DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 636 CS 213 964

AUTHOR	Busch, Kathy Antonen; Steinmetz, Sunny Deborah L.
TITLE	Shake 'Em Up, but Don't Expect 'Em To Shake Up the World: Multicultural Education in (Mostly) Monocultural Classrooms.
PUB DATE	Apr 93
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (44th, San Diego, CA, March 31-April 3, 1993).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Critical Thinking; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Methods; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; Social Attitudes; Student Needs; Undergraduate Students; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Cultural Sensitivity; Race Fairness; *Writing Contexts

ABSTRACT

Many students from cultures outside the mainstream learn about mainstream cultures at home; consequently, they are often less monocultural than students whose backgrounds are within the mainstream. For this reason teachers of writing who work for the most part with students from mainstream cultures need to provide multicultural education which asks them to encounter people who are different. Three strategies are effective in teaching multiculturally in a primarily monocultural college-level composition class: (1) through the Transformational approach themes, perspectives, and concepts are brought into the curriculum in such a way that students are able to examine them from the viewpoint of different cultural groups; (2) through the Multicultural Content Approaches multiple viewpoints are provided on multicultural issues using a combination of Analysis of Oppression and Cultural Pluralism approaches; and (3) through methods which develop Critical Thinking Skills. A fourth approach is to discuss problems which affect members of many groups (e.g., poverty), but which looks at social problems through many perspectives. The two multicultural content approaches (Analysis of Oppression and Cultural Pluralism) provide an opportunity for teachers to ask tough questions just as the Critical Thinking Skills are necessary for students to deal with those tough questions. (Four tables are included. Contains 31 references. (NH)

SHAKE 'EM UP, BUT DON'T EXPECT 'EM TO SHAKE UP THE WORLD: MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN (MOSTLY) MONOCULTURAL CLASSROOMS

by

Kathy Antonen Busch
South Dakota School of Mines & Technology
and University of Minnesota

and

Sunny (D. L.) Steinmetz
University of Minnesota

The rationale for using multicultural approaches in teaching marginalized students whose cultural traditions fall outside the European-American, mostly male, middle-class, heterosexual, etc., monocultural mainstream seems self-evident: the students need to encounter models who are like themselves, with whom they can identify or, to put it in cognitive psychological terms, they will learn better if we build on the cognitive schemata they bring with them to school.

Where, then do we, as teachers who work mainly with students who come from the mainstream culture, get our rationale for teaching them multiculturally, for asking them to encounter people who are different from them? This question seems paradoxical, until you consider that mainstream models (especially positive ones) are much easier to find in our culture than such models of marginalized peoples. Therefore, students from both the mainstream and the margins probably hear a lot about the former group before they even enter the classroom, but little about the latter group. Many students from cultures outside the mainstream learn about those cultures at home, so they are actually less monocultural than students whose cultural backgrounds are within the mainstream. So now who's in the "disadvantaged learner group"? And should we let any students stay in such a group? The answer, obviously, is an emphatic NO--we need to give every student a chance at a multicultural education.

Multicultural education has been and continues to be controversial, both outside and inside our classrooms. Challenges to multicultural education have been put forth from colleagues, as in the furor over the proposed Writing about Difference syllabus at the University of Texas at Austin (Brodkey & Fowler, 1992; Hairston, 1992). Such challenges have also been put forth by students, such as the student who wrote a condemnatory column about one of the present authors' composition course in the Minnesota Daily (Kelly, 1990), blasting her use of multicultural subject matter.

However, if we do decide that the only kind of education which would give a fair chance to our students (mostly from dominant/mainstream groups) would be a multicultural education, and we have decided this, then we need to ask ourselves what kind of multicultural education that would be. Would it be the same kind of multicultural education that was originally conceived to help students from subordinated/marginalized groups succeed in schools, by honoring and building on the cognitive schemata they had brought with them from their various cultures? What if what we're trying to do is to bring in some cognitive dissonance, to get them to think about something/someone new and different, to challenge them to alter their preconceptions, prejudices, and stereotypes? The conceptual frameworks that students bring with them to school can be a negative force in the classroom, as well

as a positive force, if such frameworks are built on insufficient evidence and/or are closed to contradictory ideas!

All of this is to say that the two of us, both teachers of writing to both native speakers and non-native speakers of English at the college level, wish to put forward here some ideas we've had on how we can best teach multiculturally in mainly monocultural classrooms, based on our own experiences and our study of some of the relevant literature. Toward that end, we'd like to present the following equation, which we believe represents a reasonable goal and crucial elements of multicultural education for mostly monocultural classrooms, especially college-level composition classrooms:

	MULTICULTURAL CONTENT	
TRANSFORMATION =	APPROACHES +	METHODS
	Analysis of Oppression	Rhetoric/Grammar
	Cultural Pluralism	Critical Thinking

In Parts I, II, and III below, we will discuss (I) our goal in working multiculturally with (mostly) monocultural students--Transformation; and the (II) Multicultural Content Approaches and (III) Methods which we believe are essential elements in reaching that goal.

PART I - TRANSFORMATION:

Banks (1989) provides a model for the integration of ethnic content into a curriculum or classroom. Level 1--the

Contribution Approach--involves inserting information on cultural holidays, ethnic heroes and cultural elements (such as food, costumes, and artifacts) into the existing curriculum, while Level 2--the Additive Approach--involves bringing multicultural content into the curriculum through the use of themes, perspectives, and concepts. In Level 3--the Transformation Approach--those themes, perspectives and concepts are brought into the curriculum in such a way that students are able to examine them from the viewpoints of the different cultural groups; that is, the basic goals and structure of the class are changed so that issues are presented from a multiethnic view, leaving the "mainstream-centric" curriculum as only one of several ways of thinking. We believe that this process of Transformation is a worthwhile goal to pursue in our writing classrooms, just as Nieto says that many ways of thinking make students richer, and that anything less than a multicultural approach (monoculturalism) makes them myopic, tunnel-visioned, miseducated (1992, p. xvii). For example, when students are studying about the Battle of the Little Bighorn, it is not only Custer's side of the story that should be examined, but also Native American viewpoints.

Banks's Level 4, the Social Action Approach, incorporates all the components of the Transformation Approach, while also adding an element of what Freire (1989, p. 75) calls "praxis," or

"action" based on the "reflection" found in Banks's Transformation Approach. This call for social action is similar to the fifth of Sleeter and Grant's (1988) five "Approaches to Multicultural Education": "Education That Is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist." Although we would be happy to see our students reach this Level, for reasons we explicate below we do not expect them to reach it. (See Tables 1 and 2 below, respectively, for Banks's four Levels, and Sleeter and Grant's five Approaches. Please note that the asterisks indicate the point in each model which we expect to be able to realistically achieve with our student populations, within the constraints of our institutions.)

Table 1. Banks's (1989, p. 192) "Levels of Integration of Ethnic Content":

Level 4
THE SOCIAL ACTION APPROACH
Students make decisions on important social issues and take actions to solve them.

*Level 3
THE TRANSFORMATION APPROACH
The structure of the curriculum is changed to enable students to view concepts, issues, events, and themes from the perspectives of diverse ethnic and cultural groups.

Level 2
THE ADDITIVE APPROACH
Content, concepts, th ..es, and perspectives are added to the curriculum without changing its structure.

Level 1
THE CONTRIBUTIONS APPROACH
Focuses on heroes, holidays, and discrete cultural elements.

Table 2. Sleeter & Grant's (1988) five Approaches to Multicultural Education:

5. Education That Is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist
*4. Multicultural Education
3. Single-Group Studies
2. Human Relations
1. Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different.

So why do we expect to stop at Banks's Transformation Level or its equivalent in Sleeter & Grant, their Multicultural Education Approach? The answer can be partially found in the demographics of our classrooms: our first-year college composition classes are composed largely of European-American, middle- to upper-class, and probably 90 percent heterosexual students. Moreover, one of us teaches at a science and engineering college where men outnumber women two to one, although the other is at a large research university where the numbers of women and men average out to about even (with, however, more men than women in the professional and technical divisions).

Our students have often reacted to people and situations involving different social classes, races, and/or sexual preferences with negative stereotyping and/or an air of superiority. We have read their papers and their journals in which they often state, directly or indirectly, that "different" means "inferior." Thus, <u>any</u> level of awareness, tolerance, or

acceptance of an "other" is an immense goal. Banks (1989, p. 189) points out that students from dominant groups need to be challenged on "their false sense of superiority"--that they should be presented with the idea that it is not only their European-American ancestors who have contributed to our culture in the United States, not only their people who continue to contribute. Banks goes on to use the term "multiple acculturation" where we use "multicultural education," to explain that "the emphasis . . . should be on how the common U.S. culture and society emerged from a complex synthesis and interaction of the diverse cultural elements that originated within the various cultural, racial, ethnic, and religious groups that make up American society" (p. 189). Many students from dominant groups may find it strange to hear that theirs is not the only culture in the U.S., and that the main reason they haven't heard more about the other cultures is precisely because theirs is dominant.

It is unrealistic to expect, in a 14-week semester or, worse, a 10-week quarter, that students who are not accustomed to thinking about multicultural issues will reach Banks's Social Action Level or get to Sleeter & Grant's Social Reconstructionist Approach, in a course designed primarily to teach them the process of writing. As Elizabeth Ellsworth demonstrates in her (1989) article, if we do not take into consideration the demographics and institutional constraints of our courses, we

will find disappointment and disillusionment with the entire critical-pedagogy (or multicultural-education) enterprise. We must only expect small changes within these limited time frames, such as personal Transformation. Thus, we can only expect to shake 'em up, but . . . [not] expect 'em to shake up the world, due to our efforts alone. Having them shake up the world would take multiple, concentrated efforts throughout the entire educational system and the community at large, as both Banks (1989) and Shortall (1986) point out. Only one voice crying in the wilderness is not enough; without other sources of encouragement and support, our solitary multicultural voices get lost, or can only take our students a limited distance down the wilderness path. True, we need to build the collaborative networks necessary for social action, but while we are building such networks we can still be bringing our students to Transformation. If they move on to help build the networks, toward social action, that's great. But we should not expect ourselves to accomplish miracles in isolation, or we may end up throwing out the baby with the bathwater, as Ellsworth indicated she was doing (unfortunately) in her (1989) article.

Donald Lazere, in his (1992a) article, reminds us that Freire intended his work to be used among peasants whose classroom situations and political worldviews differ significantly from those of students found in college composition

courses in the U.S. However, again, Freire's (1989) emphasis on reflection can aid in bringing students to a new realization of the world around them and, in a sense, to the "personal," rather than the "civic," praxis mentioned by Banks (1991, p. 131). Our goal of Transformation can also be thought of as somewhere between "disequilibrium" and "awareness" in Wurzel's "Stages of Multicultural Process" (cited in Nieto, 1992, p. 276). This Transformation is as much as we believe we can hope for, and we celebrate it when it happens. When more happens, like students sending out their writing as letters to newspapers or to their representatives (Social Action), we allow ourselves to be ecstatic.

PART II - MULTICULTURAL CONTENT APPROACHES (Analysis of Oppression + Cultural Pluralism)

At this point we need a way to look at multicultural content, to do what Banks labels "Content Integration" (1991/1992, p. 3). We see two such approaches to content emerging from all of the classifications and models we have examined--Analysis of Oppression and Cultural Pluralism. Richard Dyer, in his article "White" (1988, pp. 44-45) has discussed two common reactions he has seen in "studies of dominance by the dominant": (1) guilt over problems caused by members of one's own group--leading to what Shelby Steele (1992, p. 84), an author

with whom we don't always agree, calls a "need for innocence" being given priority over the welfare of people we see as making us feel guilty; and (2) "Me too-ism"--thinking or saying that, in Dyer's words (1988, pp. 44-45), "it is also awful to be white" (or male, or middle-class, or Christian, or heterosexual, or a member of any dominant group). We have noticed that these reactions are often also elicited in our still mostly white, middle-class (and in one case mostly male) college classrooms when multicultural issues are raised. What is more, students can have other reactions, such as denying the existence of any problems between people from different cultures. As noted above, we have been looking for possible approaches to multicultural content in writing classes which would allow us and our students to avoid, minimalize or, even better, work through these reactions, and have looked so far at Analysis of Oppression and Cultural Pluralism. We are often still at odds with each other and inside ourselves over which is better. We will discuss both below.

As was noted above, one possible Multicultural Content Approach would be to define the discussion in terms of Analysis of Oppression--the approach taken in Paula Rothenberg's controversial textbook, Race, Class and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study (1992). We agree with Maxine Hairston (1992) that this book was not designed as a composition

rhetoric or reader. We also decry its lack of a critical framework or opposing viewpoints. However, the introductions to the various parts and the readings themselves do provide an excellent introduction to racism, classism, gender bias, and other forms of oppression in the United States, an introduction which is more immediately relevant to the composition classroom and more accessible to students with little prior exposure than other volumes--like Katz's (1978) White Awareness: Handbook for Anti-Racism Training, Figueroa's (1991) Education and the Social Construction of 'Race,' or Omi and Winant's (1986) Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s (a short selection from Omi and Winant can be found in Rothenberg's anthology).

This Analysis of Oppression as a way of looking at multicultural content is also analogous to Mallea's (1986) "Alternative Theoretical Framework" for analyzing multicultural education, McLeod's "problem-oriented approach" (1986, p. ix), Part C. of Ouellet's "General Framework of a Teachers' Training Program in Intercultural Education" (1986, p. 135), and "The Anti-Racist Phase" (1986, pp. 193-194) of Lynch's five phases "in the development of multicultural education [since] the end of the Second World War [in Britain]."

Now, although the presentation of multicultural content through Analysis of Oppression is almost certain to provoke

defensive reactions like those mentioned in Dyer and Steele (cited above), a skillful teacher can help students work through such reactions. One problem is that few teachers are skilled at or feel comfortable in working through emotional reactions, their own as well as students', in the classroom. One teacher who did, and found that her students' writing improved as a result of their "passionate" reactions to feminist challenges, was Janice M. Wolff (1991, p. 484). However, if the passionate conflicts that arise are not resolved, students can become even more entrenched in any oppressive attitudes they brought into the classroom at the beginning of the term.

This may be one reason that many teachers and school systems have opted to use the other approach to integrating multicultural content: Cultural Pluralism. Cultural Pluralism is where many different cultures are studied, in the hope that empathy for members of different cultural groups will grow in students, as well as appreciation of differences. In this approach, all cultures are seen as each having different but positive perspectives on and positive contributions to make to the world; thus, this approach may be used to minimize the negative reactions students often have when hearing about the oppression of people from other cultures.

The negative side of this latter approach is that students may confuse the ideal with the real and become "colorblind"; that

is, they sometimes think that, since all groups have wonderful cultures, they already ARE equal, rather than that they WISH TO BE treated equally, in our racist, classist, sexist, anti-Semitic, heterosexist society.

Other approaches which we see as analogous to this Cultural Pluralism Approach are Wright and LaBar's "Components of Multicultural Education Based on Moral Principles" (1984, pp. 112-129), McLeod's "principles or tenets inherent in multiculturalism" (1986, pp. viii-ix), McLeod's "ethnic specific approach" (one of his "three main approaches to multicultural education," 1986, p. ix), parts A. and B. of Ouellet's "General Frameworks of a Teachers' Training Program in Intercultural Education" (1986, p. 135), and the fourth ("The Multicultural Phase") of Lynch's "five clearly identifiable chronological and conceptual phases in the development of multicultural education [since] the end of the Second World War [in Britain]" (1986, pp. 193-194).

Sometimes the two approaches (Analysis of Oppression and Cultural Pluralism) are combined, in an attempt to minimize the problems which often occur when either approach is used separately--for example, see the entirety of Ouellet's (1986, p. 135) "General Framework" below, in Table 3:

Table 3. Ouellet's (1986, p. 135) "General Framework of a Teacher's Training Program in Intercultural Education":

A. Culture and cultural pluralism
   1. The reality of culture
   2. The diversity and particularity of cultures
   3. The relativity of cultures
   4. The dynamics of culture: cultural change, acculturation.

B. Communication and cultural barriers
   1. Theories of communication
   2. Culture and diversity of mode of perception
   3. Body language and nonverbal communication
   4. Languages and diversity of ways of thinking according to cultures.

C. Psychosocial identity and inter-ethnic relations
   1. Cultural differences and question of psychosocial identity
      -- negation of differences: assimilation
      -- affirmation of differences: segregation
   2. Ethnocentrism, racism, discrimination
   3. Intercultural understanding and minority situations: sociopolitical aspects
   4. School bureaucracy, cultures, subcultures, and social classes.

The drawback to this combined approach is that often the necessary synthesis is missing. Without some link between the real (Analysis of Oppression) and the ideal (Cultural Pluralism), students sometimes experience the drawbacks of both single approaches, rather than avoiding the problems of either. (See Sleeter & Grant's first three stages, and Banks's first two, in Tables 2 and 1, respectively, above--combined, such stages may make less sense than they do separately. However, Ouellet's Framework is truly comparable to Sleeter & Grant's nor to Banks', as it is not progressive, not set up for students to move through

levels--but then there is the question of whether people really do move in a linear fashion through levels, anyway.)

A fourth approach is to discuss problems which affect members of many groups, like poverty--"rather than BLACK poverty," as Shelby Steele (1992, p. 85) says--or analyzing the political stances or biases of media sources on all sides of an issue, as Donald Lazere proposes. This fourth approach, because it avoids focusing on certain groups as either having/causing problems or having/causing none, may minimize defensive reactions while avoiding unrealistic expectations. Social problems are looked at from many perspectives, but not primarily through the lens of blame or victimization of any one group.

However, students may see this approach as dishonest (the teacher has a "hidden agenda" to get them to look at issues without directly confronting them), or they may not get exposure to social differences at all through this approach (it is possible to study poverty or media bias without discussing race, class, gender, or any other social differences). Therefore, we believe that, to provide an effective multicultural educational experience in (mostly) monocultural classrooms, it is necessary to include multiple viewpoints on multicultural issues, to focus on Analysis of Oppression as well as Cultural Pluralism (the amounts of each in the mixture is an area of disagreement between us). Also, as you will see in the next section, it is important

for the students to acquire such means as Critical Thinking and Rhetoric/Grammar, so that they can learn to make informed decisions on their own viewpoints, and to write about those decisions.

PART III - METHODS (Rhetoric/Grammar + Critical Thinking)

Of course, as Hairston (1992) avers, any course which calls itself a composition course should be a course in Rhetoric and, as Lazere (1992a) suggests, should include basics such as Grammar. However, we suggest that the key element which, when combined with the Rhetoric/Grammar and with the Multicultural Content Approaches mentioned in Part II, brings Transformation is helping our students to become proficient in Critical Thinking. By Critical Thinking, we mean something analogous to the "critical reflective process" described as one of Aoki's "three curricular approaches used by so-called multicultural programs" in Connors (1984, pp. 105-106), or the concept of "Knowledge Construction" in Banks's "Dimensions of Multicultural Education" (1991/1992, p. 3, which follows in Table 4:

Table 4. "Banks' [sic] Dimensions of Multicultural Education" (Banks, 1991/1992, p. 3):

*Content Integration Content integration deals with the extent to which teachers use examples and content from a varety [sic] of cultures in their teaching.		*Knowledge Construction Teachers need to help students understand, investigate, and determine how the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of references [sic], perspectives, and biases within a discipline influence the ways that knowledge is constructed.
	MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION	
An Equity Pedagogy An equity pedagogy exists when teachers modify their teaching in ways that will facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural, gender, and social-class groups.		An Empowering School Culture Group and labeling practices, sports participation, disproportionality in achievement, and the interaction of the staff and the students across ethnic and racial lines must be examined to create a school culture that empowers students from diverse racial, ethnic, and gender groups.

Vincent Ryan Ruggiero provides one rationale for including Critical Thinking Skills as part of a college curriculum: our

students, as products of "modern culture," often bring with them into the classroom "passivity, short attention spans, impulsiveness, [the] expectation of being entertained . . . [as well as] tolerance of mediocrity . . . [and] gullibility," according to Bellman (1991, p. 2). We worry that our students will not be able to look outside themselves, size up a situation, and figure out what are appropriate measures to take. Ruggiero describes the value of Critical Thinking Skills (1991, p. 1): "By replacing mind<u>stuffing</u> with mind<u>building</u>, thinking instruction improves reading, writing and listening; promotes mental health; counters the negative effects of popular culture; and prepares students for personal relationships, citizenship, and careers." When teachers do not teach their students Critical Thinking Skills for analysis of course content material, the material may simply be read, discussed to a minimal degree, and never internalized (or challenged).

We do not believe that Critical Thinking Skills as part of a college composition curriculum are especially controversial at this point; we merely wish to reiterate that such skills are necessary, just as our Multicultural Content Approaches are necessary (although there is some disagreement between us about the relative necessity of the two), for mainstream students to begin questioning the preconceptions, prejudices, and stereotypes about marginalized groups that they bring into our classrooms.

Unless such students learn to look at how they have formed their cognitive schemata, including their opinions and biases, and how such opinions and biases are formed and propagated in the society at large, they will have a difficult time in altering those schemata to accommodate new, more accurate information about other groups. Two possible frameworks for using Critical Thinking Skills when dealing with controversial issues in the classroom have been provided by Donald Lazere and Susan Jarratt.

Lazere's (1992b) primary goal is to "broaden the ideological scope of students' critical thinking, reading, and writing capacities so as to empower them to make their own autonomous judgments on opposing ideological positions in general and on specific issues." He provides a model for combining critical thinking and political topics in a writing course using a distinctively rhetorical framework particularly appropriate for composition courses (p. 195). This "teaching the conflicts" approach, which Lazere says he appropriated from Gerald Graff (p. 195) is, additionally, designed to accommodate students and teachers of any political persuasion. Lazere also reminds us that the level of analysis of these topics is the one found in the everyday world, not only in academic studies--i.e., the events are discussed in terms of political speeches, newspaper, radio and television reports--the sort of public discourse in which every college student should engage. Jarratt (1992) argues

for a rhetorical framework which, while not specifically focused on either of our Multicultural Approaches or explicitly centered on Critical Thinking Skills, does provide a good basis for centering a composition course on the process of writing while dealing with challenging issues of social difference. Either of these frameworks could be altered slightly to fit the purpose outlined here; one could certainly use our two Multicultural Content Approaches with either framework.

CONCLUSION

The two Multicultural Content Approaches described above (Analysis of Oppression and Cultural Pluralism) provide an opportunity for teachers to ask the tough questions that must be asked and wrestled with in order for students to develop Critical Thinking Skills, just as the Critical Thinking Skills are necessary for students to deal with those tough questions. We, as teachers of multiculturalism, believe that this combination of teaching about both Cultural Diversity and Analysis of Oppression through the vehicle of Critical Thinking Skills is crucial in achieving Transformation within college students although, as stated above, we do often differ on how much of each should make up the equation. When students learn to think actively, by engaging in topics of multicultural interest, they will not only become better students, but also better human and social beings,

and will view "others" and issues of difference with more insight and maturity, in turn hopefully treating other human beings in a more humane way.

Because of the increasing interest in multiculturalism on college campuses, many reading and writing textbooks are available which provide content material consistent with the Cultural Pluralism Approach, the best of which encourage students to use Critical Thinking Skills in their analysis of readings. One example is Rereading America: Cultural Contexts for Critical Thinking and Writing (Colombo, Cullen, & Lisle, 1992) although it, like most texts of its kind it provides little Analysis of Oppression. We believe that a composition textbook including all the elements of our equation has yet to be written. Maybe it should be written--it might just "shake up the world"!

AUTHORS' EPILOGUE: THE PRESENTATION ITSELF WAS NOT A READING OF THIS PAPER, BUT MORE A SUMMARY OF THE PAPER AND A DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES IT RAISED.

References

Banks, J. A. (1991). In C. Sleeter (Ed.), Empowerment through multicultural education (pp. 125-141). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Banks, J. A. (1991/1992, Fall/Winter). The need for a broad definition of multicultural education: The definition of multicultural education. Activist M.U.S.E., 1(1), 2-3.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds., 1989). Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bellman, S. (1991, November). Critical thinking skills workshop to be held. Campus Connections [South Dakota School of Mines & Technology], 1(7), 2.

Brodkey, L., & Fowler, S. (1992). What happened to English 306. In P. Aufderheide (Ed.), Beyond PC: Toward a politics of understanding (pp. 113-117). St. Paul: Graywolf Press.

Colombo, G. Cullen, R., & Lisle, B. (1992). Resources for teaching "Rereading America: Cultural contexts for critical thinking and writing." Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.

Colombo, G., Cullen, R., & Lisle, B. (Eds., 1992). Rereading America: Cultural contexts for critical thinking and writing (2nd ed.). Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.

Connors, B. (1984). A multicultural curriculum as action for social justice. In S. Shapson & v. D'Oyley (Eds.), Bilingual and multicultural education: Canadian perspectives (Multilingual Matters, vol. 15, pp. 104-111). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multicultural Matters.

Dyer, R. (1988, Autumn). White. Screen, 29(4), 44-64.

Ellsworth, E. (1989, August). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 59(3), 299-324.

Figuerca, P. (1991). Education and the social construction of 'race.' London: Routledge.

Freire, P. (1989). Pedagogy of the oppressed. NY: Continuum.

Hairston, M. (1992, May). Diversity, ideology, and teaching writing. College Composition and Communication, 43(2), 179-193.

Jarratt, S. C. (1992, April 25-27). Responding to critics of writing about difference. Presented at University of Chicago Institute on Issues in Teaching and Learning.

Katz, J. H. (1978). White awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Kelly, D. (1990, October 31). Instructors' agendas cause decomposition of composition. Minnesota Daily, p. 6.

Lazere, D. (1992a, January). Back to basics: A force for oppression or liberation? College English, 54(1), 7-21.

Lazere, D. (1992b, May). Teaching the political conflicts: A rhetorical schema. College Composition and Communication, 43(2), 194-213.

Lynch, J. (1987). Multicultural education in Britain: Retrospect and prospect. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), Multicultural education: A partnership (pp. 193-205). Toronto: Canadian Council for Multicultural & Intercultural Education (CCMIE).

Mallea, J. R. (1987). Multicultural education: An alterative theoretical framework. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), Multicultural education: A partnership (pp. 3-11). Toronto: Canadian Council for Multicultural & Intercultural Education (CCMIE).

McLeod, K. (1987). Introduction. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), Multicultural education: A partnership (pp. vii-xi). Toronto: Canadian Council for Multicultural and Intercultural Education (CCMIE).

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. New York: Longman.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1986). Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1980s. New York: Routledge.

Ouellet, F. (1987). Intercultural education: Teachers in-service training. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), Multicultural education: A partnership (pp. 129-142). Toronto: Canadian Council for Multicultural & Intercultural Education (CCMIE).

Rothenberg, P. S. (1992). Race, class, and gender in the United States: An integrated study (2nd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ruggiero, V. R. (1991, October). Teaching thinking. Presented at Critical Thinking Workshop, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology.

Shortall, B. (1987). Canadian teachers and multicultural/ intercultural education. In K. A. McLeod (Ed.), Multicultural education: A partnership (pp. 155-159). Toronto: Canadian Council for Multicultural & Intercultural Education (CCMIE).

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1988). Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Steele, S. (1992, May/June). Why white guilt doesn't help. Utne Reader (51), pp. 84-85.

Wolff, J. M. (1991, December). Writing passionately: Student resistance to feminist readings. College Composition and Communication, 42(4), 484-492.

Wright, I., & LaBar, C. (1984). Multiculturalism and morality. In S. Shapson & V. D'Oyley (Eds.), Bilingual and multicultural education: Canadian perspectives (Multilingual Matters, vol. 15, pp. 112-129). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multicultural Matters.