in so

many textbooks and explain that U.S. citizenship was instead *imposed*, and they emphasize that U.S. citizenship was opposed by even the two houses of the elected legislature that existed in Puerto Rico in 1917. African American historians tend to describe the active participation of enslaved Africans in their own liberation, and they often include such accounts as slave narratives to describe the rebellion and resistance of their people. Working class people who know their history usually credit laborers rather than Andrew Carnegie with the tremendous building boom that occurred in the United States, and the rapid growth of the U.S. economy, during the late 19th century and the 20th century. And Japanese Americans frequently cite racist hysteria, economic exploitation, and propaganda as major reasons for their internment in U.S. concentration camps during World War II.

Critical pedagogy is also an exploder of myths. It helps to expose and demystify as well as demythologize some of the truths that we take for granted and to analyze them critically and carefully. Justice for all, equal treatment under the law, and equal educational opportunity, although certainly ideals worth believing in and striving for, are not always the reality. The problem is that we teach them as if they are, and were always, real and true, with no exceptions. Critical pedagogy allows us to have faith in these ideals while critically examining the discrepancies between the ideal and the reality.

Because critical pedagogy begins with the experiences and viewpoints of students, it is by its very nature multicultural. The most successful education is that which begins with the learner and, when a multicultural perspective underpins education, students themselves become the foundation for the curriculum. However, a liberating education also takes students beyond their own particular and therefore limited experiences, no matter what their background.

Critical pedagogy is not new, although it has been referred to by other terms in other times. In our country, precursors to critical pedagogy can be found in the work of African American educators such as Carter Woodson and W. E. B. Du Bois.³¹ In Brazil, the historic work of Paulo Freire influenced literacy and liberation movements throughout the world. Even before Freire, critical pedagogy was being practiced in other parts of the world. Almost half a century ago, Sylvia Ashton-Warner, teaching Maori children in New Zealand, found that the curriculum, materials, viewpoints, and pedagogy that had been used in educating them were all borrowed from the dominant culture. Because Maori children had been failed dismally by New Zealand schools, Ashton-Warner developed a strategy for literacy based on the children's experiences and interests. Calling it an "organic" approach, she taught children how to read by using the words they wanted to learn. Each child would bring in a number of new words each day, learn to read them, and then use them in writing. Because Ashton-Warner's approach was based on what children knew and wanted to know, it was extraordinarily successful. In contrast, basal readers, having little to do with Maori children's experiences, were mechanistic instruments that imposed severe limitations on the students' creativity and expressiveness.³²

Other approaches that have successfully used the experiences of students are worth mentioning. The superb preschool curriculum developed nearly two dec-

ades ago by Louise Derman-Sparks and the Anti-Bias Curriculum Task Force is especially noteworthy. Another recent example is Mary Cowhey's approach. A first- and second-grade teacher, Cowhey has written about how she uses critical pedagogy to help create a strong community as well as to teach her students to question everything they learn. Catherine Compton-Lilly, in her role as a first-grade teacher and later a reading teacher, used a critical perspective to develop classroom strategies to "change the world" by confronting assumptions about race, poverty, and culture. Instructional strategies based on students' languages, cultures, families, and communities are also included in wonderful books by the educational organizations Rethinking Schools and Teaching for Change. Ira Shor's descriptions of the work he does in his own college classroom are further proof of the power of critical pedagogy at all levels. In the same category, Enid Lee, Deborah Menkart, and Margo Okazawa-Rey have developed an exceptional professional development guide for teachers and preservice teachers.³³

Summary

Multicultural education represents a way of rethinking school reform because it responds to many of the problematic factors leading to school underachievement and failure. When implemented comprehensively, multicultural education can transform and enrich the schooling of all young people. Because multicultural education takes into account the cultures, languages, and experiences of all students, it can go beyond the simple transfer of skills to include those attitudes and critical, analytical abilities that have the potential to empower students for productive and meaningful lives.

This discussion leads us to an intriguing insight: In the final analysis, multicultural education as defined here is simply good pedagogy. That is, all good education takes students seriously, uses their experiences as a basis for further learning, and helps them to develop into informed, critically aware, and empowered citizens. What is multicultural about this? To put it simply, in our multicultural society, all good education needs to take into account the diversity of our student population. Multicultural education is good education for a larger number of our students. Is multicultural education just as necessary in a monocultural society? In response, we might legitimately ask whether even the most ethnically homogeneous society is truly monocultural, considering the diversity of social class, language, sexual orientation, physical and mental ability, and other human and social differences that exist in all societies. Our world is increasingly interdependent, and all students need to understand their role in a global society, not simply in their small town, city, or nation. Multicultural education is a process that goes beyond the changing demographics in a particular country. It is more effective education for a changing world.

Notes

- 1 A comprehensive resource on the history, goals, and concerns of multicultural education is *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, 2nd ed., edited by James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004).

- 2 Meyer Weinberg, "Notes from the Editor." *A Chronicle of Equal Education* 4, no. 3 (November 1982): 7.
- 3 Michelle Fine, *Framing Dropouts: Notes on the Politics of an Urban Public High School* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).
- 4 Jonathan Kozol, "Great Men and Women (Tailored for School Use)." *Learning Magazine* (December 1975): 16–20.
- 5 Henry Giroux, "Rewriting the Discourse of Racial Identity: Towards a Pedagogy and Politics of Whiteness." *Harvard Educational Review* 67, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 285–320.
- 6 Beverly Daniel Tatum, *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria? and Other Conversations About Race* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).
- 7 Marilyn Cochran-Smith, "Blind Vision: Unlearning Racism in Teacher Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 70, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 57–190.
- 8 Karen B. McLean Donaldson, *Shattering the Denial: Protocols for the Classrooms and Beyond* (Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 2001).
- 9 Published by Delta beginning in 1994, these texts include the "core" knowledge that children are supposed to know at different grade levels in order to do well in school. As an example, see *What Your Fourth Grader Needs to Know: Fundamentals of a Good Fourth-Grade Education (The Core Knowledge)*, edited by E. D. Hirsch (New York: Delta, 1994).
- 10 Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., *Critical Literacy: What Every American Ought to Know* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm, 2005).
- 11 For a discussion of different levels of curriculum integration in multicultural education, see James A. Banks, *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies*, 7th ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2003).
- 12 See, for example, Joan Roughgarden, *Evolution's Rainbow: Diversity, Gender, and Sexuality in Nature and People* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); and Ian Ayres and Jennifer Gararda Brown, *Straightforward* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- 13 Louise Derman-Sparks, Patricia G. Ramsey, Julie Olsen Edwards, and Carol Brunson Day, *What If All The Kids Are White? Anti-Bias Multicultural Education With Young Children and Families* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2006).
- 14 A good example of how a multicultural approach includes educators, students, and families can be found in Patricia G. Ramsey, ed., *Teaching and Learning in a Diverse World: Multicultural Education for Young Children*, 3rd ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004).
- 15 Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Seabury Press, 1970).
- 16 John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Free Press, 1966; first published 1916): 153.
- 17 Henry A. Giroux, "Democracy, Freedom, and Justice After September 11th: Rethinking the Role of Educators and the Politics of Schooling." *Teachers College Record* 104, no. 6 (September 2002): 1138–1162.
- 18 "Future of the First Amendment." John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, 2005. Available at: <http://firstamendmentfuture.org>
- 19 James W. Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* (New York: New Press, reissue edition, 2005).
- 20 Children's Museum, Boston, *Many Thanksgivings: Teaching Thanksgiving—Including the Wampanoag Perspective* (Boston: The Children's Museum, 2002).
- 21 Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States, 1492–Present* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2001; 1st ed., 1980).
- 22 James A. Banks, *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies*, 7th ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2003).
- 23 Paulo Freire, *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power, and Liberation* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1985).
- 24 Geneva Gay, "Mirror Images on Common Issues: Parallels Between Multicultural Education and Critical Pedagogy." In *Multicultural Education, Critical Pedagogy,*

- and the Politics of Difference, edited by Christine E. Sleeter and Peter L. McLaren (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996): 155–189.
- 25 Christine E. Sleeter, *Multicultural Education and Social Activism* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1996): 2.
 - 26 Barbara Comber, “Critical Literacies and Local Action: Teacher Knowledge and a ‘New’ Research Agenda.” In *Negotiating Critical Literacies in Classrooms*, edited by Barbara Comber and Anne Simpson. (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001): 271.
 - 27 Joan Montgomery, “A Different Mirror: A Conversation with Ronald Takaki,” *Educational Leadership* 56, no. 7 (April 1999): 9–13.
 - 28 Ira Shor, *When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996): 3.
 - 29 Darcy Ballentine and Lisa Hill, “Teaching Beyond Once Upon a Time.” *Language Arts* 78, no. 1 (September 2000): 11–20.
 - 30 Vivian Vasquez, *Negotiating Critical Literacies with Young Children* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004).
 - 31 See, for instance, Carter G. Woodson, *The Miseducation of the Negro* (Washington, DC: Associated Publishers, 1933); W. E. B. Du Bois, “Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?” *Journal of Negro Education* 4, no. 3 (July 1935): 328–335. For a historical analysis of multicultural education and critical pedagogy, see James A. Banks, “Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice.” In *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*, 2nd ed., edited by James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004).
 - 32 Sylvia Ashton-Warner, *Teacher* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1963).
 - 33 See, for example, Louise Derman-Sparks and the A.B.C. Task Force, *Anti-Bias Curriculum: Tools for Empowering Young Children* (Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1989); Mary Cowhey, *Black Ants and Buddhists: Thinking Critically and Teaching Differently in the Primary Grades* (Portland, ME: Stenhouse, 2006); Catherine Compton-Lilly, *Confronting Racism, Poverty, and Power: Classroom Strategies to Change the World* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2004); Bill Bigelow, Linda Christensen, Stanley Karp, Barbara Miner, and Bob Peterson, eds., *Rethinking Our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice*, vol. 1 (Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, 1994); Bill Bigelow, Brenda Harvey, Stan Karp, and Larry Miller, eds., *Rethinking Our Classrooms: Teaching for Equity and Justice*, vol. 2 (Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, 2001); Ira Shor, *When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); and Enid Lee, Deborah Menkart, Margo Okazawa-Rey, *Beyond Heroes and Holidays: A Practical Guide to K-12 Anti-Racist, Multicultural Education and Staff Development* (Washington, DC: Network of Educators on the Americas [NECA], 1998). Also, two educational organizations, Teaching for Change and Rethinking Schools, have many excellent resources available.

Critical Questions

- 1 What do you see as the difference between a broadly conceptualized multicultural education and multicultural education defined in terms of “holidays and heroes”?
- 2 Do you believe it is important for anti-racism and anti-discrimination, in general, to be at the core of multicultural education? Why or why not?
- 3 Would you say that European American students are miseducated if they are not exposed to a multicultural curriculum? Similarly, are males miseducated if they do not learn about women in history? Why?
- 4 Think of a number of curriculum ideas that conform to the definition of multicultural education as social justice. How might students be engaged