DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 698 SP 033 493

AUTHOR Villegas, Ana Maria
TITLE Culturally Responsive Pedagogy for the 1990s and Beyond. Trends and Issues Paper No. 6.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-091-4
PUB DATE Dec 91
CONTRACT RI88062015
NOTE 50p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186 ($12.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; Blacks; Classroom Techniques; *Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Context; Cultural Pluralism; Elementary Secondary Education; Heterogeneous Grouping; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; *Multicultural Education; Student Characteristics; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Role; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; Diversity (Student)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this trends and issues paper is to advance the search for creative solutions to the difficulties experienced by minority students and to draw attention to what teachers need to know and do in order to work effectively with a culturally heterogeneous population. Attention is given to the schooling of minority students in general, with an emphasis on the experiences of African Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians. The paper is divided into three major sections: (1) a review of themes that emerged from the literature (explanations for the differential achievement of minority students and culturally responsive pedagogy); (2) implications from the research for the assessment of beginning teachers; and (3) concluding remarks. The empirical and theoretical literature examined is highly critical of the educational system with regard to the teaching of minority children. This element is balanced by an equally strong commitment to instructional practices that will afford these children a fair chance to prove their talent. The literature also confirms that teachers can have a positive impact on the academic growth of minority students if they are sensitive to the cultural characteristics of the learners, and have the skills needed to accommodate these characteristics in the classroom. A bibliography of approximately 160 titles concludes the volume. (LL)

ED339698

CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

ERIC

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGY FOR THE 1990s AND BEYOND

Ana Maria Villegas
Educational Testing Service

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Craig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle ♦ Suite 610 ♦ Washington, DC 20036

SP033493

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRENDS AND ISSUES PAPER · NO. 6

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGY FOR THE 1990s AND BEYOND

Ana Maria Villegas
Educational Testing Service

Published by
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle · Suite 610 · Washington, DC 20036-1186
December 1991

CITE AS:
Villegas, A. M. (1991). *Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990s and beyond* (Trends and Issues Paper No. 6). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

MANUSCRIPTS:
The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education invites individuals to submit proposals for writing Trends and Issues Papers. Proposals should include:

1. A detailed manuscript proposal of not more than five pages.
2. A vita.
3. A writing sample.

PREPAID ORDERS:
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
(202) 293-2450
$12.00

ISBN 0-89333-091-4

Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RI 88062015. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or DOE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Themes from the Literature	1
Explanations for the Differential Achievement of Minority Students	1
Deficit Theories	1
Teacher Expectations and the Self-fulfilling Prophecy	3
Cultural Difference Theory	6
Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	13
The Kamehameha Early Childhood Project (KEEP)	13
The San Diego Project	15
The Marva Collins Way	17
What Has Been Learned from Research	19
Implications for the Assessment of Beginning Teachers	23
Concluding Comments	31
Bibliography	33

PREFACE

The United States is a nation characterized by cultural and linguistic diversity, and this is evident in our school system. Currently, ethnic minorities account for over 20 percent of the school-age population, and by the year 2000, two-fifths of all school-age children will belong to minorities. The shifting demographic patterns are already noticeable in urban school districts, where minorities constitute a majority of the student enrollment in all but 2 of the 25 largest cities in our nation. However, as the student population becomes more culturally heterogeneous, the teaching force is expected to become increasingly homogeneous. If current trends are confirmed, 95 percent of the teaching force will be White by the end of the decade. More than ever before, those entering the teaching profession in the 1990s and beyond must be prepared to instruct in culturally and linguistically heterogeneous classes.

The differential achievement of minority students is well documented. In the decades to come, the schools will have to respond to the unique needs of these students more effectively than they have done in the past. Failure to be more responsive will result in a major loss of human potential, a price our society can ill afford in these times of growing economic competition worldwide. Creative solutions to the difficulties experienced by minority students are needed urgently. The purpose of this paper is to advance the search for such solutions by drawing attention to what teachers need to know and be able to do in order to work effectively with minority students.

There is an expanding, although still incomplete, body of empirical and theoretical literature dealing with what some educators have come to call a "culturally responsive pedagogy." In brief, this literature confirms that teachers can have a positive impact on the academic growth of minority students. To be successful, teachers need not be members of the students' cultural group, although having similar cultural experiences often facilitates instruction. Good teachers, however, must be sensitive to the cultural characteristics of the learners, and have the skills needed to accommodate these characteristics in the classroom. This paper examines the cultural context of teaching and learning situations, and describes the salient features of a culturally responsive pedagogy.

The paper was written primarily in support of a major initiative by Educational Testing Service (ETS) to develop a new generation of teacher assessments. *The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers*--as the new assessments are called--will include three separate but related stages. In Stage I, prospective teachers will demonstrate their en-

abling skills in areas such as reading, writing, and mathematics. Stage II will test their grasp of subject matter and their knowledge of the teaching and learning processes. Stage III will assess their application of this knowledge in actual classroom settings. The work reported here is specifically intended to inform the design of measurement strategies related to Stage III.

A committee of nine experts on different aspects of minority education advised me throughout the preparation of this paper. The responsibility of the committee was two-fold: (a) to identify the most significant current literature dealing with promising strategies for teaching minority students; and (b) to review a working draft of the paper, commenting on its content and organization. In turn, it was my responsibility to review the literature identified by the committee, prepare a draft paper based on that literature, and revise the draft using the input from the committee.

In selecting the committee, care was given to include representatives of different academic disciplines, research traditions, and theoretical orientations. The members of the committee, in alphabetical order, are:

Dr. Ursula Casanova, Arizona State University
Dr. Lisa Delpit, Morgan State University
Dr. Michele Foster, University of Pennsylvania
Dr. Asa Hilliard, Georgia State University
Dr. Jacqueline Irvine, Emory University
Dr. Gerald Mohatt, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Dr. Luis Moll, University of Arizona
Dr. Sharon Nelson-Barber, Stanford University
Professor José A. Vázquez, Hunter College-City University of New York

To generate the list of works to be reviewed for this paper, I invited each committee member to nominate 10 to 20 works relevant to the topic. All nominations were reviewed except several unpublished documents and a few books that proved difficult to locate within the time available. To this list, I added several other sources that, in my view, complemented the nominated materials.

A word about the literature is in order. The works reviewed reflect the most current and cogent thinking on minority education from the disciplinary perspectives of anthropology, sociology, linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, psycholinguistics, and curriculum and instruction. Attention is given to the schooling of minority students in general, with an emphasis on the experiences of African Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians.

Much of the empirical research is ethnographic in nature. Several studies describe in detail specific aspects of cultural discontinuity between students' home and school experiences. Other studies focus exclusively on what occurs in classrooms, comparing the communicative strategies of teachers and pupils from different ethnic groups and social classes. Both urban and rural contexts are represented. While most of the research deals with elementary education, several significant studies of secondary schooling are included as well. In general, the literature is highly critical of the educational system with regard to the teaching of minority children. This element of criticism is balanced by an equally strong commitment to the search for instructional practices that will afford such children a fair chance to prove their talent.

I have divided the remainder of this paper into three major sections. The initial section reviews themes that emerged from the literature. The second section recasts the insights gained from the review into statements about what teachers in a multicultural society need to know and do to be effective. The final section comprises my concluding remarks.

I am grateful to the advisory committee members--Ursula Casanova, Lisa Delpit, Michele Foster, Asa Hilliard, Jackie Irvine, Jerry Mohatt, Luis Moll, Sharon Nelson-Barber, and José Vázquez--for their insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper. Their comments have not been fully addressed, nor have all criticisms been met, but the paper is stronger for their input.

THEMES FROM THE LITERATURE

There are many ways of organizing a literature as rich as the one reviewed here. Given the objective of this paper, two themes prevail: (a) explanations for the achievement gap between minority and majority students; and (b) descriptions of culturally responsive educational initiatives. Each theme is developed separately in this section.

EXPLANATIONS FOR THE DIFFERENTIAL ACHIEVEMENT OF MINORITY STUDENTS

To some it may seem strange that I have chosen to begin this paper with a theoretical analysis of sources of inequality in educational performance. So much has been written on the topic already that a review of this literature might appear hardly worth the effort. However, it is precisely because so much has been written that the topic warrants attention.

Solutions to any problem are profoundly influenced by how that problem is defined at the outset. A responsible discussion of solutions to the difficulties experienced by minority children in schools must be founded upon a solid understanding of the sources of inequality in educational performance. This understanding, I believe, will place in perspective the educational solutions proposed in this paper.

Explanations as to why minority children do poorly in school abound. Some of these explanations suggest a deficiency in the children themselves and/or in their home experiences. Other explanations reject the notion of deficiency and redirect attention to educational practices that are suspected of reinforcing inequalities. Three major explanations are presented below. One of these explanations represents the deficit perspective, while the other two focus attention on school practices.

Deficit Theories

Two major deficit theories have been advanced--one focusing on IQ and the other on sociocultural factors. According to the IQ deficit theory, students of minority and lower socio-economic backgrounds do poorly in school because they are lacking in intelligence (Jensen, 1969; Herrnstein, 1973). In developing their arguments, both Jensen and Herrnstein provide evidence for a pattern of differential IQ, with minority and lower-class group members generally attaining lower scores on IQ tests than their majority and middle class counterparts. They go on to claim that intelligence is largely inherited, citing as evidence studies of twins reared apart and adoptive children. Because IQ is considered a better predictor of scholastic performance than any other measurable attribute of the child, they conclude

that the academic lag of minority and lower-class children is due to genetic deficiencies.

The IQ deficit theory was popular in the 1960s and fell into disrepute in the 1970s, even though variants of this line of thinking reappear in the literature from time to time (see for example Dunn, 1987). This theory has been criticized on several grounds. It has been argued that IQ tests do not measure important features of intelligence and are culturally biased (Locust, 1988; Mercer, 1973; Persell, 1977). Samuda (1975) contends that factors related to the administration of these tests (e.g., student anxiety, test environment, and examiner effect) make it impossible to assess students' intelligence reliably, especially for pupils of minority or lower-class backgrounds. Moreover, the very notion that IQ is inherited has been challenged (Feuerstein, 1979; Kamin, 1974).

A second major explanation of inequalities in educational performance is the cultural deficit theory (see Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966; Bloom, Davis, & Hess, 1965; Deutsch, 1963; Hunt, 1964). According to this theory, the difficulties of minority students are sociocultural in origin rather than genetic. Specifically, proponents of this position contend that deficiencies in the home environment (e.g., "disorganized family life," "inadequate sensory stimulation," "inadequate child rearing practices") deprive minority children of the types of experiences they need to do well academically. Critics of the cultural deficit theory have argued that, while differences in the sociocultural experiences of majority and minority groups are undeniable, these differences do not represent deficiencies in the upbringing of minority children (Baratz & Baratz, 1970; Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972; Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986 Erickson, 1977). I will elaborate on this criticism of the cultural deficit theory later in the paper, in the section that examines the cultural difference theory.

While differing somewhat in their explanations of failure, the IQ and cultural deficit theories have one feature in common--both place the onus of failure on minority children and their families. This premise leads to the conclusion that schools can do little, other than to provide a "compensatory education" for the purpose of "correcting" the children's genetic and/or cultural deficiencies.

With few exceptions, the works reviewed in this paper are critical of deficit theories of education. For one thing, there is evidence that the achievement gap between minority and majority students widens over time. If the differences between the groups are due to the genetic and/or cultural resources each group brings to school, the gap would be greatest when the students first enter school and gradually narrow over time. Instead, the

differences between minority and majority students become even more marked with each passing school year (Persell, 1977). Closely related to this point, is the contention of Baratz and Baratz (1970), Knapp and Shields (1990), Persell (1977), and McShane (1983) that by blaming the children for their problems, deficit theories of education detract attention from schools and the role they play in the construction of failure.

Those interested in a thorough explanation of deficit theories and the various critiques leveled against these theories will want to read Baratz and Baratz (1970), Cazden, John, and Hymes (1972); Diaz, Moll, and Mehan (1986); Feuerstein (1979); McShane (1983); Oakes (1986); and Persell (1977). For the purposes of this paper, I shall simply say that the technical inadequacies of these theories, together with their lack of constructive suggestions for solving the schooling difficulties of minorities, have paved the way for alternative theories, as described below.

Teacher Expectations and the Self-fulfilling Prophecy

The power of teacher expectations on student behavior is well documented in the literature (see Irvine, 1990; Rist, 1970; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rosenthal, 1973). The phenomenon known as the "self-fulfilling prophecy" is explained as follows. In making judgments about the academic potential of individual students in the class, the teacher develops different expectations for each student. Once formed, these expectations influence the interactions between teacher and student, resulting in positive or negative student performance, aspirations, and self-concept, which correspond to the teacher's original assessment.

It is not only that teacher expectations about students' performance are communicated in subtle and implicit ways. Expectations are often translated into overt instructional practices. One such practice is tracking students. When tracking is done schoolwide, students are assigned to their respective classes on the basis of perceived ability. Schools use this type of academic stratification frequently, particularly at the middle and secondary levels (Ekstrom & Villegas, in press; Oakes, 1985). Academic stratification occurs in elementary schools also, but usually in the form of within-class grouping, especially for reading and mathematics instruction (Brown, Palincsar, & Purcell, 1985; Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Collins, 1986). The argument made on behalf of both schoolwide tracking and within-class grouping is that by narrowing the range of ability in a given group of students, teachers can better serve the students. This argument, however, needs to be examined closely in light of research findings.

A disturbing aspect of tracking or homogeneous ability grouping is that students of minority backgrounds tend to be overrepresented in the lower academic tiers (Oakes, 1986; Villegas & Watts, 1991). One explana-

tion for this overrepresentation suggests that educators are at least partly to blame. Lacking sensitivity to cultural differences, teachers may misinterpret the behavior of minority students in ways that lead them to underestimate the true academic potential of these pupils (Hilliard, 1989; Irvine, 1990; Moll, 1986; Nelson-Barber & Meier, 1990). Once placed in a low-achieving group in the primary grades, often as early as 5 or 6 years of age when potential is most difficult to determine, students rarely move up in instructional level (Irvine, 1990; Rist, 1970). As this suggests, teachers' judgments of students' potential have profound and long-lasting effects on students' lives. For minority children, in particular, such judgments or misjudgments often prove costly.

Research shows that students placed in low-ability groups are doomed to an inferior education. For one thing, labels given to these children such as "disadvantaged" and "low" or even seemingly neutral terms like "at-risk," "bilingual," and "minority," usually carry with them negative connotations (Richardson, Casanova, Placier, & Guilfoyle, 1989). Once students are considered to be deficient in some way or other, teachers begin to treat them differently, much to the students' detriment. The evidence is overwhelming. When compared to their "high-ability" peers, "low-ability" students are called on less often in class, given less time to respond, praised less frequently, given less feedback, criticized more frequently, and prompted less often in the case of incorrect responses (Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Good, 1970; Hilliard, 1989; Irvine, 1990; Lehr & Harris, 1988; Rist, 1970; Rosenthal, 1973). Furthermore, students in low-level groups receive shorter periods of instruction than those normally accorded to their high-ability counterparts. For them, class periods begin later than schedules indicate and/or end earlier. They spend more time without work assignments, and lose more time in interruptions and management of routines (Collins, 1986; Hilliard, 1989; Lehr & Harris, 1988; McDermott, 1977; Oakes, 1986).

Marked differences exist also in the curriculum used with high- and low-level groups. Generally, instruction for low-ability students has less academic orientation, classroom activities lack clear purpose and focus, material is introduced less clearly and covered at a slower pace, objectives are lower and also less likely to be explained to the students, and academic standards are vague and less rigorously applied. Furthermore, in low-level groups, knowledge tends to be conveyed in the form of facts and simple skills. Procedures for performing basic skills are emphasized, but the purpose of carrying out these procedures is rarely explained (Anyon, 1981; Lehr & Harris, 1988; Oakes, 1986; Villegas & Watts, 1991; Wong-Fillmore, 1990). Moreover, the texts used by low-level groups generally give less information, raise fewer questions, place more emphasis on facts,

and make less mention of potentially controversial topics (Anyon, 1981; Oakes, 1986).

The instructional strategies for reading used with low-level groups are especially well documented (see Brown, Palincsar & Purcell, 1985; Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Collins, 1986; Moll, 1986). For students in low-level groups, instruction tends to focus on pronunciation and decoding. Units of text are read as word drills rather than as meaningful chunks, and meaning is questioned infrequently. Collins (1986) suggests that students taught in this manner experience reading as a set of mechanical skills detached from comprehension and unrelated to personal history. According to reading experts such as Goodman, Goodman, and Flores (1979) and Edelsky (1986), the use of strategies such as the ones observed in the teaching of low-level groups are counterproductive for learning. These researchers argue that unless children receive more practice in reading for comprehension, they are not likely to become good readers.

To summarize, the literature reviewed in this portion of the paper reveals that high and low academic tracks or instructional groups constitute different interactional contexts. Rather than narrowing the gap between the groups, the instructional methods typically used with the less advanced students tend to accentuate any inequality in skills and knowledge that may be present when children are initially admitted to school. For this reason, the overrepresentation of minority children in low-level tracks gives cause for alarm.

Hilliard (1989) contends that the lower level of achievement of minority students is a function of systematic inequalities in schooling. According to him, these inequalities stem from misjudgments of students' intellectual capabilities. Such misjudgments lead teachers to expect little of the students and ultimately to treat them in ways that stifle their learning. The research reviewed here lends support to Hilliard's contention. Irvine (1990), Levin (1987), Moll (1988), Oakes (1986), and Stage (1989) have argued that minority students are generally exposed to a "watered down" curriculum that retards their academic development. If the pattern of low academic achievement is to be reversed, teachers must raise their expectations for minority students and learn to focus on the students' strengths rather than their weaknesses. In other words, teachers must abandon the deficit view of minority children that permeates educational thinking. Moreover, they must implement a challenging and rigorous curriculum, one that extends children's thinking beyond that which is known to them already.

Cultural Difference Theory

A third major explanation for the differential achievement of minority students is the cultural difference theory. In its broadest expression, this theory attributes the academic problems of minority students to cultural disjunctures between home and school. Several versions of the theory exist, each explaining a specific area of disjuncture. Attention has been paid to differences in dialects (Gay & Abrahams, 1973; Labov, 1973; Piestrup, 1973) and in cognitive styles (Cohen, 1969; Ramirez & Castañeda, 1974). More recently, however, the focus of attention has shifted to subtle differences in the ways that language is used at home and in school, and to the failures in communication resulting from these differences.

Difficulties in cross-cultural communication. Sometimes the things closest to us are the least apparent. Most social activity is conducted through spoken language, yet most of us do not fully understand how language influences our attempts to communicate with others. Spoken language takes on added importance in classrooms because it is the predominant means by which teachers instruct their students, and students in turn display their knowledge. Those who are interested in teaching and learning cannot ignore how language is used in the classroom.

Research shows that although students and teachers in a given classroom may speak the same language, they sometimes have different ways of using it. Children whose language use at home and in their immediate community corresponds more closely to the way in which it is used in the classroom have an advantage in the learning process. For these students, prior experience transfers to the classroom and facilitates their academic performance. This seems to be the case for White, middle-class, Anglo-American students. In contrast, minority children frequently experience discontinuity in the use of language at home and in school. They are often misunderstood when applying familiar patterns of language use to classroom tasks. Of what use is prior experience to these children if their established ways of using language and making sense of the world are deemed unacceptable or prohibited in the classroom? This discontinuity is a major source of academic problems for minority children (see Au, 1980; Cazden, 1988; Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972; Erickson, 1975; Gilmore & Glatthorn, 1982; Greenbaum & Greenbaum, 1983; Heath, 1983a, 1983b; Jacob & Jordan, 1987; Michaels, 1981; Mohatt & Erickson, 1981; Moll, 1986; Philips, 1972, 1983). Three examples of cross-cultural miscommunication, taken from the literature, will illustrate the point.

The first example is taken from an extensive study of language use conducted by Heath (1983b) in the Piedmont area of the Carolinas, where she lived and worked for nine years. One part of this study focused on the use of questions at home and in school. The proper handling of questions is

critical in the classroom because much of the academic dialogue is based on interrogatives. Heath became interested in why the children from Trackton, an African American working-class community, struggled with the questions asked of them in class. The teachers were concerned and perplexed by the children's difficulties with questions. The parents were frustrated by their children's school difficulties and attributed the problem to the fact that "we [at Trackton] don't talk to our children as you folks [in school] do." Findings of the study indicated that the parents were right.

Heath found that in Trackton, children were immersed in the stream of language, but adults did not regard them as legitimate conversational partners until they were old enough to be competent communicants. When addressing the children, Trackton adults tended to use directives rather than questions. When questions were asked, they were generally "real questions" soliciting information the questioner lacked, or analogical questions calling for nonspecific comparisons of one item, event, or person with another.

The classroom represented a very different sociolinguistic environment for Trackton children. The children were expected to participate in conversations with the teacher frequently. Questions dominated classroom exchanges, and directives were used far less frequently than in the community. Rather than asking "real" or analogical questions, the teachers most often asked "test" questions, that is, questions that required students to display academic knowledge (e.g., What is this color?). They did this as a way of ascertaining what the students knew about the topic being discussed. From the children's perspective, the teacher's questions seemed peculiar. They found it difficult to understand why the teachers asked questions to which they already knew the answers. In brief, Heath showed that communicative demands placed on children in the classroom clashed with the rules that guided the use of language in the community. Given the strangeness of the classroom environment to Trackton children, it is no wonder that they were puzzled and frustrated in school and appeared academically incompetent.

The second example of miscommunication in cross-cultural classroom settings is taken from a study conducted by Philips (1972, 1983) on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation in central Oregon and in the schools attended by the children of that community. The children's reluctance to participate in instruction while in school served as the focus for the study. The silent style of American Indian children has perplexed educators for many years. Often, teachers interpret this silence as a sign of linguistic or intellectual deficiency, or shyness on the part of the children. Philips' analysis suggests a different explanation.

As the teachers had reported, Philips found that the children were silent in school. Upon closer examination, however, she discovered that the children were most reluctant to talk during whole class or group lessons directed by the teacher--a type of instruction that requires students to speak out individually in front of their peers. When the children were asked to work independently, they occasionally volunteered to speak to the teacher. Interestingly, when working in small groups in which the children (rather than the teacher) controlled the interaction, the American Indians spoke freely with their peers. These differences in the children's patterns of participation in teacher-directed lessons, individualized activities, and collaborative group work led Philips to conclude that the silence of the Warm Springs children observed in the classroom was a function of the way the teacher organized instruction, rather than a linguistic or intellectual deficiency, or shyness on the part of the youngsters.

To gain insight into the participation patterns of the children in school, Philips studied how learning occurred in the Warm Springs community. She found that children in the community were accustomed to a high degree of self-determination with little direction from adults. A system of sibling caretaking was evident as well. Under this system children learned to turn to other children rather than adults when they needed assistance. When learning from adults, the children did so primarily by observing them rather than receiving verbal instruction from them. This period of observation was followed by private practice and self-initiated testing. With this orientation toward learning, it is not surprising that the children were at a loss during teacher-directed instruction, with its emphasis on learning through verbal instruction, public display of knowledge by individuals, and tight adult control over the interactions. It is also not surprising that children reared in the manner described by Philips were more apt to participate in activities that gave them considerable control over the interaction, such as group projects. Because the teacher-directed lesson prevailed in these classrooms, rather than the more culturally compatible group project, the Warm Springs children were inadvertently relegated to a silent role. As a consequence of their silence, the children fell farther and farther behind in their schoolwork with each passing year.

A third example of miscommunication in the classroom due to ethnic differences is reported by Michaels (1981). Michaels compared the narrative styles of African American and White children in a first-grade class. She specifically focused on narratives related during "sharing time," a recurrent classroom event in which students are expected to tell their classmates and teacher about some past experience. In primary classrooms, where sharing time is used most frequently, it can serve as a bridge between the oral language that pupils bring to class and the literate discourse of written text, which emphasizes decontextualized language.

Noting that White students did better than their African American classmates during sharing time, Michaels set out to discover why. She found that African American and White students used different strategies to construct their narratives. Specifically, the accounts produced by the White children were focused on a single topic and organized sequentially. These students were more likely to name objects, and they assumed less shared knowledge on the part of the listener. Michaels provides evidence suggesting that the teacher's criteria for good narratives corresponded closely to the White students' "topic-centered" style. She contends that this correspondence enabled the White teacher in her study to work well with the White students in constructing the stories.

In contrast, the accounts of the African American children frequently contained a series of implicitly associated anecdotes. When asked directly by the researcher, the students were able to express a logical connection between the different topics in their narratives, but rarely did they do so during sharing time. The "topic-associating" narrative style of the African American children clashed with the teacher's criteria for good stories. Michaels argues that this sociolinguistic disparity prevented the White teacher from collaborating successfully with the African American students during sharing time.

An experiment conducted by Cazden and Michaels (cited in Cazden, 1988) shows that teachers' ethnicity influences their valuative judgments of students' narrative styles. The experiment consisted of playing mimicked versions of topic-centered and topic-associating narratives to seven White and five African American adults. While adhering to the respective narrative styles, all stories were tape recorded in standard English by the same speaker. The participating adults were asked to comment on the quality of each story, and to predict how successful the child, whose story they had just heard, is in school. Cazden and Michaels found that the responses of the participants differed markedly. The White adults found the topic-associating stories difficult to follow, and they generally inferred that the narrator was a low-achieving student. In contrast, the African American participants evaluated favorably both topic-centered and topic-associating narratives.

The methodology used by Cazden and Michaels in their experiment does not allow for generalizations. Nevertheless, their findings provide initial evidence of an ethnic bias in teachers' response to different narrative styles.

Heath, Philips, and Michaels provide evidence of the difficulties of cross-cultural communication, and make a convincing case for the premise that discontinuity between home and school environments prevents minority

children from using their own sociolinguistic competence successfully in the classroom. (For other examples of difficulties in cross-cultural communication, see Collier, 1979; Crago, Niniuruvik, & Annahatak, 1990; Darnell, 1971; Dumont, 1972; and Wong-Fillmore, 1990.) These studies show that without an understanding of cultural differences, even well-meaning teachers can contribute unwittingly to the academic difficulties of minority students.

A large portion of the literature examined for this paper describes cultural characteristics of different minority groups, particularly of American Indians and African Americans. A comprehensive review of ethnic differences, however, is beyond the scope of this paper. To attempt such a task in a few pages is to risk the creation or reinforcement of stereotypes of each group. Instead of preparing a list of ethnic characteristics, I refer the interested reader to sources that treat the topic more adequately than is possible here. (See Darnell, 1971; Dumont, 1972; Garcia, 1989; Greenbaum & Greenbaum, 1983; Irvine, 1990; Kochman, 1981; Locust, 1988; McShane, 1983; More, 1987; Shade, 1982; Swisher & Deyhle, 1987.)

To summarize, the studies by Heath, Philips, and Michaels, among others, show that learning--whether in or out of school--occurs in a cultural context. Built into this context are subtle and invisible expectations regarding the manner in which individuals are to go about learning. Simply put, the classroom is not a neutral arena in which students display their talent freely and openly. To succeed in school, children must be academically knowledgeable, but this is not enough. Equally important and often overlooked, children need to know the culturally appropriate ways of participating in instructional conversations and displaying academic knowledge.

The culture of the classroom. The classroom is a community comprising a teacher and typically 25 to 30 students. As in any community, the individual lines of action of the teacher and students must be orchestrated for effective interaction.

While some variation in the organization of classroom interaction exists, certain organizational features seem to prevail. For example, the dominant form of interaction is the teacher-directed lesson in which the instructor is in control, determining the topics of discussion, allocating turns at speaking, and deciding what qualifies as a correct response. Verbal participation is required of students. Implicitly, teaching and learning are equated with talking, and silence is interpreted as the absence of knowledge. Students are questioned in public and bid for the floor by raising their hands. They are expected to wait until the teacher awards the floor to one of them before answering. Speaking in turn is the rule, unless the teacher

specifically asks for choral responses. Display questions prevail. Individual competition is preferred to group cooperation. Topics are normally introduced in small and carefully sequenced steps, with the overall picture emerging only at the end of the teaching sequence.

Though not exhaustive, the features listed above provide insight into the culture of many classrooms. I use the term "culture" here in a pragmatic sense to mean the way life is organized in a community. As noted above, the classroom is a community in which the teacher's and students' actions must be orchestrated in order for the system to function effectively. For some children, their home upbringing prepares them for the tacit demands of this classroom. For example, long before coming to school many White, middle-class children have learned to accept the authority of the teacher as that of an adult who commands respect, to speak only when given a turn, to be verbally expressive, to respond to display questions, to value individual competition, to use topic-centered narratives, and to think analytically. For these children the school experience is an extension of the home experience. Such is not the case for many minority children, as Heath, Philips, and Michaels have shown. For these children, the culture of the classroom often clashes with that of the home and community. Unfortunately, teachers who lack cross-cultural sensitivity often view the response of minority children to this unfamiliar cultural context as academic incompetence.

Proposed solutions to the problem of cultural discontinuities between home and school. The researchers whose works are reviewed in this paper generally agree that the goal of education should be the same for all students. That is, students should be helped to meet high standards of achievement, regardless of their cultural backgrounds. The crucial question addressed in the literature is how best to accomplish this.

Advocates of deficit theories of education put the onus for change primarily on children and their families. Because they see the children from a deficit perspective, these researchers propose changing the culturally specific behavior of the children to mainstream behavior (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966; Bloom, Davis, & Hess, 1965; Hunt, 1964). In contrast, supporters of the cultural difference theory shift the focus of attention to the schools (Au, 1980; Au & Jordan, 1981; Cole & Griffin, 1987; Cummins, 1986b; Delpit, 1988a; Diaz, Moll & Mehan, 1986; Gallimore, 1985; Irvine, 1990; Knapp & Shields, 1990; Mehan, 1989; Philips, 1983; Wong-Fillmore, 1990). In their view, the problem stems from the ways schools and classrooms are organized, which leads teachers to interpret the culturally specific behavior of minority students (e.g., confusion over the use of display questions, silence during teacher-led instruction, topic-associating narrative style) as a deficiency.

The solution to cultural disparities between home and school is not necessarily having the school duplicate the cultural conditions of the home. Instead, what most advocates of the cultural difference theory propose is a model of mutual accommodation in which both teachers and students adapt their actions to the common goal of academic success with cultural respect (Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Cole & Griffin, 1987; Collier, 1979; Cummins, 1986a; Gallimore, 1985; Hakuta, 1989; Heath, 1983b; Mehan, 1989; Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Tikunoff, 1985, 1990; Tikunoff & Vázquez-Faría, 1982; Wong-Fillmore, 1990). For example, one of the solutions proposed by Heath (1983b) to the problems experienced by Trackton children in school was for the teachers to use metaphoric question sequences familiar to the children, especially when they first entered school. Having increased the students' classroom participation by using this questioning style, the teachers could then gradually introduce the unfamiliar display question to the youngsters.

The home-school discontinuity theory of educational failure has received a fair amount of criticism (see Hilliard, 1989; McDermott, 1977; Ogbu, 1982; Villegas, 1988). Hilliard, for example, admits that cultural disjunctures between home and school influence the learning process in important ways. However, he argues that because all children are flexible and adaptable, cultural disparity alone cannot completely explain the low school performance of minority children. As was mentioned above, Hilliard believes that the school failure of minorities is due to inequalities in the delivery of instruction, whereby minority students are treated less favorably than their White, middle-class counterparts. Taking a different tack, Villegas argues that proponents of the home-school discontinuity theory, while claiming to offer fundamental solutions to this problem, leave unexamined the social inequities underlying the problem of school failure on the part of minority children. In her view, the root of the problem is a struggle for power in our economically stratified society. In this struggle, schools play a critical role in the production or preservation of the socioeconomic order. She specifically criticizes the theory for its failure to address the question of cultural status: Why the language and culture of the White, middle-class, Anglo-American segment of the populace have higher status in our society than do those of minority groups.

While much of the literature skirts the issue of power in minority education, Delpit (1988b) tackles it directly. Like many other supporters of the cultural difference theory, she believes that schools must change. Among other changes, she advocates the fostering of more meaningful interpersonal relations in schools, affirmation of the belief that all students are capable of learning, the establishment of high academic standards for all students, and the use of students' communicative styles in teaching. But

Delpit admits that issues of power come into play in the classroom. She believes that academic success demands the acquisition of the mainstream culture, which means, in part, acquiring the communicative codes of those in power. She goes on to argue that those who do not belong to the power group should be taught explicitly the means of access to power, including the linguistic forms, and ways of talking, writing and interacting used by the powerful. Equally important, the students should be taught to value ethnic distinctions and be helped to learn that the culture of the group in power, while instrumental in our society, is not intrinsically superior to the cultures of the less powerful minority groups.

Despite the criticism of the cultural difference theory leveled by researchers like Hilliard, McDermott, Ogbu, and Villegas, the explanation holds a central position in current thinking in education. Much to its credit, the theory has paved the way for many innovative programs that have proven successful with minority children. Examples of these culturally responsive programs appear next.

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGY

A culturally responsive pedagogy builds on the premise that how people are expected to go about learning may differ across cultures. Indeed, Heath, Philips, and Michaels provide evidence of this cultural variation. Cultural differences present both opportunities and challenges for teachers. To maximize learning opportunities, teachers must gain knowledge of the cultures represented in their classrooms, then translate this knowledge into instructional practice.

Several examples of culturally responsive pedagogy are described below. The initial two examples are from well-documented programs of intervention that have used ethnographic data to establish cultural links between home and school for Hawaiian elementary school youngsters and for Hispanic secondary-level students. The third example draws on the widely publicized work of Marva Collins, a highly successful African American teacher who has used her cultural knowledge to create rewarding classroom experiences for African American students. These and other such examples of culturally responsive pedagogy are encouraging, for they demonstrate that schools can make a difference for minority students.

The Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP)

KEEP started in the early 1970s as a research and development project with the dual goal of: (a) developing a program for Polynesian children in Hawaii that would raise their reading scores on standardized tests; and (b) disseminating the resulting program throughout the public

schools attended by these children. It took several years of research and development for the program to evolve, but results more than justify the investment of time, energy, and money. Within three years of the program's inception, the students in the KEEP laboratory school improved their reading scores dramatically. These results were subsequently replicated in public school settings. Those interested in this highly successful project will want to read fuller descriptions of it (see Au, 1980; Au & Jordan, 1981; Au, Tharp, Crowell, Jordan, Speidel, & Calkins, 1985; Gallimore, 1985; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

While observations in the Hawaiian homes showed the children to be adept learners, at school they appeared unresponsive to instruction. To reverse this school pattern, the program introduced several instructional strategies carefully designed to bridge the gap between the children's home and school experiences. The changes worked.

One such culturally sensitive strategy introduces the collaborative orientation observed in the Hawaiian homes into the classroom. According to Au et al. (1985) and Gallimore (1985), this collaborative orientation is derived from the structure of family life and from early socialization practices involving siblings as caretakers. In such a system, older children have a great deal of responsibility for younger ones. As a result, when children need assistance they turn to peers rather than adults. To capitalize on this community practice, KEEP set up peer learning centers in the classrooms. As used in the project, the centers encourage children to help one another with academic tasks. The organization of learning in peer centers contrasts sharply with the way instruction is typically organized during teacher-led lessons, the most frequent form of instruction. In peer centers, the students have a fair degree of responsibility for their own learning, much like the Hawaiian children have in their own homes. In teacher-directed lessons, the instructor has tight control over the actions of students, a feature that clashes dramatically with the norms of the Hawaiian community.

A second example of cultural accommodation in KEEP is evident in the reading lessons themselves. By design, the allocation of turns at speaking during the lessons resembles the rules for participation in the "talk story," a recurrent speech event in Hawaiian culture. Specifically, students are allowed to build joint responses during story time, either among themselves or together with the teacher. This strategy of collective turn-taking parallels the joint narration of a story by two or more individuals, which is typical of the talk story. Joint turn-taking contrasts markedly with the one-speaker-at-a-time convention that prevails in mainstream classes.

Peer learning centers and joint turn-taking are examples of a set of important changes that KEEP made in the culture of the traditional classroom. These examples illustrate ways in which the links between home and school were strengthened for the benefit of Hawaiian children.

Jordan (1985) emphasizes that the process of transforming information about pupils' home and community experiences into culturally compatible classroom practice is complex. In KEEP, it required a continuous revision of existing classroom strategies using home culture information. According to Jordan, a culturally responsive educational program does not attempt to replicate every aspect of the students' home culture. Rather, one targets certain features of classroom life (e.g., type of interactions among peers) that, if changed, have the potential for increasing student involvement in academic activities. Jordan also recommends that the new practice (e.g., peer learning centers) be selected from the array of accepted educational strategies. While new in a particular setting, the "innovation" is likely to gain greater credibility if it is already part of the repertoire of teaching practices.

It should be emphasized that educational strategies are not strictly culture-specific. A strategy that is effective with Hawaiian children, for example, may also be satisfactory for children from other cultures. However, programs like KEEP are not entirely transferrable to other settings, even when the students in those settings are culturally similar to KEEP pupils (Jordan, 1985). To be culturally responsive, educational strategies require adaptation to local circumstances (Cole & Griffin, 1987; Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Gallimore, 1985; Jordan, 1985; Nelson-Barber & Meier, 1990). This concern for transportability of effective teaching practice from one setting to another is addressed later in the paper.

The San Diego Project

The second example of culturally responsive pedagogy is taken from the work of Moll and Diaz (1987). As described by them, the aim of the San Diego Project was to find ways of motivating secondary-level bilingual students to write by engaging them in activities relevant to their needs and interests. Because the project is complex, only a portion of it is reported here. (For details, see Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Moll, 1986; Moll & Diaz, 1987.)

The project was carried out in a San Diego community with a large concentration of ethnolinguistic minorities, especially Hispanic. Interviews and observations conducted by Moll and Diaz gave little evidence of the use of writing in the community. Most of the writing observed in the homes

had a practical purpose such as preparing a grocery list, taking phone messages, or composing a letter. Initially, the researchers intended to foster cultural continuity between home and school by helping the teachers find ways of using in their writing classes the literacy events observed frequently in the community, much as KEEP did with the talk story. This approach proved unproductive in San Diego, however. The teachers in the project argued that the relatively undemanding nature of the nonschool writing events (e.g., preparation of shopping lists and taking of phone messages) would not facilitate mastery of the advanced goals of secondary education. Agreeing with the teachers on this point, the researchers decided to take a different approach.

Although the writing events in the community did not translate well into the literacy classes in secondary schools, information on other community characteristics proved invaluable. The researchers learned that homework assignments created the most frequent opportunities for writing in the homes. They also found that parents valued education, and considered the development of writing skills essential for their children. Finally, it was observed that, while literacy was a topic of concern to the community, other social issues such as unemployment, immigration, and the need to learn English were equally important or even more compelling for its members. This information about the community was used in constructing a set of writing modules that became the vehicle for bridging the gap between home and school.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe all the modules, but one of those used in an English-as-a-second-language (ESL) classroom will show how one instructor was able to use the cultural resources of the students in teaching English language skills. Bilingualism, a topic of interest to the community and to the students, was the central theme of this particular module, which required the students to develop a questionnaire to survey the opinions of community members about bilingualism. The students were then expected to administer the questionnaire to several members of the community and prepare a report of findings. The objective of ascertaining the community's opinions gave purpose to all the writing connected with this module. As Moll and Diaz explain, because the students were curious to find out the different views on bilingualism held in the community, they became fully engaged in the various writing activities. Students who had previously been considered incapable of writing in English became sufficiently motivated to produce essays in their second language. According to Moll and Diaz, the key to the success of this module was the opportunity it gave the students to engage in purposeful writing, especially on a topic of interest to them and of relevance to their community.

The everyday experiences of minority children from low-income

backgrounds are often considered unsafe terrain for educators to explore. As a result, many topics of interest to minority students are avoided by teachers. This is unfortunate because it tends to alienate students and to distance them from the learning process (Fine, 1986, 1989; Freire & Macedo, 1987). As the San Diego Project shows, the introduction of community-related themes into instruction (even though these themes may appear controversial at times) can increase students' motivation to learn.

The Marva Collins Way

Unlike the case with KEEP and the San Diego Project, Marva Collins' success with African American students in Chicago has not been the subject of detailed ethnographic research. Nonetheless, her work is widely publicized. Her teaching is described and analyzed both in scholarly journals and the popular press (see Collins & Tamarkin, 1982; Hollins, 1982). Many attribute Ms. Collins' success to factors typically associated with effective teaching, such as high expectations for the students, high rates of time on task, and active teaching behaviors. Hollins (1982) maintains, however, that underlying this success is Ms. Collins' ability to establish cultural congruence between teaching activities and the experiences of the students at home and in their communities.

According to Hollins, the climate of Marva Collins' classroom is similar to that found in the traditional African American family setting. By this Hollins means that both the classroom and the family foster "cooperation, flexibility, collective responsibility, autonomy, and strong adult leadership." For Ms. Collins, learning is more important than competition, which she tends to minimize. She encourages the students to help one another by engaging them in carefully structured cooperative group activities. The use of tests is kept to a minimum, and direct comparisons of the performance of students is avoided.

Clearly in control of her classroom, Ms. Collins establishes the teaching objectives, decides on the content of instruction, and structures the learning activities. But she does not use her authority coercively. The students are free to work or not, as long as they understand clearly the consequences of their choice.

According to Hollins, Ms. Collins occasionally corrects the students' grammar, thereby emphasizing the importance in our society of mastering standard English. However, she also encourages the use of community language patterns in the classroom. For example, analogical comparisons often used in traditional African American speech are evident in Ms. Collins' teaching. Jive talking, based on improvisation with language, is accepted as a viable means of communication in her classroom. By capital-

izing on the students' language resources, Ms. Collins is able to engage the students in tasks they might otherwise reject. Equally important, by using the language of the students, she lets them know that their ways are valued and respected in school, thereby supporting the development of positive cultural identities.

Still another link between home and school is Ms. Collins' classroom use of interaction patterns commonly found in the African American church. According to Hollins, these patterns include "choral and responsive reading, audience participation, use of analogies, and the identification of a moral or personal message from the passage read."

In brief, by engaging students in culturally relevant learning, Marva Collins has improved her pupils' academic performance. Moreover, she has helped the students maintain and strengthen their sense of identity and personal worth.

The three examples of culturally responsive pedagogy presented above demonstrate that it is possible to design instruction which promotes learning by building on students' cultural experiences. (For other examples of culturally responsive pedagogy see Barnhardt, 1982; Dillon, 1989; Foster, 1989; Mohatt & Erickson, 1981.) Educational strategies such as the ones described here have given rise to a new pedagogical optimism. Schools can make a difference, if only they can bridge the cultural gap between community and school that exists for many students. It is important to note that in none of these examples is cultural sensitivity equated with a focus on easily stereotyped artifacts of the culture, such as the traditional art and food of the ethnic groups involved. Instead, cultural sensitivity is shown by the use of subtle communication patterns familiar to the students, as well as themes of interest to them.

The examples of culturally responsive pedagogy reported in the literature reviewed here expand the view of effective instruction described by Brophy and Good (1986). Consistent with the effective instruction literature, culturally responsive teachers hold high expectations for their students, achieve and maintain high levels of involvement in learning tasks, and have a high sense of efficacy (Tikunoff, 1985; Tikunoff & Vázquez-Faría, 1982). But their effectiveness is defined primarily by the ability to create meaningful classroom activities that take into account students' background experiences.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED FROM RESEARCH

Several points made in this paper are worth repeating. The research reviewed here suggests that if schools are to help all students reach their fullest potential, educators need to take a critical look at their teaching practices. One practice commonly used in school--grouping students for instruction on the basis of perceived ability--seems particularly detrimental. While this practice is meant to meet the individual needs of students, research shows that rigid homogeneous grouping is of no special value to pupils in the high-ability groups, and of definite harm to those in the less advanced groups. Because minority students are overrepresented in the lower academic tiers, they are especially hurt by this practice. The overwhelming evidence shows that, once assigned to a low-level group, students tend to receive less instruction and have less favorable interaction with the teacher than do their peers in higher groups. Furthermore, students judged to be of low ability are typically given undemanding and watered-down curricula. In light of these findings, it is not surprising to learn that those placed in low-ability groups rarely move up to more advanced instructional levels. Because placement in ability groups begins as early as ages 5 and 6, when academic potential is extremely difficult to determine and not stable, this practice is highly questionable. In brief, all children must be treated equitably and given a rigorous curriculum. This is more likely to occur if educators eliminate the common practice of grouping students according to perceived ability, whether schoolwide or within classes.

The importance of teachers' judgments of students' potential is also emphasized in the literature, which suggests that teachers are at least partly at fault for the overrepresentation of minority students in low-ability groups. Lacking sensitivity to cultural differences, even well-intentioned teachers often interpret the behaviors of minority students in ways that underestimate their academic potential. Even more serious, these judgments or misjudgments frequently translate into low expectations for the students and discriminatory treatment, which result in low academic performance.

The literature indicates that exposed to different socialization practices, youngsters from different communities approach learning differently. Unfortunately, this fact is often overlooked by schools. As traditionally organized, classroom instruction assumes a particular type of socialization that corresponds most closely to the experiences of White, middle-class, Anglo-American students, but clashes with home and community experiences of minority students.

It seems clear from the research that unless teachers learn to integrate the cultural patterns of minority communities into their teaching, the failure of schools to educate students from these communities will continue. This

realization has opened the way for a number of instructional innovations designed to establish cultural links between home and school. The success of many such culturally responsive educational projects has sparked a renewed hope that solutions to the academic problems of minority children are possible.

But a word of caution about the use of this research is needed. Many researchers and program developers are careful to point out that the findings from this type of investigation, which is usually ethnographic, are not always applicable "across the board." Practices found successful in one community may not be effective in other communities, even when these are similar in ethnic composition (Cole & Griffin, 1987; Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Gallimore, 1985; Nelson-Barber & Meier, 1990). For example, what might work for students in a rural Hispanic community is likely to require major adaptation for inner-city Hispanic students. Similarly, practices that prove effective with middle-class African American students do not guarantee success with low-income children from the same ethnic group. Even when two communities appear very similar, each will have its unique circumstances and history. Those differences in local circumstances and history will inevitably be reflected in the culture.

Individual differences within any single group make the teaching situation even more complex. Educators must remember that descriptions of cultural patterns represent cultural configurations for groups, not the specific behavior of any given individual within the groups (Laosa, 1977). Obviously, then, allowances must be made for individual differences in learning.

Given the uniqueness of each community and the individual differences found within each group, it is impossible to develop a general solution for the schooling problems experienced by minority children. Even so, the research reviewed here has great value. From it we have learned that all students bring cultural resources to the classroom. We have also gained a new understanding of classroom life. Specifically, we have come to realize that the classroom itself has a culture, and that teachers can use this culture for the benefit of all students.

The lack of specific prescriptions for a culturally sensitive pedagogy presents a major challenge to educators. In a sense, the unavailability of a script places an ethical responsibility on teachers to seek information about the local communities represented in their classrooms and to find productive ways of using that information in their teaching. This requires an openness on the part of teachers to learn from community members, including parents.

Anticipating a dramatic increase in minority enrollment in schools, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

adopted a standard in 1977 requiring teacher education programs to provide training in multicultural education. Because more than half of the nation's teacher education institutions are accredited by NCATE, the multicultural standard has stimulated widespread curricular reform (Banks, 1987). Since then, the research reviewed in this paper has been making its way into teacher preparation courses. So, too, must this research inform the development of the new generation of teacher assessments. The next section outlines implications of this research for the assessment of beginning teachers.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF BEGINNING TEACHERS

The ideas suggested in this section of the paper should not be viewed as rigid prescriptions for "effective teaching." The diversity of experience that characterizes cross-cultural classroom settings precludes the use of fixed scripts by teachers. To be effective, educators must have the freedom to adapt instruction to local circumstances and to individual children. As the literature cautions, there is no general solution for the problems minority children encounter in school. Instead, solutions must be worked out by educators in their own settings. Nevertheless, teachers can use the literature to help guide their instructional decisions. Equally important, test developers can and should take this research into consideration in designing assessments for beginning teachers.

In what follows, I identify five cultural criteria for ETS to consider when developing its new performance assessment for beginning teachers. While not exhaustive, this set of competencies is meant to provide a basis for discussion and to guide key decisions on how best to ensure that beginning teachers have the preparation needed to instruct effectively in a multicultural society.

1. Teachers should have an attitude of respect for cultural differences, a belief that all students are capable of learning, and a sense of efficacy.

This initial criterion summarizes the attitudinal prerequisites for effective teaching in a multicultural society. The behavior of culturally different students should be understood by educators in terms of the norms of the community in which the children are reared rather than as deviations from the norms of the White middle-class. Teachers who consider behavior that differs from the mainstream as something to be remedied will generally not make accurate assessments of children's strengths and limitations (Hilliard, 1989; Moll, 1986; Nelson-Barber & Meier, 1990; Villegas, 1988). Such an attitude leads teachers to emphasize what students cannot do, rather than what the children are capable of doing well. To capitalize on the resources the students bring to class, beginning teachers must show respect for and appreciation of cultural differences (Brooks, 1987; Edelsky, 1986; Heath, 1983a). They must accept all students as learners who already know a great deal, and who have experiences, concepts, and language which can be built upon and expanded to help them learn even more. It is this respect that serves as the basis for a meaningful relationship between teacher and students.

Teachers must believe that all students are capable of learning, and they must have high expectations for each pupil, regardless of his or her

background (Brooks, 1987; Brophy, 1982; Collins & Tamarkin, 1982; Delpit, 1988b; Dillon, 1989; Gallimore, 1985; Irvine, 1990; Knapp & Shields, 1990; Lehr & Harris, 1988; McShane, 1983; Moll, 1986, 1988; Tikunoff, 1990). When teachers consider their students capable of learning, those students tend to do well academically. Teachers who believe students can learn convey this confidence in numerous ways, such as high expectations for them, high performance standards, and encouragement to excel.

Teachers also need to have a sense of efficacy (Brophy, 1982; Brophy & Good, 1986; Irvine, 1990; Tikunoff, 1985). Teachers who see themselves as capable of making a difference in their students' learning are more likely to have academically successful students. When teachers accept the responsibility for teaching their students, they treat the students' difficulties as challenges to their own ingenuity rather than as excuses for ineffectiveness. Instead of blaming the children for academic problems, teachers with a sense of efficacy find ways of restructuring learning activities to meet the children's needs.

2. Teachers must know the cultural resources their students bring to class, and they must be aware of the culture of their own classrooms.

Being knowledgeable about the cultural resources students bring to school is crucial in planning and implementing an effective instructional program in a multicultural society. As the literature shows, building on these resources in the classroom is the key to a culturally responsive pedagogy (Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Delpit, 1988b; Diaz, Moll, & Mehan, 1986; Gallimore, 1985; Heath, 1983a; Hollins, 1990; Moll, 1988; Wong-Fillmore, 1990).

To become knowledgeable about students' cultural backgrounds and to translate this knowledge into instruction, teachers need to have a clear understanding of the term "culture." Particularly useful to teachers is a pragmatic view of culture, one which defines it as the way life is organized in a community (whether it is students' home/neighborhood community or the classroom community), including how its members interact, use language, and approach learning. Equipped with such a definition, teachers will be in a better position to identify subtle aspects of the students' home experiences that are relevant to instruction but which are usually overlooked. Although beginning teachers need some knowledge of different cultures, it would be unrealistic and impractical to require them to have a thorough understanding of the numerous cultural groups in our society. It is not unrealistic, however, to expect those entering the teaching profession to know various procedures by which they can gain information about those communities represented in their classes (Nelson-Barber & Meier, 1990).

These procedures can include making home visits, conferring with community members, talking with parents, consulting with minority teachers, and observing children in and out of school to discern patterns of behavior that may be related to their cultural background. During their initial year of employment, teachers can be expected to use different information-seeking procedures in their local settings, and to draw upon this information in their teaching.

It should be emphasized that teachers' communication with parents and other community members is essential to their developing a proper understanding of the students' home culture. Without such understanding, even well-intentioned teachers might erroneously accept questionable behaviors they believe are culturally determined, but which are actually considered inappropriate in the students' homes (L. D. Delpit, personal communication, November 4, 1990; Casanova, personal communication, October 24, 1990).

A pragmatic view of culture will also help a teacher think of his or her classroom as a community that has its own culture (Villegas, 1988). As noted in the literature reviewed above, the classroom is not a neutral setting. Built into every teaching-learning situation is a set of implicit rules that govern the way in which participants gain access to instruction and display their knowledge (Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972; Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Heath, 1982; Michaels, 1981; Moll, 1988; Philips, 1983). Teachers in a multicultural society should be as sensitive as possible to the cultural demands that different types of classroom activities place on students. It is doubtful that beginning teachers will have the skills required for a careful analysis of the culture of their own classrooms. Nevertheless, those entering the teaching profession should at least know that learning, whether in or out of school, occurs in a cultural context. Additionally, they must understand that the classroom strategies they choose (e.g., peer centers, group projects, questioning students in front of their peers, types of questions asked) can, and often do, clash with the ways in which some of their students approach learning situations at home. Moreover, beginning teachers should be aware that cultural disjunctures between home and school can make students appear academically incompetent, even when these students actually know the subject matter.

3. Teachers should implement an enriched curriculum for all students.

Like all students, minority pupils need a fast-paced curriculum that actively engages their attention (Irvine, 1990; Levin, 1987; Moll, 1988; Pogrow, 1990; Stage, 1989). This curriculum should be intellectually stimulating rather than overly simplified, especially for those students who

are performing below expectation. The research shows that an emphasis on simplified academic tasks does not necessarily help low-achieving minority pupils. This is not to say that teachers should reject drill, practice, and rote-learning activities altogether, but such instruction should be embedded in authentic learning activities. Every student needs to acquire basic skills. However, instruction which focuses exclusively on basic skills is doomed to fail, because students are bound to lose interest in the work when they cannot see the purpose of the activity.

Teachers need to plan and implement a curriculum that challenges students to develop higher-order knowledge and skills. The instructional goal should be to enrich students' experiences, not to correct deficiencies. Students must be taught several strategies which they can use to monitor their own learning of familiar material and also apply to new problems (Knapp & Shields, 1990). Learning objectives should be demanding and they should be explained clearly to the students. Activities should be meaningful, and students must be helped to see the point of the tasks so that they do not consider them simple busywork or arbitrary demands made by the teacher (Delpit, 1988b; Edelsky, 1986; Fuller, 1977; Langer & Applebee, 1986; Moll & Diaz, 1987). Academic standards should be clear and students should be held accountable for their failure or success according to those standards (Delpit, 1988a).

4. Teachers must build bridges between the instructional content, materials and methods, and the cultural backgrounds of the students in their classes.

A rigorous and fast-paced curriculum is needed to engage youngsters actively in learning. But a high level of engagement cannot be achieved if the instructional content, materials, and methods are unrelated to the students' cultural experiences. Because this cultural bridge between home and school is achieved through various strategies, I have subdivided this broad criterion into subcomponents, as described below.

Establishing links between instructional materials and students' cultural experiences. Because teaching must build upon and modify students' prior knowledge rather than merely attempting to pour new information into empty vessels, teachers must select and use instructional materials that are relevant to the cultural experiences of the students they teach (Heath, 1983b; Hollins, 1990; Tikunoff, 1990). But at the same time teachers must also stretch students beyond their own world. That is, the cultural resources pupils bring to school should serve as a foundation for new knowledge.

Varying instruction to accommodate students' cultural differences. Because active participation in classroom activities is a stimulus for learning, teachers must deliberately plan and implement instruction so as to involve all students (Cazden & Leggett, 1981; Irvine, 1990; Stage 1989; Tikunoff, 1985). In cross-cultural classroom settings, this necessitates a flexible and varied teaching style that can accommodate cultural differences in learning. For example, the literature shows that while some students learn well through direct instruction, others benefit more from cooperative group projects or peer centers.

Because today's student population is culturally diverse, teachers cannot rely on a single instructional method if they are to be effective. Instead, they must have a repertoire of instructional approaches that will enable them to reach children of different backgrounds in culturally appropriate ways. Such a repertoire must include skills in direct instruction as well as the management of cooperative learning (e.g., group projects, peer centers, reciprocal teaching). Although it is unrealistic to require those just entering the teaching profession to show mastery of multiple instructional methods, it seems appropriate to expect that they at least understand how the methods they use compare with the preferred participation styles of the children in their care. Moreover, one can reasonably expect that during the initial year of teaching, educators learn to expand their repertoire of instructional methods, and in so doing find ways of accommodating the different cultural characteristics of their students.

Skills in interactive decision making. Teachers must be receptive to important signals from the students indicating the effectiveness of instruction, make inferences about the pupils' possible misunderstanding of content or procedures, and decide whether to adhere to the instructional plan or to deviate from it if adjustments are needed.

In classrooms with minority students and/or students of limited proficiency in English, teachers must be especially sensitive to verbal and nonverbal signals from the learners which indicate that they are confused or do not understand what is expected of them. This requires an understanding of culturally specific ways of expressing confusion or understanding. For example, silence may denote confusion in one group, but comprehension in another.

The ability of educators to make decisions while teaching is acquired gradually. It is unreasonable to expect novices to implement their instructional plans and simultaneously receive, interpret, and act on subtle signals from the students. However, progress in this aspect of instruction can be expected during the initial year of teaching. Minimally, when reflecting

upon instruction already given, beginning teachers should be able to identify junctures at which the students seemed to experience difficulties. And, they should be able to explain how they hope to remedy the problem in future lessons.

Creating a classroom climate that encourages students to express themselves. Cultural links between home and school are a prerequisite to a classroom environment conducive to learning and self-expression. Instructors who see cultural differences as strengths and draw upon students' cultural resources when teaching, tend to communicate more effectively with the students. The literature suggests that teachers who are able to establish open and meaningful relationships with minority students have a positive influence on their academic achievement (Delpit, 1988b; Edelsky, 1986; Foster, 1989; McDermott, 1977; Nelson-Barber & Meier, 1990; Shields, 1989).

Managing the classroom in culturally sensitive ways. Effective learning environments require that teachers establish, communicate, and maintain classroom routines and procedures. Such organization lets students know what is expected of them in different learning situations, how they are supposed to act, and how to get help when they need it. The effective manager continuously monitors activity in the room, anticipates difficulties before they arise, and responds quickly once behavioral problems emerge (Brophy, 1982; Brophy & Good, 1986; Tikunoff, 1985).

In all this, teachers must be aware of cultural differences in interaction styles if they are to interpret their students' behavior accurately and respond appropriately. For example, lack of familiarity with a particular turn-taking procedure may lead some students to call out in class instead of raising their hands and waiting until the teacher awards them the floor. This calling out, while inappropriate in certain classroom situations, may be exactly what is expected of those youngsters in their community. In this case, instead of automatically interpreting the students' behavior as a conscious breach of discipline, it would be more productive for the teacher to verify whether the student actually knew the turn-taking rule being enforced. To prevent such misunderstandings in culturally diverse classrooms, teachers must make as clear as possible to the students what is expected of them in different classroom situations. And when a student's behavior does not conform to expectations, the teacher must first rule out the possibility of failure in communication before concluding that the student is misbehaving.

5. Teachers should be aware of cultural differences when evaluating students.

Evaluating students is critical to the learning process. Teachers often use the information gleaned from evaluations to give students feedback about their work and to redirect their learning if necessary. Additionally, this information gives teachers insight into their own instructional effectiveness.

In cross-cultural classroom situations, the task of evaluating students is especially complex. Children from different groups enter school with culturally specific understandings of the appropriate means of displaying knowledge. If the teacher and students do not share this understanding, it is likely that the instructor will misjudge the pupils' competence unless he or she is generally sensitive to cultural differences. For example, teachers frequently assess what students know on a given topic by asking display questions (e.g., What is the capital of the United States?). As explained above, these questions require students to display their knowledge before other students in a public forum. Because many American Indian children are not accustomed to this "spotlighting" method of assessment, their performance in situations that rely on it may not be indicative of what they really know. In cases such as this one, teachers need to exercise caution when interpreting assessment results.

Teachers must use a variety of methods or strategies to evaluate students, especially in cross-cultural classroom settings (Moll, 1988). These strategies can include informal observations of students in various contexts, examination of students' work products, close attention to students' answers to oral questions or comments during class discussions, and analysis of students' scores on written tests. Reliance on a single method of evaluation is likely to create a disadvantage for some children.

A word of caution is needed in the case of bilingual children who appear competent in English. Research shows that children can usually gain a fair degree of oral proficiency in a second language within one or two years of schooling. However, it generally takes from five to six years for the students to master the more demanding, context-reduced language of classroom instruction and written text. Teachers must be aware of this natural process of language development when evaluating bilingual students. What may appear as an academic problem to a teacher might actually be a stage of normal language development (Ortiz & Maldonado-Colon, 1986).

Because instruction and evaluation are especially complex processes in cross-cultural settings, teachers should not conclude automatically that students who fail to meet expectations are incompetent or unmotivated. A

more appropriate response would be to reexamine their own teaching and evaluation methods, and to identify features of those methods that could be changed for the benefit of the students.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The literature reviewed in this paper confirms that classroom life is complex and dynamic. To a great extent, the complexity of teaching stems from the close interaction of teachers with relatively large numbers of students with different individual characteristics and cultural backgrounds. Given this variety, teachers need to have a wide repertoire of instructional strategies and the skill to select from it those strategies most appropriate for the students in their care. Such adaptation of curriculum and instruction to specific situations is a major challenge for educators.

An assessment system for those entering the teaching profession in the 1990s and beyond must mirror as accurately as possible the complexity of classroom life. Moreover, such a system must reconcile the objectives of establishing standards which reflect the most advanced thinking in education, and assuring that candidates have had opportunities for acquiring the knowledge and skills assumed by these standards. In connection with this last point, some individuals may argue that because training in multicultural education is a relatively recent phenomenon in teacher preparation, little should be expected of teacher candidates in this area. I think otherwise. For one thing, the multicultural education standard adopted by NCATE in 1977 has made a significant impact on teacher education. This claim is supported by the findings of a survey of beginning teachers reported recently by *Education Week* (Diegmueller, 1990), which revealed that a large majority of the respondents believe their professional training has prepared them adequately to teach culturally heterogeneous classes. Admittedly, improvements are needed in the teaching of multicultural education, but this does not mean that current training is lacking altogether. More importantly, even if many programs have failed to provide adequate training in this area, the public has a right to expect those entering the teaching profession to be adequately prepared to instruct culturally heterogeneous classes. Teachers skilled in multicultural education are urgently needed now, and they will be even more necessary as minority children become the majority of the school-age population in the near future.

In my view, the question of whether an assessment should lead the field or lag behind it is not as pressing for Stage III of the Praxis Series as it might be for more traditional assessments. As conceived, Stage III would involve collecting performance data at different points in time during a candidate's initial year of teaching. By giving candidates a full year to meet the performance standards, they would have a fair opportunity to develop the skills sought in cross-cultural teaching through on-the-job experience and in-service training. This feature of Stage III makes it a potentially valuable educational experience for teacher candidates.

Noticeably missing from this paper is a discussion of the decreasing minority representation in the teaching profession. If projections are confirmed, minority teachers will account for less than 10 percent of the teaching force by the mid-1990s. In sharp contrast, minority students will comprise over one-third of the school-age population. While having a similar cultural background to that of students is not a prerequisite for good teaching, much benefit can be derived from an increase in the number of minority teachers. Specifically, the experience of growing up as a member of a minority group gives a teacher unique insights into the lives of minority pupils. This personal experience, combined with good training, prepares such teachers to serve as "cultural translators" or "cultural brokers" (to borrow the terms used by Irvine and Delpit, among others) for their minority students.

While the responsibility for increasing minority participation in the teaching profession does not lie with test developers, assuring a fair and equitable assessment for those entering teaching, including minority candidates, does. Just as teachers should be expected to plan and implement culturally responsive educational programs for their students, so too must test developers design and use assessment methods that are sensitive to the cultural differences among teacher candidates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References identified with an EJ or ED number have been abstracted and are in the ERIC database. Journal articles (EJ) should be available at most research libraries; documents (ED) are available in ERIC microfiche collections at more than 700 locations. Documents can also be ordered through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (800) 443-3742. For more information contact the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186, (202) 293-2450; or (800) USE-ERIC.

Acosta-Belen, E., & Sjostrom B. R. (Eds.). (1988). *The Hispanic experience in the United States*. New York: Praeger.

Adler, M. (1981). *The paideia proposal: An educational manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), 3-42. EJ 243 846

Au, K. H. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaii children: An analysis of a culturally appropriate instructional event. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11*(2), 91-115. EJ 224 674

Au, K. H., & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, MA: Newbury House. ED 226 877

Au, K. H., Tharp, R. G., Crowell, D. C., Jordan, C., Speidel, G. E., & Calkins, R. (1985). The role of research in the development of a successful reading program. In J. Osborn, P. T. Wilson, & R. C. Anderson (Eds.), *Reading education: Foundations for a literate America* (pp. 275-289). Lexington, MA: Heath.

Banks, J. (1987). The implications of multicultural education for teacher education. In F. Klassen & D. Gollnick (Eds.), *Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies* (pp. 38-42). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Baratz, S., & Baratz, J. (1970). Early childhood intervention: The social science base of institutional racism. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*(1), 29-50. EJ 015 444

Barnhardt, R. (1982). Tuning-in: Athabaskan teachers and Athabaskan students. In R. Barnhardt (Ed.), *Cross-cultural issues in Alaskan Education, Vol 2* (pp. 144-164). Fairbanks, AK: Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska. ED 232 814

Barnhardt, R. (1990). Minority education in rural contexts. In M. Galbraith (Ed.), *Education in the rural American community* (pp. 52-67). Melbourne, FL: Krieger.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in preschool.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bloom, B. S., Davis, A., & Hess, R. (1965). *Compensatory education for cultural deprivations.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. See ED 001 717

Brooks, C. K. (1987). Teachers: Potent forces in the learning lives of black children. In D. S. Strickland & E. J. Cooper (Eds.), *Educating Black children: America's challenge* (pp. 55-62). Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Brophy, J. E. (1982). Successful teaching strategies for the inner-city child. *Phi Delta Kappan, 63*(8), 527-530. EJ 261 516

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan. See ED 251 422

Brown, A. L., Palincsar A. S., & Purcell, L. (1985). Poor readers: Teach, don't label. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *The school achievement of minority children* (pp. 105-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. See ED 269 500

Bruner, H. (1981). Developing positive multiethnic/multicultural learning environments. In W. E. Sims & B. Bass de Martinez (Eds.), *Perspectives on multicultural education* (pp. 130-163). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Cardelle-Elawar, M., & Nañez, J. E. (1990, April). *A metacognitive approach to teaching bilingual students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Bilingual Education, Tucson, AZ.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. ED 288 206

Cazden, C. B., John V. P., & Hymes, D. (Eds.). (1972). *Function of language in the classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press. ED 066 752

Cazden, C. B., & Leggett, E. L. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Recommendation for achieving LAU remedies II. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 69-86). Rowley, MA: Newbury House. See ED 226 877

Cazden, C. B., & Mehan, H. (1989). Principles from sociology and anthropology: Context, code, classroom, and culture. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 47-57). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press. See ED 312 247

Cohen, R. A. (1969). Conceptual styles, cultural conflict, and nonverbal tests of intelligence. *American Anthropologist, 71*(5), 828-856.

Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1987). *Contextual factors in education.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Education Research. ED 288 947

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher, 16*(6), 32-38. EJ 363 043

Collier, M. (1979). *A film study of classroom in Western Alaska.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Alaska, Center for Cross-Cultural Studies, Fairbanks, AK.

Collins, J. (1986). Differential instruction in reading groups. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), *The social construction of literacy* (pp. 117-137). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, M. & Tamarkin, C. (1982). *Marva Collins' way.* Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher. ED 328 629

Crago, M. B., Niniuruvik, L., & Annahatak, B. (1990). *The shaping of an Inuk: Lessons for northern schools taken from the early communicative interactions of young Inuit children and their caregivers.* Precirculated papers & abstracts, Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies, CHAGS 6, 2, 745-760.

Cummins, J. (1986a). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(1), 18-36. EJ 330 827

Cummins, J. (1986b). Psychological assessment of minority students. In A. C. Willig & H. F. Greenberg (Eds.), *Bilingualism and learning disabilities: Policies for teachers and administrators* (pp. 3-11). New York: American Library.

Darnell, R. (1971). The bilingual speech community: A Cree example. In R. Darnell (Ed.), *Linguistic diversity in Canadian society* (pp. 155-172). Edmonton, Canada: Linguistic Research.

Delpit, L. D. (1988a). *Teachers' voices: Rethinking education for diversity.* Paper presented at the Western meeting of the Holmes Group, Boulder, CO.

Delpit, L. D. (1988b). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3), 280-298. EJ 378 426

Deutsch, M. (1963). The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), *Education in depressed areas* (pp. 163-179). New York: Teachers College Press. See ED 012 721

Deyhle, D. (1983). Measuring success and failure in the classroom: Teacher communication about tests and the understandings of young Navajo students. *Peabody Journal of Education, 61*(1), 67-85. EJ 298 806

Diaz, S., Moll, L. C., & Mehan, H. (1986). Sociocultural resources in instruction: A context-specific approach. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 187-230). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University. See ED 304 241

Diegmueller, K. (1990, September 26). New teachers say they are prepared to teach ethnically diverse students. *Education Week*, p.6.

Dillon, D. R. (1989). Showing them that I want them to learn and that I care about who they are: A microethnography of the social organization of a secondary low-track English-reading classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 26*(2), 227-259. EJ 409 699

Dolson, D. P. (1985). *The application of immersion education in the United States.* Arlington, VA: National Center for Bilingual Education.

Dumont, R. (1972). Learning English and how to be silent: Studies in Sioux and Cherokee classrooms. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 344-369). New York: Teachers College Press. See ED 066 752

Dunn, L. M. (1987). *Bilingual Hispanic children on the U.S. Mainland: A review of research on their cognitive, linguistic, and scholastic development.* Monograph of the American Guidance Service. Circle Pine 9, MN: AGS. See ED 304 274

Duran, R. (1986). The testing of linguistic minorities. In R. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed., pp. 573-587). New York: Macmillan.

Edelsky, C. (1986). *Writing in a bilingual program; Habia una vez.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex. ED 305 192

Ekstrom, R. B., & Villegas, A. M. (in press). Ability grouping in middle grades mathematics: Process and consequences. *Journal of Research in Middle Level Education.*

Enright, D. S., & McCloskey, M. L. (1985). Yes, talking!: Organizing the classroom to promote second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(3), 431-453. EJ 325 373

Erickson, F. (1975). Gatekeeping and the melting pot: Interaction in counseling encounters. *Harvard Educational Review, 45*(1), 44-70. EJ 115 255

Erickson, F. (1977). Some approaches to inquiry in school-community ethnography. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 8*(2), 58-69. EJ 165 132

Feuerstein, R. (1979). *The dynamic assessment of retarded performers: The learning potential assessment device: Theory, instruments and techniques.* Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Fine, M. (1986). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high school. *Teachers College Record, 87*(3), 393-409. EJ 332 415

Fine, M. (1989). Silencing and nurturing voice in an improbable context: Urban adolescents in public school. In H. A. Giroux & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle* (pp. 152-279). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Foster, M. (1989). "It's cookin' now": A performance analysis of the speech event of a Black teacher in an urban community college. *Language in Society, 18*(1), 1-29. EJ 387 288

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Fuller, R. (1977). *In search of the IQ correlation: A scientific whodunit.* Stony Brook, NY: Ball-Stick-Bird.

Gallimore, R. (1985, May). *The accommodation of instruction to cultural differences.* Paper presented at the University of California Conference on the Underachievement of Linguistic Minorities, Lake Tahoe, CA.

Garcia, E. (1989). *Hispanic children: Theoretical, empirical and related curriculum issues.* Paper commissioned by the California Curriculum Commission, Sacramento, CA.

Gay, G., & Abrahams, R. D. (1973). Does the pot melt, boil, or brew? Black children and white assessment procedures. *Journal of School Psychology, 11*(4), 330-340.

Genesee, F. (1986). The baby and the bathwater or what immersion has to say about bilingual education. *Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 10*(3), 227-254. EJ 369 366

Gilliland, H. (1988). *Teaching the Native American.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Gilmore, P., & Glatthorn, A. A. (Eds.). (1982). *Children in and out of school.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. ED 216 554

Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn P. C. (1989). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society.* Columbus, OH: Merrill. See ED 271 419

Good, T. (1970). Which pupils do teachers call on? *Elementary School Journal, 70,* 190-198.

Goodman, K., Goodman, Y., & Flores, B. (1979). *Reading in the bilingual classroom: Literacy, and biliteracy.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Greenbaum, P. E., & Greenbaum, S. D. (1983). Cultural differences, nonverbal regulation and classroom interaction: Sociolinguistic interference in American Indian education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 61*(1), 16-33. EJ 298 803

Greenwood, C. R., Delquadri, J. C., & Hall, R. V. (1989). Longitudinal effects of classwide peer tutoring. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(3), 371-383. EJ 399 801

Hakuta, K. (1989). *Curriculum needs of language minority students.* Paper commissioned by the California Curriculum Commission, Sacramento, CA.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society, 11*(1), 49-76. EJ 263 237

Heath, S. B. (1983a). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing ethnography: Educational anthropology in action* (pp. 102-131). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Heath, S. B. (1983b). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* London: Cambridge.

Herrnstein, R. J. (1973). *IQ in the meritocracy.* Boston: Atlantic-Little, Brown.

Hilliard, A. (1989). Teachers and cultural styles in a pluralistic society. *NEA Today, 7*(6), 65-69. EJ 404 551

Hollins, E. (1982). The Marva Collins story revisited: Implications for regular classroom instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(1), 37-40. EJ 260 748

Hollins, E. (1989). *A conceptual framework for selecting instructional approaches and materials for inner-city Black youngsters.* Paper commissioned by the California Curriculum Commission, Sacramento, CA.

Hunt, J. (1964). The psychological basis for using pre-school enrichment as an antidote for cultural deprivation. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 10,* 209-248.

Irvine, J. J. (1990). *Black students and school failure.* New York: Greenwood Press. ED 320 992

Jacob, E., & Jordan, C. (1987). Explaining the school performance of minority students, [Special issue]. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*(4). See EJ 365 552 and EJ 365 543

Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review, 39*(1), 1-123. EJ 008 537

Jordan, C. (1985). Translating culture: From ethnographic information to educational program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 16*(2), 104-123. EJ 322 974

Kamin, L. J. (1974). *The science and politics of I.Q.* Potomac, MD: Erlbaum.

Knapp, M. S., & Shields, P. M. (1990). Reconceiving academic instruction for the children of poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(10), 753-758. EJ 410 180

Kochman, T. (1981). *Black and White styles in conflict.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ED 313 490

Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition (LCHC). (1986). Contributions of cross-cultural research to educational practice. *American Psychologist, 41*(10), 1049-1058. EJ 360 272

Labov, W. (1973). The logic of non-standard Negro English. In N. Keddie (Ed.), *The myth of cultural deprivation* (pp. 21-66). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Langer, J., & Applebee, A. (1986). Reading and writing instruction: Toward a theory of teaching and learning. In E. Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 171-194). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Laosa, L. M. (1977). Cognitive styles and learning strategies research: Some of the areas in which psychology can contribute to personalized instruction in multicultural education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(3), 26-30.

Lehr, J. B., & Harris, H. W. (1988). *At-risk, low-achieving students in the classroom.* Washington, DC: National Education Association. ED 298 232

Levin, H. M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership, 44*(6), 19-21. EJ 353 782

Levine, D. U., Levine, R. R., & Enbanks, E. E. (1985). Successful implementation of instruction at inner-city schools. *Journal of Negro Education, 54*(3), 313-332. EJ 320 598

Locust, C. (1988). Wounding the spirit: Discrimination and traditional American Indian belief systems. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3), 315-330. EJ 378 428

McDermott, R. P. (1974). Achieving school failure. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Education and cultural-process* (pp. 82-118). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

McDermott, R. P. (1977). Social relations as contexts for learning in school. *Harvard Educational Review, 47*(2), 198-213. EJ 163 585

McShane, D. (1983). Explaining achievement patterns of American Indian children: A transcultural and developmental model. *Peabody Journal of Education, 61*(1), 34-48. EJ 298 804

Mehan, H. (1978). Structuring school structure. *Harvard Educational Review, 48*(1), 32-64. EJ 180 903

Mehan, H. (1989, August). *Understanding inequality in schools: The contribution of interpretive approaches*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Mercer, J. (1973). *Labeling the mentally retarded*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press. ED 081 878

Michaels, S. (1981). Sharing time: Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society, 10*, 423-442.

Mohatt, G., & Erickson, F. (1981). Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa school: A sociolinguistic approach. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie, & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom* (pp. 105-119). Rowley, MA: Newbury House. See ED 226 877

Moll, L. C. (1986). Writing as communication: Creating strategic learning environments for students. *Theory into Practice, 25*(2), 103-108. EJ 336 842

Moll, L. C. (1988). Some key issues in teaching Latino students. *Language Arts, 65*(5), 465-472. EJ 374 895

Moll, L. C., & Diaz, R. (1987). Teaching writing as communication: The use of ethnographic findings in classroom practice (pp. 195-221). In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Literacy and schooling* (pp. 55-65). Norwood, NJ: Ablex. See ED 307 582

More, A. J. (1987). Native Indian learning styles: A review for researchers and teachers. *Journal of American Indian Education, 27*(1), 17-29. EJ 376 730

Nelson-Barber, S., & Meier, T. (1990). *Multicultural context a key factor in teaching*. Academic Connections. New York: The College Board.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. ED 274 749

Oakes, J. (1986). Tracking, inequality, and the rhetoric of school reform: Why schools don't change. *Journal of Education, 168*(1), 60-80. EJ 338 427

Ogbu, J. (1982). Cultural discontinuities and schooling. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 13*(4), 290-307. EJ 278 954

Ortiz, A. A., & Maldonado-Colon, E. (1986). Reducing inappropriate referrals of language minority students in special education. In A. C. Willig & H. F. Greenberg (Eds.), *Bilingualism and learning disabilities* (pp. 37-50). New York: American Library Publishing Company.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 2*, 117-175.

Pedersen, E., Faucher, T. A., & Eaton, W. W. (1978). A new perspective on the effects of first-grade teachers on children's subsequent adult status. *Harvard Educational Review, 48*(1), 1-31. EJ 180 902

Persell, C. H. (1977). *Education and inequality*. New York: Free Press.

Philips, S. U. (1972). Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden, V. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom* (pp. 370-394). New York: Teachers College Press. See ED 066 752

Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.* New York: Longman. ED 226 878

Piestrup, A. M. (1973). *Black dialect interference and accommodation of reading instruction in first grade* (Monograph No. 4). Berkeley, CA: Language Behavior Research Laboratory. ED 119 113

Pogrow, S. (1990). Challenging at-risk students: Findings from the HOTS program. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(5), 389-397. EJ 400 589

Pollard, A., & Tann, S. (1987). *Reflective teaching in the primary school.* London: Cassell Educational Limited.

Ramirez, M., & Castañeda, A. (1974). *Cultural democracy, bicognitive development, and education.* New York: Academic Press.

Ramsey, P. D. K. (1983) Fresh perspectives on the school transformation-reproduction debate: A response to Anyon from the antipodes. *Curriculum Inquiry, 13*(3), 295-320. EJ 285 290

Richardson, V., Casanova, U., Placier, P., & Guilfoyle, K. (1989). *School children at risk.* London: Falmer. ED 306 343

Rist, R. C. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review, 40*(3), 411-451. EJ 025 119

Rosenthal, R. (1973). The pygmalion effect lives. *Psychology Today, 7*(4), 56-60, 62-63.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Samuda, R. J. (1975). *Psychological testing of American minorities.* New York: Dodd, Mead. ED 124 677

Sarason, S. B. (1982) *The culture of the school and the problem of change* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Shade, B. (1982). Afro-American cognitive style: A variable in school success? *Review of Educational Research, 52*(2), 219-244.

Shields, P. (1989). Holy Angels: Pocket of excellence. *Journal of Negro Education, 58*(2), 203-211. EJ 390 018

Sizemore, B. (1988). The Madison elementary school: A turnaround case. *Journal of Negro Education, 57*(3), 243-266.

Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifyin.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Spindler, G. (1982). *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Stage, E. (1989). *Strategies and materials for meeting the needs of all students in math, science, technology and health.* Paper commissioned by the California Curriculum Commission, Sacramento, CA.

Stallings, J. A., & McCarthy, J. (1990). Teacher effectiveness research and equity issues. In H. P. Baptiste, Jr., H. C. Waxman, J. W. deFelix, & J. E. Anderson (Eds.), *Leadership, equity, and school effectiveness* (pp. 186-205). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Swisher, K., & Deyhle, D. (1987). Styles of learning and learning of styles: Educational conflicts for American Indian/Alaskan native youth. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 8*(4), 345-360. EJ 366 237

Szasz, M. (1977). *Education and the American Indian.* Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Taylor, D. (1989). Toward a unified theory of literacy learning and instructional practices. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(3), 184-193. EJ 398 929

Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, T. (Ed.). (1978). *The schooling of Native America.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the United States Office of Education. ED 168 751

Tikunoff, W. J. (1985). *Applying significant bilingual instructional features in the classroom.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Tikunoff, W. J. (1990). *Toward a pedagogy of authentic second language development.* Keynote address at the annual meeting of the New York State Association for Bilingual Education, New York.

Tikunoff, W. J., & Vázquez-Faría, J. A. (1982). Successful instruction for bilingual schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education, 59*(4), 234-271. EJ 269 204

Trueba, H. T., Guthrie, C. P., & Au, K. H. (1981). *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers. ED 226 877

Villegas, A. M. (1988). School failure and cultural mismatch: Another view. *The Urban Review, 20*(4), 253-265. EJ 390 065

Villegas, A. M., & Watts, S. M. (1991, April). *Life in the classroom: The influence of class placement and student race/ethnicity.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Walsh, C. E. (1987). Schooling and the civic exclusion of Latinos: Toward a discourse of dissonance. *Journal of Education, 169*(2), 115-131. EJ 369 754

Wilson, A. (1978). *Psychological development of the Black child.* ew York: Africana Press.

Wong-Fillmore, L. W. (1990). *Now or later? Issues related to the early education of minority group students.* Unpublished paper, Council of Chief School State Officers, Washington, DC.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 655-667). Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.

Young, V. (1974). A Black American socialization pattern. *American Ethnologist, 1*(2), 405-413.