DIVERSITY WITHIN UNITY

Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society

James A. Banks

Peter Cookson

Geneva Gay

Willis D. Hawley

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine

Sonia Nieto

Janet Ward Schofield

Walter G. Stephan

DIVERSITY WITHIN UNITY

Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society

James A. Banks

Peter Cookson

Geneva Gay

Willis D. Hawley

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine

Sonia Nieto

Janet Ward Schofield

Walter G. Stephan

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A consensus panel of interdisciplinary scholars worked over a four-year period to determine what we know from research and experience about education and diversity. The panel was cosponsored by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington and the Common Destiny Alliance at the University of Maryland. The panel was supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and chaired by James A. Banks. The 12 major findings of the panel, which are called essential principles, constitute this publication. They are presented in this Executive Summary.

This publication also contains a checklist designed to be used by educational practitioners to determine the extent to which their institutions and environments are consistent with the essential principles.

Teacher Learning

Principle 1: Professional development programs should help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups within U.S. society and the ways in which race, ethnicity, language, and social class interact to influence student behavior.

Student Learning

Principle 2: Schools should ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards.

Principle 3: The curriculum should help students understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects researchers' personal experiences as well as the social, political, and economic contexts in which they live and work.

Principle 4: Schools should provide all students with opportunities to participate in extra- and cocurricular activities that develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that increase academic achievement and foster positive interracial relationships.

Intergroup Relations

Principle 5: Schools should create or make salient superordinate crosscutting group memberships in order to improve intergroup relations.

Principle 6: Students should learn about stereotyping and other related biases that have negative effects on racial and ethnic relations.

Principle 7: Students should learn about the values shared by virtually all cultural groups (e.g., justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion, and charity).

Principle 8: Teachers should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with students from other racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups.

Principle 9: Schools should provide opportunities for students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups to interact socially under conditions designed to reduce fear and anxiety.

School Governance, Organization, and Equity

Principle 10: A school's organizational strategies should ensure that decision-making is widely shared and that members of the school community learn collaborative skills and dispositions in order to create a caring environment for students.

Principle 11: Leaders should develop strategies that ensure that all public schools, regardless of their locations, are funded equitably.

Assessment

Principle 12: Teachers should use multiple culturally sensitive techniques to assess complex cognitive and social skills.

DIVERSITY WITHIN UNITY

Essential Principles for Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society

The ethnic, cultural, and language diversity in the United States and in the nation's schools is increasing considerably. Between 1991 and 1998, 7.6 million immigrants entered the United States (Riche, 2000), most from nations in Asia and Latin America. The U.S. Census estimates that more than one million immigrants will enter the United States each year for the foreseeable future (Riche, 2000). Thirty-five percent of the students enrolled in the nation's schools in 1995 were students of color (Pratt & Rittenhouse, 1998). If current demographic trends continue, students of color will make up 46% of the nation's students in 2020 (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1989).

Many of the students entering our nation's schools speak a first language other than English. The 1990 census indicated that 14% of the nation's school-age youth lived in homes in which the primary language was not English. In addition to the increase of racial, ethnic, and language diversity among the student population, more and more students are poor. The percentage of children living in poverty rose from 16.2% in 1979 to 18.7% in 1998 (Terry, 2000). The gap between rich and poor students is also increasing. While the student population is becoming increasingly diverse, the teaching force remains predominantly White, middle-class, and female. In 1996, 90.7% of the nation's teachers were White, and almost three-quarters (74.4%) were female (National Education Association, 1997). Consequently, a wide cultural, racial, and economic gap exists between teachers and a growing percentage of the nation's students.

The increasing diversity within the nation and its schools poses serious challenges as well as opportunities (Gay, 2000; Hawley & Jackson, 1995). An important goal of the schools should be to forge a common nation and destiny from the tremendous ethnic, cultural, and language diversity. To forge a common destiny, educators must respect and build upon the cultural strengths and characteristics that students from diverse groups bring to school. At the same time, educators must help all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become participating citizens of the commonwealth. Cultural, ethnic, and language diversity provide the nation and the schools with rich opportunities to incorporate diverse perspectives, issues, and characteristics into the nation and the schools in order to strengthen both.

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT DIVERSITY AND EDUCATION

What do we know about education and diversity and how do we know it? This two-part question guided the Multicultural Education Consensus Panel that was sponsored by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington and the Common Destiny Alliance at the University of Maryland. *Diversity Within Unity* is the product of a four-year project during which the panel reviewed and synthesized research related to diversity. The panel's work was supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The panel members are specialists in race relations and multicultural education. An interdisciplinary group, it was made up of two psychologists, a political scientist, a sociologist, and four

multicultural education specialists. The panel was modeled after the consensus panels that develop and write reports for the National Academy of Sciences. In Academy panels, an expert group decides, based on research and practice, what is known about a particular problem and the most effective actions that can be taken to solve it.

The findings of the Multicultural Education Consensus Panel, which are called *essential principles* in this publication, describe ways in which educational practice related to diversity can be improved. These principles are derived from research and practice. They are designed to help educational practitioners in all types of schools increase student academic achievement and improve intergroup skills. Another aim is to help schools successfully meet the challenges of and benefit from the diversity that characterizes the United States and its schools.

We believe that schools can make a difference in the lives of students and are a key to maintaining a free and democratic society. Democratic societies are fragile and are works-in-progress. Their existence depends upon a thoughtful citizenry that believes in democratic ideals and is willing and able to participate in the civic life of the nation-state (Dahl, 1998). We realize that the public schools are experiencing a great deal of criticism. However, we believe that they are essential to maintaining our democratic way of life.

We have organized these twelve essential principles into five categories: (1) Teacher Learning; (2) Student Learning; (3) Intergroup Relations; (4) School Governance, Organization, and Equity; and (5) Assessment. Although these categories overlap to some extent, we think that this organization will be helpful to readers.

TEACHER LEARNING

Principle 1: Professional development programs should help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups within U.S. society and the ways in which race, ethnicity, language, and social class interact to influence student behavior.

Most educators, like most other U.S. citizens, are socialized within homogeneous communities and have few opportunities to interact with people from other racial, ethnic, language, and social-class groups. The formal curriculum in schools, colleges, and universities provides educators with scant and inconsistent opportunities to

acquire the knowledge and skills needed to work effectively in culturally diverse educational settings.

Although significant gains have been made since the 1960s and 1970s in incorporating ethnic and cultural content into the teacher education curriculum, many students complete their programs with incomplete knowledge about the cultural, racial, ethnic, and language diversity that characterize today's classrooms and schools (Banks & Banks, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 2000).

Continuing education about diversity is especially important for educators because of the increasing cultural and ethnic gap that exists between the nation's teachers and students. Effective professional development programs should help educators to: (1) uncover and identify their personal attitudes toward racial, ethnic, language, and cultural groups; (2) acquire knowledge about the histories and cultures of the diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups within the nation and within their schools; (3) become acquainted with the diverse perspectives that exist within different ethnic and cultural communities; (4) understand the ways in which institutionalized knowledge within schools, universities, and popular culture can perpetuate stereotypes about racial and ethnic groups; and (5) acquire the knowledge and skills needed to develop and implement an equity pedagogy, defined by Banks (1995) as instruction that provides all students with an equal opportunity to attain academic and social success in school.

Within the popular and academic communities ethnic groups are often described in ways that give little attention to the enormous diversity that exists within each. Some interpretations of the educational literature itself, especially that written during the late 1960s and 1970s, reinforce these static and essentialized conceptions of ethnic groups. Notable among the educational literature published during this period is the learning style research (Ramírez & Castañeda, 1974; Shade, 1989). It is often the *interpretation* of such research that results in misleading and over-generalized conceptions of ethnic group behavior, rather than the research itself. Many educators interpret this research to mean that ethnic status can predict learning style, yet the researchers give a much more complex interpretation of their findings. Cox and Ramírez (1981) lament the ways in which their work has often been interpreted and used by educational practitioners.

Professional development programs should help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups

and how variables such as social class, religion, region, generation, extent of urbanization, and gender strongly influence ethnic and cultural behavior. These variables influence the behavior of groups both singly and interactively. Social class is one of the most important variables that mediate and influence behavior. In his widely discussed book *The Declining Significance of Race,* Wilson (1978) argues that class is becoming increasingly important in the lives of African Americans. The *increasing significance of class* rather than *the declining significance of race* is a more accurate description of the phenomenon that Wilson describes. Racism continues to affect African Americans in every social-class group, although it does so in complex ways that to some extent—but by no means always—reflect social-class status (Feagin & Sikes, 1994).

The widening gap between the rich and poor that is a salient characteristic of American society today is affecting all racial, ethnic, cultural, and social-class groups. The top 1% of households in the U.S. have doubled their share of national wealth since the 1970s (Collins, Leondar-Wright, & Sklar, 1999). The class schism within the United States is strikingly manifested within ethnic communities of color. African Americans and Latinos join the exodus to the suburbs when they experience social–class mobility.

Low-income members of these groups are left in urban communities and have few interactions with the upper-status members of their ethnic groups (Wilson, 1987). Social class strongly influences the opportunities and possibilities of ethnic group members such as Asian Americans, Latinos, and African Americans. However, it does not protect them from institutional and structural racism (Feagin & Sikes, 1994).

If teachers are to increase learning opportunities for all students, they must be knowledgeable about the social and cultural contexts of teaching and learning. Although students are not solely products of their cultures and vary in the degree to which they identify with them, there are some distinctive cultural behaviors that are associated with ethnic groups (Boykin, 1986; Deyhle, 1986; Irvine & York, 1995). Teachers should become knowledgeable about the distinctive cultural backgrounds of their students. They should also acquire the skills needed to translate that knowledge into effective instruction and an enriched curriculum (Gay, 2000). Teaching should be culturally responsive to students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Valdés, 2001).

Making teaching culturally responsive involves strategies such as constructing and designing relevant cultural metaphors and multicultural representations to help bridge the gap between what students already know and appreciate and what they will be taught. Culturally responsive instructional strategies transform information about the home and community into effective classroom practice (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Villegas, 1991) and use community members and parents as resources (Moll, 1990).

Research on learning styles emphasizes the powerful, yet often overlooked, social and cultural factors that influence both the teaching and learning processes (Cazden & Mehan, 1989; Irvine & York, 1995; Nieto & Rolon, 1997; Villegas, 1991). These cultural factors influence the values, beliefs, norms, languages, and symbols of students and teachers. Effective teachers for a multicultural society contextualize instruction by first understanding how their own teaching styles and preferences may hinder the learning of students who have different learning styles and preferences. In addition to being self-aware, teachers should probe and reflect upon the existing knowledge and cultural experiences of their students and use those insights to increase access to knowledge (Giroux, 1992). Rather than relying on essentialized and generalized notions of ethnic groups that can be misleading, effective teachers use knowledge of their students' culture and ethnicity as a framework for inquiry. They also use culturally responsive activities, resources, and strategies to organize and implement instruction.

STUDENT LEARNING

Principle 2: Schools should ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards.

Schools can be thought of as collections of opportunities to learn (Hawley, Hultgren, & Abrams, 1996). A good school maximizes the learning experiences of students. One might judge the fairness of educational opportunity by comparing the learning opportunities students have within and across schools. The most important of these opportunities to learn are: (1) teacher quality (indicators include experience, preparation to teach the content being taught, participation in high-quality professional development, verbal ability, and teacher rewards and incentives); (2) a safe and orderly learning environment; (3)

time actively engaged in learning; (4) student-teacher ratio; (5) rigor of the curriculum; (6) grouping practices that avoid tracking and rigid forms of student assignment based on past performance; (7) sophistication and currency of learning resources and information technology used by students; and (8) access to extra-curricular activities.

Although the consequences of these different characteristics of schools vary with particular conditions, the available research suggests that when two or more cohorts of students differ significantly in their access to opportunities to learn, differences in the quality of education also exist (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Dreeban & Gamoran, 1986). Such differences affect student achievement and can undermine the prospects for positive intergroup relations.

The content that comprises the lessons students are taught influences the level of student achievement. This is hardly surprising, but the curriculum students experience, and the expectation of teachers and others about how much of the material students are expected to learn, varies from school to school (Darling-Hammond, 1995). In general, students taught curricula that are more rigorous learn more than their peers with similar prior knowledge and backgrounds who are taught less rigorous curricula. For example, early access to algebra leads to greater participation in higher math and increased academic achievement.

Most researchers agree that tracking, in which students are grouped by interest, prior performance, and presumed ability into curricular tracks that define most or all of their academic experiences, has a negative effect on the achievement of many students in lower tracks and does not particularly benefit those in higher tracks (Oakes, 1985; Levine & Lezotte, 1995). There is an ongoing debate about whether this generalization applies to the 3% to 5% of students who are most able academically (Kulik & Kulik, 1982). A number of effective instructional strategies do group students by past academic performance for limited and particular purposes (Mosteller, Light, & Sachs, 1996). These practices, commonly but inappropriately called ability grouping, can become unproductive if they result in continuous assignment to the same groups, cluster students by performance levels for all subjects, or restrict student access to more demanding curricula (Oakes, 1990). There are many alternatives to tracking and unproductive ability grouping, including various ap-

proaches to cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and multi-aged classrooms (Cohen, 1994).

Principle 3: The curriculum should help students understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects researchers' personal experiences as well as the social, political, and economic contexts in which they live and work.

In curriculum and teaching units and in textbooks, students often study historical events, concepts, and issues only or primarily from the points of view of the victors (Sleeter & Grant, 1991). The perspectives of the vanquished are frequently silenced, ignored, or marginalized. This kind of teaching privileges mainstream students—who most often identity with the victors or dominant groups—and cause many students of color to feel left out of the American story.

Concepts such as the *discovery of America*, the *westward movement,* and *pioneers* are often taught primarily from the points of view of the European Americans who constructed them. The curriculum should help students to understand how these concepts reflect the values and perspectives of European Americans as well as their experiences in the United States. Teaches should help students learn how these concepts have very different meanings for groups indigenous to America and for groups such as African Americans who came to America in chains.

In teaching concepts and topics such as the westward movement, teachers should help students to raise and discuss these kinds of questions: What is the westward movement? Who invented this concept? Why? Who benefits from this concept? Who loses? Teachers should help students to understand that the westward movement has very different meanings for Native Americans who were indigenous to the West and for European Americans who migrated to the West. The West was not the west for Native Americans who lived there but was their homeland and the center of the universe. The West represented hope, possibilities, and progress for most of the European American migrants who went there. For the Native Americans, the West often meant death, destruction, and defeat.

Teaching students the different and often conflicting meanings of concepts and issues for the diverse groups that make up the United States will help them to better understand the complex factors that contributed to the birth, growth, and development of the nation, to develop empathy for the points of views and perspectives that are normative within various groups, and to increase their ability to think critically (Banks, 1996). These kinds of lessons will also help students to understand the powerful ways in which personal and cultural experiences influence and mediate the construction of knowledge. Students should also be provided opportunities to construct knowledge themselves in order to deepen their understanding of the ways in which point of view influences the construction of knowledge and to become more critical consumers of the knowledge within the popular, academic, and school communities (Banks, 2001).

Principle 4: Schools should provide all students with opportunities to participate in extra- and cocurricular activities that develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that increase academic achievement and foster positive interracial relationships.

Research evidence that links student achievement to participation in extra- and cocurricular activities is increasing in quantity and consistency (Braddock, 1991; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Jordan, 1999; Mahiri, 1998). There is significant research that supports the proposition that participation in after-school programs, sports activities, academic associations like language clubs, and school-sponsored social activities contributes to academic performance, reduces high school drop-out rates and discipline problems, and enhances interpersonal skills among students from different ethnic backgrounds. Gutiérrez and her colleagues, for example, found that "non-formal learning contexts," such as after-school programs, are useful in bridging home and school cultures for students from diverse groups. Braddock concluded that involvement in sports activities was particularly beneficial for African American male high school students. When designing extracurricular activities, educators should give special attention to recruitment, selection of leaders and teams, the cost of participating, allocation of school resources, and opportunities for cooperative equal-status intergroup contact (Allport, 1954).

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Principle 5: Schools should create or make salient superordinate crosscutting group memberships in order to improve intergroup relations.

Creating superordinate groups, or groups with which members of all the other groups in a situation identify, improves intergroup relations (Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & Anastasio, 1994; Sherif, 1966). When membership in superordinate groups is salient, other group differences become less important. Creating superordinate groups stimulates liking and cohesion, which can mitigate pre-existing animosities.

In school settings there are many superordinate group memberships that can be created or made salient. For example, it is possible to create superordinate groups through extracurricular activities. There are also many existing superordinate group memberships that can be made more salient: the classroom, the grade level, the school, the community, the state, and even the nation. The most immediate superordinate groups are likely to be the most influential (e.g., students or members of the school chorus rather than Californians), but identification with any superordinate group can decrease prejudice.

Another potentially useful approach to improving intergroup relations is to create or make salient crosscutting group memberships (Commins & Lockwood, 1978). These are aspects of identity (religion, age, sex) that people share with some of the members of their own racial or ethnic group but not with other members. Making crosscutting group memberships salient can reduce prejudice because it is hard to dislike people with whom you share important aspects of your identity.

Principle 6: Students should learn about stereotyping and other related biases that have negative effects on racial and ethnic relations.

We use categories in perceiving our environment because categorization is a natural part of information processing. But the mere act of categorizing people as ingroup and outgroup members can result in stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination (Tajfel, 1970; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Specifically, making distinctions between groups often leads to perceiving the other group as more homogenous than one's own group and to an exaggeration of the extent of the perceived group differences (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Linville, Salovey, & Fischer, 1986). Thus, categorizing leads to stereotyping and to behaviors influenced by

those stereotypes. In addition, people often enhance their self-esteem by favorably evaluating the groups to which they belong (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Unfortunately, this is often accomplished by negatively evaluating other racial and ethnic groups.

Intergroup contact can counteract stereotypes if the situation allows members of each group to behave in a variety of ways across different contexts so that their full humanity and diversity are displayed. Negative stereotypes can also be modified in noncontact situations by providing ingroup members with information about multiple outgroup members who disconfirm the stereotype across a variety of situations (Crocker, Hannah, & Weber, 1983; Johnston & Hewstone, 1992; Mackie, Allison, Worth, & Asuncion, 1992; Rothbart & John, 1985). Experiential exercises can also be used. One well-known technique that increases the participants' intentions to act in nondiscriminatory ways is a simulation that divides students by eye color and demonstrates to them the arbitrariness of intergroup distinctions (Byrnes & Kiger, 1990).

Principle 7: Students should learn about the values shared by virtually all cultural groups (e.g., justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion, and charity).

Teaching students about the values that virtually all groups share, such as those described in the UN Universal Bill of Rights (Banks, 1997a; Kohlberg, 1981; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990), can provide a basis for perceived similarity that can promote favorable intergroup relations. In addition, the values themselves serve to undercut negative intergroup relations by discouraging injustice, inequality, unfairness, conflict, and a lack of compassion or charity.

The value of egalitarianism deserves special emphasis since a number of theories suggest that it can help to undermine stereotyping and prejudice (Allport, 1954) and to restrict the direct expression of racism (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Katz, Glass, & Wackenhut, 1986). An emphasis on egalitarianism, both as a value and in actual interaction, counteracts one of the most invidious aspects of ethnocentrism: the idea that the ingroup is superior to the outgroup. There are ways to promote egalitarianism in schools. For example, Cohen (1990; Cohen & Roper, 1972) uses cooperative groups to accomplish this goal, combined with treatments designed to counteract negative stereotypes of the ability of minority group members. Other cooperative techniques have attempted to equalize the roles played by the participants of different backgrounds by assigning them roles of equal importance or

rotating the more important roles (e.g., teacher, learner) (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, & Snapp, 1978).

Principle 8: Teachers should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with students from other racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups.

One of the most effective techniques for improving intercultural relations is to teach members of the cultural groups the social skills necessary to interact effectively with members of another culture (Bochner, 1986; 1993). Students need to learn how to perceive, understand, and respond to group differences. They need to learn not to give offense and not to take offense. They also need to be helped to realize that when members of other groups behave in ways that are inconsistent with ingroup norms these individuals are not necessarily behaving antagonistically.

Being the target of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination is a painful experience. People react in a variety of ways, many of them potentially damaging. For instance, people respond with anger, rage, and violence, they reciprocate the prejudice and discrimination, or they can accept the stereotypes as potentially applicable to them. One intergroup relations trainer (Kamfer & Venter, 1994) asks members of the minority and majority groups to discuss what it feels like to be the target of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination. Sharing such information informs the majority group of the pain and suffering their intentional or thoughtless acts of discrimination cause. It also allows the members of minority groups to share their experiences with one another. Other techniques that involve sharing experiences through dialogue have also been found to improve intergroup relations (Zúñiga & Nagda, 1993).

Conflict resolution is a skill that can be taught in the schools in order to improve intergroup relations (Deutsch, 1993). Learning to resolve conflicts involves understanding their origins, which might include disputes over resources (e.g., power and resources), differences in values, beliefs, and norms, or inability to meet basic human needs (e.g., respect, security, affirmation). Students should also learn how to avoid conflicts by using techniques of de-escalation such as negotiation, bargaining, making concessions, or giving apologies or explanations (Fisher, 1994). A number of school districts throughout the United States are teaching students to act as mediators for disputes among other students (Deutsch, 1993). This type of mediation holds promise as one approach to resolving certain intergroup conflicts in schools.

Principle 9: Schools should provide opportunities for students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups to interact socially under conditions designed to reduce fear and anxiety.

One of the primary causes of prejudice is fear (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1996; Katz, Glass, & Wackenhut, 1986; McConahay, 1986; Sears, 1988; Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Fear leads members of social groups to avoid interacting with outgroup members and causes them discomfort when they do (Stephan & Stephan, 1996).

Fears about members of other groups often stem from concern about realistic and symbolic threats to the ingroup—that the ingroup will lose some or all of its power or resources or that its very way of life will be undermined. Many such fears have little basis in reality or are greatly exaggerated.

To reduce uncertainty and anxiety concerning interaction with outgroup members, the contexts in which interaction takes place should be relatively structured, the balance of members of the different groups should be as equal as possible, the probabilities of failure should be low, and opportunities for hostility and aggression should be minimized (Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

Providing factual information that contradicts misperceptions can also counteract prejudice based on a false sense of threat. Undercutting myths about the values of outgroups can also facilitate social interaction with members of the other group. Stressing the value similarities that exist between groups should also reduce the degree of symbolic threat posed by outgroups and thus reduce fear and prejudice.

SCHOOL GOVERNANCE, ORGANIZATION, AND EQUITY

Principle 10: A school's organizational strategies should ensure that decision-making is widely shared and that members of the school community learn collaborative skills and dispositions in order to create a caring environment for students.

School policies and practices are the living embodiment of a society's underlying values and educational philosophy. They also reflect the values of those who work within schools. Whether in the form of curriculum, teaching strategies, assessment procedures, disciplinary policies, or grouping practices, school policies do not emerge from thin air; they embody a school's beliefs, attitudes, and ex-

pectations of its students (Nieto, 1999). This is true whether the school is one with extensive or limited financial resources, with a relatively monocultural or a richly diverse student body, or located in a crowded central city or an isolated rural county.

School organization and leadership can either enhance or detract from developing learning communities that prepare students for a multicultural and democratic society. School models of pluralism and democracy can serve as apprenticeships of these values for students, or conversely, they can distort the messages of democracy and pluralism that are conveyed in exalted mission statements and biased textbooks. Thus, for example, if schools are rigidly authoritarian, students might learn that democracy is a lofty ideal but an elusive practice. Likewise, if diversity is celebrated in superficial and meaningless activities but important knowledge continues to be defined as that which is found in a static and monocultural canon, the message to students is that diversity is irrelevant in learning (Banks, 1993).

Schools that are administered from the top-down are unlikely to create collaborative, caring cultures. Too often schools talk about democracy but fail to practice shared decision-making. Powerful multicultural schools are organizational hubs that include a wide variety of stakeholders, including students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members. There is convincing research evidence that parental involvement, in particular, is critical in enhancing student learning (Fruchter, Galleta, & White, 1992; Klimes-Dougan, Lopez, Nelson, & Adelman, 1992). A just multicultural school is receptive to working with all members of the students' communities.

One formative step in creating a school that encourages collaborative skills and dispositions is the process by which shared decision-making is institutionalized in school governance. Opening schools up to an honest and productive form of discourse is an important step in creating schools in which diversity is valued.

Issues of institutional power and privilege in society are played out in daily interactions in a school through its policies and practices. Unfortunately, these issues are rarely made part of the public discourse in schools (Freire, 1985; Fine, 1991). Instead, individual merit, ambition, talent, and intelligence are touted as the only source of academic success, with little consideration given to the impact of structural inequality based on race,

ethnicity, gender, social class, and other differences. Students whose difference may relegate them to a subordinate status in society are often blamed for their lack of achievement (Nieto, 2001). Although it is true that individual differences are also important in explaining relative academic success or failure, they must be understood in tandem with the power and privilege of particular groups in society (McIntosh, 1988).

Leaders in schools can confront issues of power and privilege in a number of ways. Teachers and other school personnel, for example, can be encouraged to individually reflect on their own status, values, perspectives, biases, and experiences and how these might influence their relationships with students and with students' families (Cummins, 1989). Racism and other manifestations of both individual and institutional discrimination need to be considered in terms of their impact on policy decisions and on classroom and school-wide practices. It follows that teachers and administrators need to continually examine the personal, social, and cognitive consequences of policies and practices in order to promote equity in their schools. Thus, for example, retention, ability grouping, and testing are policies laden with value judgments about students' capabilities (Darling-Hammond, 1991). Tracking is generally supported by a privileged few whose children might benefit from it. Consequently, it continues even though it might jeopardize the opportunity to learn for the majority of students (Oakes, 1990). Also, the curriculum can explicitly focus on issues of power and privilege through the countless examples found in history, literature, art, science, and other disciplines (Banks, 1997a).

Including a study of racism and social justice as part of the curriculum is not enough. It needs to be accompanied by structural changes in the school and changes in pedagogical assumptions and strategies. Thus, recruitment and retention of a diverse staff is an important part of changing a school; changing decision-making structures to be more democratic is another. Pedagogical strategies that promote social responsibility and action, as well as equitable relations of power in the classroom, are also needed. In the final analysis, all those who work in schools need to analyze critically how their policies and practices benefit some students and jeopardize others, and make changes that will contribute to promoting learning among greater numbers of students.

Principle 11: Leaders should develop strategies that ensure that all public schools, regardless of their locations, are funded equitably.

School finance equity is a critical condition for creating just multicultural schools. The current inequities in the funding of public education are startling (Kozol, 1991). Two neighborhoods, adjacent to one another, can provide wholly different support to their public schools, based on property values and tax rates (McCall, 1996). Students who live in poor neighborhoods are punished because they must attend schools that are underfunded when compared to the schools located in more affluent neighborhoods.

Some policy makers and researchers argue that variations in funding are not strongly correlated with variations in student learning (Hanushek, 1994). This literature has convinced some policy makers and politicians that funding is not a critical issue in improving America's schools. Investigators who have examined this situation more carefully have found that when funds are used for instructional purposes there are positive effects on student learning (Dreeben & Gamoran, 1986). Thus, schools that have adequate supplies and learning aids such as computers are more likely to increase student learning than schools without these supplies and aids. While this finding may seem obvious, it has been obscured by those who wish to substantially reduce funding for public education.

There is considerable debate on whether money makes a difference in the quality of education (Burtless, 1996). However, there is growing agreement among researchers that when money is allocated to enhance student opportunities to learn and is used well, the consequence is, on average, improved student performance (Hedges, Laine, & Greenwald, 1995). Of course, as is true for many other investments, educational expenditures are often poorly spent and are sometimes allocated to nonproductive priorities (Murnane & Levy, 1996). *Equity* does not mean sameness. It focuses attention on need. Thus, students with needs for special assistance to ensure that they maximize their potential should receive additional learning opportunities (usually involving greater expenditures) if their education is to be equitable. The failure of schools and school systems to provide all students with equitable resources for learning will, of course, work to the disadvantage of those receiving inadequate resources and will, usually, widen the achievement gap in schools. Since

achievement correlates highly with student family income, and since persons of color are disproportionately low income, inequity in opportunities to learn contribute to the achievement gap between students of color and students who are White.

ASSESSMENT

Principle 12: Teachers should use multiple culturally sensitive techniques to assess complex cognitive and social skills.

Evaluating student progress is one of the most frequent instructional behaviors performed by teachers. If done effectively, assessment enhances student learning and performance. However, unidimensional and cursory assessments not only delay achievement but can also reduce the confidence and self-esteem of students. Evaluating the progress of students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups is complicated by differences in language, learning styles, and cultures. Hence, the use of a single method of assessment will likely further disadvantage students from particular social classes and ethnic groups.

Teachers should adopt a range of formative and summative assessment strategies that give students an opportunity to demonstrate mastery. These strategies should include observations, oral examinations, performances, and teacher-made as well as standardized measures and assessments. The intellectual, affective, and action skills required to adequately prepare students for a multicultural future are diverse and complex. Students must be able to know, think, feel, believe, and behave in ways that demonstrate respect for people, experiences, issues, and perspectives that are different from their own. They must be informed, critical, socially conscious, and ethical change agents who are committed to social, political, cultural, and educational equality. Other goals include self-knowledge and acceptance, understanding other cultures, improving intergroup relations, combating racism and other forms of oppression, and increasing the academic achievement of students of color. Diverse strategies and programs are required to attain these goals.

This range and complexity of skills defy a single standard, indicator, or measure of achievement or competence. Although test scores on knowledge about the contributions of ethnic groups can provide an indication of how much factual information a student has acquired, they provide

few insights into how well individuals can relate to people from other racial and ethnic groups. They also provide little information about a student's sense of moral outrage about racial, gender, and social-class inequities, or about her or his will and skill to oppose racism (Howell & Rueda, 1994; Moreland, 1994; Padilla & Medina, 1994). Yet, these abilities, along with many others, are essential for the nation's multicultural future. Schools must help students develop them and must use some systemic ways of determining the degree to which they have been attained.

Students learn and demonstrate their competencies in different ways. The preferred mode of demonstrating task mastery for some is writing, while others do better speaking, visualizing, or performing; some are stimulated by competitive and others by cooperative learning arrangements; some prefer to work alone while others like to work in groups (Shade, 1989; Barbe & Swassing, 1979; Lazear, 1994). Consequently, a variety of assessment procedures and outcomes that are compatible with different learning, performance, work, and presentation styles should be used to determine if students are achieving the levels of skill mastery needed to function effectively in a multicultural society. These assessments might include a combination of observations, performance behaviors, self-reflections, portfolios, writing assignments, case study analyses, critical thinking, problem-solving, creative productions, real and simulated social and political actions, and acts of crosscultural caring and sharing.

Assessment should go beyond traditional measures of subject matter knowledge and include complex cognitive and social skills. Effective citizenship in a multicultural society requires individuals who have values and abilities to promote equality and justice among culturally diverse groups. This empowerment encompasses a complex and wide-ranging set of personal, social, intellectual, moral, and political knowledge, beliefs, ethics, and skills. It is not enough simply to teach isolated facts about the national origins, cultural contributions, historical experiences, and social problems of a few highly visible ethnic groups in several subjects at selected times during the school year. Nor should only one or a few aspects of the educational enterprise, such as social studies or language arts, bear the responsibility for teaching multicultural knowledge and skills. Rather, schools should use systemic and holistic reform strategies, in which all of their component parts are directly involved. All classroom teachers in all subject areas, along with all administrators, counselors, policy makers, and support staffs, should be actively involved in and held accountable for preparing students for a multicultural future (Banks & Banks, 2001; Bennett, 1995).

CONCLUSION

Powerful multicultural schools help students from diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, and language groups to experience academic success. Academic knowledge and skills are essential in today's global Internet society. However, they are not sufficient. Students must also develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to interact positively with people from diverse groups and to participate in the nation's civic life (Banks, 1997b). Students must be competent in intergroup and civic skills to function effectively in today's complex and ethnically polarized nation and world.

Diversity in the nation's schools is both an opportunity and a challenge. The nation is enriched by the ethnic, cultural, and language diversity among its citizens and within its schools. However, whenever diverse groups interact, intergroup tension, stereotypes, and institutionalized discrimination develop (Howard, 1999; Stephan, 1999). Schools must find ways to respect the diversity of their students as well as help to create a unified nation-state to which all of the nation's citizens have allegiance. Structural inclusion into the nation-state and power sharing will engender feelings of allegiance among diverse groups. *E pluribus unum*–diversity within unity–is the delicate goal toward which our nation and its schools should strive. We offer these design principles with the hope that they will help educational practitioners realize this elusive and difficult but essential goal of a democratic and pluralistic society.

Diversity Within Unity
Essential Principles Checklist

Principles	Rating				
	Hardly at All		Somewhat		Strongly

1.0 Do professional development programs in your school district help teachers understand the complex characteristics of U.S. ethnic, racial, and cultural groups?

1.1 Do professional programs help teachers to understand the ways in which race, ethnicity, culture, language, and social class interact in complex ways to influence student behavior?

1.2 Do professional programs help teachers to uncover and identify their personal attitudes toward different racial, ethnic, language, and social-class groups?

1.3 Do professional programs help teachers to uncover and identify their behaviors related to diverse racial, ethnic, language, and social-class groups?

1.4 Do they help teachers acquire knowledge about the history and cultures of diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural groups?

1.5 Do they help teachers become knowledgeable about the diverse perspectives on historical and current events within different ethnic, racial, language, and cultural communities?

1.6 Do they help teachers develop the knowledge and skills needed to modify their instruction so that students from diverse ethnic, racial, cultural, and language groups will have an equal opportunity to learn in their classrooms?

2.0 Do the schools in your district ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards?

2.1 Are the teachers and administrators in schools with large minority and low-income populations comparable in terms of experience, degrees held, and endorsements with teachers and administrators in other schools in the district?

2.2 Are the curricula in schools with large minority and low-income populations as rigorous as the curricula in other schools in the district?

2.3 Do schools in your district avoid tracking and rigid forms of student assignment?

2.4 Are the learning resources and information technology in schools with large minority and low-income populations comparable to those of other schools in the district?

2.5 Is access to technology distributed equitably within the school among students from different ethnic, cultural, and social-class backgrounds?

Principles	Rating				
	Hardly at All		Somewhat		Strongly

2.6   Are the opportunities for access to extra- and cocurricular activities comparable in schools throughout the district?

2.7   Are language minority students provided with the extra services and support they need to achieve academic success?

2.8   Are schools with large minority and low-income populations given extra services that provide students with the support they need to attain high levels of academic achievement?

2.9   Are language minority students, students of color, and low-income students represented proportionately in particular schools and classrooms?

3.0   Does the curriculum in your school help students to understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects the personal experiences and the social, political, and economic contexts in which they live and work?

3.1   Does the curriculum help students to understand historical events from the perspectives of various racial, ethnic, and cultural groups?

3.2   Does the curriculum help students understand the ways in which the unique experiences of peoples or groups cause them to view the same historical and social events differently?

3.3   Do the instructional materials used in your district, such as textbooks, supplementary books, and videotapes, describe historical, social, and political events from the perspectives of different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups?

3.4   Are the textbooks and other instructional materials used in your school written by authors from different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups?

4.0   Do the schools in your district provide all students with opportunities to participate in extra- and cocurricular activities that are congruent with the academic goals of the school and that develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that increase academic achievement and foster positive interracial relationships?

4.1   Do students who attend schools with large minority and low-income populations have as many opportunities to participate in extra- and cocurricular activities as students who attend other schools in the district?

4.2   Are ethnic and language minority students represented proportionately in the extra- and cocurricular school activities?

4.3   Are deliberate actions taken by the school staff to make sure that ethnic and language minority students are represented proportionately in the school's extra- and cocurricular activities?

4.4   Do fees and other policies and practices inadvertently exclude many minority and low-income students from participating in specific extra- and cocurricular activities?

Principles	Rating				
	Hardly at All		Somewhat		Strongly
4.5 Does the school staff take deliberate steps to make sure that students from different racial, ethnic, language, and social-class groups experience cooperative equal status in extra- and cocurricular activities?					
4.6 Are some extra- and cocurricular activities in the school stratified by race or social class?					
5.0 Do teachers and school administrators act to create or make salient superordinate and crosscutting group memberships in order to improve intergroup relations in the school?					
5.1 Do teachers in your school take steps to make extra- and cocurricular activities interracial and crossethnic so that superordinate group memberships can be created?					
5.2 Do the schools in your school have rituals, exercises, or activities that highlight or emphasize crosscutting group memberships that exist in the classroom and school?					
5.3 Do teachers in your school organize activities and projects that enable students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups to work together cooperatively and develop a superordinate group identity?					
6.0 Are students in your school taught about stereotyping and other related biases that have negative effects on racial and ethnic relations?					
6.1 Are the students taught social science information about how stereotyping and categorization can result in prejudice and discrimination?					
6.2 Are students given opportunities to have meaningful contact with students from other racial and ethnic groups in order to observe them behaving in a variety of ways across different contexts?					
6.3 Are students provided information about individuals from outside ethnic and racial groups who refute the stereotypes about these groups?					
6.4 Do the students have opportunities to participate in simulations, role-playing, and other activities that enable them to experience what it is like to be a victim of discrimination?					
7.0 Are students taught about the values shared by virtually all cultures, such as justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion, and charity?					
7.1 Are students taught about the values that undergird the founding documents of the United States, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights?					
7.2 Do teachers implement democratic values, such as egalitarianism and social justice, in their interactions with students and colleagues?					
7.3 Do teachers use teaching strategies, such as cooperative groups, to promote and teach egalitarianism?					

Principles	Rating				
	Hardly at All		Somewhat		Strongly

7.4 Do teachers require students to act in ways consistent with democratic values when interacting with each other?

8.0 Do teachers help students to acquire the social skills that are needed to interact effectively with students from other racial, ethnic, and cultural groups?

8.1 Do teachers in your school talk openly and constructively about race with students?

8.2 Do teachers encourage students from different ethnic and racial groups to talk openly and constructively about race?

8.3 Do teachers help students to acquire the knowledge and skills they need to have thoughtful, constructive, and heartfelt discussions about race?

8.4 Do teachers encourage students from different racial and ethnic groups to have open and constructive conversations about being victims of racism and discrimination?

8.5 Do teachers encourage students from different racial and ethnic groups to discuss the benefits and costs to groups who are the perpetuators of racial discrimination?

8.6 Do teachers in your school talk openly and constructively about race with each other?

9.0 Does your school provide opportunities for students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups to interact socially under conditions designed to reduce fear and anxiety?

9.1 Do teachers structure interracial cooperative groups that enable students from different racial and ethnic groups to become acquainted as individuals?

9.2 Are students provided with factual information in the social studies or other subjects that contradicts misconceptions about ethnic and racial groups?

9.3 When teaching about ethnic and cultural differences, do teachers point out the important ways in which all human groups are similar?

10.0 Does the organizational structure of the school ensure that decision-making is widely shared and that members of the school community learn collaborative skills in order to create a caring environment for students?

10.1 Is decision-making within the school widely shared among school administrators, teachers, parents, and students?

10.2 Do members of the school community learn collaborative skills?

10.3 Do the adults in the school community create a collaborative and caring environment for the students?

Principles	Rating				
	Hardly at All		Somewhat		Strongly

10.4 Are parents involved in meaningful ways in school policy and decision-making?

10.5 Do teachers and administrators continually examine the personal, social, and cognitive consequences of policies and practices in order to promote equity in their schools?

10.6 Does the school curriculum include a focus on issues of power and privilege through examples in history, art, science, and other disciplines?

10.7 Are structural changes being made in the school to make it a more affirming and just environment for students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, language, and social-class groups?

10. 8 Are changes being made in teaching strategies to accomodate students from different racial, ethnic, cultural, language, and social-class groups?

10.9 Are successful efforts being made at the district and school level to recruit a racially, culturally, and ethnically diverse administrative and teaching staff?

11.0 Are leaders developing strategies to ensure that all public schools, regardless of their locations, are funded equitably?

11.1 Are school administrators endeavoring to help state legislators and other state policy makers to understand the significant influence that funding has on student outcomes?

11.2 Are teacher organizations endeavoring to educate state legislators and other state policy makers about the influence of funding on student outcomes?

11.3 Are parent and community groups endeavoring to ensure that schools are funded equitably?

11.4 Are state and district level officials endeavoring to provide additional funding for schools with low-income populations?

12.0 Do school district policies encourage the use of multiple ways of assessing student learning that are culturally sensitive and that measure complex cognitive and social skills?

12.1 Do teachers use a range of formative and summative assessment strategies that give students opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of knowledge and skills?

12.2 Do teachers use a variety of assessment devices to ensure that students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural, and language groups meet rigorous standards in the academic subjects?

12.3 Do teachers use a variety of assessment devices to measure student outcomes that are related to improved race relations?

12. 4 Does assessment go beyond traditional measures of subject matter knowledge to include complex cognitive and social skills?

REFERENCES

Alford, C. F. (1994). *Group psychology and political theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Banks, J. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(5), 4-14.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 1-24). New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (1996). *Multicultural education, transformative knowledge, and action.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. (1997a). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1997b). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum and teaching* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Barbe, K. H. P., & Swassing, R. H. (1979). *Teaching through modality strengths: Concepts and practice.* Columbus, OH: Zaner-Bloser.

Bennet, C. I. (1995). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 179-196.

Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations. In S. Bochner (Ed.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 5-44). London, England: Pergamon Press.

Bochner, S. (1986). Training intercultural skills. In C. R. Hollins and P. Trower (Eds.), *Handbook of social skills training: Applications across the life span* (Vol. 1). Oxford: Pergamon.

Bochner, S. (1993). Culture shock. In W. Lonner and R. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture* (pp. 245-252). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boykin, A. W. (1986). The triple quandary and the schooling of Afro-American children. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *The school achievement of minority children: New perspectives* (pp. 57-92). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Braddock, J. (1991). Bouncing back: Sports and academic resilience among African-American males. *Education and Urban Society*, 24(1), 113-131.

Burtless, G. (Ed.). (1996). *Does money matter? The effect of school resources on student achievement and adult success.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1990). The effect of a prejudice-reduction simulation on attitude change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20, 341-356.

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

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cohen, E. (1990). Teaching in multiculturally heterogeneous classrooms. *McGill Journal of Education*, 26, 7-22.

Cohen, E. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for heterogeneous classrooms* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, E., & Roper, S. (1972). Modification of interracial interaction disability: An application of status characteristics theory. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 643-657.

Collins, C., Leondar-Wright, B., & Sklar, H. (1999). *Shifting fortunes: The perils of the growing American wealth gap.* Boston: United for a Fair Economy.

Comer, J. P., & Haynes, N. M. (1991). Parent involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *The Elementary School Journal*, 91, 271-277.

Commins, B., & Lockwood, J. (1978). The effects on intergroup relations of mixing Roman Catholics and Protestants: An experimental investigation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 8, 383-386.

Cox, B. G., & Ramírez, M., III. (1981). Cognitive styles: Implications for multiethnic education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Education in the 80s: Multiethnic education* (pp. 61-71). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Crocker, J., Hannah, D. B., & Weber, R. (1983). Personal memory and causal attributions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 55-66.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students.* Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Dahl, R. (1998). *On democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). The implications of testing policy for quality and equality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(3), 220-225.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1995). Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 465-483). New York: Macmillan.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ancess, J. (1994). *Graduation by portfolio at Central Park East Elementary School*. New York: NCREST.

Davidman, L., & Davidman, P. T. (1994). *Teaching with a multicultural perspective: A practical guide*. New York: Longman.

Dawkins, M. (1999, April). *Sports involvement as a protective factor in drug abuse prevention among African American youth.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Education Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Deutsch, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and conflict resolution in an alternative high school. *Cooperative Learning*, 13, 2-5.

Deyhle, D. (1986). Success and failure: A micro-ethnographic comparison of Navajo and Anglo students' perceptions of testing. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 16, 365-389.

Diaz, C. (Ed.). (2001). *Multicultural education for the 21st century*. New York: Longman.

Dreeben, R., & Gamoran, A. (1986). Race, instruction, and learning. *American Sociological Review*, 51(5), 660-669.

Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescence Research*, 14(1), 10-43.

Feagin, J. R., & Sikes, M. P. (1994). *Living with racism: The Black middle-class experience.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban high school.* Albany: State University of New York.

Fisher, R. (1994). General principles for resolving intergroup conflict. *Journal of Social Issues,* 50, 47-66.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Frutcher, N., Galleta, A., & White, L. (1992). *New forms of parent involvement: A policy study*. Submitted to the Lily Endowment. New York: Academy for Educational Development.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-90). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Nier, J. A., Ward, C. M., & Banker, B. S. (1999). *Across cultural divides: The value of superordinate identity*. In D. A. Prentice and D. T.

Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 173-212). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gaertner, S., Rust, M., Dovidio, J., Bachman, B., & Anastasio, P. (1994). The contact hypothesis: The role of a common ingroup identity on reducing intergroup bias. *Small Group Research*, 25, 224-249.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. *Educational Researcher*, 21, 4-11.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Paquedano-Lopez, P., Alvarez, H. H., & Chiu, M. M. (1999). Building a culture of collaboration through hybrid language practices. *Theory into Practice*, 38(2), 87-93.

Hanushek, E. A. (1994). School resources and student performance. In G. Burtless (Ed.), *Does money matter? The effect of school resources on student achievement and adult success* (pp. 43-73). Washington, DC: Brookings.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hawley, W. D., & Jackson, A. (Eds.). (1995). *Toward a common destiny: Improving race and ethnic relations in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hawley, W. D., Hultgren, F., & Abrams, A. (1996). *The characteristics of effective schools*. Report to the Maryland State Department of Education. College Park: University of Maryland.

Hedges, L. V., Laine, R. D., & Greenwald, R. (1995). Does money matter? A meta-analysis of studies of the effects of a differential school inputs on school outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 23, 5-14.

Howard, G. (1999). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Howell, K. W., & Rueda, R. (1994). Achievement testing with culturally linguistic diverse students. In L. A. Suzuki, P. J. Meller, & J. G. Ponterotto (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural assessment* (pp. 253-290). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Irvine, J. J., & York, D. E. (1995). Learning styles and culturally diverse students: A literature review. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 484-497). New York: Macmillan.

Johnston, L., & Hewstone, M. (1992). Cognitive models of stereotype change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 360-386.

Jordan, W. J. (1999, April). *Sports and schooling: Athletics matter in comprehensive high schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Kamfer, L., & Venter, J. L. (1994). First evaluation of a stereotype reduction workshop. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 24, 13-20.

Katz, I., Glass, D. C., & Wackenhut, J. (1986). An ambivalence-amplification theory of behavior toward the stigmatized. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 103-117). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Klimes-Dougan, B., Lopez, J. A., Nelson, P., & Adelman, H. S. (1992). Two studies of low-income parents' involvement in schooling. *The Urban Review*, 24, 185-202.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Kulik, C. C., & Kulik, J. A. (1982). Effects of ability grouping on secondary school students: A meta-analysis of evaluation findings. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 451-428.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamskeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Preparing teachers for diversity: Historical perspectives, current trends, and future directions. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes, (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 86-123). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lazear, D. (1994). *Multiple intelligence approaches to assessment: Solving the assessment conundrum.* Tuscon, AZ: Zephyr Press.

Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. (1995). Effective schools research. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.

Linville, P. W., Salovey, P., & Fischer, G. W. (1986). Stereotyping and perceived distributions of social characteristics: An application to ingroup-outgroup perception. In J. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 165-208). New York: Academic Press.

McCall, C. H. (1996). An agenda for equitable and cost-effective school finance reform. *New York State Office of the State Comptroller*. Albany, NY: Public Information Office.

McConahay, J. G. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91-125). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. Working paper no. 189. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Mackie, D. M., Allison, S. T., Worth, L. T., & Asuncion, A. G., (1992). Social decision-making processes: The generalization of outcome-biased counter-stereotypic inferences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 28,* 23-42.

Mahiri, J. (1998). *Shooting for excellence.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mehan, H. (1992). Understanding inequality in schools: The contribution of interpretive studies. *Sociology of Education, 65,* 1-20.

Meier, D. (1994). Transforming schools into powerful communities. *Teachers College Record, 3,* 654-658.

Moll, L. C. (Ed.). (1990). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moreland, K. L. (1994). Persistent issues in multicultural assessment of social and emotional functioning. In L. A. Suzuki, P. J. Meller, & J. G. Ponterotto (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural assessment* (pp. 51-76). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mosteller, F., Light, R. J., & Sachs, J. A. (1996). Sustained inquiry in education: Lessons from skill grouping and class size. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 797-828.

Murnane, R. J., & Levy, F. (1996). *Teaching the new basic skills: Principles for educating children in a changing economy.* New York: Free Press.

National Education Association (1997, July). *Status of the American public school teacher,* 1995-96. Washington, DC: Author.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Nieto, S. (2001). School reform and student learning: A multicultural perspective. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed., pp. 381-401). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nieto, S., & Rolon, C. (1997). Preparation and professional development of teachers: A perspective from two Latinas. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners* (pp. 93-128). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

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

Oakes, J. (1990). *Multiplying inequalities: The effects of race, social class, and tracking on opportunities to learn mathematics and science.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Padilla, A. M., & Medina, A. (1994). Cross-cultural sensitivity in assessment: Using tests in culturally appropriate ways. In L. A. Suzuki, P. J. Meller, & J. G. Ponterotto (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural assessment* (pp. 3-28). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pallas, A. M., Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1989). The changing nature of the disadvantaged population: Current dimensions and future trends. *Educational Researcher*, 18(5), 16-22.

Pratt, R., & Rittenhouse, G. (Eds.). (1998). *The condition of education, 1998.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Quattrone, G. A. (1986). On the perception of a group's variability. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 25-48). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

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

Riche, M. F. (2000). America's diversity and growth: Signposts for the 21st century. *Population Bulletin*, 55(2), 1-43. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

Rothbart, M., & John, O. P. (1985). Social categorization and behavioral episodes: A cognitive analysis and the effects of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues,* 41, 81-104.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 58, 878-891.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz and D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 53-85). New York: Plenum.

Shade, B. J. R. (Ed.). (1989). *Culture, style, and the educative process.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sikkema, M., & Niyekawa, A. M. (1987). *Design for cross-cultural learning.* Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.

Sizer, T. R. (1985). *Horace's compromise.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current textbooks. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (pp. 78-101). New York: Routledge.

Stephan, W. (1999). *Reducing prejudice and stereotyping in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues,* 41, 57-176.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). *Intergroup relations.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejuice and discrimination* (pp. 23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tajfel, H. (1970, November). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American*, 96-102.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Terry, D. (2000, August 11). U.S. child poverty rate fell as economy grew, but is above 1979 level. *New York Times*, p. A10.

United States Bureau of the Census (1991). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 1991* (111th ed.). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: ESL classrooms as sites of struggle.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Villegas, A. M. (1991). *Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990s and beyond.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Wilson, W. J. (1978). *The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing American institutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zúñiga, X., & Nagda, B. (1993). Dialogue groups: An innovative approach to multicultural learning. In D. Schoem, L. Frankel, X. Zúñiga, & E. Lewis (Eds.), *Multicultural teaching in the university* (pp. 233-248). Westport, CT, and London: Praeger.

Multicultural education is an idea, an educational reform movement, and a process. As an idea, multicultural education seeks to create equal educational opportunities for all students, including those from different racial, ethnic, and social-class groups. Multicultural education tries to create equal educational opportunities for all students by changing the total school environment so that it will reflect the diverse cultures and groups within society and within the nation's classrooms. Multicultural education is a process because its goals are ideals that teachers and administrators should constantly strive to achieve.

The Center for Multicultural Education focuses on research projects and activities designed to improve practice related to equity issues, intergroup relations, and the achievement of students of color. The Center also engages in services and teaching related to its research mission.

James A. Banks is Professor and Director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle. A specialist in social studies and in multicultural education, he has written widely in these two fields. His books include *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society* and *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum, and Teaching.* Professor Banks is a member of the National Academy of Education.

Peter Cookson is a faculty member at Teachers College, Columbia University, and President of Teachers College Enterprises. A sociologist who specializes in education, he is the author or co-author of 14 books on education reform, including *School Choice: The Struggle for the Soul of American Education.*

Geneva Gay is Professor of Education and Faculty Associate of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle. A specialist in general curriculum and multicultural education, she has written more than 100 articles and 3 books, including *At the Essence of Learning: Multicultural Education* and *Culturally Responsive Teaching.*

Willis D. Hawley is Professor of Education and Public Affairs at the University of Maryland, where he served as Dean of the College of Education from 1993 to 1998. Hawley has published numerous books, articles, and book chapters, including *Toward A Common Destiny* (co-edited with Anthony W. Jackson).

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine is the Charles Howard Candler Professor of Urban Education at Emory University, Atlanta. Her research interests are multicultural education and urban teacher education. Her books include *Black Students and School Failure*, which received two national awards, and *Critical Knowledge for Diverse Learners*, published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Sonia Nieto is Professor of Language, Literacy, and Culture in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. She is the author of numerous publications in bilingual education and in multicultural education, including *Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*, and *The Light in Their Eyes: Creating Multicultural Learning Communities.*

Janet Ward Schofield is Professor of Psychology and a Senior Scientist in the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh. She is a social psychologist whose major interest has been social processes in desegregated schools. *Black and White in School: Trust, Tension or Tolerance?* is one of her best-known publications.

Walter Stephan is Professor of Psychology at New Mexico State University. He has published articles on attribution processes, cognition and affect, intergroup relations, and intercultural relations. He wrote *Reducing Prejudice and Stereotyping in Schools* and is co-author (with Cookie White Stephan) of *Improving Intergroup Relations.*

Center for Multicultural Education

focuses on research projects and activities designed to improve practice related to equity issues, intergroup relations, and the achievement of students of color. The Center also engages in services and teaching related to its research mission.

Research related to race, ethnicity, class, and education represents the central mission of the Center. This research contributes to the improvement of practice in schools, colleges, and universities through the synthesis and dissemination of findings in multicultural education and the development of guiding principles for the field.

Publications such as the *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (1995), edited by James A. Banks and Cherry A. McGee Banks, provide remarkable depth and breadth and an impressive look at research and scholarship in the field.

The Symposium-Lecture Series focuses attention on topics related to race, ethnicity, class, and education. The symposium-lecture series features prominent scholars and outstanding practitioners such as Shirley Brice Health, Linda Darling-Hammond, Claude M. Steele, and Lisa Delpit.

Graduate Study with top university scholars at the master's and doctoral levels prepares educators for working in an increasingly diverse nation and world. At the master's level, practicing teachers and other education professionals acquire essential knowledge and skills necessary to work in multicultural environments. At the doctoral level, researchers and scholars develop expert knowledge and leadership skills necessary to teach in colleges and universities or lead educational institutions and agencies.

A wide range of courses in multicultural education offers opportunities to build a broad and deep understanding of the issues confronting our society and the world and the means to reconcile them. Courses run throughout the regular academic year. In addition, the Center offers several short summer courses, institutes, and workshops. Examples of courses include Educating Ethnic Minority Youths; Teaching the Bilingual-Bicultural Student; and Race, Gender, and Knowledge Construction: Curriculum Considerations.

CENTER FOR
Multicultural Education

College of Education
University of Washington
110 Miller
Box 353600
Seattle, WA 98195-3600

PHONE: **206-543-3386**
E-MAIL: **centerme@u.washington.edu**
WEB SITE: **http://depts.washington.edu/centerme/home.htm**