UCLA
InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies

Title
Becoming Protagonists for Integration: Youth Voices from Segregated Educational Spaces

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7791x9tn

Journal
InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies, 6(1)

ISSN
1548-3320

Authors
Johnston-Goodstar, Katie
Nagda, Biren (Ratnesh)

Publication Date
2010-01-25

DOI
10.5070/D461000671

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

> To me, the issue is that almost anywhere you go in the United States today, if you want to see a really segregated school, you ask for a school named Martin Luther King or Rosa Parks or Thurgood Marshall. It's the ultimate irony.
>
> – Jonathan Kozol (quoted in Shaw, 2005)

Desegregation strategies such as busing and racial tiebreakers have proven inadequate to achieve the national mandate for equality in education. Despite these and other efforts, American schools have been progressively re-segregating over the past two decades (Orfield & Lee, 2007), including an alarming development of in-school segregation otherwise known as two-tiered schooling (Morrell, 2004) or segregation between advanced learning and regular learning programs (Epstein, 1985; Ford & Webb, 1994). In this article, we claim that critical pedagogy can provide an alternative strategy for anti-segregation work. Critical pedagogies of integration can provide youth with the educational engagement needed to challenge their lived segregation, in school and in society. This article will present the history and findings of a project titled *Worlds Apart, HeARTS Together,* a critical pedagogy developed for students of a middle school experiencing profound racial and socioeconomic segregation between the gifted and regular learning programs.

A Brief History of Segregation in Seattle Schools

For years, Seattle-based social justice and education advocates and community members have found evidence of residential and school segregation in direct contrast to the city's reputation as liberal and diverse (Turnbull, 2007). The Seattle school district claims that "diversity is a hallmark" of education and for decades it has engaged policies such as busing and racial tiebreakers as a commitment to this diversity (Seattle Schools Annual Reports, 2006). In an effort to diversify, Seattle schools used racial tiebreakers if a school had "more applicants than available seats, and the school's proportion of white and nonwhite students deviated 15 percent or more from the district average" (Bhatt, 2004). How could it be, then, that despite these efforts and the expressed desire for diversity, that the Seattle school district has segregated schools?

According to some scholars, Seattle is not unusual. Cities and schools across the United States are becoming increasingly segregated (Kozol, 2006; Orfield & Lee, 2007). School enrollment is often linked to residential location, as is the case in Seattle, where students are given priority enrollment for their neighborhood schools. Because Seattle's citizens often live in neighborhoods where people share their economic, racial, and historical identities, school enrollment mirrors these larger patterns of segregation (Bhatt, 2004; Shaw, 2005) In an attempt to address this, the school district pursued the aforementioned diversification strategies and even appealed a case to the U.S. Supreme Court

(*Parents Involved in Community Schools (PICS)* v. *Seattle School District No. 1,* 2007).

Legal challenges to the district's desegregation efforts are recurrent and success toward integration has been sluggish. Further compounding these efforts is the notable increase of in-school segregation through an expansion of advanced learning programs. The Seattle school district, like many across the nation, sponsors a "gifted" program and manages its enrollment through intelligence quotient and cognitive performance testing. Only those students who take and pass standardized tests in the top 5% ("academically gifted"—Spectrum Program) and 2% ("highly academically gifted"—APP: Accelerated Progress Program) of national averages are guaranteed enrollment in the advanced learning program classes. Seventy-five percent of those found eligible for "gifted" education in the Seattle school district are White despite a district average of 40% (Heffter, 2007).[1] Indeed, the advanced learning program is so markedly segregated that an independent review demanded the district act "aggressively to diversify its program" (Heffter, 2007) and found that the program is perceived by some as "elitist," "exclusionary," "racist," and "promoting institutional racism" (Callahan, Brighton, & Hertberg Davis, 2007, pp. 7-8). Students of color who gained acceptance to the program reported bullying and isolation including such comments as "Stop coming here. This is a white school" (Callahan et al., 2007, p. 38).

The "gifted" learning programs not only provide advanced curriculum to challenge the student at levels one to two years above their peer averages, but they also contribute to perpetuating disparities by providing other privileges such as the reputation of National Merit scholarship, easy access to extensive Advanced Placement (AP) courses, and instruction by the "best" teachers in the building. Assessment for these programs is also competitive and contentious, with built-in processes that reinforce segregation. In addition to cultural and economic biases commonly found in standardized testing (Suzuki & Valencia, 1997), the district-sanctioned appeals process can be administered and paid for in the private sector, an option so common that these independent consultants are termed "go-to guys" (Callahan et al., 2007). If this option proves financially or morally unacceptable, parents of privilege can turn instead to private school, as did one participant's mother who anonymously remarked about her younger child who had not qualified, "My daughter didn't get in so we are going to [send her to] a private school." The mother's statement can be explained in many ways, but the certainty is that for those with personal resources and cultural privileges, there are many loopholes to avoid "regular" education in the district. School districts generally present highly gifted academic ability as an innate talent rather than a social phenomenon. This premise, however, begs alternative interpretations. Are children of color not highly academically gifted in Seattle, or is there a significant

predicament in the identification and categorization of gifted students that supports segregation? In other words, we ask: highly gifted or highly privileged?

Worlds Apart, HeARTS Together: A Critical Pedagogy for Integration

In addition to unsuccessful desegregation strategies, the presence of in-school segregation in our project school coupled with our belief that the racial disparity in the gifted programs was social in origin, led us to seek alternative anti-segregation efforts. We needed to develop an approach to integration and found that critical pedagogy was exceptionally suited for such a task. Critical pedagogy is an approach to education that centers concerns of social justice, focuses on structural disparities, and uses experiences central to students' lives to engender intellectual engagement (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Kincheloe, 2008; Morrell 2004).

In creating our project, we approached the topic of segregation using a paradigm of justice put forth by Iris Marion Young (1990) in *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Arguing for a conception beyond simple distributive justice, Young proposed processual justice to account for dynamics of domination and oppression as manifested in social relations, cultural recognition, and historical structures. Without devaluing desegregation, we wanted to focus on something different than the distribution of diverse students. We were interested in developing a parallel process of integration where diverse people, knowledge, and places become valued components of educational equality. We turn next to the team and the project we developed.

Project Design and Methods

Project Methodology

Our project was based on a participatory action research (PAR) methodology. PAR is a "participatory democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing" (Reason & Bradbury, 2001, pp. 1-2). As a research methodology, it is typified by collaboration between researchers and community members. Using PAR, research partners engage in the co-creation of knowledge that will be mutually beneficial to all (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998, pp. 177-179). Additionally, stemming from the critical philosophical tradition, PAR seeks to expose and confront power through the identification of and engagement with macro-social origins of oppression. Through the PAR process, research partners aim to translate the "research findings into action for education and change" (Minkler, 2000, p. 192; Baum, MacDougall, & Smith, 2006). Given these

philosophical foundations and practice orientations, PAR was an exceptionally well-suited methodology for our investigation.

Curricular and Research Teams

The project became reality as a parent representative with a background in anti-apartheid work began to map out ideas and recruit volunteers (L. Markowitz, personal communication, 2006). Over the course of a few months, both the research and curriculum teams were formed through her coordinated efforts. Teachers, artists, parents, and community activists were among the final team of volunteers who delivered the project curriculum. This article discusses the findings of the research team which consisted primarily of the parent coordinator and three members of a local university: the first author, a doctoral student (at that time) with interests in critical pedagogy and social justice; the second author, a faculty member with a background in South African history and intergroup dialogue (Nagda & Gurin, 2007), and a professional artist and graduate student in the department of education. A collaborative agreement from the school administration was secured and following successful grant applications, project planning began.

Curricular Description

The *Worlds Apart, HeARTS Together (WAHT)* project required desegregation. For one full week, slightly more than 300 students of the eighth grade class participated in learning and dialogue groups outside of their socially enforced, academic labels of "gifted" and "regular." To our knowledge, not one student questioned this prerequisite; students eagerly crossed these borders later noting that they "met people they'd never even seen before!" Using the topic of South African apartheid as a generative theme (Freire, 1970; Kincheloe, 2008) for students to begin exploring American segregation, the pedagogy sought to raise questions and to deeply explore and connect the history of apartheid with school segregation.

We launched the week with an inspirational speech by Archbishop Desmond Tutu who spoke about the history and ongoing effects of apartheid in South Africa, diversity in education, and the emergence of a new democracy post-apartheid. Later, students watched a literary adapted drama (Boal, 1985; Book-It Repertory Theatre, 2007; Hanley, 1998) based on Alan Paton's (1948) book, *Cry, The Beloved Country*. Also included were firsthand autobiographical accounts of life under segregation in South Africa by Linda Biehl and Ntobeko Peni. Linda Biehl was the mother of Amy Biehl, a White American woman who was murdered in South Africa while on a Fulbright Scholarship. Ntobeko Peni was one of four Black South African men who were convicted of her murder. The two

had reconciled under the auspices of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and worked together for the Amy Biehl Foundation. Finally, students were introduced to the knowledge, language, music, and traditions of a variety of South African tribes through the presentations of seven South African peer educators.

Data Collection and Analysis

We relied on multiple collectors and methods of data collection including individual interviews, participant observation, community testimony, media reports, and demographic data. These multiple sources of data demonstrated the success of the project in many ways and they also allowed us to reflect upon and refine the project as it was implemented. The data included features by local and regional media outlets, having community members and student participants attend and reflect upon various activities, and engendering community dialogue about segregation in the schools.

The project timeline was swift and there were limited resources for systematic data collection. These limitations, combined with the research team's interest in the way that individual participants experienced and employed the pedagogy to act as protagonists of integration, led to the decision to collect and analyze individual interviews. The first author conducted these individual interviews with participants shortly after their participation in the project.

Interview Participants

An invitation to interview was originally sent to all students participating in the project. This invitation was included with project permission slips. Despite receiving permission slips from all students, the response to the interview recruitment proved heavily biased. Although the school is fairly evenly split into gifted and regular programs and approximately 40% of the student body identify as White, almost 100% of the students who volunteered to be interviewed were White and members of the advanced learning programs.

Being a justice-oriented project, the research team was especially interested in exploring how a diverse sample of students, including students of color and students in the regular education program, experienced and employed the pedagogy. Additionally, since the team wanted to explore and describe rather than make generalizations about the pedagogical experience, we decided to employ purposeful (also known as *judgment*) sampling particular to qualitative research paradigms (Marshall, 1996).

The project coordinator recruited four students who she identified as having a keen interest in the project (i.e., students who had expressed ongoing interest and/or had volunteered beyond school hours with the project activities). Those students then recommended additional students for recruitment (see

snowball sampling in Marshall, 1996). In total, 10 students were recruited, with 8 students responding and accepting the invitation to participate. In the end, only 6 students completed the interviews because 2 students were not able to be interviewed due to the short timeline and conflicting schedules.

A diverse representation of gender, race, and program affiliation was achieved. The interviewees were three girls and three boys who ranged in age from 13 to 14 years. There were three African American, one Multi-racial, and two White participants and they represented 50% advanced learning and 50% regular learning program.

The first author conducted the interviews, which lasted approximately one to two hours and followed a semi-structured interview guide that included such questions as: tell me about your school, describe the project, and what did you do and learn from the project? Interviews were recorded and transcribed. Interview notes and interview reflections were kept and at times supplemented the transcription due to an inadequate length of tape. The transcriptions were subsequently analyzed for themes that could contribute to a deeper understanding of how youth experienced and employed the pedagogy to becoming protagonists of integration. This article presents the initial findings of the individual interviews.

Before introducing our thematic findings, it is important to note that the thematic voices move from the personal to the social and while they could appear to follow a linear path of conscientization (Freire, 1970), we do not intend to establish any such path. This is in part because our project was relatively short in duration and not nearly of the time necessary to make such a claim. It is also because the "voices" did not reveal any chronological order to their expression and the data support a cyclical rather than linear process of reflection, engagement, and action, each with numerous starting points depending on the social location of each individual at any given point of interaction.

Findings

We report our findings below, organized along the three major themes—the reflective voice, the dialogic voice, and the praxis voice. Under each theme, we present the sub-themes in ***bold italics*** and include a short discussion and illustrative voices from the youth. The names of the youth have been altered to protect confidentiality. We further elaborate on these three themes and their meaning in the discussion section.

“We Just Take Regular Classes”: Reflective Voice and the Self Awareness of Segregation

We define reflective voice as an individual ***awareness of segregation*** and segregated places experienced at the level of the self or self-identified community. Although it is likely that students had an awareness of segregation prior to the pedagogy, when asked to reflect upon their experiences, our participants employed the pedagogy to articulate segregation and its consequences at their school. This is evident in the following quotes from Crystal:

> I was a teacher’s assistant….I went to the APP class; I might have saw a handful African Americans in there!
>
> I was the only African American in that class [a lower-level honors class that allows regular students in with recommendation].
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

Crystal’s language conveys a clear racial awareness of the token status of African Americans in advanced program classes. This awareness of segregation, however, was not limited to students of color; it was also evident when Kaya, a White student, questioned the sincerity of her school’s commitment to diversity while enforcing segregation:

> [Our school’s motto is] unity and diversity because there’s people from every group here. Everyone just says it’s diverse, but like it’s not really as much—it’s not that people won’t be friends with someone who’s a different race than they are, but it’s just if you don’t have classes with them, like people don’t really reach out and try to make friends with someone they don’t know.
>
> -Kaya, White, gifted program

Participants’ reflections also revealed the significant ***consequences*** associated with segregation—lowered self-esteem, an increased vulnerability to negative social image, disciplinary action, and academic discouragement. For example, one participant’s reflections revealed a lower sense of esteem in himself and discouragement his classes:

> I know a few people from [the gifted program]. They just work a lot harder and have more stuff to do…. Spectrum and APP are special. If you’re lucky, a couple of them will be in your classes. We just take regular classes.
>
> -Jesse, Multi-racial, regular program

Crystal also spoke about the conditions of the classroom in the advanced versus regular program:

> I would look at those [APP] classes, the teachers would talk, and everybody’s writing and taking notes, and then I go into the regular class and I see the teachers all looked all strict and the kids are all rowdy.
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

Another participant remarked on the social images that accompany advanced and regular student status:

> They say oh, the regular kids are always getting in trouble and the APP kids are just perfect…no, we're not. I'm in AP[P], we're not perfect little anybodies, nobody's perfect.
>
> -Tenisha, African American, gifted program

There were also ***indirect consequences*** built into the initial segregation during elementary school and points thereafter. For example, Ahmed identified being unable to "make it" into the school band because of the tough competition.

> They have a good band program at the school. And a lot of kids come to our school for the band…. I didn't make it.
>
> -Ahmed, African American, regular program

This tough competition, while often attributed to differential skills and capacities, largely derives from the high levels of music and sports preparation offered at segregated elementary schools and afforded by economically privileged parents. Such competition, as mentioned by Ahmed, existed in many of the school's opportunities. In fact, when asked about what the ***best*** things about the school were, students overwhelmingly mentioned: 1) the academically gifted program (even if they were not enrolled in it), 2) the band, and 3) championship sports teams. Many of the regular education students did not "make it" or had scheduling conflicts that prevented them from participating in the remaining two extracurricular activities that were not regulated by district testing processes. On the other hand, the gifted students were frequently involved in these activities, as members of the team that won the district championships and being in the band.

The reflective voice expressed by our students, most particularly students of color, evidenced that not only were they aware of segregation, but that they knew its personal consequences all too well. The pedagogy gave youth an opportunity to reflect upon how segregation built formidable and perpetual disparities into their education and contributed to the lasting reproduction of educational inequalities.

"They Get a Broader View of Life, They Probably Learn": Dialogic Voice, Linking the Segregating of Schools and Society

We define dialogic voice as the co-creation of understanding and communal recognition of the linkage between structural forces and social consequences of segregation, that is, the recognition that schools and other institutions are a site for the reproduction of (and as we show later, resistance to) segregation and inequalities.

Specific to our African American participants, ***solidarity in opposition to segregation*** was observed when these students re-told their experiences of the pedagogy. Their re-telling often held conscious and subconscious reference to themselves and their community histories. For example, unconscious references were found in the mistaken identification of South Africans as African Americans and vice versa, and in the recollection of a public execution reframed in terms of a "tree," a symbolic manifestation of the public lynching of African Americans. Examples found among all of our students who identified as African American or Multi-racial, are as follows:

> He [a man in the play] wanted to help the African Americans—well, not *African Americans*, I mean the *South Africans* at the time during the apartheid.
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

> They [South African tribes] get robbed of their land, like the Native Americans. All their resources taken away and then they were left with scraps.
>
> -Jesse, Multi-racial, regular program

> [On White students laughing at the story of a South African man sentenced to public execution on the *gallows*] They were laughing, like oh, aha! That's not funny, somebody gettin' ready to go hang on a *tree*. That's not—there's nothing funny about that. That's a serious matter.
>
> -Tenisha, African American, gifted program

> A couple of *African American* guys, they came and like I guess they killed her [speaking on the murder committed by *South Africans* during the anti-apartheid movement].
>
> -Ahmed, African American, regular program

Participants also ***explicitly*** identified mutual experiences with South Africans and solidarity in opposition to segregation, such as the following quotes shared by Crystal and Jesse:

> I think [American] school systems are set up the way they were in South Africa. Like people—this is what it should look like over here and this is the way it should look over there. The regular system of learning is predominantly like Latinos and Blacks, and then in the Spectrum and the APP, it's predominantly White and maybe Asians.
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

> [Discussing South African history] I guess this was just another way of telling us that we [African Americans] are not the only ones that were hurt and different. It was a good experience for me.
>
> -Jesse, Multi-racial, regular program

South African apartheid and the struggle for freedom from it gave African American students a starting point, an analogy to introduce their experiences of segregation, oppression, and violence. South Africa was especially profound for

students of color but it also proved to be a jumping point for White students to engage their voices through an ***acknowledgement of social privileges*** that accompany segregation. White students acknowledged structural privileges and institutional power that was afforded to Whites during apartheid.

> The White people weren't originally from there [South Africa], and then they just came and tried to like take over and there was a lot of resentment, like it's well-deserved resentment because they tried to run someone else's country.
>
> -Kaya, White, gifted program

> The government in South Africa basically separated Blacks from Whites…and they gave them more privileges and more farm land and the Blacks were kept down for a really long time. They had laws to keep them down, like the passbooks. And eventually the Blacks got really upset and they started to rise up against the government, but a lot of them were killed.
>
> -Jacob, White, gifted program

The South African experience was a site of inspiration for both White and African American students. It provided an example of national commitment that could begin a process of transformation and reconciliation. It was in this inspiration that a somewhat unexpected finding emerged from the data, that of ***healing and reconciliation.*** We were especially pleased that the pedagogy was identified as a site of moral learning and personal, even spiritual growth. This can be seen in the following quotes by Jacob, Tenisha, and Jesse:

> Yeah, I thought that was a little weird [to meet and enjoy a man who had participated in a murder], but I didn't—I just thought about it…he was just not in a right state of mind when he did it. And he'd been granted amnesty by Truth and Reconciliation [Commission].
>
> -Jacob, White, gifted program

> [On a Truth and Reconciliation Commission story of forgiveness between a mother and the man who killed her daughter] It brought a lot of emotions. Forgiveness is a powerful thing.
>
> -Tenisha, African American, gifted program

> "I don't honestly know how you forgive them"; someone said that [to Desmond Tutu and his response was] "I'd still be in that prison if I didn't know how to forgive." So that's one part of it—they had a whole lot of hardship, there's been a whole lot of pain and suffering from that, and to forgive somebody, it's astonishing.
>
> -Jesse, Multi-racial, regular program

Our students expressed a communal recognition of the structural nature of segregation, solidarity in opposition to it, and a commitment to healing and reconciliation. They expressed this through their mutual identification with the South African experience and in their acknowledgement of the social privileges

afforded by segregation and perhaps most inspirational, through their common desire for healing and reconciliation.

"The Whole World Needs To Clean Up Their Mess": Praxis Voice and the Commitment to Transform

Our final theme, praxis voice, is identified as the commitment to transform segregated educational spaces and make a commitment to subdermal diversity. The presence of this voice supports our claim that youth can become and are protagonists of integration through their critical understanding of social segregation and the application of that understanding to their academic spaces. It is precisely in this theme where students evidenced their ability to merge critical awareness and dialogic relations within a segregated context to pursue expressed social desires such as interracial interactions, racial harmony, desegregation, and equality.

Praxis is often envisioned as including democratic engagement or direct political action, such as testimony at school board meetings, petitions, or media advocacy. Because of the short duration of the project, social actions like these were difficult to link directly to our pedagogy. We did, however, find an equally stimulating form of praxis—a robust social critique of educational segregation and commitments to "diversity."

Schools were identified as lacking true "diversity" and students identified standardized curricula and testing processes as supporting segregation. They unabashedly supported education paradigms that resisted standardized White or Western images of educational attainment. They not only desired an increase in the physical diversity in classrooms, but also questioned the diversity of epistemology and content in American curricula. The students insisted on the recognition of what we term ***subdermal diversity***.[2] Subdermal diversity recognizes that knowledge is culturally and historically situated and the simple presence of children of color in the classroom is insufficient to claim diversity. Their assessment of the lack of diverse languages and music is one way they recognized that diversity is more than a matter of skin color or statistics, as expressed by Kaya, Crystal, and Jesse:

> I think that's one of the worst things about the schooling in America is you don't learn other languages from early on. Languages say something about diversity.
>
> -Kaya, White, gifted program

> There used to be *world* music, but that was last year and then the teacher got fired or laid off or something. [There is however an ongoing *classical* band program.]
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

> It's like it [drumming and singing] brings his [a South African peer educator] joy to him. That probably brought a lot of pain away from the apartheid and stuff.
>
> -Jesse, Multi-racial, regular program

Another indication of the student's critique and commitment to subdermal diversity was their desire for education to improve global citizenship and to understand the histories and geographies of other countries. Knowledge of global content was situated by Crystal as a form of educational giftedness, a notable divergence from the giftedness measured by the school district's advanced learning program. Crystal and Ahmed submit bold claims, claims expressed with a particular tone of disappointment because curriculum with subdermal diversity was an obvious source of inspiration, interest, and solidarity, for African American students.

> There were all these people that we haven't learned of, yet they're like famous leaders in other countries…
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

> [Speaking of the pedagogy that included South African peer educators] The South Africans should have had more time, we should have learned more about it. I would want to learn more about those issues. Really it's about the lesson plans!
>
> -Ahmed, African American, regular program

> If you ask the teacher, can we learn about this, can we learn about that? It'll be like oh, no, we don't have enough time, we have to learn this stuff now…so a lot of times we don't get to learn stuff with our teacher. We have to do it on our own, we have to go out on our own time, which isn't that bad, but you would prefer to learn it in the classroom.
>
> -Crystal, African American, regular program

> Oh! I forgot to tell you, another event that happened was when Archbishop Tutu came. I didn't know how important that was to me until after.
>
> -Ahmed, African American, regular program

Crystal and Ahmed together display an awareness and critique of how curricular choices reflect and deflect certain communities. As educational departments across the country increasingly shift away from arts, music, and place-based education[3] toward math, science, and English (Winner & Hetland, 2007; Gruenewald, 2003), our students call attention to the fact that these choices reflect certain cultural priorities and knowledge. They call for a commitment to subdermal diversity, demanding a space to be critically educated about our society. This praxis voice not only reveals resistance to the shift toward standardization, but also explores its contribution to our segregation.

Discussion

In expressing their experience with and application of this pedagogy of integration, our students engaged in three layers of voice—reflective, dialogic, and praxis. The reflective voicing demonstrates the youth's active awareness of what academic segregation means and the consequences it entails for them. The sense of exclusion felt particularly by African American youth and the cascading privileges for the gifted program students all speak to the real impact that segregation had on these youths' engagement in schools. The *WAHT* pedagogy enabled these student reflections to surface, to be legitimized and honed where they previously may not have been voiced or heard.

The youths' voices also speak to how the reflective voices were linked to dialogic voicing. In a sense, the dialogic voicing revealed a meeting place, an encounter, of the different reflective voices. The youth shared their insights and understandings not just as individuals or members of self-defined communities, but as members of certain groups in interaction or in relation to other students also defined by group membership. By seeing both similarities and contrasts compared to their own situations, the generative theme of South African apartheid and face-to-face interactions with the South African youth, the pedagogy allowed a space for students to probe more deeply their own understandings of social structures, exclusion, oppression, and social privilege. For African American youth particularly, the solidarity with Black South African experience was striking. The dialogic similarity validated these students' own experiences and a sense of "not the only ones that were hurt and different." For most of the White students in the gifted program, the dialogic dissimilarity allowed for recognition of their social privileges.

Together, reflective and dialogic voicing define the meeting place for different students with different experiences and understandings. On one hand, for students of color, there is a clear acknowledgment of continuing disparities, similar to the metaphor of sticky floors used to describe the perpetual lack of any relative advancement for blue collar workers in bottom-rung jobs (Fletcher, 1999). On the other hand, for White students and students in the gifted program, there seems to be a corollary metaphor of a snowball of privileges, a cascading of many advanced opportunities that build on each other. This meeting place of the reflective and dialogic voices appears to be important in forging yet another voice—the praxis voice—that conveys a more empowered stance to act upon the contextualized understanding of social exclusion and social privileges. The real life examples of healing and reconciliation, the understanding of the South Africans' resiliency, and the recognition of the breadth of the South Africans' capacity for forgiveness seem to have spurred the youth to think about their own situations in a different way, and to voice alternatives or supplements to their own

education that engage, complicate, and enrich diversity beyond just representation.

The Future of Pedagogies of Integration

> [Reflecting on educational segregation] I don't know…I think it shouldn't be like that, I think it would be better if it was more mixed.
>
> -Kaya, White, gifted program

Acknowledging the time-restricted and non-sustained nature of our pedagogy, as well as our limitations in sample size, it is still worth drawing some general lessons for developing more sustained pedagogies of integration. Youth are always actively participating in their learning environments. They process interactions and are well aware of inequalities and segregation in their spaces. Most important, it appears, is to recognize that we have a choice of whether or not to provide constructive educational opportunities for youth to bring personal reflections about this segregation into spaces for open dialogue and inquiry. Our experience with the *WAHT* project speaks to the creative and productive possibilities for combining the private reflections with public dialogue for informing and imagining new practices for integration. The combination of different learning modalities, encounters that push beyond superficial interactions with familiar people as well as strangers, and opportunities to share the learning with different others can all help in creating engaging learning projects. At the heart of it, as gathered from the students' voices, is to creatively harness their reflective, dialogic, and praxis learning. Interestingly enough, the students' learning helps expand our own notions of pedagogies of integration. While we developed the *WAHT* project with a social and political lens on integration as contrasted with segregation, the students' learning revealed a layer of integration at the level of educational engagement—thinking, interacting, and visioning. Such learning may be important for any subject matter, but we emphasize its particular applicability in the context of diversity and inequality, issues that continue to challenge educators in how best to address them.

The project received local attention and acclaim for instituting a pedagogy of integration, but pedagogies such as these face constant competition from education paradigms that operate on fundamentally different assumptions. American education systems primarily serve to prepare students to enter the job market rather than what Kehrberg (2007) and Theobald and Curtiss (2000) claim was the original purpose of education: to prepare students to use their rights and responsibilities as people living in democracies. The *WAHT* project began as a modest, but mindful attempt to address segregation in our local schools. By envisioning emancipatory curricula as a critical component to understanding and acting upon segregation, we prepared a project that traversed local, national, and

global contexts. Drawing on the history and experience of segregation in South Africa, our students were encouraged to make sense of and address their experiences of educational segregation. In doing so, they became protagonists of integration. Not only did they expand upon their own understanding of segregation, but they also spoke back to those structures maintaining it and demanded that their educational spaces and curriculum exemplify a truly diverse society.

While the youths' voices and the learning they availed from the project are affirming of the project itself, we acknowledge the limitations of our action research project and cannot, as yet, claim how much structural change has come about as a result of the project. We can, however, say that our project has contributed to a growing public dialogue about strengthening critiques of the segregation within the advanced learning programs in our school district (see Turnbull, 2007). Our hope is that these findings represent the possibilities of carefully constructed emancipatory education programs that involve youth as subjects in transforming their own lived spaces rather than merely being subjected to unjust practices.

Notes

[1] In a review of school district data, we found that students' racial and economic statuses were highly correlated (approximately .90). While an informal review, it supports the notion that both income and race play critical roles in the school segregation process.

[2] Subdermal diversity is a term developed by Johnston-Goodstar (2007).

[3] Place-based education refers to the notion that education should arise from place and incorporate the local landscape, cultures, and knowledge. Outdoor/experiential education and Indigenous education tend to be place-based educational frameworks (see e.g., Gruenewald, 2003 for an introduction to place and how "standardization" trends deflect this learning/knowledge).

References

Baum, F., MacDougall, C., & Smith, D. (2006). Participatory action research. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60*, 854-858.

Bhatt, S. (2004, July 28). Seattle schools' racial tiebreaker ruled improper. *Seattle Times.* Retrieved November 16, 2009, from http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/education/2001990649_skuls28m.html.

Boal, A. (1985). *Theatre of the oppressed*. New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Book-It Reparatory Theatre. (2007). *About Book-It*. Retrieved November 21, 2007, from http://www.book-it.org/about/default.asp.

Callahan, C., C. Brighton, & H. Hertberg Davis. (2007). *Evaluation report: Accelerated progress program.* Seattle, WA: Seattle Public Schools.

Duncan-Andrade, J., & Morrell, E. (2008). *The art of critical pedagogy: The promises of moving from theory to practice in urban schools*. New York: Peter Lang

Epstein, J. L. (1985). After the bus arrives: Resegregation in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(3), 23-44.

Fletcher, B. (1999). Internalized oppression: The enemy within. In National Training Laboratories, *Reading book for human relations training* (8th ed., pp. 97-102). Arlington, VA: NTL Institute.

Ford, D., & Webb, K. S. (1994). Desegregation of gifted educational programs: The impact of Brown on underachieving children of color. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *63*(3), 358-375

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

Gruenewald, D. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 3-12.

Hanley, M. S. (1998). *Learning to fly: The knowledge construction of African American adolescents through drama*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Washington.

Heffter, E. (2007, December 3). Seattle's gifted program "elitist." *Seattle Times*.

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, B. A. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 19*, 173-202.

Johnston-Goodstar, K. (2007). *"Dividing society by nose size": Youth reflections on diversity and its meaning in education.* Paper presented at the International Globalization, Diversity and Education Conference, Spokane, WA.

Kehrberg, G. (2007). *Place-based education: An annotated bibliography*. Retrieved December 29, 2007, from http://www.clearingmagazine.org/place-based.html.

Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Knowledge and critical pedagogy: An introduction*. New York: Springer. *Knowledge and critical pedagogy*

Kozol, J. (2006). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Marshall, M. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice, 13*(6), 522-525.

Minkler, M. (2000). Using participatory action research to build healthy communities. *Public Health Reports: Focus on Healthy Communities, 11*, 191-197.

Morrell, E. (2004). *Becoming critical researchers: Literacy and empowerment for urban youth.* New York: Peter Lang.

Nagda, B. A., & Gurin, P. (2007). Intergroup dialogue: A critical-dialogic approach to learning about difference, inequality and social justice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 111,* 35-45.

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2007). *Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies*. UCLA Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles. Retrieved December 21, 2007, from http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/deseg/reversals_reseg_need.pdf.

Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1 (*PICS*), 551 U.S. ___, 127 S.Ct. 2738, 2746 (2007).

Paton, A. (1948). *Cry, the beloved country*. New York: Scribner's Sons.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seattle Schools Annual Reports. (2006). Retrieved September 19, 2007, from Seattle Schools Student Information Services Office: http://www.seattleschools.org/area/siso/test/smallsisoschoollist.xml.

Shaw, L. (2005, March 25). Author says segregation endures in Seattle, nation. *Seattle Times.* Retrieved November 16, 2009, from http://community.seattletimes.nwsource.com/archive/?date=20050926&slug=kozol26.

Suzuki, L. A., & Valencia, R. R. (1997). Race–ethnicity and measured intelligence: Educational implications. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 1103-1114.

Theobald, P., & Curtiss, J. (2000). Communities as curricula. *Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy, 15*, 160-111.

Turnbull, L. (2007, March 28). Race and class splinter Madrona. *Seattle Times.*

Winner, E., & Hetland, L. (2007, September 2). Art for our sake: School arts classes matter more than ever- but not for the reasons you think. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved November 16, 2009, from http://www.boston.com/news/globe/ideas/articles/2007/09/02/art_for_our_sake/.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Authors

Katie Johnston-Goodstar, Ph.D., M.S.W. is a postdoctoral associate in the Youth Studies Department at the University of Minnesota's School of Social Work. Her research and teaching interests focus on Indigenous youth and social justice work,

critical and Indigenous pedagogies and methodologies, critical media literacy, and histories of social work in Indigenous communities. Her current work explores how Indigenous youth use media to engage in issues of place, decolonization, and Indigenous community building.

Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda, Ph.D., MSW, MA is an associate professor of social work and director of the Intergroup Dialogue, Education and Action (IDEA) Center at the University of Washington. His research and teaching interests focus on cultural diversity and social justice, intergroup dialogue, and multicultural and empowerment-oriented social work practice and education. He has published widely in social work, education and social science journals, and is the recipient of many departmental and university-wide teaching awards. His current theoretical, empirical, and practical work is based on re-theorizing intergroup contact through a social justice perspective.