Teaching Strategies Adopted By Teachers in Multicultural Classrooms in Ex-Model C Secondary Schools in South Africa

Logamurthie Athiemoolam & Annaline Vermaak

Introduction

The pre-1994 era in South Africa was characterized by separate education for the various racial and ethnic groups. This meant that learners from the diverse ethnic groups attended schools in their own designated group areas and were cut off from other ethnic and racial groups within South Africa as a whole. The first attempts at desegregating South African schools were effected in 1991 when the then minister of education, Adri Claase, proposed different models of schooling that created opportunities for some White schools to accept learners from other ethnic groups by adopting Model C status.

This model was embraced by a number of White schools due to dwindling numbers of White learners, which resulted in learners from other ethnic groups being admitted to these schools. In the early 1990s, the Model C schools implemented strict admission requirements, which meant that they could be selective in terms of the numbers and the learners they admitted.

The learners attending these schools were assimilated into the traditional culture of the school; they had to adapt to the language of learning and teaching (LOLT); and teachers continued to utilize the same strategies they had adopted in the past, even though the demographics of their schools had changed.

Logamurthie Athiemoolam is an associate professor and Annaline Vermaak is a lecturer, both in the Faculty of Education at Nelson Mandela University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

The post-1994 period, however, after the demise of apartheid, signified a new era for South African education, which led to the desegregation of all schools and the concomitant transformation of the former White ex–Model C schools from monocultural to multicultural centers of learning, in which, as pointed out by Jordaan in Le Roux (1997), discrimination on the basis of racial or cultural differences was no longer justifiable or admissible. According to Lemmer, Meier, and Van Wyk (2012), after 1994, a nonracial education system was instituted, and schools were compelled to serve the needs of all learners in the country.

South African schools, however, continue to operate in a constantly changing policy environment, and many educators, especially those teaching in ex–Model C schools, who are predominantly White, are faced daily with the challenge of having to teach and manage learners from cultures that may be vastly different from their own (Lemmer et al., 2012). Although the admission policy changed, which saw large numbers of African, Colored, and Indian learners being admitted to ex–Model C schools, the teachers at these schools received virtually no training to cope in diverse settings; neither did the teacher demographics change significantly.

At the time, Le Roux (1997) was vocal in his assertion that "almost every teacher in this country has been trained in a mono-cultural context and is therefore not adequately prepared for implementing multicultural education in their classes." This was borne out by the conflicts between teachers from the former ex–Model C schools and learners from other ethnic backgrounds and the numerous incidences of racism and racial attacks involving ethnic learners admitted to the schools from outside and in conflict with the indigenous learners.

One of the worse cases of racism in an ex–Model C secondary school occurred at Vryburg High School, which saw the school divided along racial lines and violent racial attacks between White and African learners. Since 2008, however, the incidences of racism and racial attacks in ex–Model C schools appear to be on the decline, but they do resurface at various intervals.

Although it seems as if the various groups are becoming more accommodating and tolerant of each other, there is a need to establish what strategies teachers in ex–Model C secondary schools adopt to address diversity in their classes and to enhance teaching and learning 24 years after schools were officially desegregated. Lemmer et al. (2012) contended that most research in South African schools indicates that responses to the increasing diversity in schools cannot pass as multicultural education. Thus the implementation of multicultural education is viewed as problematic in many respects, because schools are hesitant to adapt their original classroom cultures to cater to the changed demographics.

According to Le Roux (1997), multicultural education is about changing the nature of teaching and learning to create a suitable learning environment for learners from diverse cultural backgrounds. A major goal of multicultural education, as highlighted by Banks and Banks (2010), is that it incorporate the idea that all students—regardless of their gender; social class; and ethnic, racial, or cultural characteristics—should have an equal opportunity to

learn in school. Multicultural education, however, is a particular educational phenomenon that gives rise to many different perceptions and meanings among teachers and researchers. As a result, many teachers in South Africa have come to view multicultural education as ill defined and lacking in substance and have therefore been hesitant to adopt it as a sound educational approach, thus failing to see its value (Lemmer & Squelch, 1993).

White teachers who teach in schools where the demographics have changed from exclusively monoethnic (catering only to White learners) to multiethnic may either decide to adopt multicultural educational principles in their teaching to cater to a diverse learner population or adopt the assimilationist, color-blind, or business-as-usual approaches of the past. Adopting the latter entails that they will continue to teach as they always have, without taking into consideration the changed demographics in their classrooms and schools.

In their study commissioned by the South African Human Rights Commission, Vally and Dalamba (1999) concluded that most former ex–Model C (White) schools adopt an assimilationist approach to integration and that much still needs to be done to ensure that multicultural education in South African schools really comes to fruition.

According to research conducted by Zeichner (2003), teachers tend to view diversity of student backgrounds as a problem rather than as a resource that enriches teaching and learning. Moreover, many of these teachers have negative attitudes toward racial, ethnic, and language groups other than their own. Such attitudes manifest in low expectations for their students, which are then expressed in watered-down and fragmented curricula for children of poverty and diverse cultures.

Vandeyar's (2006) research in ex–Model C schools in South Africa also questioned the culture that these schools reflect, asking whether learners from other ethnic groups receive equal access to knowledge, and whether their voices are being heard or suppressed.

South Africa recently celebrated 24 years of desegregated schooling, with the majority of former White schools in the country now representative of the demographics of the country as a whole. It is with this background in mind that this study examines how teachers who taught pre-1994, when schools were monoethnic, and post-1994, when schools were multiethnic, have adapted their teaching strategies and approaches to cater to diversity within their classrooms.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical approach used in this study was based on Castagno's framework of typologies to examine whether the teachers included were still restricted to adopting assimilation and amalgamation approaches in their teaching or whether they had moved to embrace critical awareness and social action. Castagno's (2009) framework of typologies focuses on the goals of education, so that teachers would have the advantage of adapting their strategies to suit the context and the approaches they used in order to be evaluated for consistency and the impact they made on students. The argument for a multifaceted approach to teaching and learning would enable teachers to vary their teaching strategies according to their students' identities and position.

Castagno's framework of typologies for multicultural education can be divided into six categories or approaches. These approaches are as follows: (a) educating for assimilation, (b) educating for amalgamation, (c) educating for pluralism, (d) educating for cross-cultural competence, (e) educating for critical awareness, and (f) educating for social action.

Castagno (2009) conceptualized all her approaches as "approaches to education," but the last category—*educating for social action*—she perceived to be a truly multicultural one. In her view, educating for social action is the only approach that fulfills her understanding of multicultural education.

Multicultural education, according to her understanding, focuses on equality in education, culture, and power by expecting a high level of achievement from all learners. This includes an infusion of multiculturalism into the curriculum to ensure that students develop a wide worldview that fosters a critical understanding among students about issues of power, privilege, and oppression, "so that they may formulate their own ideas about how they might work toward social justice" (Castagno, 2009, p. 48).

In contrast, *educating for amalgamation* maintains "neutrality towards diversity" by stressing "commonalities across groups in an effort to reduce prejudice" (Castagno, 2009, p. 48). The fostering of intercultural competencies for developing understanding across cultures is motivated by this approach, which aims at the improvement of intercultural relations. The third approach, *educating for pluralism*, has an emphasis, according to Castagno (2009), on differences rather than commonalities. The focus of this approach is on maintaining group identities and affiliation and inculcating an attitude of respect for the "other."

The fourth approach is *educating for cross-cultural competence.* This approach builds on the second approach, educating for amalgamation, in that it calls for students' acquisition of the skills and knowledge (intercultural competencies) that enable them to function across cultures (Lemmer et al., 2012).

Educating for critical awareness is the fifth approach. In this approach to teaching and learning, there is an emphasis on learners developing a critical awareness and "understanding of power, privilege and oppression within and between groups" (Castagno, 2009, p. 46). Such methodologies as the transformative approach (Banks & Banks, 2007), multicultural social justice education (Sleeter & Grant, 2007), and culturally responsive teaching approach (Gay, 2000) all fit into this fifth category because they promote social justice and transformation (Castagno, 2009).

The last category Castagno suggested is *educating for social action.* According to Lemmer et al. (2012), this approach is based on the premise that students need to "act to affect social change." The distinctive characteristic between this approach and the previous one is that the creation of a critical awareness, albeit a necessary step, is not adequate to ensure real change in society. Castagno (2009) claimed that the comprehensive definition offered by Nieto (2004) and the theory of culturally relevant pedagogy developed by Ladson-Billings (1995) resonate with this last approach because they suggest social action must be added to critical awareness to effect real social change.

Castagno's framework served for us to provide insights into how teachers viewed multicultural classes based on how they engage with learners within classroom context. On the basis of the way teachers relate to their learners and the kinds of approaches and strategies they employ in multicultural classes, either color-blind or color conscious, we were able to gauge whether the teachers have interrogated their own practices and approaches adequately to incorporate critical pedagogy into their classroom practices.

Literature Review

Approaches Adopted by Teachers When Schools Become Desegregated

When the schools transformed from monoethnic to multiethnic environments, teachers could either adopt the same strategies and approaches they used in the past, when the school was monoethnic, or adopt strategies that cater to diversity. Educational approaches that militate against diversity education have all, in some way or another, been a response to the challenges that diverse student populations place on the education *per se*, the educational institutions and the teaching and learning context.

The assimilationist approach, although conscious of diversity, ignored the implications thereof and it was expected for "minority group learners" to "change and adapt" to the mainstream culture of the dominant group (Jansen, 1999; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). Other approaches that followed the same perspective of failing to recognize diversity are the business-as-usual, color-blind and contributionist approaches. As stated, these approaches were some of the earliest reactions to complex challenges of diverse classrooms.

The approaches are briefly discussed for the role that they play in militating against diversity education, especially in the South African context, where integration continues to be more intricate and complex than what is visible on the surface (Lemmer et al., 2012).

South African teachers are faced daily with numerous challenges in the school and teaching environment. These challenges are due to the constantly changing policies and teaching environment but also to managing and teaching learners from diverse backgrounds, language groups, and cultures.

However, if teachers are unable to establish how their content is related to cultural issues, they will easily dismiss multicultural education with the argument that it is not relevant to their disciplines, which will lead them to adopt an assimilationist approach where they expect learners from other ethnic groups to adapt to the culture of the school and classroom (Banks & Banks, 2010).

According to Howe and Lise (2014), assimilation could be defined as the process whereby "members of a cultural group adapt to and become part of another cultural group." In this sense, then, as Healy (2011) posited, "formerly distinct and separate groups come to share a common culture and merge together socially" (p. 43). Within the context of the classroom, the ethnic learners are expected to relinquish their own cultures, languages, and traditions and accept the dominant culture of the school and the classroom.

In the South African context, with specific reference to ex–Model C schools, which were reserved for former White learners, this entails that if ethnic learners hope to adapt to the school, they will have to adapt to either the English or Afrikaans culture. Eventually, as Healy (2011) pointed out, as a society undergoes assimilation, differences among groups decrease because the ethnic groups are assimilated into the dominant culture of the society or school.

The aim of assimilation, as Lemmer et al. (2012) highlighted, is to minimize cultural difference and to encourage social conformity and continuity so that ethnic groups become assimilated into the mainstream of the dominant group culture and adopt the language, cultural modes, and values of this group. Within the context of South African schooling, and with specific reference to ex–Model C schools in the Nelson Mandela Metropole (Port Elizabeth, South Africa), this entails that ethnic learners, namely, African, Colored, and Indian learners, are expected to adapt to the LOLT and accept the cultural practices and approaches of the school.

To do this, the teachers and the school will expect learners to relinquish their own languages, cultures, religions, and traditions in favor of the dominant culture that existed in the school pre-1994, when the school was monoethnic and only catered to White learners espousing specific cultural beliefs and practices. This process of cultural assimilation, also known as *acculturation* (Healy, 2011), entails that the dominant culture within the school holds the power of tolerance or rejection, ultimately demonstrating acceptance of the assimilated minority.

Compatible with the assimilationist approach to desegregation is the *business-as-usual* approach. Sagar and Schofield (1984), in their research on desegregated schools, contended that schools adopting the business-as-usual approach maintain the same basic curriculum, the same academic standards, and the same teaching methods that prevailed under segregation. These schools uphold their former traditional way of thinking and methods of teaching and do not consider the new diverse population.

It is expected of the learners to adjust to the school and its traditional methods and way of thinking. According to Bennet (1995), this type of response does not consider whether old rules or procedures are desirable when the nature of the learner population has changed. Business-as-usual schools proceed as they have in the past and, perhaps unconsciously, expect all new learners to fit in.

The business-as-usual approach to education operates on the principle that nothing has changed in the educational landscape, even in the advent of classrooms globally becoming more heterogeneous and diverse in nature. The trilogy of policy makers, educational institutions, and the educators who occupy them continues to operate in a monocultural, static manner oblivious to dynamic changes that inherently accompany the complexities of teaching and learning.

According to Hurd and Weilbacher (2014), the players in the educational arena "maintain the status quo" and remain "in the ideological mainstream." For teaching and learning, this approach ignores change and, with that, diversity in all its forms. Hence this approach, although still widely applied in education in subtle ways, is nonprogressive and holds no promise of a better future for education.

Another approach that teachers tend to use when schools become desegregated is the color-blind approach, which Jansen (1999, 2004) defined as an approach where teachers maintain that they do not see race or color in dealing with diverse learners, thereby maintaining the status quo at the school. The adoption of this approach enables teachers to suppress their own prejudices and stereotypes against ethnic-minority learners different from their own ethnicity by professing not to see color.

According to Ullucci and Battey (2011), color-blindness can take on many forms and purposes, depending on the circumstances and goals of the actor. The premise is essentially that, as Rist (cited in Banks & Banks, 2010) highlighted, the ethnic group membership is irrelevant to the way individuals are treated.

Consequently, as Lemmer et al. (2012) pointed out, teachers espousing this viewpoint often try to suppress their prejudices against learners from racial groups other than their own by "professing not to see color." In an effort to create a unified citizenry, the color-blind perspective "seeks to ignore or de-empha-

size subgroup identities and differences" (Banks & Banks, 2010, p. 260). The general argument advanced is that by ignoring color, racism is minimized.

However, as Ullucci and Battey (2011) pointed out, the adoption of color-blindness contributes to a collective ignorance that relieves individuals from fighting against the impact of racism. In this way, "inequalities that exist in the classroom are masked" (Kandaswamy, 2007, p. 7). In a sense, then, teachers who adopt this approach are provided with ultimate protection by claiming to treat everyone the same and, in the process, as Ullucci and Battey (2011) contended, "shut down any need to discuss inequality" (p. 1197).

Consequently, the adoption of the approach stands in the way of achieving fairness because it justifies moving away from race-based or ethnically based policies designed to promote fairness. The adoption of this approach, then, as Banks and Banks (2010) argued, leads to a misrepresentation of reality in ways that allow and even encourage discrimination against minority group members. According to Kandaswamy (2007), a color-blind approach "protects racism by making it invisible" (p. 7). An extension of her argument points to the way that color-blindness and its inherent ignorance of race perpetuates the privilege of the dominant group, indicating that this is an empty and destructive approach to diversity.

Color-blindness, according to Rosenberg (2004), allows people to deny that "race, especially skin color has consequences for a person's status and well-being" (p. 257). Yet certain societies, as Ullucci and Battey (2011) opined, associate significant benefits with racial and cultural identity.

In this sense, it is incumbent on teachers to implement strategies in their classes that aim at eradicating racism, not eliminating race, which, according to Ullucci and Battey, could be achieved through a focus on color consciousness within classroom contexts. Therefore, if a teacher wants to effectively teach the curriculum in a diverse classroom, he or she should be aware of the learners' backgrounds and cultural identities to ensure that teaching is effective and relevant to the needs of all the learners in the classroom.

In schools, we find many teachers using different approaches toward multicultural education in classrooms. Sleeter (2013) viewed schools as essential to building a just multicultural, democratic society. If teachers are to play a meaningful role in addressing the problem of cultural diversity in today's classrooms, then they have to be empowered with the necessary skills. This implies that a multicultural teacher should learn more about his or her learners, and more about their world in general, to step out of the teacher's own world and learn to understand some of the experiences, values, and realities of others.

In this regard, Lemmer et al. (2012) opined that multicultural education should entail a multidimensional educational approach that accords equal recognition to all cultural groups and provides all learners with a meaningful and relevant educational experience. According to Sleeter (2013), what makes more sense is for teachers to bring to the classroom an awareness of diverse cultural possibilities that might relate to their students, but then to get to know the students themselves. Her contention is that because excellent teachers take their time to get to know their students, "they shape their pedagogy around relationships with them" (p. 56).

The most commonly known "add-on" approach to catering to diverse classrooms is the *contributionist* approach (Lemmer et al., 2012). This approach follows the principle of creating recognition for diversity in ways that require students to contribute something representative of their culture by means of cultural displays, exhibitions, drama, art, or music. Displaying cultural difference in this way fails to confront diversity on a deeper and more meaningful manner. It is a superficial approach and does not lead to change or a paradigm shift in terms of understanding the other.

This approach found large appeal among South African schools, with many institutions claiming to embrace multicultural education, but fell significantly short of engaging with the deeper issues of diversity, such as race, racism, inequality, and language. This "brushing over" of multicultural education has been referred to as the *heroes and holidays* approach, as it was only implemented when there was good reason to do so.

Chisholm (2004) highlighted the inability of these add-on approaches to effectively address the complex intersections of race with issues such as gender, ethnicity, and class. The contributionist approach does not achieve much more than a recognition that other cultures exist outside of the mainstream culture. That makes it a poor attempt at engaging with diversity for the sake of enhancing student understanding. Chisholm pointed out further that this approach cannot foster the development of students' critical awareness and critical understanding.

Although the contributionist approach makes the learners aware of different cultures, it does not change the mainstream curricula. South African schools that use this approach will have a "cultural day" at school, where learners will sing different songs from different cultures, dress up in clothing of the different cultures, and eat food linked to the different cultures.

According to Banks and Banks (2010), the contributionist approach is widely used, particularly by teachers with a limited knowledge of multiethnic/multicultural content. Some of the disadvantages of this approach, as Banks and Banks pointed out, include the tendency to avoid or minimize addressing issues like racism, poverty, power, and discrimination.

Nkomo, McKinney, and Chisholm (2004) argued that discussions on school integration should not be confined to race but should also seek to address other prejudices, such as ethic narrow-mindedness, prejudice, gender inequality, xenophobia, and other intolerances that are contrary to the South African constitution.

Research Methodology and Design

This research was based on the qualitative approach, which tends to view the world in terms of people, situations, events, and the processes that connect these; explanation is based on an analysis of how some situations and events influence others. According to Merriam (2009), qualitative research is interested in uncovering the meaning of a phenomenon for those involved by understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences.

The qualitative method was chosen because the goal of this study was to discover and uncover patterns of meanings that could help explain a certain phenomenon, in this case, teaching strategies adopted by teachers in multicultural classrooms. Because the design was not fixed, patterns and themes emerged from the data as the research unfolded (Thomas, 2009).

According to Conrad and Serlin (2011), identifying a study's research

design is important "because it communicates information about key features of the study." For the purposes of this study, a phenomenological research design was adopted.

According to Lichtman (2013), phenomenology is "a type of qualitative research with philosophical roots that emphasize the study of lived experiences and a systematic investigation of phenomena" (pp. 324–325). Lichtman thus pointed out that the purpose of phenomenology is to describe and understand the essence of "lived experiences of individuals who have experienced a particular phenomenon" (p. 83).

For the purposes of this study, the lived experiences of teachers teaching in multiethnic learning environments were investigated. The rich, thick data elicited through in-depth interviews with 16 teachers that constituted the data set for the purposes of this study were interpreted and analyzed thematically.

Population and Sample

Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) defined a *target population* as "all the members of a real or hypothetical set of people, events, or objects to which researchers wish to generalize the results of their research" (p. 220). The population for the purposes of this study included White teachers from ex–Model C English-medium secondary schools in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, who taught pre-1994, when schools were predominantly monoethnic, and post-1994, when schools were multiethnic.

White teachers were selected because the ex–Model C schools only employed White teachers pre-1994.The sampling technique adopted for the purposes of the study was purposive, as our focus was on teachers who currently teach at ex–Model C English-medium secondary schools and who were able to provide us with the data required for this qualitative study.

From the ex–Model C English-medium secondary schools in the Nelson Mandela Metropole, we selected four schools purposefully. Four White teachers from each of the four ex–Model C English-medium secondary schools were selected in order to provide the data needed to gain an understanding of the experiences of teachers in multicultural schools both pre-1994, when schools were predominantly White, and post-1994, when schools were multiethnic. The participants thus included 16 teachers from the FET phase (Grades 10–12) across all learning areas. The participants were classified as Grade 10–12 White teachers whose specific areas of teaching were identified.

Interviews were conducted with the 16 participants from the four schools. The participants represented both White male and female teachers from ex–Model C English-medium secondary schools between the ages of 40+ years and 60+ years who received their teacher training pre-1994 but who taught both in monoethnic White schools before 1994 and in desegregated multiethnic secondary schools post-1994. The demographic details of the participants appears in Table 1.

Data Collection Strategies

According to Struwig and Stead (2013), qualitative studies focus primarily on the depth and richness of the data, and therefore the qualitative researcher generally selects samples purposefully. For the purposes of this study, data were collected by means of semistructured interviews.

Face-to-face audio-recorded interviews were conducted with the teachers to establish how and whether their teaching strategies and approaches changed when schools became multiethnic. Prior arrangements were made with each of the participants to discuss interview modalities, to obtain permission to record the interviews, and to sort out ethical issues.

Data Analysis

The data collected during the course of this study were analyzed qualitatively according to themes, with the analysis progressing through the classification of ideas, themes, topics, activities, types of people, and other categories relevant to the study (Lapan, Quartaroli, & Riemer, 2012). The rich data obtained through the in-depth interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and analyzed using inductive analysis. The codes used to identify individual teachers' responses are provided in Table 1.

Findings

The findings reveal that although all the participants indicated that they were in favor of multiethnic schools, two groups of teachers espoused varying viewpoints in terms of how the diverse groups should be accommodated within ex–Model C (former White) schools.

Whereas one group felt that there was no need to adapt their teaching strategies to cater to diversity as "children are children," the other group, who were in the minority, adapted their teaching in minor ways to cater to diversity. We discuss the findings that emerged from this study with reference to these two groups.

Teachers Who Did Not Change Their Teaching Strategies

Generally, this group of teachers, who were in the majority, expressed the view that they did not see the need to change their teaching strategies after the school became desegregated as children are children and they learn in the same ways. These teachers tended to adopt the color-blind, assimilation,

Table 1
Demographics

Participant	*School*	*Gender*	*Race*	*Age (estimated; years)*
1	A	female	White	50+
2	A	female	White	50+
3	A	male	White	50+
4	A	male	White	50+
5	B	female	White	60+
6	B	male	White	60+
7	B	female	White	50+
8	B	male	White	60+
9	C	female	White	50+
10	C	male	White	50+
11	C	female	White	60+
12	C	female	White	60+
13	D	male	White	50+
14	D	female	White	40+
15	D	female	White	60+
16	D	male	White	50+

business-as-usual and contributionist approaches.

Educating for assimilation. The majority of the White teachers who taught pre- and post-1994, when schools were desegregated, were of the view that assimilation was the best approach to adopt to cater to diverse schools and classes, as trying to cater to all the groups could be problematic. This view was succinctly summed up by Teacher 2A, who felt that all the learners should be treated as one group, since "it will cause chaos if you catered for every cultural belief." Teacher 16D expatiated on this viewpoint as follows:

> I don't think we can teach all the beliefs or cultures, we can't. We must surely cater for them but for us to enforce or cater for every one—what I am saying is, we can't teach nine different cultures or five different cultures.

Inherent in this viewpoint is the focus on a single worldview that is largely Anglo and based on Christian principles that represented the culture of the school before it became desegregated. This viewpoint of assimilating learners into the original culture of the school is further enhanced by one of the teachers, who was quite vocal in projecting her own religious viewpoints on the learners by articulating her views as follows:

> My strategies are just I have tried to accept everybody—I see people. I try and see people the way Jesus sees people.

It is clear from an analysis of the above quotations that teachers perceive assimilation as the most appropriate strategy, since they regard diversity pedagogy as problematic and, as one of the participants indicated, "chaotic."

Teachers adopting color-blind racism. Another viewpoint articulated by the teachers that featured prominently was color-blind racism, in which White teachers tried to justify their monoethnic teaching strategies by claiming that since "a child is a child" (Teacher 5B), "kids are kids" (Teacher 7B), and "children are children" (Teacher 11C), there was no need to change or adapt pedagogies to cater to diversity, "since they all are the same irrespective of their backgrounds, gender, cultures and histories" (Teacher 12C). Teacher 6B said that when he walked into the school, he did not actually see color, and he could not remember seeing color since:

> The kids came in and you taught them, White, Black, Coloured, it did not matter you taught them using the same strategies.

Teacher 16D further expatiated on this view as follows:

> Whether you are Black or White it does not really matter and that is my way—the teaching was not really a thing that changed.

Teacher 2A was vocal in his obliviousness to racism in his classes because, as he put it:

> I don't see race and I'm grateful that I don't, so I try and get to know them better.

Teacher 4A also stated this viewpoint as follows:

> No I have never seen race, I have never seen color.

Teacher 9C remarked that although they may be from different colors and cultures, they are not seen as different but as the same:

> I don't ever see the difference when you see the learners. If you close your eyes you don't see the color. There is no differences these days anymore.

Responses such as these illustrate that teachers tend to be oblivious to diversity within their teaching and learning contexts, and since they espouse color-blindness, they are unable to acknowledge the cultural, religious, and linguistic backgrounds of their learners.

Business-as-usual approach. The group of teachers who did not adapt their teaching to cater to diversity by implementing different strategies expressed the view that their focus was on completing the prescribed schemes of work based on the syllabus. It was clear that this group tended to use teaching strategies and approaches adopted before the schools became desegregated. Teacher 5B, for example, stated that she used the same approach to teaching as in the past, because the focus was on ensuring that the work as prescribed in the syllabus was completed. She articulated this viewpoint as follows:

> I don't think they are any different to teaching prior to 1994, my methodology and my attitude, to how I present my subject . . . umm remain the same. I teach in a multi-, umm in an audio-visual manner, using modern technology umm which I did back in the day as well so I really don't think that it has changed at all.

This viewpoint was corroborated by Teacher 6B, who also mentioned that he used the same strategies in multicultural classrooms that he used prior to 1994 in monocultural classrooms. He expressed this viewpoint as follows:

> The kids came in and you taught them; White, Black, Colored—it didn't matter, you taught them using the same strategies.

Teacher 8B's viewpoint captured the essence of the business-as-usual approach very succinctly as follows:

> Personally the people slipped in almost unnoticed and there was really no difference. Teaching just remained pretty much the same.

Teachers' perspectives of teaching in multicultural classes did not change because, as far as this group was concerned, the business-as-usual approach was the most appropriate strategy to adopt under the circumstances. They still taught in the same way; did not change their teaching strategies; and turned a blind eye to the needs of learners from other cultural, religious, and linguistic groups.

For some teachers, because the changes in the demographics of the school from monocultural to multicultural happened gradually and there were no noticeable differences initially, they were not under pressure to adapt quickly, thereby enabling them to pursue the strategies that they always used in the past.

According to some of them, what also helped was that the learners from the school did not see the children as different but just as new learners in their environment. Teachers also expressed their views that their expectations of their learners, irrespective of race, were the same as in the past; the learners were required to perform to the best of their abilities and to work diligently.

From the above viewpoints expressed by White teachers, it is clear that some teachers who taught pre- and post-1994 did not see the need to change any teaching strategies and used the same approaches and strategies that they used in the past when the school was monoethnic. An analysis of this group of teachers' viewpoints indicates that they predominantly adopted the color-blind, assimilation, and business-as-usual approaches.

Teachers Who Adapted Teaching Strategies Catering to Diversity

Whereas the previous group of teachers felt that it was unnecessary to adapt their teaching strategies to cater to diversity in their classes, a second group of teachers, in the minority, effected minor adaptations to their teaching approaches. Some teachers adapted their teaching by using examples from the lifeworlds of ethnic learners to explain certain concepts.

Using examples from the learners' lifeworlds. It was interesting to note that some teachers used examples from the learners' lifeworlds to facilitate an understanding of concepts. Closely aligned to the lifeworlds of the learners are the townships where most of the Black learners grew up. Not many White South African teachers take the time and trouble to visit these areas and gain knowledge about the learners' backgrounds. In these township areas, there is a lot of poverty, social injustice, and crime, among other socioeconomic challenges.

When learners find that teachers are interested in their lifeworlds, it leads to mutual respect and interest, which Teacher 13D articulated as follows:

> I relate that I had tours of the Red Location and Silver Town in the 1980s when White faces were not seen in that area and when I make comments like that, I can see the glow of interest especially among the Xhosa speaking children.

The same respondent (Teacher 13D) presented the following viewpoint on including the lifeworlds of learners in the diverse classroom:

> Being able to use examples that they are aware of and other cultural groups are not aware of, I think helps in the bonding process between the learner and the specific teacher.

Teacher 8B's comment further emphasized the importance of getting to know more about ethnic learners:

> The more you know the better you can understand, although sometimes you don't want to understand.

The fact that he was prepared to learn about other cultures and get to know them better indicates the awareness on the part of some of the teachers that multiple perspectives of reality are important if learning is to be meaningful.

Some teachers afford learners opportunities to share their cultural experiences, which leads to enhanced understanding and appreciation of diversity. Teacher 14D, for example, articulated this viewpoint as follows:

> From a positive point of view umm I think teaching with children of various groups—I'm able to get various cultures to comment from their perspective and umm broaden the knowledge of other cultural groups within the class.

The above viewpoint was further expressed by Teacher 9C, who contended that she uses learners from other cultural groups to explain to the White group what their cultural background values are and why some of the practices within the cultural group are different from the practices of the so-called White group.

This was further elaborated by Teacher 9B, who questions learners about their culture and uses their answers to enlighten other learners in his class about cultures with which they are unfamiliar. By students sharing their experiences in the classroom, intercultural understanding develops, as highlighted by Teacher 2A, because students gain firsthand knowledge from other learners about their cultures, which enriches the class as a whole.

The described teaching strategy illustrates teachers' desire to ensure that learners' worldviews are included in lessons, which aligns to the funds of knowledge idea and the multiple perspectives of reality.

Interacting with learners from other groups on a personal level. Teachers interviewed in this study related experiences when they interacted with learners on a personal level. These experiences made them aware of their values, religions, and different cultural practices. In the process, teachers gained much insight into the lifeworlds of the diverse learners. Teacher 12C related how learners showed their appreciation when they were acknowledged in various ways:

> I would love to speak their language. I can only say a few words and but you know what it's quite heartwarming if you remember a girl or a boy's name.

Teacher 14D, who often interacted with learners because she spoke Xhosa fluently, articulated her viewpoint as follows:

> What I find always the most fascinating is that the kids like to speak English, the Xhosa kids, but if they have a problem they will come and speak to me in Xhosa.

Interacting with learners on a personal level is a process of enlightenment. It is a positive approach that serves to reduce prejudices as teachers seek opportunities to engage with learners on a personal level, thereby enabling them to embrace diversity on all levels in the multicultural classroom.

Inclusion of aspects of culture. According to some teachers, adopting pedagogy for the development of intercultural competencies will lead to an enhancement in intercultural understanding. This could be achieved by encouraging learners from different ethnic groups to share their values and cultural beliefs with all learners by creating different platforms for them at school. It could happen in the classroom, at a sporting function, or at any intercultural function.

This notion of sharing cultures is more akin to the heroes and holidays approach synonymous with the contributionist concept of learning. As far as some of the teachers were concerned, such cultural days were a major shift from what was done in the past, when the schools were monoethnic, hence they signified the essence of multicultural education.

Teacher 14D explained that they have a cultural day at the teacher's school to share the lifeworld of the Xhosa learner:

> We have a Xhosa cultural day and like a cultural evening, but ja that is where everyone produces something in relation to their culture.

Teacher 12C also added that by the Xhosa learners sharing their cultures, the teachers learn more about the Xhosa learners and get to understand their cultures better:

> So you see they teach me quite a lot of these cultures, so we understand them much better now.

Although the inclusion of such minor adaptations may be a start to getting to know learners from other cultural groups better, it emerged from the study that teachers tended to get stuck in this approach as they focused on aspects of culture rather than moving into higher levels of diversity pedagogy focusing on notions of social justice and critical pedagogy.

Discussion of Key Issues

The findings emerging from the study indicate that although the teachers interviewed embrace diversity in the sense that they are positively predisposed to teaching in multicultural contexts, they have not engaged adequately with the implementation of diversity pedagogy in diverse classes. An analysis of the content of the interviews reveals two main streams of teachers in the post-1994 schools—one group that carried on teaching as previously, which was the majority group, saw no need to change their teaching strategies, while the other group adapted their teaching strategies in minor ways to accommodate diverse learners. The latter group was in the minority, and the practices adopted did not reflect the deeper levels of critical engagement espoused by Castagno's higher levels.

The approaches adopted by the former group when the schools became desegregated tended to lean more toward the color-blind, business-as-usual, and assimilation approaches. In a sense, then, these teachers tended to focus on the delivery of the content and used teaching strategies, approaches, and examples in the classroom as if nothing had changed. They continued to teach from a Eurocentric perspective, catering to the needs of the White learners whose culture predominated in the school pre-1994.

Many teachers in the study preferred not to see color or race in the multicultural classroom, as they did not feel the need to engage with multicultural perspectives in teaching. In some schools, there are a culture and religion that are more Eurocentric and that some of the teachers would like to maintain. The view expressed by this group was that the nondominant culture or religion be assimilated into the major culture and religion as the learners from other ethnic groups needed to adapt to the school's culture and not the other way around.

However, this is problematic, as the majority group in many of the ex–Model C former White schools is non-White. Hence these learners cannot be regarded as ethnic-minority learners. A further conundrum is that although these schools have mainly non-White learners, the teachers are still predominantly White. Furthermore, it emerged that none of the teachers interviewed received training in multicultural education or diversity pedagogy.

While some of them sought to expand their knowledge through engagement with learners by enquiring about their cultural beliefs and practices, others felt that such training was irrelevant and unnecessary. The implication of this viewpoint is that if teachers are expected to embrace strategies associated with diversity pedagogy, more concerted efforts need to be made by the various bodies to empower them with the requisite skills, values, knowledge, and attitudes.

The group of teachers that made no changes to their teaching strategies implemented strategies such as the business-as-usual, color-blind, and assimilation approaches. Learners in the diverse school were assimilated not only according to race or culture but also based on their religious beliefs. Since these approaches adopted by teachers did not recognize the learners' own identities and cultures, the potential for cultural and racial tension between the various ethnic groups was a reality. The implementation of color-blind racism ensured that learners from ethnic groups were denied a voice, essentially alienating them from the class and making them invisible to the teacher.

According to the findings of the study, most teachers tend to use marginalizing, traditional teaching strategies and approaches that do not cater to diverse learners in multicultural classrooms. They felt that they did not need to change their strategies and approaches because these were adequate and appropriate. In this sense, then, they did not demonstrate an eagerness to cater to diversity in their everyday teaching. The implication of this approach is that learners from other cultural groups within the school are assimilated into the dominant culture, thereby denying their cultures, languages, and religions.

The application of Castagno's framework of six levels, which focuses on approaches adopted by teachers and schools when monoethnic schools become desegregated, indicates that most teachers are only on Levels 1 (education for assimilation) and 2 (education for amalgamation). This indicates that the majority of the 16 teachers interviewed have not moved beyond these levels into education for cross-cultural awareness (Level 4), critical awareness (Level 5), and social action (Level 6), which represent the more critical and deeper levels of teaching within multicultural contexts.

The implication of this is that ethnic learners whose cultures are not drawn into classroom discussions and teaching will feel alienated and marginalized, thereby stifling their academic ability. According to Goldenberg (2013), because education is a process that occurs largely "through the interactions between teacher and student, we must recognize that for children of all races and ethnicities to be successful, these interactions must be beneficial and productive for the student" (p. 112). If, however, according to Milner (2010), teachers operate primarily from their own cultural ways of knowing, "the learning milieu can be foreign to students whose cultural experiences are different and inconsistent with teachers' experiences" (p. 3).

Ullucci and Battey (2011) argued that teachers have clear moral and ethical reasons to educate children in environments that respect their cultural dignity and distinctiveness. They posited that to prepare teachers to work with children from diverse backgrounds, a critical first step should be a willingness to see how discrimination functions in a society. To become a teacher and make teaching a success in diverse classrooms, the teacher should take into consideration the learner's cultural and racial identity.

Darling-Hammond (2011) articulated a similar argument in her contention that teachers who are unaware of cultural influences on learning and of the structure and substance of inequality will find it difficult to understand learners whose experiences do not resemble what the teachers remember from their own limited experiences.

For the process to be meaningful and engaging, teachers need to value the "nondominant" kinds of cultural capital that learners bring to the teaching and learning environment (Carter, 2005). Thus, if the worldviews of the learners are to be acknowledged and embraced, it is incumbent on teachers, as Goldenberg (2013) pointed out, "to recognize this capital and pedagogically utilize it in the classroom in ways that enhance student learning" (p. 17).

To attain this ideal, according to Carter (2005), teachers need to be "multicultural navigators" to help demonstrate to learners how to use both dominant and nondominant cultural capital and develop adeptness at moving through a range of sociocultural settings. The strategies that could be implemented for the achievement of this end, according to Ullucci and Battey (2011), include storytelling through biography and autobiography, interviews, defining race and culture, the use of videos, reading and book groups, and fieldwork

in communities. The implementation of these strategies within the context of the multicultural classroom could also serve to challenge the color-blind and business-as-usual approaches.

Since teachers, according to Delpit (2006), interpret behaviors, information, and situations through their own cultural lenses, "which operate involuntarily, below the conscious awareness" (p. 151), the danger exists that they will make it appear as if their own view is simply "the way it is." If ethnic learners are to achieve success within the multicultural teaching and learning environment, it is thus imperative that teachers acknowledge the cultural capital that all their learners bring into the classroom (Goldenberg, 2010).

Culturally responsive teachers need to make concerted efforts to take all aspects of the learners' backgrounds into account during teaching so that the learners will experience a sense of engagement and connectedness to the learning process. Gay (2010) defined culturally responsive teaching "as using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference and performance styles of ethnically diverse learners to make learning encounters more relevant and effective to them" (p. 3).

Gay identified four actions she regarded as essential for implementing culturally responsive teaching: (a) replacing deficit perspectives of students and communities, (b) being aware of the criticism leveled against CRT, (c) being aware of why culture and difference are essential ideologies for CRT, and (d) making pedagogical connections within the context in which teachers are teaching.

Banks and Banks (2010) aligned culturally responsive pedagogy to equity pedagogy by contending that if effective teaching and learning are to materialize in multicultural classrooms, it is incumbent on teachers to modify their teaching in ways that will facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural, gender, and social-class groups. This includes using a variety of teaching styles and approaches that are consistent with the wide range of learning styles within various cultural and ethnic groups.

Morrow's (2007) notion of culturally responsive teaching requires that teachers undergo a "paradigm shift" by including a variety of teaching styles and approaches that are consistent with the wide range of learning styles within various cultural and ethnic groups. Sleeter and Grant (2003), who expanded on CRT, contended that teachers should adapt their instructional processes in the classroom to support high expectations, build on strengths that diverse learners bring to the classroom, and actively engage learners in knowledge production.

The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 aimed to address the democratic transformation of schools by redressing past injustices in educational provision and providing education of progressively high quality for all learners. In doing so, it envisaged that education would lay the foundation for the "development of all our people's talents and capabilities, advance the transformation of society, combat racism and sexism and all other forms of discrimination and intolerance" (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, preamble).

In addition to this legislation, the *Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy* (Republic of South Africa, 2001), which was released by the South African Department of Education, was founded on the idea that the constitution expressed South Africa's shared aspirations as well as the moral and ethical direction the country had set for the future. In this manifesto, 10 values relating to education in the country were highlighted: respect, reconciliation, democracy, equality, social justice and equity, Ubuntu (human dignity), nonsexism and nonracism, accountability, sustaining an open society, and the rule of law.

If the pillars of the South African Schools Act and *Manifesto on Values in Education and Democracy* are to be realized within South Africa, it is incumbent on the government and all stakeholders to make concerted efforts to ensure that the needs, aspirations, and worldviews of all learners are catered to within the context of teaching and learning in South African schools.

Conclusion

This study indicated that in addition to lacking the pedagogical knowledge and skills to engage successfully with diverse learners in multicultural classrooms, most White teachers do not see the need to change the teaching strategies that they used pre-1994, when schools were monoethnic and only catered to White learners.

If teaching and learning are to be meaningful and relevant to all learners regardless of race, language, and cultural group, it is incumbent on teachers to strive to implement culturally responsive pedagogies that will cater to the needs of all learners. This implies that they need to tap into the funds of knowledge of diverse groups of learners and recognize the significance of the multiple perspectives of reality and the richness that such diversity brings to the teaching–learning situation.

The implications of the findings are that the various stakeholders, including the South African Department of Education, teacher unions, school governing bodies, parents, and school management teams, need to work collaboratively to ensure that teachers transform their teaching strategies from color-blindness to color consciousness.

References

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2007). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (2010). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (7th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

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

Carter, P. L. (2005). *Keepin' it real: School success beyond Black and White*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Castagno, A. E. (2009). Making sense of multicultural education: A synthesis of the various typologies found in the literature. *Multicultural Perspectives, 11*, 43–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960902717502

Chisholm, L. (2004). *Changing class: Education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa.* Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996, *Government Gazette 378*, no. 17678 (1996).

Darling-Hammond, L. (2011). Foreword. In A. F. Ball & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Studying diversity in teacher education* (pp. XX–XX). Baltimore, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York, NY: New Press.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. New York, NY: Pearson.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry, 43*, 48–70. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12002

Goldenberg, B. M. (2013). White teachers

in urban classrooms: Embracing non-White students' cultural capital for better teaching and learning. *Urban Education, 49*, 111–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912472510

Healy, J. F. (2011). Race, ethnicity, gender and class. In *The sociology of group conflict and change* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Howe, W. A., & Lise, P. L. (2014). *Becoming a multicultural educator: Developing awareness, gaining skills, and taking action.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Jansen, J. D. (1999). Setting the scene: Historiographies of curriculum policy in South Africa. In J. D. Jansen & P. Christie (Eds.), *Changing curriculum: Studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa* (pp. 3–18). Kenwyn, UK: Juta.

Kandaswamy, P. (2007). Beyond colour-blindness and multiculturalism: Rethinking anti-racist pedagogy in the university classroom. *Radical Thinker, 80*, 6–11.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 465–492. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Lapan, S. D., Quartaroli, M. T., & Riemer, F. J. (2012). *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Research design and methodology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Educational International/Prentice Hall.

Lemmer, E., Meier, C., & Van Wyk, J. N. (2012). *Multicultural education: An educator's manual* (2nd ed.). Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik.

Lemmer, E., & Squelch, J. (1993). *Multicultural education: A teacher's manual.* Pretoria, South Africa: Sigma Press.

Le Roux, J. (1997). *Multicultural education: What every teacher should know.* Pretoria, South Africa: Kagiso.

Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertler, C. A. (2009). *Action research: Improving schools and empowering educators* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milner, H. R. (2010). *Start where you are, but don't stay there: Understanding diversity, opportunity gaps, and teaching in today's classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Morrow, W. (2007). *Learning to teach in South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Nkomo, M., McKinney, C., & Chisholm, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Reflections on school integration: Colloquium proceedings*. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Nkomo, M., & Vandeyar, S. (2008). *In search of best practice in South African desegrated schools.* Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Republic of South Africa. (2001). *Manifesto on values, education and democracy*. Cape Town, South Africa: Government Printers.

Rosenberg, P. (2004). Colour-blindness in teacher education: An optical delusion. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Pruitt, & A. Burns (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on power, privilege and resistance* (pp. 257–272). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sager, H. A., & Schofield, J. W. (1984). Integrating the desegregated school: Problems and possibilities. In D. E. Bertz & M. L. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement*. Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2013). *Power, teaching and teacher education: Confronting injustice with critical research and action*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

South African Schools Act, no. 84, *Government Gazette, 377*, no. 17579 (1996).

Struwig, F. W., & Stead, G. B. (2013). *Research planning, designing and reporting* (2nd ed.). Cape Town, South Africa: Pearson Education.

Thomas, G. (2009). *How to do your research project*. Washington, DC: Sage.

Ullucci, K., & Battey, D. (2011). Exposing color blindness/grounding color consciousness: Challenges for teacher education. *Urban Education, 46*, 1195–1225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911413150

Vally, S., & Dalamba, Y. (1999). *Racism, "racial integration" and desegration in South African public secondary schools*. Pretoria, South Africa: South African Human Rights Commission.

Vandeyar, S. (2010). Responses of South African teachers to the challenge of school integration. *South African Journal of Education, 30*, 343–359. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v30n3a359

Zeichner, K. M. (2003). Educating teachers to close the achievement gap: Issues of pedagogy, knowledge, and teacher preparation. In B. Williams (Ed.), *Closing the achievement gap* (pp. XX–XX). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.