Rethinking the Pedagogy of Ethnicity

The Teagle Working Group on the Pedagogy of Ethnicity
© 2006

Ryan K. Balot
Lara Bovilsky
Robert W. Cape, Jr.
Patricia DeMarco
Hillel Kieval
Joseph Loewenstein

Victoria Martinez
Alfred C. Miranne, III
Julian Murchison
Guy D. Nave, Jr.
Lea Pickard
Lisa Satanovsky

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Participants

Ryan Balot – Principal Investigator
Associate Professor, Classics, Washington University in St. Louis

Lara Bovilsky
Assistant Professor, English, Washington University in St. Louis

Robert Cape
Associate Professor, Classics, Austin College

Patricia DeMarco
Associate Professor, English, Ohio Wesleyan University

Hillel Kieval
Goldstein Professor of Jewish History and Thought, History,
Washington University in St. Louis

Joseph Loewenstein
Professor, English, Washington University in St. Louis

Victoria Martinez
Associate Professor, Romance Languages, Union College

Alfred C. Miranne, III
Associate Professor, Sociology, Gonzaga University

Julian Murchison
Assistant Professor, Anthropology, Millsaps College

Guy Nave
Assistant Professor, Religion, Luther College

Lea Pickard
Assistant Professor, Anthropology, Luther College

Lisa Satanovsky
Lecturer, Washington University in St. Louis

Introduction

In the spring of 2005, the Teagle-sponsored Working Group based at Washington University in St. Louis commenced its efforts to rethink the pedagogy of ethnicity. Our explicit goals were to understand the proper role of the study of ethnicity in liberal education and to improve our pedagogy in courses either dedicated to or touching on ethnicity. Since the Group includes faculty colleagues from a wide range of humanistic and social-scientific disciplines, participants have advocated diverse approaches to both questions. We believe that such diversity is all to the good, because it has inspired us to articulate our own views transparently, to confront challenges to them, to revise in accordance with more plausible understandings, and to define for ourselves what liberal education in ethnicity involves. The paper that follows is a traditional White Paper in the sense that it outlines a theoretical understanding of ethnicity and offers strategies and recommendations for approaching the pedagogy of ethnicity in higher education. Our White Paper contrasts with traditional policy papers, however, in that we have aimed throughout to preserve the diversity of viewpoints characteristic of our group. Such a "dialogic" presentation represents our work accurately and will, ideally, invite readers to participate actively in our ongoing debates.

Our project also presents two other features that might be unusual or contrary to initial expectation. First, apart from Dr. Lisa Satanovsky, whose Ph.D. is in Education, no members of our Group have backgrounds in the discipline of Education. This feature of our Group will, we hope, enable us to take an entirely different and original perspective on the pedagogy of ethnicity. Second, most professional literature on our subject focuses on primary and secondary education. By contrast, our focus has been entirely on college- and university-level education. As a result, our discussions tend to grow out of our experiences in higher-education classrooms, as well as our individual reflections on and group conversations about such experiences.

Our discussions of the pedagogy of ethnicity have inevitably taken place within larger interpretations of our project goals. While we are unanimously convinced of the value of improving our theoretical understanding and our pedagogical practices, nothing has attracted more controversy than the interpretation of precisely *why* we have been doing what we have been doing. This is the subject of the two essays in Section I, which consider the study of ethnicity in light of contemporary political thought (Section I.1) and propose a civically-oriented skill set that could apply, in principle, to a wide range of ethnicity-related courses (Section I.2). Our goal in the first section is to establish

the wider framework of discussion within which our work has taken place, while indicating the variety of opinions expressed in each case. Publishing these clearly articulated controversies will hopefully encourage educators to persist in reflecting upon their own aspirations within the context of the larger academy and, indeed, the larger political and cultural world.

Throughout the project, but especially at the beginning, we made every effort to familiarize ourselves with contemporary theories of ethnicity, as used both in the humanities and social sciences. Accordingly, a discussion of ethnicity as an analytic category in the humanities (Section II.1) is followed by a comparable analysis in the social sciences (Section II.2). Beyond seeking to understand ethnicity in history, practice, and theory, most participants in the project have focused specifically on the pedagogy of ethnicity – how to construct helpful syllabi, how to inspire students to approach charged topics honestly and openly, and how to reflect self-consciously on the instructor's own mediation between controversial scholarly work and undergraduate students. Our results in these areas are presented as pedagogical strategies (Section III.1), reflections on the instructor's subject-position and self-understanding (Section III.2), and reflections on dialogue and the visual in pedagogy (Section III.3).

At the request of the Teagle Foundation, we have developed methods for assessing the pedagogy of ethnicity – methods we have applied to ten "test-bed" courses, which members of the group taught concurrently with and specifically in connection with the project. Along with general reflections on assessment in higher education, our own efforts to assess ourselves and to develop evaluative instruments, both qualitative and quantitative, are described in Section IV. A general discussion of assessment in our project, along with examination of several rich examples, is offered in Section IV.1, while a numerically-based assessment of a single course with control group is offered in Section IV.2. Section V lists the works cited throughout the White Paper. Finally, in Section VI, we present a working bibliography for educators, which is based on our teaching and reading in the subject. We hope that this bibliography will be useful for those working within specific disciplinary paradigms, but we expect it to be especially helpful to those seeking a cross-disciplinary vision of ethnicity as understood in the contemporary academy. As befits a project focused on pedagogy in higher education, the bibliography emphasizes resources that will be particularly useful for instructors in college- and university-level courses.

Although we have discussed all of the foregoing issues as members of the Group, we have found it useful to divide up the composition of this White Paper according to individual interests, backgrounds, and specialties. Upon completion, drafts of each section were circulated for additional feedback and commentary; in some cases, this process led to extensive further discussion. Despite our division of labor in the composition of this paper, however, we believe that the paper forms a coherent whole and that the sections are often, either implicitly or explicitly, in conversation with one another. As a result, we find, the paper accurately reflects our conversations for the past 18 months – conversations that have been diverse and at times contentious, but also, perhaps at a deeper level, unified by a shared commitment to improve the pedagogy of ethnicity in higher education.

Section I.1: Project Goals

Since the inception of our project in the spring of 2005, we have frequently discussed the long-term goals of studying ethnicity. Perhaps not surprisingly, we have not achieved a consensus position on such a thorny issue – nor have we insisted on doing so. Instead, we have educated ourselves through reading and conversation, and we have developed what are, I hope, significant views about the value of studying ethnicity in a liberal democracy.

Our group's most persistent and least controversial idea, at least internally, is that studying ethnicity contributes to the civic mission of the university. Enabling our students to understand ethnicity more deeply will, we hold, improve the quality of their democratic citizenship. Provisionally, and for the purpose of this section, I use "ethnicity" to refer to a species of group-based identification, revolving around a socially constructed set of markers or indicators of group allegiance, such as genealogy, history, territory, culture, religion, language, and nomenclature (for fuller accounts, see Section II). In its simplest form, the civic interpretation says that since ethnicity frequently figures in political debate, our students will be better civic participants if they understand ethnicity more deeply (for what such understanding might involve in specific pedagogical situations, see Section I.2).

We have, however, probed this claim more deeply, because it leaves open the questions of why ethnicity has become politically important and what an education in ethnicity might contribute

to improving our politics. Practically speaking, ethnicity is central to current debates because of specific episodes of violence or tension which either participants or observers have interpreted through the lens of ethnicity. The larger political point, though, is that ethnic oppositions often establish lines of suspicion and fear between groups of fellow citizens or inhabitants of a shared territory. At one extreme, such oppositions have led to well-known cases of brutality, forced migration, and "ethnic cleansing." Within the Western liberal democracies, ethnic tensions also lead to outbreaks of violence, and, more subtly, to the erosion of characteristic liberal values and practices: freedom, equality, civic trust, and public deliberation. This is true despite the widespread acknowledgment that ethnic identities are socially "constructed." Amy Gutmann has put this point as follows:

> Some nonracialist ways of identifying and distinguishing ourselves, by nationality and ethnicity, for example, do not rest on any scientific fiction, and may even recognize their own historical contingency and social construction, but they nonetheless fuel a sense of superiority, hostility, distrust, and disrespect among groups. This sense of animosity among groups typically leads to unjust and undemocratic discriminations in the distribution of basic liberties and opportunities. (Gutmann 1996, 164-65)

Self-definition through opposition is of course very familiar; it might, in fact, be intrinsic in the construction of ethnic identity, as the famous "Robbers' Cave" experiment suggests (Muzafer Sherif et al. 1961/1988, Appiah 2001). In recent years we have witnessed the bitter fruits of ethnic oppositions and hostility, even if, as John Bowen has argued, the Western media has too often overstated the specifically ethnic roots of conflict throughout the world (Bowen 2000).

Accordingly, it is possible to construe our civic aims within the framework of both international and domestic politics. More knowledgeable graduates will contribute ever more significantly to public discussions of ethnic hostility abroad. In order to meet our responsibilities as democratic citizens, we must acquire the intellectual resources to take a well-informed stand on the foreign policies of our elected officials (Kateb 1992). Within American culture, moreover, our prospectively well-educated graduates will, we believe, strengthen our respect for freedom and equality, raise our level of civic trust, and contribute meaningfully and sympathetically to public deliberation with those from other ethnic backgrounds.

How so? To describe these links more fully, it is necessary to identify very specifically the core values or virtues of citizenship that we aspire to foster. At this juncture, the Working Group tends to split into divergent camps, with some recommending radically egalitarian transformations in existing institutions; with others, drawing on Nietzschean or Foucauldian theories of power, recommending that we view ethnic relations, like all social relations, as inevitably enmeshed in social networks of power; with others recommending deep respect for existing ethnicities and other cultural forms in the spirit of a "politics of recognition"; and with still others proposing that it is not our task, as educators, to provide clear and determinate links between pedagogy and citizenship. My own view is that, as educators, we must clearly and explicitly articulate our long-range goals, because these goals inform our everyday practices in countless ways. For my own part, I view our project in terms of three key educational values: autonomy, toleration, and imagination. These values are critical to democratic citizenship, in ways that are specifically relevant to ethnicity.

I. The Public Value of Autonomy

At its root, autonomy means "self-governance." It is largely uncontroversial to say that autonomy consists, at a minimum, in continual rational reflection on one's own desires and beliefs, with a view to ironing out inconsistencies and revising one's preferences in the light of more rationally attractive options (e.g., Levinson 1999, 22-25; MacMullen 2005, 93-193; Rawls 1971, 515-16). Autonomy does not involve reinventing oneself each day, but it does require individuals to remain open to new evidence. Autonomous individuals revise their beliefs in accordance with the best rational arguments of which they are aware. Moreover, they have the motivation, not simply the capacity, to test their beliefs (Callan 1997, 227-30). Education for democratic citizenship is, above all, education for autonomy viewed particularly as an epistemic virtue (MacMullen 2005; Callan 1997, 12-69; Gutmann 1987/1999, 50-52; Rawls 1971, 513-20).

To see why autonomy is a central virtue of democratic citizenship, we must briefly examine one of the central activities of democratic citizens – namely, public deliberation. The political duties of democratic citizens consist chiefly in making, and often in articulating, rational and publicly acceptable judgments about what the principles of justice or other principles of political morality demand. We deliberate democratically through evaluating the reasoned arguments of others,

forming our own opinions after due reflection, confronting challenges to our preconceived notions, resisting any claims based on authority or tradition, and revising our views when other, more plausible ideas have presented themselves (Benhabib 1996, Gutmann and Thompson 1996, Talisse 2005). Democratic deliberation depends upon, calls forth, and helps to develop autonomy in the specified sense (Weinstock 1999). Without the habits of rational reflection that are characteristic of autonomy, "sophisticated political agency" (cf. Section I.2) would be impossible. That deliberative agency, as I have described it, is *distinctively* democratic appears to be illustrated by the cross-cultural focus on public deliberation within most known democracies, even in the earliest democracies of classical Greece (Balot 2004).

Typically, political theorists have argued that education for autonomy should occur already in primary and secondary education, but I believe that such education should be extended and deepened at the university level. This involves, of course, teaching critical thinking in all university-level courses. But the critical study of *ethnicity* is publicly important because of the internal dynamics of ethnic groups. Ethnic identifications are, as a matter of fact, often central to the self-image of both our students and our fellow citizens. Like other powerful cultural groups, ethnic groups exert strong pressures on individuals: "Ethnicity under certain circumstances has a propensity to become 'totalising', displacing other loyalties and obligations to become the sole basis of identity" (Kennedy 1999, 110). One liberal worry, accordingly, is that such "totalizing" identities tend to produce conformity within ethnic groups. (Note that the following remarks apply more fully to such cases of all-consuming identifications, rather than the relatively cost-free, "leisure-time" forms of ethnic identification that Herbert Gans has called "symbolic ethnicity" [Gans 1979/1996].)

Conformity to group norms, unreflective respect for authority in general or for particular leaders, and unaudited adherence to tradition tend to erode the capacity for democratic deliberation, through undermining the persistent rational reflection at the heart of autonomy. In our courses on ethnicity, we have the opportunity to encourage our students to live their own lives and to speak their own voices in politics, specifically in relation to the charged issues of ethnic identity. Developing such capacities in our students is crucial to supporting the aspirations of liberal democracy. We want our graduates to be familiar with the dynamics of individuals and groups, both in history and in literary representation, so that they will be more sensitive to the ways in which collective identities act upon them and their fellow citizens. As Julian Murchison (Section II.2) and

Guy Nave (Section III.2) have pointed out, for example, we can contribute to our students' self-awareness through rendering visible the ordinarily invisible effects of dominant ethnicities, such as "whiteness." Whiteness is surely one of the most totalizing ethnicities in contemporary America. Making our students aware of their own, perhaps unreflective participation in dominant ethnicities, as the case applies, contributes significantly to their ability to think self-consciously and deliberately about their political behavior. For non-white students, our efforts to make visible dominant ethnicities might also prove liberating, in that "whiteness" could begin to be de-centered from any presumptively normative status.

As for other practical consequences, our pedagogy might, for example, lead individuals to think carefully for themselves about how to resist ethnic stereotyping, rather than allowing group leaders to define the normative responses appropriate to all members of the group – Catholics, Muslims, African-Americans, Irish-Americans, etc. (Gutmann 1994). Or it might mean that individuals will decide, in "concocting" their public affiliations and identities, not to emphasize ethnicity at all, once this is presented as a plausible choice (Zelinsky 2001, 155-84, at 170). This is, I think, what Appiah means when he suggests that a gay African-American man might decide that his sexuality, ethnic practices, and so on should remain his own private affair rather than a matter of political policy or discussion on which he is intrinsically obligated by his group affiliations to act (Appiah 1994, 159-63).

Whatever strategies we may apply in particular classroom situations (see Section III.1), a pedagogical focus on autonomy means that we will encourage individuals, not (say) the leaders of their ethnic groups, to define for themselves what their ethnic affiliations mean in particular circumstances, so as to avoid both unthinking conformity and unreflective nonconformity. Cultivating autonomy in our students will help them resist the pressures that are internal to ethnic groups. Studying ethnicity in both the humanities and social sciences will help them become more fully aware of how groups exert pressures on individuals, and what forms of resistance to such pressures are possible. In this way, our students will become more active and thoughtful contributors to public dialogue about ethnicity in its own right and about other meaningful social and political issues.

II. The Personal Value of Autonomy

Similar thoughts animate my belief in the personal (as opposed to public) value of autonomy. Despite the strongly civic definition of the individual favored by some members of the Working Group (see, e.g., Section I.2), the heart of liberal democracy is, and has always been, individualism. We should not "regard citizenship as a comprehensive universal identity" (Gutmann 1994, 6), to be adopted without question. Instead, as Whitman, Emerson, and Thoreau, our chief theorists of democratic individualism, recognized long ago, individuals show respect for their own dignity by developing their capacities for autonomous self-creation (Kateb 1992). To insist that everyone accept the primacy of politics is to damage human dignity through a failure to respect each individual's right to live his own life as he chooses.

Studying ethnicity supports the irreducibly valuable project of self-determination. Through exposure to historical examples and literary narratives, among much else, our students will appreciate that ethnic formations are not "natural" or inevitable. They themselves have choices to make in subscribing (or not) to ethnic identifications and in interpreting the ethnic claims or ascriptions made by others. De-naturalizing ethnicity through education is especially important because people who inhabit or identify with particular ethnicities often view their identifications as natural, necessary, inevitable, and constitutive of their "real" identities. For, as Wilbur Zelinsky has argued, "[W]e have been afflicted with an unspoken consensus … to the effect that ethnicity is eternal and changeless" (Zelinsky 2001, ix). This consensus, if one does indeed exist, is both wrongheaded and harmful.

Promoting autonomy through denaturalizing ethnicity is a characteristically democratic form of education, even if it targets personal development rather than civic consciousness. For central to the project of democracy, since classical antiquity, is the willingness to reject or revise traditional authority through self-conscious human invention. This can have important personal consequences within ethnic groups. For example, a young Indian woman of college age, born and raised in the United States, might refuse to accept her parents' decision to give her in marriage to an Indian-born man she has never met before (cf. Appiah 1994). If so, then she is exercising the individual choice to resist authority and traditional ethnic practices in order to live the life that she finds most

fulfilling. Studying ethnicity will, we believe, enable our students to make rational, responsible choices about their own lives, and to understand more completely the basis of their choices to subscribe (or not) to particular ethnic affiliations and practices.

III. Controversies about Autonomy and Responses

The foregoing remarks about autonomy, and thoughts along the same lines, have proved highly controversial within the group. Many have worried that I view our project as that of "undoing" ethnicity, even though ethnicity is widely recognized to be a source of meaning or identity for those who affiliate strongly with ethnic groups. This worry has frequently grown out of the view that so-called "autonomous" individuals are a myth, in that we are always already constituted by our natal families and cultural groups, and deeply marked by the effects of larger social, cultural, and economic forces. Members of the Working Group have related these worries to one or more familiar communitarian charges, according to which liberal autonomy (1) either makes lives worthless, because "unencumbered selves" are unanchored in meaningful cultural values; or (2) makes individuals selfish and narcissistic, because they fail to work usefully for larger collective goals; or (3) provides an account of individuals that, shaped as it is by limited models of "rational choice" or the market, does not properly acknowledge the emotional, affective, or irrational elements that actually drive human psychology (Sandel 1982, 1996; MacIntyre 1981; Kymlicka 1989, 47-73).

All of these charges are substantial and help to clarify the usefulness and limitations of autonomy as an analytic category for our project. Autonomy, as I have construed it, does not imply the stronger thesis according to which individuals should strive to differentiate themselves from others in a Millian or quasi-Nietzschean quest for originality, individuality, and difference (cf. Appiah 2001). Autonomy does not necessarily involve the lyrical, Zarathustrian celebration of individual difference for its own sake. Nor does it involve the incoherent idea of creating a self *ex nihilo*: as everyone recognizes, individuals are brought up as children within cultures, and they necessarily assume values that are transmitted to them during their minority. Moreover, the life-options available to them as objects of rational choice are themselves determined by the cultures in which they are raised or in which they otherwise find themselves (Kymlicka 1989, 164-66). Even during

adulthood, finally, one might argue for the need for thick cultural identification, on the grounds that "We become full human agents, capable of understanding ourselves, and hence of defining our identity," through "dialogical" exchanges with "significant others" who help us acquire, understand, and clarify our views (Taylor 1994, 32). To what extent does my picture of autonomy hold up against these criticisms, and particularly against Taylor's plausible account of self-definition within social practice?

Rather than undermining the value of autonomy, Taylor's dialogical view of the self points the way to a rapprochement between our group's liberal/communitarian tensions. If our personalities are necessarily formed and maintained through engagement with others, then participating in ethnic and other cultural practices can function as a way to promote individual autonomy and growth. We often confront our most meaningful and challenging "others" in the local, even intimate circumstances of ethnic culture. But becoming "full human agents" through such dialogical engagement works only if individuals continue to take an active, reflective stance toward their ethnic affiliations.

Thus, contrary to the view that autonomy implies deracination, and contrary to the opposite view that strong identifications necessarily require forgetfulness or denial of the self, our graduates' ethnic commitments will be real without being unconditional or blind (cf. Levinson 1999, 30-35). This will be a "high-wire act," no doubt, but it is a balancing act that is characteristic of liberal democratic citizenship (Callan 1997, 37-38). If they choose to participate in particular ethnic rituals and symbolic forms, then our graduates will, we hope, be able to articulate precisely what they value about such forms of participation. In all likelihood, as it happens, many autonomous individuals will choose to subscribe to the cultural norms and values of ethnic and other groups in which they have been raised. Education in ethnicity helps our students do so reflectively – that is, on the basis of clear reasons which they have articulated, and in such a way as to remain open to reconsideration and revision of their group affiliations. This does not undermine the "meaningfulness" of the ethnic experience, unless meaning is imagined to reside only in mystical experiences. Rather, thoughtful engagement, self-directed activity, and self-conscious choices make experiences more meaningful than they otherwise could be.

IV. Toleration

       Just as ethnic groups might promote autonomy in the way I have suggested, so too is autonomy, as I have construed it, essential, rather than harmful, to the survival and strengthening of ethnic groups. This might be counterintuitive to those in the Working Group who maintain that individuality erodes group cohesion by promoting selfishness or narcissism. In his helpful discussion of toleration, however, Michael Ignatieff offers a number of arguments against this idea, starting with the observation that intolerance is rooted in an unwillingness to view others as individuals:

> Indeed, in most forms of intolerance, the individuality of the person who is despised is all but ignored; what counts is merely his or her membership in the group…. Going further, one could say that intolerant people are uninterested in the individuals who compose despised groups: indeed they hardly see 'them' as individuals at all. What matters is the constitution of a primal opposition between 'them' and 'us'. Individuality only complicates the picture, indeed makes prejudice more difficult to sustain, since it is at the individual level that forms of identification and affection can arise to subvert the primal opposition between 'them' and 'us'. (Ignatieff 1999, 83).

       Ignatieff proceeds to argue that the unwillingness to recognize others as individuals itself derives from the failure of individuals to think for themselves:

> Their own identities are too insecure to permit individuation: they cannot see themselves as the makers of their individualities and hence they cannot see others as makers of theirs either. In their intolerance, they allow themselves to be spoken for by the collective discourses that have taken them over; they do not, as it were, speak in their own right. (Ignatieff 1999, 83).

       If this is correct, then individual autonomy cooperates with toleration to further the viability of ethnic groups as meaningful expressions of culture. From an individualist's perspective, indeed, ethnic pluralism should be a welcome fact about modernity. Ethnic pluralism embodies the state's respect for the rights of individuals to associate freely and to live as they choose. Moreover, ethnic diversity raises our consciousness of human novelty and human difference and thus proves

educational for those who are secure enough to appreciate it – for those who, in Ignatieff's words, "learn to think for themselves" and "become true individuals," who "can free themselves, one by one, from the deadly dynamic of the narcissism of minor difference" (Ignatieff 1999, 106). By exposing students to ethnic "alterity," by encouraging them to engage actively and sympathetically with narratives from diverse ethnic groups, we stimulate their imaginations. We confront them with different, though plausible, life-plans and thus help them to test and possibly reconsider their own life-plans (cf. Rawls 1971, 209-11; Mill 1859/1991, 20-61). Students who value autonomy should also, therefore, value the continued thriving of ethnic diversity.

V. Controversies and Future Directions

Toleration, however, has also proved to be controversial for participants in the Working Group, both because it appears to be "thin gruel" and because we should not tolerate the ways in which ethnic identities have been marked by histories of oppression. Tolerance itself is, indeed, a notoriously troubled civic value, since it appears to be called for only in cases where we find the beliefs or practices of others to be unacceptable or, in short, intolerable (Williams 1999). Yet, whatever its conceptual difficulties, toleration is still highly regarded in liberal democracies either as promoting stability or as an expression of respect for others' equal liberty.

In response to the group's objections, however, we have come to strive for a value that is more substantial than the sort of toleration that implies enforced acceptance of what one finds unacceptable. We might say that "respect," which is "far more discriminating" than tolerance, better captures our Group's working idea: whereas toleration is limited simply by laws forbidding harm to others, respect implies the more substantial belief that others are "reflecting a moral point of view," even if we disagree with their views (Gutmann 1994, 22). Either way, whether we prefer to use the term "toleration" or "mutual respect," this value should not be equated with an omni-tolerant relativism. Our group respects diversity of all sorts, but there are boundaries defined at a minimum by laws forbidding harm to individuals either inside or outside groups, and by moral sentiments that encourage all individuals to show respect to themselves and others (cf. Rawls 1971, 211-221).

But there is diversity within our group as to what our vision of the future ought to be. Perhaps not surprisingly, the division occurs along the lines of communitarianism and liberalism.

On the one hand, there are those who would emphasize the multicultural picture in which ethnic cultures (e.g., Quebecois culture) are valued as "primary goods" in the context of which individual lives acquire meaning. Proponents of this view suggest that collective identification is an ineradicable feature of individual identity and that, as a result, peace, tolerance, and mutual respect will arise only when group (e.g., ethnic) cultures are properly funded and socially recognized (Neuberger 1999, Kennedy 1999). Individuals, to put it differently, are most likely to consent to the thinner, structural norms of the wider society when they are allowed, even encouraged, to develop their own ethnic identifications and to be respected for them on an equal basis with others.

The other major view within the group is cosmopolitan. The cosmopolitan approach views ethnic differences as minor rather than major, in the grand scheme of things, and encourages us to look across and beyond ethnic difference so as to appreciate our shared humanity (Appiah 2001, Ignatieff 1999, Fitzgerald 1999). Cosmopolitans would emphasize solidarity among all human beings, on the grounds that what unites us as human beings – in particular the use of reason, but also language, rituals of death, the experience of biological need, religion, and other cultural universals – is much more significant than the minor differences that act as ethnic indicators. The cosmopolitan view takes seriously Susan Mendus's point that ethnic or racial differences are often based on adventitious human characteristics, rather than qualities that individuals are responsible for, and this in itself raises questions about whether such markers of difference are a legitimate basis for creating divisions among ourselves (Mendus 1999, Mendus 1989). Thus, for cosmopolitans, the question is not so much whether we should strive to "undo" ethnicity, as whether we should aspire to emphasize our commonality rather than our differences.

On either view, though, education in ethnicity can strengthen our mutual respect for one another. Education in ethnicity potentially strengthens the multicultural approach by reducing the level of suspicion among ethnic groups, on the basis of greater mutual understanding and appreciation. Such education also potentially bolsters the cosmopolitan approach in that deeper understanding will in all likelihood yield the insight that very many diverse ethnic groups all give rise to practices with a comprehensible logic and to symbols, clothing, food, and other forms of cultural expression that are interesting and that are, beyond local differences, all recognizable and valuable expressions of our shared humanity.

VI. Imagination

Finally, studying ethnicity helps students develop the imaginative resources to envision a different world from the one we inhabit. The starting-point of such an imaginative project might be the identification of what needs to be changed in the first place. Here we have benefited from Patricia DeMarco's interpretation of our aims in promoting university-level study of ethnicity in courses on literature, history, and culture. As DeMarco has emphasized, we should not simply be content to accept ethnic avowals or ascriptions as they currently exist, since, in all likelihood, those ethnic identifications are significantly marked by ethnocentric, supremacist relations of power. As citizens, therefore, we have obligations to educate ourselves in the history of ethnic oppression and stigmatization, and to make every effort to rectify such injustices – particularly if we (or our groups) are the historical beneficiaries of such injustices. If we (and our students) recognize the particular ways in which we are all "implicated" in the history and contemporary structures of social power, then we will be in a better position, both epistemically and morally, to transform ourselves into the just, generous, and free people we all aspire to be. Note that this analysis does not render toleration problematic, since toleration, as I have construed it, mandates not that we should accept, but rather that we should reject, injustices of precisely this kind.

On the other hand, cultivating our students' imaginations will help them, we hope, to make ethnic affiliation a meaningful feature of their own self-image, if they should choose to express themselves this way. In the spirit of DeMarco's suggestions, this will require students to resist the power of ethnic stereotypes ascribed to them by the wider culture. Such resistance will not be an easy or straightforward process, as Appiah has noted:

> In our current situation in the multicultural West, we live in societies in which certain individuals have not been treated with equal dignity because they were, for example, women, homosexuals, blacks, Catholics … people who have these characteristics find them central – often negatively so – to their identities (Appiah 1994, 160-61).

If we are able to foster resistance to such stereotyping in our ethnicity courses, then we might also be able to encourage students to imagine positive ways in which historically undervalued ethnic identities can be recreated in a more positive and affirming way. This is the imaginative

project. Our hope is that our courses will help students develop the imaginative resources to make such novel, creative forms of ethnic expression possible. Our autonomous students, respectful of others, will strive to develop novel ways in which "blackness," "whiteness," "Greekness," or other ethnic identifications can be positively expressed.

Once again, however, we are led to the division between the multicultural and cosmopolitan views within the group. Multiculturalists would, I think, argue that positive expressions of ethnic identity are a suitable final goal for our project, in that individuals will always view such collective identities as an integral part of their own self-image. Cosmopolitans would, on the other hand, view such positive expressions – for example, winning respect as a black, Catholic, Muslim, etc. – as valuable, indeed, but also as steps along the way toward a culture in which it was not necessary to demand respect specifically as a black, Catholic, Muslim, etc. The worry here is that the "politics of recognition" might possibly replace "one kind of tyranny with another" (Appiah 1994, 162-63). If we truly value autonomy, then we will want to be respected as self-creating individuals, capable of not only developing positive ethnic identities, but also of transforming the very categories through which we identify with ethnic groups. In all likelihood, such a project of self-creation would require even more ambitious efforts of the imagination than those previously described.

Section I.2: Skill Set

Early in our discussions it seemed useful to establish a core repertoire of skills and a core body of information that would constitute what we (advisedly) began calling ethnic literacy. I was inspired to develop the following set of skills in the belief that the civic importance of studying ethnicity is primary, that ethnicity should be a central focus of contemporary liberal education, and that our classroom efforts are best directed toward just the following set of skills.

Seven basic skills for the understanding of ethnicity

A college- or university-educated American citizen should be able to analyze ethnicity; to that end, he or she should have

1. the ability securely to distinguish between avowed (emic) and ascribed (etic) ethnicities and to reflect critically on those avowals and ascriptions.

       avowed or ascribed ethnicity

2. the imaginative capacities to appreciate and understand the experiences of others living within particular ethnicities; these "others" can be either real or fictional.

       ethnicity imaginatively understood

3. a familiarity with the history of both academic and popular uses of the term "ethnicity," including its historical relation to terms like "race," "tribe," or "nation."

       ethnicity as a technical term

4. the ability to discern how ethnic identifications interact with other identifications (including, but not limited to, religious, class, and gender identifications), whether avowed or ascribed.

         ethnicity as a modifier

5. a clear sense that ethnicity functions contextually -- i.e., that its functions vary in different places and times -- and an ability to describe several discrete instances of that functioning. (As always in the humanities and social sciences, the ability to adduce and analyze pertinent examples is essential.)

       conditional character of ethnicity

6. the ability to think clearly about the place of ethnicity in important issues in ethics and politics, e.g., toleration, cosmopolitanism, inequality. This might entail an understanding of the relation of ethnicity to one or more crucial historical transitions: state-formation, modernization, colonialization, decolonialization, or globalization.

       ethics and politics of ethnicity

7. the ability to extend ideas about ethnicity by relating it to other group-forms -- e.g., clubs, subcultures, peer groups, parties, sects.

       ethnicity as a group-form

Commentary

Defining these core skills proved controversial within the group, both because of disagreements over ultimate aims and because of difficulties in pinpointing the level of sophistication we may expect in college students with a wide range of interests and limited time to experiment.   Several faculty participants, for example, regard the proposed standard of ethnic literacy as too demanding or idealistic, while others have wondered whether the proposed skill set goes far enough. There has also been debate over whether the skill set is too overtly civic in its framing – are there, for example, personal qualities and resources that study of ethnicity might equally help to develop? This debate arose in a particularly sharp way in the context of disagreements over whether ethnic affiliations are unambiguously positive and life-affirming for individuals or merely instrumentally useful or even potentially harmful in posing threats to individual rights.

I continue to hold strongly to the importance of this skill set as a set of specifically civic, democratic criteria by which to judge the merits of a good liberal education. Because "ethnicity" is one of the key terms not only in contemporary social science, but also in modern political debate, the defenders of the proposed skills argue that both informed social scientific understanding and sophisticated political agency – or, more precisely, the sophisticated political agency that higher education arguably should enable – require all of these skills. Mastering only one or two of them would be a shallow achievement, although better than nothing. A high standard is appropriate if we expect to enable college graduates to speak persuasively about ethnicity, to understand their own and others' ethnic identifications, and to make clear-sighted moral and political decisions in contexts of ethnic practice and discourse. Public speaking, wide understanding, ethical decision-making: these are the central ingredients, I would argue, in engaging at an appreciably high level in the activities of modern democratic citizenship.

Many members of the group insisted that mastering all the foregoing skills was too much to ask of all Americans; doubtless we could not expect that such skills could be mastered within, say, a secondary school curriculum. If this is conceded, however, then we must acknowledge that "engaging at an appreciably high level in the activities of modern democratic citizenship" might

require a college degree or the equivalent. This suggestion offended the populism of some participants in the Working Group, on the grounds that it offers an unacceptably elitist vision of democratic citizenship. Others countered by asking whether it is indeed unrealistic or undemocratic to assert that higher education could claim to refine and strengthen the citizenship of graduates, that is, that higher education might quite properly aim to develop civil skills and aptitudes that go beyond that mutual respect that is fundamental to citizenship and should therefore be fostered in *all* citizens.

There was no consensus among those who thought the standard too high as to which of the constituents should be demoted to subordinate status, though several members of the group regarded item #3 as being of least obvious merit. Those defending the importance of understanding the intellectual history of ethnicity urged that historical perspective was especially useful for disentangling the various and competing uses of the term "ethnicity" now current in public discourse. Moreover, adherents of item #3 urged that it was important for students to understand, by non-trivial exposure to examples, that social scientific concepts, variant in time, are consequential, since the conceptual apparatus of any given moment not only systematizes, but also shapes perception and behavior and thereby influences political decision-making. Hence the history of concepts of ethnicity may be regarded as central to the understanding of ethnicity *per se.*

Although we acknowledge that our list is heavily theoretical, we do not find it crucial that students be able to formulate their understanding precisely according to these categories. Even so, we maintain that a certain degree of abstraction and theoretical reflection – core activities in liberal education, as we understand it – will give students leverage in the development of practical knowledge and intuitions. Abstract and carefully theorized understandings of ethnicity will enable our graduates to confront a wide array of novel practices and beliefs with correspondingly diverse and sophisticated intellectual tools. Thus we hope that our way of educating them in the understanding of ethnicity will enable them to find satisfaction in continuing to explore ethnicity in politics and culture throughout their lives.

Section II.1: Theorizing Ethnicity: Humanities

The study of ethnicity emerged more or less coextensively with the very origin of historical and literary study in the humanities.[1] For early historians and literary critics, that human nature varied predictably and reliably in accordance with racial, ethnic, and national groupings was axiomatic; that specific racial, ethnic, and national temperaments and abilities were therefore represented in national literatures was equally axiomatic. Indeed, one of the chief purposes of literary study or historical chronicling was to investigate and organize such distinctions. Conversely, comparative analysis of the literary and cultural achievements of civilizations taken to be made of distinct populations was itself a major tool of ethnic and racial study. Assessments of a group's art and literature could be of greater interest than physical descriptions of members of that same group. Thus, we find that the Count de Gobineau's argument for racialism – a canonical text for numerous later racisms – focuses more on the "moral and intellectual diversity of races" than on physical or social descriptions of the peoples de Gobineau hopes to distinguish.[2] In a more literary and humane context, such as Henry James's enthralled reviews of an Italian performer of Shakespeare's *Othello*, we find aesthetic assessments taking in national and ethnic considerations as a matter of course:

> [Salvini's characters] present themselves to him – as they naturally do to the Italian imagination – as embodiments of feeling, without intellectual complications; the creature to be represented appears a creature of passion, of quick susceptibility, of senses lying close to the surface.[3]

For James in this passage, knowledge of the nature of ethnic and national character is a prerequisite for competent aesthetic analysis, and dramatic performance provides access to a static ethnic truth.

---

[1] While it would be possible to trace similar associations in classical through Renaissance history and anthropology (e.g. in Pliny or the *Dissoi Logoi*, or in Jean Bodin, William Camden, or Richard Verstegan), I am focusing my brief observations on the period that saw the rise of modern universities, academic departments, and disciplines. I therefore intend "early" here to mean the nineteenth century. For thorough treatment of the distinctive early modern "geohumoralism" inherited from Galen and others, see Floyd-Wilson 2003.

[2] de Gobineau 1856.

[3] James 1883.

Thus, if interest in the experience and nature of ethnicity, race, and nation occupies a central place in humanistic study today, the centrality of the interest is nothing new. What has changed is the understanding of the nature of the facts disclosed. In particular, while numerous disciplines are invested in recording and analyzing individual and group experiences of ethnicity, ethnic identity is no longer seen as static and no longer taken predictably or reliably to entail particular temperaments, behaviors, or abilities in a given human being.

One explanation for this is historical. In the wake of decolonization, of the ethnic tragedies of the twentieth century, and of movements agitating for political and human rights for formerly disenfranchised groups across the globe, the moral urgency of the choice of methodology employed in ethnic study is incontestable. On the one hand, interest in preserving often fragile histories imperiled by the most extreme and malign oppressions has led to historical, anthropological, and sociological efforts to detect or recover social and personal experiences that might once have been dismissed as unworthy of neutral or valorizing academic attention. In this spirit, continuing sites of ethnic study include empirical collection and analysis of data on a massive scale, description of the role of ethnicity in the lives of individuals and the affairs of nations, and accounts of the processes by which ethnic groups provoke, organize, and suffer the effects of tensions and strife. On the other hand, worries about the intellectual underpinnings of traditional understandings of ethnicity have encouraged and rewarded self-reflection about and questioning of the entity studied, generating a second major focus for the study of ethnicity.

Just what is ethnicity? It had long been virtually universally assumed that distinct ethnic groups emerged from the relative isolation of one culture or group from another allowing distinctive traits and behaviors to be conserved in endogamy and transmitted across generations. Conviction that ethnic qualities and differences were static, that ethnic identities were stable, and that ethnic groups were separate had rested on this assumption. In 1969, Fredrik Barth presented an important corrective to this view, arguing instead that ethnic distinctions were maintained primarily by the widespread *belief* in stable classifications of group differences, belief capable of overriding awareness of significant variation within groups or overlap between them.[4] Remarkably, Barth was able to theorize and document the emergence of ethnicities out of "social processes of exclusion and incorporation" that delineated discrete groups in pointed contrast to the fact of "a flow of

---

[4] See Barth 1969, 9-38, now reprinted in Sollors 1996, 294-324.

personnel" among them in the form of "changing participation and membership in the course of individual life histories."[5] Barth marshaled examples of conversion and assimilation capable of "canceling" a prior ethnic identification (which would have been perceived as an unalterable attribute until the transfer of identities). Even where an individual's ethnic identity remained stable, Barth's theory showed that this stability depended less on "intrinsic" qualities of ethnic identification than on belief in them and on showy, possibly *ad hoc* contrasts with the identities of others.

Barth's observations that individual ethnicity can be altered or even discarded represent an important component of the second strand in the study of ethnicity, a strand ultimately less concerned with compiling empirical data or contingent histories of ethnic experience (though hardly hostile to such work). Rather, this strand studies the genesis and proliferation of ethnic identities in "social processes," attending to the logics and fallacies that sustain belief in determinate human groups.[6] For instance, in the service of maintaining myths of ethnic integrity and stability over time, group membership will be selectively or circularly determined; likewise, the diversity or hybridity of groups will be ignored or denied.[7] The study of ethnicity continues to elaborate on the instances and types of such social processes.

Thus far I have silently eliminated the terms "race" and "nation" from my discussion. But just as these terms were inseparable from "ethnicity" in invocations of human groups up through the twentieth century, they are likewise intimately related to this second strand of ethnological study. The use of "race" and "nation" as rubrics for individual and group identity is generated by fervent and fervid social beliefs which generally share both form and content with the beliefs that produce and govern ethnic distinctions.[8] While – particularly in the United States – ethnic identity can seem less intense or "real" and more situational than racial identity, the close resemblance and logical

---

[5] Barth 1969, 9, 10.

[6] Though for certain practitioners there may indeed be a certain tension between an ethnological theory which discounts intrinsic group distinctions and an ethnological practice which documents such distinctions, there is no inherent conflict. Theorists do not dispute the phenomenological effects of the beliefs they study, the sense that a given identity may not be changed, or the lived, often inflexible reality of socially-ascribed labels.

[7] I expand on the logics and fallacies that support belief in determinate groups in the introduction to Bovilsky, forthcoming. See also Appiah 1990, 3-17, and Appiah 1985, 21-37. For the methodologically and theoretically flawed science that served social desires in attempting to document elusive group distinctions, see Gould 1981.

[8] In many contexts, "class" is likewise an interwoven term. For useful exposition of some of these relationships in the contemporary United States, see the foreword in Sollors 1996.

relationship between the two in fact explains phenomena such as wholesale transfers of entire

groups from one rubric to the other (as has happened in the U.S. with groups such as the Irish,

Syrians, Italians, and Jews – groups that were once, but are now no longer generally, seen as distinct

races).[9]

Nominative and theoretical inconsistencies aside, the relationship of race and ethnicity, for

instance, in groups of people who may share one ascription but not another, may be productively

studied. Similarly, the impact of sex on ethnicity, of ethnicity on age, and of ethnicity generally as it

interacts with other domains which shape the lives of individuals and groups, is a productive field of

study, which we may identify as the third strand of the study of ethnicity. This area, like the study of

the experience of ethnicity, employs the collection and analysis of empirical data, for which both real

events and their textual representation (such as films, novels, or newspapers) may be mined. Like

the study of ethnicity as an entity and a result of social processes, this area also encourages work that

reflects on ethnicity and group-formation itself.

Section II.2: Theorizing Ethnicity: Social Sciences

In their analyses of diverse societies and cultures, social scientists have had to grapple with

questions of group identity, the causes or sources of these identities, and the tangible consequences

of group identity. For instance, political scientists pose complex questions about how these

identities can motivate political movements, and they craft arguments about the connections

between these identities and violence. Meanwhile, in their attempts to understand the processes of

social stratification, sociologists examine the different social positions and classes that members of

different groups tend to occupy in society. Anthropologists produce ethnographies about different

cultural groups and study the ways in which these groups and their cultures evolve, change, and

interact. All of these central disciplinary questions have encouraged social scientists to maintain a

---

[9] For ethnicity's lesser "reality" than race in the U. S., see Sollors 1990, 289. For ethnicity's "situational" elements, see Banton 1998 [1987], 159-160. For an account of the shifts in American Jewish racial identity during the twentieth century, see Sacks 1994. For the analogous impact of dizzying changes in categories of race and ethnicity appearing in the United States Census, see Goldberg 2002, 188-190. For the ascendance of ethnicity theories over race-based ones in twentieth-century sociology, see Omi and Winant 1994 [1986], 14-23. But for difficulties in distinguishing between ethnicity theory and race theory, see Banton 1977, 8 and Sollors 1996, xxix-xxxv.

broad interest in ethnicity as a principal type of group identity. Ethnicity is a cultural and social phenomenon of longstanding analytical importance.

For many years, social scientists took ethnic groups (along with "races" and "tribes"[10]) to be central *units of analysis*. In essence, the ethnic group was taken as a given – a starting-point for the study of society. Groups were assumed to exist and to be identifiable. Therefore, many social science analyses (including a number of classic texts in the disciplines)[11] focus on the ethnic group as the unit to be analyzed. In other instances, discrete groups were compared in terms of their respective characteristics. Even in these comparative texts, the ethnic group remains the unit of analysis; two or more units are being compared.

In recent years, social scientists have moved from treating the ethnic group as a unit of analysis to exploring the concept of ethnicity as a *subject of analysis*. Barth's ground-breaking work viewed ethnicity and identity as situational, as negotiable; Barth recognized ethnic affiliations as having distinct political motivations and ramifications.[12] Barth's analyses of ethnicity marked a key moment in the social sciences, because they catalyzed a major shift in approach and theoretical understanding. Social scientists began to question the solidity of ethnic groups as units of analysis and have increasingly focused their interests on the ways that identities emerge and dissipate and the ways that alliances and divisions manifest themselves within and between groups.

This shift has resulted in major changes in research agendas and in the professional literature. Much of the recent work helps to highlight the notion that ethnic identities are not primordial identities. Texts today tend to examine particular ethnic identities within a framework of

---

[10]The use of both these terms – "tribe" and "race" – has been justifiably criticized by social scientists in recent years. Social science critiques of the notion of race (and its support for racism) go back at least as far as Franz Boas in American anthropology, and most anthropologists reject the use of tribe as a generic term of reference for a group of people because of its pejorative connotations. In a sense, ethnicity has become the default term that has replaced these oft-critiqued terms; use of the term "ethnicity" often seems to assume that the term is relatively neutral in its theoretical and political ramifications. However, this assumption of neutrality may mask the complexity of the term and the underlying concepts.

[11]The ethnic group as a unit of analysis is perhaps most obvious in classic anthropological ethnographies, such as *The Nuer* by E.E. Evans-Pritchard. In these ethnographic texts, the focus is on the ethnic group and the culture that it possesses.

[12]Barth 1959 provides excellent and detailed analysis of the ways in which individuals negotiate identities within groups. Barth 1969 helped to mark the significant shift in thinking about ethnicity as an analytical category.

history, economics, and politics in the assumption that these identities can and do evolve over time either as a result of intentional manipulation or as an unintended result of historical circumstances.[13] More recently, there has been a noticeable move to focus analytical attention on the "invisible" ethnic identities of politically and economically dominant groups; this move has produced a number of important works that examine the construction and evolution of "whiteness" as an identity connected to political and economic power.

In disciplines like anthropology, the shift from ethnic group as a unit of analysis to ethnicity as the subject of analysis has destabilized many of the longstanding assumptions and tenets of the discipline. It means that the texts for teaching anthropology (and the other social sciences) have changed significantly, and new pedagogical techniques and strategies are needed as a result. Even at the introductory level, classes have to deal with the fluidity of ethnic identity as an analytical concept. An engaged teacher can no longer simply teach about the Nuer and the Yanomami as the most famous case studies of ethnic groups in the field of anthropology. An engaged teacher has to help her students to see the complex makings of ethnic identities and to understand related developments such as ethnic nationalism, ethnocentrism, economic and political stratification, and social mobilization.

One of the difficulties in teaching about ethnicity as the subject of analysis stems from the relatively ill-defined nature of the concept itself. Because ethnicity has been used as a presumably neutral, catch-all category, it can and does refer to a wide variety of social phenomena and to a wide variety of types of group identities.[14] Especially when they first encounter ethnicity and related concepts, students are often troubled by the lack of analytical specificity and the need to think critically about the concept itself. Students can no longer comfortably refer to a particular ethnic group and its social and cultural characteristics without thinking about how membership in that

---

[13]Mamdani's work on the historical origins of the Hutu-Tutsi conflict in colonial policies and relationships is an excellent example of this sort of historically informed analysis of contemporary ethnic identities: see Mamdani 2002.

[14]The recent work of Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper and others argues that ethnicity is analytically separable from the existence and experience of social groups. Our group began discussions with a reading from Brubaker, which prompted a good deal of debate about "groupness" and the relationship between ethnicity and groups. Brubaker's work represents a school of thought suggesting that ethnicity is expressed and experienced independent of social groups. This claim may be a logical extension of Barth's argument about individual and situational negotiations of identity; however, it was a controversial claim for our group. See Brubaker and Cooper 2000.

group is assumed or ascribed and how the accompanying social identity will be interpreted and experienced by various individuals.

Section III.1: Pedagogical Strategies

Two broad themes emerged as our Working Group considered the pedagogical strategies involved in dealing with ethnicity in the classroom—pedagogical theory and practice. The theory sets the tone for how an instructor will deal with ethnicity—in essence creating a guideline or worldview for the planning and execution of teaching about ethnicity in the classroom. The practice addresses the practical issues that arise in teaching about ethnicity—particularly the strategies and challenges an instructor faces in doing so. While certainly these categories overlap considerably, we found that conceptualizing the pedagogy of ethnicity in this way allowed us to articulate some actual "how to's," as well as explaining the basis for our pedagogical strategies. Hence this section of the white paper focuses on both theory and practice, and attempts to articulate issues and practical strategies we felt could be important to any instructor approaching ethnicity self-consciously in the classroom—whether the course is an introductory-level course in Cultural Anthropology or an upper-level course on Medieval Literature. Not surprisingly, in an effort to create broadly applicable guidelines for the theory and practice of ethnicity in the classroom, we have had to give up much of the specific detail that might be relevant to individual classrooms and even entire disciplines. Specific details drawn from our own experiences nonetheless inform our ideas.

I. Pedagogical Theory of Ethnicity

By the pedagogical 'theory' of ethnicity, we mean the conscious creation of the tone the course should take regarding ethnicity, which will guide the instructor as he or she prepares the course and interacts with students. Like a teaching philosophy that guides how one creates and carries out any course, this acts as a worldview that involves setting goals and planning course content.

1.	*Set goal(s):* The first step is to set a goal or goals for what you want students to learn about ethnicity. These will be central to structuring and teaching the course. If the goal is to enable students to acquire particular items of knowledge, then you will want to focus on transmitting these particular items effectively. However, if you consider the overarching goal of teaching about ethnicity to be a social transformation for students, then you may need to teach in a very different way. In her Spring 2006 test-bed course in anthropology, for example, Lea Pickard articulated as one teaching goal that students learn the ways in which ethnicity is shaped by group power relations. Having this goal in mind from the beginning led Pickard to establish a corresponding plan for teaching, so as to achieve her particular goal. One point emphasized in our discussions was that instructors should be aware that they will not be able to teach everything about ethnicity. Hence, since an instructor cannot possibly do everything, decide the most important goal(s) for your specific course.

2.	*Establish course content and format*: Beginning with course goal(s) will allow the instructor to create a plan for teaching about ethnicity. In creating this plan, some of the questions an instructor might ask include: What readings will allow me to achieve my goals? What format for the course will be most effective? Should the course include a variety of teaching methods? Should it be primarily discussion based? What type of class environment should I create and how might I achieve this? What assignments will most effectively allow me to achieve my goals?

3.	*Assess effectiveness:* Follow up on the plan you have established by assessing whether the goal is being met. Our working group considered assessment especially important, and during our test bed courses we worked to assess the effectiveness of teaching about ethnicity through a pre-course and post-course test. However, in the process we also learned that this is an effective strategy for teaching about ethnicity more generally, particularly for ensuring that an instructor is meeting his or her course goal.

II. Pedagogical Practice of Ethnicity

The work of "theorizing" pedagogical strategies will create a foundation on which an instructor will build by actually interacting with students in the classroom. This is the practice of teaching about ethnicity and involves considering the actual teaching techniques and practicalities of day to day teaching. The first section addresses some general "techniques" that emerged from our working group's discussions of test bed courses. These techniques are not laid out in a detailed "how to" format, but are described broadly as techniques that, we agreed, offer something unique and effective to teaching about ethnicity. After describing our proposed techniques in detail, we offer a discussion of the challenges that tend to emerge from these techniques and that may be unique to classroom contexts dealing with ethnicity as a subject matter. Our discussion also draws on the "theory" of the pedagogy of ethnicity and helps to integrate the theory of effective teaching about ethnicity with its practice.

While the first section offers basic, broadly applicable techniques, the second section draws more specifically from (and thus may speak more narrowly to) one instructor's experiences with a literature course. However, this is not to say that the challenges this instructor addresses will not be encountered in a variety of pedagogical situations. Indeed, we anticipate that faculty will find much here to aid their own pedagogical endeavors.

1. *Techniques in the Pedagogy of Ethnicity:* Throughout our discussions, some general recurring "techniques" for effectively teaching about ethnicity emerged from the test bed courses. The following strategies draw more generally on pedagogical techniques that could be used in any classroom, but seem to be particularly effective for teaching about ethnicity.

- **Disarm students**

All test bed instructors spoke to some extent of "decentering" students' perceptions by addressing ethnicity in a way that students would not typically think about it. There might be multiple ways to do this. For example, an instructor could use comedy to get students thinking about an aspect of ethnicity in a way that makes it simultaneously more approachable and unusual.

- **Use narratives to get at ethnicity experientially**

While instructors often feel pressure to "define" something clearly for students, ethnicity often does not lend itself to easy definition. For that reason, test bed instructors found that reading about a variety of experiences that people have with ethnicity helps to position it as something that students are able to understand and identify in people's lives as well as to understand the implications of the concept.

- **Create some discomfort**

While to some degree disarming students may facilitate a certain level of comfort when dealing with ethnicity, this strategy encourages the creation of discomfort. When students (and indeed instructors) are able to move outside of their comfort zone, they are forced to rethink their own ways of dealing with material. However, it is important that this does not itself become the classroom environment (to which students may react negatively), but instead is used to advance students' thinking about ethnicity.

- **Use examples that challenge students' ideas and force critical thought**

Students bring cultural assumptions and their own experiences of ethnicity to the classroom and often believe those to be universal truths. It is of utmost important to force reflection on their assumptions by using examples which force them to think critically about what they believe and why they believe what they believe. For example, an instructor may want to challenge American college students' cultural assumptions about race—particularly about the cultural belief of a clear dichotomy of "black" and "white"—by addressing an example of how race is defined in another cultural context such as Brazil, where race is defined quite differently.

2.   *Classroom Practices:* An important element of an effective pedagogy of ethnicity is to plan self-consciously for challenges that may be unique to teaching about this subject. This section addresses those challenges in two ways. The first is a list of general challenges faced in a classroom setting and the second a typology of potential issues that might arise while interacting with students

around the topic of ethnicity. Both constitute what we see as an important aspect of effective teaching—the conscious awareness of and planning for the unique situations, reactions, and feelings that can arise in the classroom when teaching about ethnicity.

2.a: The Practice of Setting Goals and Recognizing Challenges

In an earlier section, "goal-setting" was discussed as an important component of any course design. What is assembled here is a list of challenges which one instructor, Patricia DeMarco, put together based on her experiences teaching a test-bed course in English literature. The list specifies the kind of knowledge that it was assumed students would not possess as well as the kinds of misunderstandings to which students were expected to be prone. It represents both challenges that were anticipated ahead of time, and those that were unanticipated.

Taking the time to devise such a list of challenges can help you in articulating course goals. It can also help shape your selection of course materials and format. And, as the list-making reveals the kind of knowledge you hope to give students, it can also be useful in devising methods of assessment. While this list is not intended to be exhaustive, the kinds of knowledge, attitudes and effects identified are fairly broad and wide-ranging. In setting goals for a specific course, you will want to decide which challenges to address and how to prioritize amongst challenges.

Particular Challenges:

- Racism and ethnic stereotypes are typically seen by students
  - as a matter primarily of attitudes
  - as views passed on by an older generation (e.g., grandparents)
  - as views cemented by living in rural, homogeneously white, communities
  - as views held only by "extremists"

- Efforts to oppose and eradicate racism and ethnic hostility are
  - seen primarily as questions of changing attitudes (vs. implementing change in practices, discourses, and institutions)

o equated most commonly with simple, "one-shot" solutions such as attending a diverse school; having friends different from you; reading literature that helps you appreciate difference; etc.

o deemed at times to be fruitless in the face of "inevitable" ethnic or racial conflicts.

- Students typically lack knowledge and a sophisticated understanding of

o the material, institutional, and structural hierarchies that perpetuate and construct racial injustice and ethnic hostilities

o the political interests generating discourses of racial and ethnic difference and served, in turn, by their perpetuation as independent and pre-existing categories

o the historical emergence of racial and ethnic group identities and their continual re-definition over time

o the shifting salience of ethnicity and race as attributes of personal identity, as forces felt to motivate conflict or violence or both, and as instruments of (political) power

o the lack of stable, objectively definable criteria for ethnic and racial group membership; internal contradictions within definitions of self and others; complexities arising from the multiple "situationality" of individuals (in relation to ethnicity and race, as well as gender, sexuality, etc.)

o how much effort is required to live together in harmony, peace, justice; and how efforts of the imagination can prevent despair and inspire action for change

- Whiteness tends to be invisible; "others" are deemed to have a "race"; similarly an Anglo ethnicity is consistently and normatively understood as the prototypical American identity, while "others" are categorized (as immigrants, aberrant or exotic, needing to be assimilated, etc.) and rendered objects of study.

- The experiences of ethnic groups are deemed to be historically equivalent and interchangeable irrespective of how they are coded in respect to whiteness; thus, for instance, the success of a given ethnicity group that was defined or came to be defined as a "white" ethnic group in overcoming ___ (poverty, discrimination, etc) is taken to establish a norm of reasonable

possibility for other non-white ethnic groups despite differences in privilege (which remain unacknowledged)

- Study of ethnicity and race is itself viewed suspiciously: students conflate racism with the acknowledgement of racial prejudice and with action (especially government action) designed to rectify past and present injustices shaped by racial and ethnic classification.

2.b: The Practice of Instructor Interaction: A Typology of Instructor-Student Interaction

Effective pedagogy is often a function of the ability of faculty to intervene in the moment, as students articulate views during discussion that call for exploration, discussion, redirection, and even at times correction. While the contexts in which we teach will necessarily determine which strategies will be successful (and those contexts vary not just from institution to institution, but even within a given institution, from discipline to discipline, or even from one course to another), this section isolates certain types of student comments that seem to occur with such a frequency that it may be possible to anticipate them, and to suggest strategies that might be effective.

What follows is derived from DeMarco's reflections on teaching a literature class on identity in contemporary fiction. It gives a typology of student responses that recurred in that context and describes interventions that were—at least in this instructor's context—successful.

- **Type 1: The Defensive Formation**, or "My best friend is/was a black person."

Early in the semester in my fall test-bed course, several white students were eager to demonstrate their good will towards minority groups and to establish their lack of complicity with racist structures of the culture. Because I wanted to provoke students to reflect critically on their own attitudes, beliefs, and actions, as well as to confront the structural support systems of racial hierarchies in this country, I looked for ways to redirect such student remarks.

Although I think there are limits to personal self-disclosure as a central pedagogical method, I found it useful to counter a student's disowning of racism with brief counter-examples from my

own past experience. Thus when a white woman in my class challenged a novelist's portrait of social segregation amongst blacks and whites by saying that her "parents' best friend was a black couple, and race was never an issue..." I responded, "That's interesting. My experience has been really different...." Intervening with counter-testimony from my own life (sometimes childhood) helped take away their fear that I would judge them, and made it possible for us to explore racism in a deeply probing manner with less defensiveness, on the one hand, and more willingness to take responsibility for privileges attached to dominant ethnic group memberships, on the other.

- **Type 2: The Universalizing Posture**, or "We don't have ethnic traditions in my family, and I don't think I have an ethnicity (or race). I understand that some people take pride in their heritage, but I think it'd be better if rather than emphasizing their differences, they tried to fit in more."

This is an attitude that I had hoped would be challenged by both the structure of my course and the selection of readings. In literature courses, in particular, there is a risk that the course structure will reinforce the invisibility of white privilege[15] and naturalize the culturally dominant positions of individuals who don't identify as "White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant" but whose very claim to a normative American identity is predicated on such a (disavowed) identification.

To meet this challenge, faculty can assign works that draw attention to both white and non-white identities, texts in which "mixed race" identities are represented, and narratives that trace the historical evolution of ethnic categories themselves. Especially productive in this regard was assigning works such as Tim Tyson's memoir, *Blood Done Sign My Name*, which illustrates the ways in which being white, southern, Christian, and 'non-ethnic' positions Tyson's family within a dominant group, enabling them to enjoy unearned privileges and material benefits because of an unjust system,

---

[15] When structuring a literature course focused on ethnicity there are two major options: to focus the course on the writings of one particular ethnic group (Chicano Literature, Italian American Literature) or to structure the course comparatively (ranging from one ethnic or racial group to another within a given country such as the US, or looking at the construction of ethnicity or race along other comparative axes (within a region, on a continent, etc.). Having chosen to structure my class as a comparative survey of contemporary American identity as reflected in memoirs and fiction cast in the memoir form, one challenge was to create a course structure that would render whiteness visible as a racial and ethnic category and avoid reinforcing a structure whereby the dominant group appears to have no ethnicity or race while minority groups are rendered the visible "objects" of study.

though without any overt or personal discriminatory action on their part. Similarly helpful was Jeffrey Eugenides's *Middlesex*, a work which, in addition to emphasizing the fluidity of gender and sexual identities, traces the changing experiences of ethnic identity in three generations of a Greek immigrant family. Such narratives can help students see how the enjoyment of a "symbolic" relationship to ethnicity is enabled historically for some groups and not for others (and indeed as *Middlesex* helps to show, one group's access to the luxury of a symbolic identity is often predicated on a willingness to distance that group from those identified as an ethnic or racial group – in the novel, primarily African-Americans).

- **Type 3: The Rendering of Privilege as Victimization**, or "Obviously segregation was wrong and we needed civil rights for that, but punishing whites today with Affirmative Action policies isn't fair. I haven't personally discriminated against any black person or other minority. So why should I be penalized?"

This comment and its familiar variants emerged on several occasions when the literary texts we were discussing circled around contemporary responses to racial injustice. To address students' presuppositions, I assigned Peggy McIntosh's essay, "White Privilege: Unpacking The Invisible Knapsack," and followed up with students by discussing the hidden but plentiful ways in which whites continue to enjoy privilege in fields as diverse as education, housing, and treatment within our systems of governance (e.g. in the judicial and legislative systems). Since the ethnic diversity within our class existed within the confines of those deemed to be white (a student self-identifying as "Hispanic," another as "Arab American," and a third as "South-East Asian"), we were able to discuss the differential construction of whiteness, and the impact this made on those individuals' experiences of privilege and disenfranchisement, respectively.

To cement what students discovered about their own privilege (and these are privileges not only structured along racial and ethnic lines, but along intersecting lines of gender, class, (dis)ability, and sexuality), I called on students in subsequent discussions to attend to privileges accrued and exercised by literary characters and by authors themselves.

- **Type 4: The Homogenizing Impulse**, or "People back then thought of _____(Whites, Blacks, Arabs, Latinos, etc.) as _____... ". Sometimes embedded in the form of a question: "How did this group view or treat another group?"

Students in both of my test beds struggled with two related challenges: on the one hand their coursework led them to see membership in an ethnic or racial group as entailing shared experiences (e.g., of discrimination) in the present and common identifications with past histories. On the other hand, students were being pushed to recognize conflicting definitions of group attributes and the social construction of ethnic and racial traits. Related to this, students' impulse to generalize (especially about ethnic and racial attitudes in the past) often left both the multiplicity of views within a given ethnic and racial community as well as differences within a group (e.g. those born of the shaping force of attributes such as gender) unappreciated.

Several strategies were helpful here. Most generally it helped to have chosen literary texts in which competing views and conflicting experiences within an ethnic or racial community were given representation. Tyson's memoir, *Blood Done Sign My Name*, for instance, helped illustrate the ways in which differently situated African-Americans (young men in high school or college, adult male veterans of Vietnam, and an older middle class community) assessed competing political approaches to civil rights in Eastern North Carolina in very distinctive ways. Similarly, in my test-bed course focused on medieval representations of the crusades, students benefited from reading narrative representations of the earliest pogroms on Jewish communities, in which a variety of Latin Christian responses were evident: from those crusaders who incited the violence against Jews in the Rhineland, to those who defended their Jewish neighbors against that violence, to those Christians whose initial acts of protection gave way under the pressures of self-interest to a withdrawal of aid and silent complicity with the murder of their neighbors. Such narratives make it difficult for students to posit reductive formulations about 'how people felt back then,' while still giving them the kind of concrete, detailed representation of inter-racial and inter-ethnic conflicts they need in order to appreciate how imposed ethnic and racial and religious identities are subsequently reinforced through shared experiences of oppression and injustice.

- **Type 5: The 'Paralysis of Fear,**'[16] or the silent type.

Fear amongst students is as diverse as their situations: in my class there were those who feared to narrate how they have been marginalized and oppressed, those who feared to admit their own biases, and those who feared they would offend or "make a stupid remark."

I found it helpful to have read accounts of other faculty navigating these issues, from bell hooks' discussion of black students' fear of white violence and reprisal to Beverly Tatum's discussion of ways to break through the "white culture of silence about racism".[17] Throughout the term, I reminded myself how little experience many students have had with public discussion of ethnicity and race, and tried to remember that I might well be the first teacher to use ethnicity and race as a lens of analysis (for a different use of this metaphor, see Section III.2).

In my test bed courses, I tried to help students navigate their anxieties and to encourage them to speak in a number of ways. Framing the course at the beginning seemed crucial. On the first day, I emphasized that this was a class in which we were probably going to embarrass ourselves once or twice, one in which we would talk about issues that might make us exceedingly uncomfortable. I suggested that that was okay, and even an important part of the process of creating a space for dialogue and understanding. While suggesting that the class would be a safe space to talk about cultural taboos surrounding race, sexuality, and gender, I also emphasized the need for students to commit to creating a space of respectful listening and speaking. Finally, in my own posture and affect, I balanced intellectual seriousness with irreverence and humor, which ranged from the self-deprecating to the gently chiding.

In terms of facilitating discussion, I found that students benefited from my efforts to model different ways of intervening in discussion early in the term. Also helpful was calling on multiple students in a row (e.g. when four hands go up, call each of the four students' names and let them speak in that order without interruption). As a faculty member, you're freed from responding to each individual student (unless you choose to follow up), while students are encouraged to situate their remarks in relation to each other.

---

[16] This phrase is taken from the subtitle to Beverly Tatum's "Breaking the Silence" (Tatum 2005), a discussion to which I am indebted in this section.

[17] The phrase comes from Tatum 2005; see also hooks 2005.

Perhaps the most counter-intuitive strategy pursued successfully was refusing to let comments derived from racist thinking stand without remark. While an alternative approach might only address such remarks selectively – fearing that too much confrontation might shut down discussion – once I had established relations of trust, I found that students were willing to take correction directly or to pursue a line of questioning that would help them identify the problems without feeling attacked. The experience has led me to wonder how much we as faculty silence ourselves out of fear more than we should.

Conclusion

It is our belief that the most successful teaching about ethnicity will involve conscious thought on the part of the instructor. To be effective at illuminating the concept of ethnicity for students, it will be important to think and rethink how this can best be done in ways that match the instructor's goals for students within the course. This section is not meant to exhaust the ways in which an instructor may best teach about ethnicity. Hopefully, however, it will inspire the thoughtful consideration of teaching itself, particularly about such an important topic as ethnicity. Indeed, our working group has probably found this to be one of the most significant lessons regarding the pedagogy of ethnicity.

Section III.2: Instructor's Self-Understanding

The title of this working group, "Rethinking the Pedagogy of Ethnicity," suggests at least two possible understandings of the objectives or goals of the group. The genitive in the title can be read as an objective genitive—suggesting that ethnicity is the object of study and that the focus is on how to teach ethnicity—or the same genitive can be read as subjective—suggesting that the focus is on how ethnicity influences, shapes, and affects teaching and learning. While I believe both foci are extremely important, I am personally more interested in the latter than the former, and I joined the group assuming that the latter understanding reflected the objectives and goals of the group. It was not until after our first group meeting that I even considered the possibility that the genitive of the title was meant as an objective genitive.

During the course of this project, I often wondered why it was that most of the other participants in the group seemed to have entered the project with a clear understanding that the group title included an objective genitive rather than a subjective genitive. I wondered how it was that I could have missed what was apparently so obvious to the other participants in the group. I re-read the initial grant proposal and description to see where I went astray. Sure enough, the opening sentence of the description reads, "Washington University in St. Louis proposes a Working Group focused on the teaching of ethnicity." How much more explicit could it be? The group's objective was to focus on "the teaching of ethnicity."

For some reason, however, even after re-reading the proposal, I still wanted to understand the "pedagogy of ethnicity" as a subjective genitive. I initially convinced myself that when read within the context of the rest of the proposal, the first sentence does not appear as obvious or as explicit as at first glance. After a while, however, I began to wonder if maybe my own social location was influencing the way I understood the phrase "pedagogy of ethnicity." As a black American living in a predominantly white American society, I do not share what I consider to be an academic fascination with "studying the other." My lack of fascination with studying the other is partly due to the fact that my own social experiences have led me to the realization that I am often considered "the other" by the majority of American society. I'm sure my displeasure with being "othered" and reduced to nothing more than an object of study contributes to my being far more interested in how issues and questions of ethnicity influence, shape, and affect teaching and learning rather than being interested in how to teach ethnicity.

While my experiences and social location most likely do influence my understanding of the phrase "pedagogy of ethnicity," the fact that I, like most college faculty, am not in a discipline where ethnicity is the object of study and instruction also contributes to my interest in how issues of ethnicity affect teaching and learning. It is difficult for me to teach ethnicity in my classes as either a unit of analysis or a subject of analysis. It is, however, possible—and even beneficial—for me to use ethnicity as a "lens of analysis," i.e., to consider how issues of ethnicity affect teaching and learning (for a different conception of using ethnicity as a "lens of analysis," see Section III.1). Using ethnicity as a lens of analysis rather than as an object of analysis is something that can be done by most instructors in virtually every discipline and every classroom.

During conversations with working group participants regarding how issues of ethnicity affect teaching and learning, I often made comments about the importance of considering the social location and identity of instructors. As a result of those comments, I was assigned the task of considering and writing reflections on "the instructor's subject-position." It is extremely important for instructors not only to be aware of their own social locations and identities, but also to be aware of how such locations and identities impact both teaching and learning. As professors, many of us often fail to take into consideration how our own social locations and social identities shape our views and influence our teaching. While we engage in and encourage our students to engage in critical reflection regarding the subject matter that we teach, we often fail to examine critically the deeply held biases that are typically the product of our own social locations and identities. Factors such as race, class, gender, age, and ethnic identification often cause us to experience the world differently and therefore impact our teaching. No matter how much we extol objectivity as a virtue, we are all subjective beings whose personal identities impact not only our teaching but also the way our students relate to us as instructors.

As I began considering the importance of critical self-reflection upon my own pedagogy, it became apparent to me that it is not enough simply to recognize or even understand our own social location. As instructors, we must also understand that our social location is merely one among many social locations. While reflecting on the question of the instructor's subject position, I began to realize that a potential danger with placing too much emphasis on our own social location is that in so doing we may try to compensate for our own social location by providing what we consider to be correctives to the biases we possess. Unfortunately, however, we often inadvertently end up privileging our own social location because it becomes the "normative" position from which we start and from which knowledge is generated. We position our social location *against* all other social locations rather than simply positioning it *among* all other social locations. The objective is to recognize our social location but not to overemphasize it. Instead of emphasizing our social location, we should try to minimize it by acknowledging it simply as one among many social locations. One of the ways we can do this is by intentionally examining the experiences and perspectives that we foreground in our classrooms.

While I did not teach a test bed class during the course of this project, in the fall 2005 semester I conducted an experiment in my introductory Bible course. I teach a number of

introductory and upper-level religion courses at Luther College, all of which fulfill the college's religion general education requirement. My particular area of specialization is Christian Origins/New Testament, with an emphasis on methods of interpretation (i.e. hermeneutics). Part of my teaching goal is to help students recognize, through their reading of biblical texts, how ethnic, political, economic, social, and religious assumptions and ideologies serve as the basis for the construction of religious and non-religious convictions, beliefs and practices. In an effort to accomplish this goal, I made a conscious decision to teach one of my introductory Bible courses intentionally foregrounding experiences of marginality reflected in biblical texts and using the experiences of African-Americans as a lens for interpreting the full complexity of human experiences reflected in biblical texts. In the student evaluations for this particular course, one student responded to a question about course weaknesses by writing, "Sometimes [Nave] relates things to the problems of African-Americans in history—this makes some of the *all-white members* of the class uncomfortable" (emphasis added). I assume the student meant to say that this makes some of the members of the "all-white class" uncomfortable.

In all of my years as a student and a teacher, I have never encountered or even heard of a white student commenting that the foregrounding of predominant culture experiences was a weakness because it might make non-white students uncomfortable. Because the experiences and perspectives of white America are assumed and taken for granted as normative, the foregrounding of such experiences and perspectives is never questioned or even evaluated for its pedagogical effectiveness. The student's comment clearly demonstrates how issues of race either enable or constrain the production of knowledge, or both. The comment also illustrates the need for students and faculty to recognize that racial and ethnic perspectives are always being foregrounded in the classroom either consciously or unconsciously. Lastly, the student's comment should force us as instructors to consider the pedagogical implications, benefits, and necessities of consciously considering the experiences and perspectives we choose to foreground in our classrooms.

As a result of that experience, I began thinking about how foregrounding issues of ethnicity in the classroom might significantly impact classroom pedagogy. The objective is not to teach ethnicity per se, but to use ethnicity as a critical lens for instruction. It seems to me that this is something that can occur in any class: whether it is biology, chemistry, business, economics, computer science, history, English, religion, and the list goes on. What would happen in an

economics course if the instructor foregrounded issues of ethnicity? What would happen in a U.S. history course if the instructor foregrounded issues of ethnicity? In my Bible courses, the understanding of stories such as the conquest of the Promised Land, Abraham-Sarah-and-Hagar, Jesus and the Canaanite Woman, the Parable of the Good Samaritan, and the coming of the Kingdom of God take on significantly different meanings when I foreground issues and questions of ethnicity. Students have a fundamentally different understanding of the biblical account of Israel's conquest of the "Promised Land" when they read the story through the eyes and perspective of the Canaanites rather than the eyes and perspectives of the Israelites. Both the message and implications of the story are significantly different when questions and issues of ethnicity are foregrounded.

Using ethnicity as a lens helps reveal the multivalent nature of knowledge and knowledge production, and can, therefore, function as a valuable pedagogical tool in the classroom. Using ethnicity as a lens helps prevent the privileging of dominant perspectives simply because they are dominant. It also prevents the arbitrary privileging of certain marginal perspectives as correctives to the privileging of dominant perspectives. Foregrounding issues and questions of ethnicity serves to destabilize most if not all normative perspectives that might be present in a classroom, whether they are the perspective of the instructor or of individual students. Foregrounding issues and questions of ethnicity allows the instructor to deal with his or her own subject position without privileging that subject position the way that I chose to when using the experiences of African-Americans as a lens for interpreting the complexity of human experiences reflected in the Bible.

While my comments and reflections in no way represent a critical examination or study of the ways in which ethnicity influences, shapes, and affects teaching and learning, they do illustrate the need and importance of engaging in such an examination and study. It is my hope that this white paper will lead to such future examinations and studies.

Section III.3: Dialogue, Imagination, and the Visual Arts

I. Introduction

John Dewey (1981) states in his work "The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy" that the function of the mind is to "project new and more complex ends—to free experience from routine and caprice" (1981, 94). In his book *Experience and Nature* (1958) he expands on this idea in his discussion of art. He places routine on one end of the spectrum and caprice on the other. For Dewey, real life vibrates between these two extremes. He suggests that there is a need to think, reflect, and imagine between these two "limiting terms." He says:

> Routine exemplifies the uniformities and recurrences of nature, caprice expresses its inchoate initiations and deviations. Each in isolation is unnatural as well as inartistic, for nature is an intersection of spontaneity and necessity, the regular and the novel, and the finished and the beginning. It is right to object to much of current practice on the ground that it is routine, just as it is right to object to much of our current enjoyments on the ground that they are spasms of excited escape from the thralldom of enforced work. (1958, 360-361)

The contemporary educational landscape vacillates between caprice and routine. On the caprice side, there is much to do about making learning fun—not pleasurable or satisfying in any long-term way, but rather simply fun. Educators often view themselves, with institutional encouragement, as performers whose job it is to keep students stimulated and entertained. They adhere to a version of romantic escapism that employs popular media and corporate fantasy. Entertainment passes as the new education.

Such an emphasis on ease and entertainment leads to superficial efforts to celebrate diversity. At all educational levels, from pre-school to college, teachers and students engage in activities such as lighting Chanukah candles, observing Japan Day, simulating the histories of slavery and oppression, and watching movies or reading books about the immigrant experience. In themselves none of these activities should elicit criticism, but a superficial approach to cultural difference is not enough. What is missing in the enjoyment of learning *about* the customs and traditions of different cultures is learning *with* others or learning *toward* something.

By "learning with others," I mean that in the focus on celebrating, there tends to be a failure to acknowledge and connect to the broader issues of ethnicity, and worse, to the localized challenges that stare educators in the face. Issues surrounding ethnic life in classrooms usually go unattended. The role of ethnicity fades into the background as power is negotiated and curricular issues arise. Ethnicity is treated as a separate, independent category of study rather than (more honestly) as an embedded part of all classroom life. By failing to "learn toward something," I mean that scant time is spent imagining together how we might prepare ourselves for better intercultural living in the future. The classroom as a social space holds an enormous amount of potential for forging such futures. Yet, opportunities are often missed as diversity is safely approached without consideration of pathways that lead to transformation.

The "routine" side of education requires little explanation. The "corporate ethos" prevails at all levels of American education. Observe the hyper-rational, technocratic and mechanistic rhetoric that constitutes the public discourse on education today. It's drenched with talk of standardized tests as the supreme mode of assessment. Students are analyzed as results, quantities, even "outcomes." Technology is touted as the best teacher. Curricula are proposed with no mention of social context. The ideal classroom is epitomized as a sterile space rinsed clean of emotion, power relations, and controversy. Dewey describes this "machine-like" plane as one in which "individuals use one another so as to get desired results," without reference to the emotional and intellectual disposition of those used. This is harmful to the dignity of everyone involved because, as Dewey also points out, "Such uses express physical superiority or superiority of position, skill, technical ability, and command of tools, mechanical or fiscal" (1958, 5). Within the "routine" conception of education, classrooms must function as well-oiled machines – and that's that.

The rhetoric, values, and politics that shape such an educational conception leave no room for a serious and well-rounded pedagogy of ethnicity. Its simple facts and "right answers" cannot adequately answer to the intricacies of ethnic life. Its built-in insistence on the "superiority" of some over others defies an even-handed study of ethnicities. Its privileging and exclusive focus on technical and mechanical thought snuffs out the imaginative and reflective thought that sparks transformative action and discussion in classrooms. Its negation of the individual narratives and ethnic identities that lend life and vitality to classrooms dispels the possibility of a meaningful study of ethnicity. In the routine conception of education, ethnicity might be approached from a distance

and as if it is devoid of emotion or of issues pertaining to social and economic justice. Thus, education in its "routine" mode could never encourage students to undertake a genuine study of ethnicity.

Both the capricious and the routine in education leave little room for meaningful or in-depth treatments of ethnicity. Both promote stifling silences and denials. The capricious classroom does this by avoiding the unsavory and troubling issues that accompany the study of ethnicity. The routine classroom does this by ignoring the issues of ethnicity altogether. Both pretend there are no problems to address. Neither one can accommodate the sociopolitical dialogue that a serious study of ethnicity demands. Neither one renders the classroom as a space to imagine possibilities for the future.

II. Dialogue

Dialogue based on inquiry, reflective thinking, and imagination is neither caprice nor routine. It lies between the two, and it is the life blood of education.

Dewey (1954) writes that dialogue is a fundamentally humanizing activity in which ideas come alive. He favors the spoken word over the written one: "The winged words of conversation in immediate intercourse have a vital import lacking in the fixed and frozen words of written speech" (1954, 218). Hence, for Dewey, it is within dialogue that ideas take root and grow: "Ideas which are not communicated, shared and reborn in expression are but soliloquy, and soliloquy is but broken and imperfect thought" (1954, 218). Dialogue encourages each participant to reflect deeply on his own preconceptions and to make his thoughts living features of the social environment. This dimension of dialogue has particular importance for the pedagogy of ethnicity.

The study of ethnicity requires a space where individual ideas and experiences can be uniquely voiced and made public. It is only through such exchanges that we can learn first-hand about the subjective experiences of others. This invaluable first-hand learning cannot take place by reading textbooks, taking tests, watching educational movies, or writing papers at computers. There is no replacement for listening to and hearing an idea as it is voiced by its owner. In dialogue, the issues pertaining to ethnic life are granted nuance, emotion, and complication as they are articulated

through diverse voices. Moreover, it is through dialogue that silenced and conventionally devalued voices can, under the right circumstances, be respected and heard.

Emphasizing dialogue in pedagogy has important political implications. As Dewey (1954) argues, meaningful dialogue and the struggles that accompany it are central to any viable democracy: "The essential need… is the improvement of the methods and conditions of debate, discussion and persuasion. That is *the* problem of the public" (1954, 208). If we wish to practice democracy in our classrooms and not simply to study it as an abstraction, and if we wish to improve the civic skills and repertoires of our students, then we must focus on dialogue as a pedagogical method. Learning how to engage in dialogue can even be viewed, in fact, as an objective in itself. Part of the study of ethnicity is learning about how to practice inclusion and social justice in everyday communication. It is about practicing the nearly lost art of careful listening. This includes opening oneself to unfamiliar ideas and experiences. It means taking into account the moral and emotional layers that lie beneath the surface of spoken words. Dialogue in classrooms provides practice in the art of listening.

In "The Limits of Dialogue as a Critical Pedagogy," Nicholas Burbules argues that many educators veer away from addressing issues through dialogue because it is typically difficult and unpredictable. Conflicts arise, issues emerge, assumptions are challenged, and questions come up. Dialogues can be adversarial and hateful. They can be unjust and oppressive – silencing some and giving voice to others. Ironically, they can even shut down further discussion. This makes teachers, administrators, and students uncomfortable. Dialogue does not guarantee the fun that capricious classrooms require, nor does it promise the safe and simple answers that routine classrooms are after.

However, as Burbules concludes, dialogue, after all, is what we are left with in education. Even when dialogues fail to produce "good" outcomes, it is always worth making the attempt. He points out that within the interstices of dialogues' mishaps, struggles, and failures lies the groundwork for yet further education. Dewey makes a similar point in *Democracy and Education* when he writes, "All communication is educative. To be a recipient of a communication is to have an enlarged and changed experience" (1944, 5). He further points out that that the act of speaking requires accurate formulation of our thoughts as we attempt to make ourselves understood. For him, these actions alone are filled with possibilities for learning and growth—never mind the educationally fertile ground of dialogue's problems.

III. Pause as Part of Dialogue

It is easy to preach the worthiness of dialogue, and the virtues of sticking with it even when it is miserable. However, when the going gets tough for educators and they find themselves mired in the mud, it's understandable that they would question why they put themselves through dialogue's difficulties. It would be much easier merely to provide students with the facts or with a few educational games and call it a day. Moreover, after class, when educators might look for a useful body of literature on dialogue, they find that there is precious little in the way of guidance for messy, grueling dialogues. Most researchers and theorists of classroom dialogue merely nod at the problems and conclude: Yes, dialogue is a good thing, but next to impossible.

Given the paucity of fresh approaches to the dilemmas that plague dialogue, I would like to propose one method for moving beyond impasses. It involves pausing from the verbal and inserting other means of communication into the conversation. Rather than approaching this pause as stopping the discussion, it should be considered an enhancement to and an integral part of it. When discussions turn stale, participants might engage in other activities together in order to allow different ideas and modes of thinking to emerge. Activities that exercise imaginative, creative, and reflective faculties are especially good for moving things along since they reach beyond the realm at hand, and require the exploration of new territories. This pause should be considered a move. It should not be used to stop, dismantle, or shut down the conversation. Instead, it should be treated as another way of continuing it. The group takes time out from talking, but not from attempting to communicate. The work of trying to engage in democratic dialogue moves to another plane.

Pablo Neruda (2003) speaks of such a move in his poem "Keeping Quiet." He imagines that everyone might pause at the same moment to, as he writes, "interrupt this sadness" and "this never understanding ourselves." His poem begins with the following stanzas:

> Now we will count to twelve
> and we will all keep still.

> This one time upon the earth,

let's not speak any language,

let's stop for one second,

and not move our arms so much.

It would be a delicious moment,

without hurry, without locomotives.

all of us would be together

in a sudden uneasiness.

(2003, 103)

IV. Imagination

I believe Burbules would salute such a pause. He suggests that one way to derive educational benefit from failed attempts at dialogue is through the invocation of the imaginative capacities. He suggests that these capacities are required for considering "radically different ways of approaching the world." The world can be approached differently in the classroom by employing a variety of methods that explicitly demand imaginative thought, and that grant it a central place in ongoing dialogues. It is through imagination that students might envision better dialogues and better worlds.

It is clear that the "routine" classroom would never be able to accommodate such exercises of imagination. However, Dewey (1944) also renders problematic the sort of imagination that is frequently practiced in "capricious' classrooms." He says, "The engagement of the imagination is the only thing that makes any activity more than mechanical. Unfortunately, it is too customary to identify the imaginative with the imaginary, rather than with the warm and intimate taking in of the full scope of a situation" (236-237). In *How We Think*, Dewey (1991) takes up this idea again when he notes that far from the flight and fancy that accompany the imaginary, "The proper function of imagination is vision of realities that cannot be exhibited under existing conditions of sense-perception." (1991, 224). Taken this way, imagination serves to "supplement" and "deepen" our powers of observation and logic. It sheds new light on realities.

The sort of imagining that I advocate springs from real life. It does not dally in fantasy. The imagination that is popularized and is often practiced in capricious classrooms is too flimsy to match the grit of hardy dialogues or a full-range, unrelenting pedagogy of ethnicity. The imagination I seek works from the trenches. I locate Dewey's imagination against a backdrop of American culture in which fantasy, not imagination, is celebrated. Unfortunately, popular ideas regarding ethnic life and identities are drawn from such fantasy. They are constructed out of sugar-coated notions of multiculturalism and surface representations of ethnic histories and issues.

This fantasy thrives on illusion, while Dewey's imagination thrives on vision and possibility. This fantasy leads to escape. Dewey's imagination requires immersion in life and calls for reflective problem-solving and for struggling to realize collective dreams. Fantasy invites complacency—it satiates and stymies. Imagination keeps us hungry and on the move. American fantasy is for consuming; imagination is for creating. Fantasy feeds capitalism; imagination fuels democracy.

V. Visual Arts and Dialogue

When language is not working, when imagination is blocked, when classroom discussions become repetitive, dishonest, superficial, adversarial, or violent, perhaps different forms of communication are called for. Eliot Eisner states:

> The hegemony of language on our curriculum, and a narrow version at that, limits
> what students can come to know and restricts thinking processes to those mediated
> mainly by language. What language can carry is not all that we can know. Ultimately,
> what we know is rooted in qualities encountered or images recalled and imagined.
> (2005, 111)

Visual communication is one of many possible methods that can take the place of talking. It is one way of pausing. Relinquishing the use of words for a while and replacing them with images that relate to the discussion at hand takes the conversation out of the realm of exacting rational thought and places it in the sphere of sensory perception. This mode of thinking is qualitatively different from the one that usually dominates educational dialogue. It is more about receptivity and awareness than it is about reasoning. Students gain the sort of tacit understanding that comes from absorbing and examining the flow of visual details. When students create visual art, they make

decisions based on visceral and aesthetic sensibilities instead of sequential logic. This mode of thought clears the path for all sorts of imaginative possibilities because, if nothing else, it signifies a release from routine and familiar methods of communicating.

During the immediate experience of looking and seeing, the modes of observation and description are in the foreground. Analysis, judgment, and interpretation are suspended as students attempt to gain full cognizance of the art they create or view. Students of ethnicity should be encouraged to put their beliefs and opinions on hold as they name and describe what they see and how it makes them feel. In pause mode, students are free to form new impressions and imagine new worlds as they experience the "affective effects" of composition, color, and visual rhythms. Students may be asked to imagine, picture, and dream "better futures" as they pause from dialogue. Such imagining is grounded in real life, in so far as it addresses questions pertaining to how particular lives and situations may possibly improve.

Though such imagining can be carried out through different means, visual art is especially conducive to it. Students can imagine new cultural possibilities by creating art that takes on larger social issues and inquires about the possibility of change. They may imagine and visually depict better scenarios regarding the particular dialogues they are engaged in. They may imagine what their opinions, feelings, beliefs, and ideas "look like" by representing them in art. Better yet, they may imaginatively and visually represent the views of others in the group. Dewey (1944) notes that, "One has to assimilate imaginatively, something of another's experience in order to tell him intelligently of one's own experience" (1944, 6). Such imagining promotes empathetic relations and deep understanding and invites further conversation.

In a culture that alternately favors routine or capricious educational experiences, my own aim is to explore pedagogical methods that mark the middle ground, and break from the tiresome, the convenient, and the known. In order to transcend the worlds of routine and caprice, we must consider the examination of ethnic life to be more than academic. The study of ethnicity should include openings in classrooms for dialogue, imagination, and even healing. It should serve the larger goal of building humane cultural and educational spaces for everyone.

Section IV.1: Assessment

Most of the courses planned and taught in the Teagle project seek to introduce ethnicity into the curriculum at levels or in areas where the topic may not be customarily taught. In a few disciplines, such as anthropology, the subject matter is more traditional but the emphasis of our test-bed courses has been different. In all cases, though, we have focused less on introducing critical terms or methods merely to have the students regurgitate them, than on challenging students to interpret past, present, and future situations and artistic products more critically with reference to ethnicity as an informing element of cultural production or consumption or both. For example, instructors stated that they wanted students "to be more aware of how race and ethnicity affect the criminal justice system," to learn "how race and ethnicity are represented and constructed in Renaissance texts," "to understand the long-term effects of colonialism," and to "have a more nuanced understanding of such processes and categories as citizenship, acculturation, integration, ethnicity, and religion as they pertain to the modern Jewish experience." In sum, the courses developed here are intended to move beyond the teaching of facts in order to deepen students' conceptual frameworks and practices. At our meetings, moreover, colleagues have frequently expressed the view that these courses require that we, as instructors, become more sensitive to and clear-headed about our own "subject positions," beliefs, associations, and practices, as well as our perceived ethnic backgrounds as we present material to students from both different and similar positions (cf. Section III.2).

The courses we have developed share many of the larger goals of courses that use critical and feminist pedagogy and align themselves closely with what Alka Arora (2005) has termed "socially transformative courses." Arora distinguishes socially transformative pedagogy from a more traditional pedagogy based on conferring knowledge and skills in this way:

> First, not only is education focused on learning "new" material, but also on "unlearning" oppressive ways of thinking and being. Second, effective learning implies behavioral change and is linked to the concept of praxis. Third, a socially transformative pedagogy includes *instructor* learning as a course goal. (160)

A question that naturally arises is how we should assess student learning in such a course. Since such courses do not aim to build a fund of knowledge for simple retrieval, but rather to affect student behavior and practice, assessment needs to address outcomes particularly in these areas.

Accordingly, assessment in these courses would seek to measure changes in students' critical analyses of new materials and the students' own subsequent actions in situations informed by ethnic affiliations. Such assessment of the development of skills and action is more complex than assessment of knowledge retained, and assessment measures should be, ideally, equally complex and diverse. One also needs to be wary of simple data collection measures, asking for discrete definitions or multiple choice questions, and asking students whether and how their attitudes have changed. Self-reporting of this latter type is not a meaningful assessment of practice or increased critical perspective. Moreover, there are limitations on how much change can be expected. After a one-semester course using ethnicity as a critical focus or lens of analysis, students may be expected to say that their attitudes have changed, but can changes in their critical perspectives be measured in practice? The time frame of one semester is very short to have a significant impact on thought and behavior, especially when such changes would involve interrogating and modifying previously unquestioned everyday practices that may also be part of a student's cultural or socioeconomic perspective. The learned behaviors of nearly twenty—or more—years are not easily questioned or changed. Likewise, changes, when they can be measured, may be small or subtle, and they may not show steady development patterns depending on the student's own variable encounters. Finally, in the college environment, many students will be compelled to address new awareness of ethnic issues that will affect their behavior but cannot be directly attributed to the class. Therefore, we must exercise prudence in making claims for our outcomes and caution in our assessment.

There are, currently, no shared or even well-formulated standards of assessment for socially transformative courses. Much of the assessment we are familiar with is based on assessing levels of knowledge or understanding and emphasizes course outcomes relative to an agreed upon standard (e.g., standardized testing). As a group, we have felt that for the variety of the courses we developed, such standards would be artificial or represent an extremely low common denominator of skills or knowledge and would not assess the more critical elements of personal development emphasized in socially transformative courses. Since we wish not only to inform student perception, analysis, and practice, but also to document that there has been a change, the participants in the

Teagle project decided to adopt a pre- and post-course exercise to determine the level of the students' understanding of ethnic issues. The exercises would include interpretation and be in narrative form, and many would include material not covered in class, so that the exercise would not be a measure of merely learning the content or "correct interpretation." In this way, our project is aligned with many of the contemporary assessment projects discussed in the Teagle Foundation's own bibliography of materials on assessment (Teagle Foundation 2006).

The body of assessment materials we have gathered from our courses is rich and complex. It also represents only a first attempt to collect this type of information. In this sense, therefore, all of our self-assessment is part of a "pilot project" (cf. Section IV.2), because, as we have been developing instruments of assessment, we have also concurrently been striving to achieve clarity about precisely what it is we would like to assess. Ideally, we would be able to refine the assessment instruments over several iterations of the courses, each with a large number of students, and include control groups and questions as well. We have developed our ideas about assessing our courses during the process of developing and teaching them, so that we do not have precisely comparable data for all courses. For example, the importance of pre- and post-testing was not agreed upon before the first test-bed courses were already underway. Thus, we have assembled a diverse body of measurements based in part on what each instructor took to be the fundamental aims of teaching about ethnicity (cf. Sections I.1 and I.2). Moreover, the variety of course topics and the level of the courses, ranging from freshman introductory courses to senior seminars, make correlation across courses difficult. Finally, the personal experiences of students vary so dramatically that it is difficult to establish a baseline for college students' understanding of how ethnicity is constructed or informs contemporary or historical and "native" or "foreign" cultural practices.

The method for "scoring" the pre- and post-course responses is to read them carefully and identify how many "learning rubrics" are found in the responses. These rubrics are to be found as the learning goals stated by the instructors in the syllabi and have been further extended through discussion at our meetings. For example, a student may be asked to identify how an author describes a character in ethnic terms and relate it to modern notions of ethnicity. The student response might show the elements of some of the following rubrics:

(1)   no understanding of how the author defines the character ethnically

(2)   obvious use of ethnicity markers (based on examples)

(3)   subtle use of ethnicity markers (based on examples)

(4)   distinctive markers of ethnicity based on the author's perspective or time vs. modern markers

(5)   no understanding of modern definitions of ethnicity

and so on. The goal of assessment in this context will be to determine whether students have become better at accomplishing the course goals stated in the syllabus.

As an example of both good practice and the challenges of interpreting the results, let us examine the second question from Professor DeMarco's "Medieval Literature" assessment (see the Appendix to this Section of the paper). After reading a passage, the student is asked to describe what the writer "understands by the concept 'race,'" and to give examples, and to relate it to the student's "sense of the contemporary meaning of 'race.'" There are thirteen pre-course response sets, of which eleven have answers to this question, and seven post-course sets. Small numbers are, obviously, a concern for the validity of the percentages, as is the absence of a control group. Only one of the test-bed courses had a control group (Section IV.2), and in that course quantitative data was obtained, uniquely in our project, through soliciting numerical rather than narrative responses from students (Section IV.2, appendices).

The responses to Professor DeMarco's question indicate that at the outset of the class, four of eleven students (35%) identified correctly that the author used personality or character traits to characterize a race. Ten of the students (91%) responded that this differs from modern notions of race based on cultural heritage, lineage, skin-color, etc. In the post-course survey, only two of the seven respondents (29%) indicated that the author used personality or temperament to characterize race, while four (57%) said this differed from modern notions of race. On the face of it, comparing the same response answers seems to yield a slightly decreased percentage of students recognizing the author's basis for understanding a race and a severely diminished capacity in half the students to recognize differences from modern practice. Yet, upon further analysis, four of the students at the end of the course (57%) answered that it was a larger, regional identity that characterized race. These students took more examples from across the three types of people mentioned, not just the Kelts, and may have synthesized and generalized the author's comments to understand them at a higher level. As a result, they did not see differences in mediaeval and contemporary standards of race when using regional identity as a characteristic marker. Thus, six of seven students (86%)

recognized how the author characterized race—two did so in the obvious, but limited way, and four did so at a higher level, and all six students understood that modern perceptions of race and ethnicity can include regional identity or origins. (The seventh student gave a general statement that cannot be used.) In the end, we can report that the students are approaching the question in a more sophisticated way by the end of the course and 86% of respondents have a better understanding of modern notions of race, compared to 57% at the beginning.

This type of assessment goes beyond end of semester examinations and standard questionnaires about how much students believe they have learned. With careful reading and comparisons among responses, we should gain a more nuanced understanding of student learning. Ideally, we would also be able to modify the instruments over several iterations to better assess our target goals and we would revise course materials and modes of presentation to better enable student learning. The same question provides an example in this area. For instance, the students at the end of the course who generalized the three racial characterizations in the passage are clearly reading ethnicity more subtly in the text. Unfortunately, they express their own synthesis of the author's explicit and implicit characterizations as a category understood in modern discussions of race and ethnicity. As a result, they elide real distinctions between the mediaeval and modern views and cannot comment on the differences. This is useful information for the instructor, who can, in the next offering of the course, address the critical distinctions between the author's categories and modern interpreters' categories. The new course's assessment instrument might also include a reworked question to better discriminate between types of responses. Thus, even a question that revealed positive learning outcomes might lead to creative changes in the curriculum and future assessment.

A few of the instruments reveal other problems in collecting useful data. The same question, in the post-course version, produced responses that were more perfunctory than those seen on the first. It seems that the students realize they are responding to the teacher who taught them this material and do not feel the need to explain basic definitions. One might assume this indicates that the students possess a greater understanding or at least comfort level with the material. Neither of these assumptions, however, is demonstrated clearly.

Finally, even with pre- and post- course exercises it may be difficult to compare students' responses if the similarities between questions are too loose or abstract. This would not be

uncommon for courses that include a significant ethnicity component within a framework pre-determined by departmental or college-wide requirements. The main issues treated at the beginning of a course may be very different from those taught at the end. In these cases, the ethnicity section might last only a few weeks and the change in students' critical practices may be too small to measure.

This discussion is preliminary to a fuller report on the outcomes of our assessment efforts that will be delivered to the Teagle Foundation later in 2006. The analysis must be complex if it is to capture the type of learning fostered in a socially transformative course. It should also extend beyond the evaluation of the single course regularly done by instructors. Since the time-frame of our project covers only two semesters of courses and requires immediate reporting, it has not been possible to analyze all the student responses for this essay. Nor is it possible to trace the extended impact of the courses here. Nevertheless, I hope we have indicated the potential for this type of assessment of student learning in a socially transformative course.

Pre-Test for
Medieval Literature: Christian, Muslim, Jew
English 330   Spring 2006
Prof. DeMarco

Please read this brief excerpt. It is one medieval writer's description of an event in what is known as the People's Crusade. Then please answer the questions that follow. Write four or five sentences per question.

The report of the preaching of a certain Kelt, called Peter the Hermit, spread everywhere, and the first to sell his land and set out on the road to Jerusalem was Godfrey [of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine]. Godfrey was a very rich man, extremely proud of his noble birth, his own courage and the glory of his family. (Every Kelt desired to surpass his fellows.) The upheaval that ensued as men *and* women took to the road was unprecedented within living memory. The simpler folk were in very truth led by a desire to worship at Our Lord's tomb and visit the holy places, but the more villainous characters (in particular Bohemond and his like) had an ulterior purpose, for they hoped on their journey to seize the capital itself, looking upon its capture as a natural consequence of the expedition. Bohemond disturbed the morale of many nobler men because he still cherished his old grudge against the [Byzantine] emperor. Peter, after his preaching campaign, was the first to cross the Lombardy Straits, with 80,000 infantry and 100,000 horsemen. He reached the capital via Hungary. The Kelt, as one might guess, are in any case an exceptionally hotheaded race, and passionate, but let them once find an inducement and they become irresistible.

...[Peter the Hermit] crossed the Sea of Marmora with his followers and pitched camp near a small place called Helenopolis. Later some Normans, 10,000 in all, joined him but detached themselves from the rest of the army and ravaged the outskirts of Nicaea, acting with horrible cruelty to the whole population; they cut in pieces some of the babies, impaled

others on wooden spits and roasted them over a fire; old people were subjected to every kind

of torture. The inhabitants of the city, when they learned what was happening, threw open

their gates and charged out against them. A fierce battle ensued, in which the Normans

fought with such spirit that the Nicaeans had to retire inside their citadel.

1. What kinds of characteristics does the writer choose to tell us about Godfrey? What might the writer's choice of detail -- however limited -- tell us about the way personal and group identity are understood in this era?

2. The writer refers to the Kelts as a "race" and offers several descriptions of them. Based on this passage, what would you say the <u>writer</u> understands by the concept "race," and where would you point in this passage to illustrate key aspects of this understanding? Does this writer's understanding of "race" fit with <u>your</u> sense of the contemporary meaning of "race"? Explain.

3. How and why might it be significant that those Normans who "ravaged the outskirts" of the city of Nicaea had "detached themselves from the rest of [Peter's army]"? Why do you think the writer bothered to tell us this detail about the Norman attackers? Can you infer why this is considered to be an important fact?

4. Explain the writer's interest in the religious motive (or lack of that motive) in the different participants. What do you make of the contrast between the motives of the "simpler folk" and that of "Bohemond and his like"?

Section IV. 2: Assessment ("Pilot Experiment")

I. Pre-Course and Post-Course Surveys

      Using a morning section of "Introduction to Criminal Justice" as a control group and an afternoon section as an experimental group, I administered the attached survey (Appendix A) on the first day of class for a pre-course test, and again on the last day of class for a post-course test. While both classes were informed that the survey was part of an experiment, they were given no details as to the focus of the experiment.

      The specific items of interest – #4 dealing with race and #5 dealing with ethnicity – were discreetly embedded in the middle of a general 10-item survey of opinions regarding our criminal justice system. This was done in order to reduce potential bias from the students knowing what the instructor is looking for. If the students knew I was looking for a change in their opinions regarding the issue of race and ethnicity in our criminal justice system, then that knowledge might affect their responses at the end of the experiment.

      The control class was taught as I traditionally do in order to provide a baseline. While race and ethnicity were addressed as relevant concerns, they were not a major focus of the course.

      For the experimental class the issue of race and ethnicity was a major focus. First, they were assigned to read *To Kill a Mockingbird.* This assignment was coordinated with their viewing the documentary "Scottsboro: An American Tragedy" so that fact and fiction might reinforce each other. When the students saw what occurred in the infamous Scottsboro trials of the 1930s, I believe it gave more relevance to the novel – just as the novel brought the documentary home. Second, they were shown the 2005 Frontline documentary "The O.J. Verdict" which revisits the O.J. Simpson trial of 1995 and explores the dominant role race played in the most controversial verdict in recent history. And because this was a trial that all the students could recall, at least vaguely, they were more easily able to accept its relevance to today's world. Third, they were shown the documentary "Murder on a Sunday Morning" which won an Academy Award in 2002 for the best documentary feature. This documentary was rated to be the best in the student course evaluations, probably because the students could better relate to the defendant, who is about the same age and

just as innocent as they are. In Jacksonville, Florida, Brenton Butler, a 15 year old black male was arrested walking down a street in May, 2000. He was incarcerated for 6 months and put on trial for murder. Fortunately, through the efforts of an extraordinary public defender, the defense was able to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Butler's only crime was walking while black.

Comparing the survey results of the experimental class with the control class at the beginning of the semester provides a baseline with which to compare differences in survey results between the experimental and control class at the end of the semester. If my efforts to sensitize students in the experimental class to the issue of race and ethnicity within our criminal justice system were successful, we should see a greater change in the surveys for the experimental class than for the control class. Unfortunately, there was a ceiling effect in the experimental class for the race variable, as can be seen in Table A. While the control class started the semester with a mean score of 3.3 (3 = Neutral) on a 5 point scale for both race and ethnicity, the experimental class started the semester with a mean score of 4.1 (4 = Disagree) for race and 3.7 for ethnicity. That means while the students in the control class were largely neutral on the issue of whether or not "everyone receives equal justice" regardless of their race or ethnicity at the beginning of the semester, the students in the experimental class were not similarly neutral, so that there was less room for the students in the experimental class to change their views in the desired direction. Consequently, the fundamental assumption of similar groups at the outset of the experiment was seriously undermined, particularly with regard to race. As a result, while the difference between pre- and post- course test for ethnicity was statistically significant at the .05 level, the difference for race was not. I can only speculate as to why the views of the students in the two classes differed so much at the beginning of the semester. Of course I didn't have the luxury of being able to assign students to the two classes randomly.

II. Student Self-Assessment Survey

In addition to the pre-course and post-course surveys, I also asked the students in both classes to fill out a self-assessment survey (see Appendix B) on the day of their final exam. In this survey, students in both classes were asked how much their views had changed over the course of the semester.

Results from the self-assessment survey indicate that the students in the experimental class experienced a greater change in their views regarding justice being blind to race and ethnicity than did the control group (see Table B). While none of the students in the control class indicated that their views regarding the issue had changed "significantly", 8% of the experimental class indicated that their views had changed "significantly". In addition, the proportion of students indicating that their views had changed [but not "significantly"] in the expected direction was roughly twice as high in the experimental class than in the control class. Even so, an analysis of variance for the self-assessment data failed to achieve the standard .05 level of significance for confidently rejecting the possibility that the differences between the two groups might be due to chance. So while there was a substantial difference between the two classes it was not great enough to achieve statistical significance.

III. Recommendations

As with any experiment, there are things I would change if I were to do it again. First, I would have the students use some sort of identification for their surveys that only they would recognize – like the name of their favorite pet. This would preserve their anonymity while allowing me to connect their responses to improve the power of the statistical analysis. Second, I would increase the survey response options to 10. The even number would eliminate the option of a neutral position, and the increased number of options would allow for greater variance. Third, I would run the numbers from the pre-course survey right away to see if the two classes were similar at the beginning of the semester.

Table A: Pre- and Post-Test

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Race * Cont/Treat * Pre/Post	92	97.9%	2	2.1%	94	100.0%
Ethnicity * Cont/Treat* Pre/Post	92	97.9%	2	2.1%	94	100.0%

Report

Cont/Treat	Pre/Post		Race	Ethnicity
Control	Pre-Test	Mean	3.3182	3.3182
		N	22	22
		Std. Deviation	1.28680	1.21052
	Post-Test	Mean	3.9500	3.8500
		N	20	20
		Std. Deviation	.60481	.58714
	Total	Mean	3.6190	3.5714
		N	42	42
		Std. Deviation	1.05812	.99125
Treatment	Pre-Test	Mean	4.0769	3.7308
		N	26	26
		Std. Deviation	.62757	.91903
	Post-Test	Mean	4.0833	4.2083
		N	24	24
		Std. Deviation	.97431	.77903
	Total	Mean	4.0800	3.9600
		N	50	50
		Std. Deviation	.80407	.87970
Total	Pre-Test	Mean	3.7292	3.5417
		N	48	48
		Std. Deviation	1.04657	1.07106
	Post-Test	Mean	4.0227	4.0455
		N	44	44
		Std. Deviation	.82091	.71380
	Total	Mean	3.8696	3.7826
		N	92	92
		Std. Deviation	.95178	.94725

General Linear Model

Warnings

Post hoc tests are not performed for Class1n2s because there are fewer than three groups.

Post hoc tests are not performed for Pre1Post because there are fewer than three groups.

Between-Subjects Factors

		N
Cont/Treat	1.00	42
	2.00	50
Pre/Post	1.00	48
	2.00	44

Multivariate Tests[b]

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.952	864.694[a]	2.000	87.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.048	864.694[a]	2.000	87.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	19.878	864.694[a]	2.000	87.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	19.878	864.694[a]	2.000	87.000	.000
Cont/Treat	Pillai's Trace	.058	2.698[a]	2.000	87.000	.073
	Wilks' Lambda	.942	2.698[a]	2.000	87.000	.073
	Hotelling's Trace	.062	2.698[a]	2.000	87.000	.073
	Roy's Largest Root	.062	2.698[a]	2.000	87.000	.073
Pre/Post	Pillai's Trace	.084	3.968[a]	2.000	87.000	.022
	Wilks' Lambda	.916	3.968[a]	2.000	87.000	.022
	Hotelling's Trace	.091	3.968[a]	2.000	87.000	.022
	Roy's Largest Root	.091	3.968[a]	2.000	87.000	.022
Cont/Treat * Pre/Post	Pillai's Trace	.079	3.724[a]	2.000	87.000	.028
	Wilks' Lambda	.921	3.724[a]	2.000	87.000	.028
	Hotelling's Trace	.086	3.724[a]	2.000	87.000	.028
	Roy's Largest Root	.086	3.724[a]	2.000	87.000	.028

a. Exact statistic

b. Design: Intercept+Cont/Treat+Pre/Post+Cont/Treat * Pre/Post

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Race	9.033[a]	3	3.011	3.610	.016
	Ethnicity	9.256[b]	3	3.085	3.750	.014
Intercept	Race	1355.695	1	1355.695	1625.308	.000
	Ethnicity	1299.843	1	1299.843	1579.997	.000
Cont/Treat	Race	4.532	1	4.532	5.434	.022
	Ethnicity	3.385	1	3.385	4.114	.046
Pre/Post	Race	2.320	1	2.320	2.781	.099
	Ethnicity	5.803	1	5.803	7.053	.009
Cont/Treat * Pre/Post	Race	2.228	1	2.228	2.671	.106
	Ethnicity	.017	1	.017	.020	.887
Error	Race	73.402	88	.834		
	Ethnicity	72.396	88	.823		
Total	Race	1460.000	92			
	Ethnicity	1398.000	92			
Corrected Total	Race	82.435	91			
	Ethnicity	81.652	91			

a. R Squared = .110 (Adjusted R Squared = .079)

b. R Squared = .113 (Adjusted R Squared = .083)

Table B: Self-Assessment

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
SelfAssRac * Cont/Treat	47	50.0%	47	50.0%	94	100.0%
SelfAssEth * Cont/Treat	47	50.0%	47	50.0%	94	100.0%

Report

Cont/Treat		SelfAssRac	SelfAssEth
Control	Mean	3.3333	3.1905
	N	21	21
	Std. Deviation	.73030	.74960
Treatment	Mean	2.8846	2.8077
	N	26	26
	Std. Deviation	.95192	.98058
Total	Mean	3.0851	2.9787
	N	47	47
	Std. Deviation	.88046	.89660

Oneway

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SelfAssRac	Between Groups	2.339	1	2.339	3.159	.082
	Within Groups	33.321	45	.740		
	Total	35.660	46			
SelfAssEth	Between Groups	1.702	1	1.702	2.171	.148
	Within Groups	35.277	45	.784		
	Total	36.979	46			

Appendix A:
Criminal Justice Survey

1.   In our criminal justice system, a person will not be convicted unless the proof of guilt is beyond a reasonable doubt.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

2.   The innocent have nothing to fear in our criminal justice system.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

3.   In our criminal justice system, justice is blind – everyone receives equal justice regardless of their social class.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

4.   In our criminal justice system, justice is blind – everyone receives equal justice regardless of their race.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

5.   In our criminal justice system, justice is blind – everyone receives equal justice regardless of their ethnicity.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

6.   Our criminal justice system us the best in the world.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

7.   Our judicial system is the best in the world.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

8.   Our police are the best in the world.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

9.   Our prison system is the best in the world.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

10.   It is un-American to criticize our criminal justice system.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B:

Criminal Justice Survey

Please indicate if your views have changed over the course of the semester regarding the following:

1. In our criminal justice system, a person will not be convicted unless the proof of guilt is beyond a reasonable doubt.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

2. The innocent have nothing to fear in our criminal justice system.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

3. In our criminal justice system, justice is blind – everyone receives equal justice regardless of their social class.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

4. In our criminal justice system, justice is blind – everyone receives equal justice regardless of their race.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

5. In our criminal justice system, justice is blind – everyone receives equal justice regardless of their ethnicity.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

6. Our criminal justice system is the best in the world.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

7. Our judicial system is the best in the world.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

8. Our police are the best in the world.

Significant Change   No Change

                1   2   3   4

9.   Our prison system is the best in the world.

Significant Change   No Change

              1   2   3   4

10.   It is un-American to criticize our criminal justice system.

Significant Change   No Change

              1   2   3   4

Rethinking the Pedagogy of Ethnicity: Test Bed Courses

<u>Spring 2006 Courses</u>

English 330 Medieval Literature (Christian, Muslim, Jew)
Dr. Patricia DeMarco, Ohio Wesleyan University

Introduction to Criminal Justice
Dr. Al Miranne, Gonzaga University

Introduction to Anthropology
Dr. Julian M. Murchison, Millsaps College

American Diversity (Anthropology 201)
Dr. Lea Pickard, Luther College

John Dewey's Vision of American Democracy
Dr. Lisa Satanovsky, Washington University in St. Louis

<u>Fall 2005 Courses</u>

Heritage of Western Culture 101: The Odyssey Imperative
Dr. Robert Cape, Austin College

English 176, Identity in the Modern World
Dr. Patricia DeMarco, Ohio Wesleyan University

JNE/History: Diaspora in Jewish and Islamic Experience
Dr. Hillel J. Kieval, Washington University in St. Louis

Spanish 401: Crossing Borders
Dr. Victoria Martinez, Union College

American Diversity (Anthropology 201)
Dr. Lea Pickard, Luther College

Section V: Works Cited in the White Paper

Angelo, Thomas A., and K. Patricia Cross. 1993. *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*. 2nd ed. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

Appiah, K. Anthony. 1985. "The Uncompleted Argument: Du Bois and the Illusion of Race." In *'Race,' Writing, and Difference*, ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 21-37. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Appiah, K. Anthony. 1990. "Racisms." In *Anatomy of Racism*, ed. David Theo Goldberg, 3-17. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Appiah, K. Anthony. 1994. "Identity, Authenticity, Survival: Multicultural Societies and Social Reproduction." In Gutmann 1994, 149-63.

Appiah, K. Anthony and Amy Gutmann. 1996. *Color Conscious: The Political Morality of Race*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Appiah, K. Anthony. 2001. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Arora, Alka. 2005. "Aligning in Socially Transformative Courses," in *Aligning for Learning: Strategies for Teaching Effectiveness*, edited by Donald H. Wulff, et al., 147-61. Anker: Bolton, Mass.

Balot, Ryan K. "Free Speech, Courage, and Democratic Deliberation." In *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*, eds. I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 233-59.

Banton, Michael. 1977. *The Idea of Race*. Boulder, Co.: Westview Press.

Banton, Michael. 1998 [1987]. *Racial Theories*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barth, Fredrik. 1959. *Political Leadership Among Swat Pathans*. New York: Athlone Press.

Barth, Fredrik (ed.). 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture* Difference. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Barth, Fredrik. 1969. "Introduction," in Barth 1969, 9-38. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. "Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy." In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, edited by Seyla Benhabib, 67-94. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bovilsky, Lara. Forthcoming. *Barbarous Play: Race on the English Renaissance Stage.*
        Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bowen, John R. 2000. "The Myth of Global Ethnic Conflict." *Journal of Democracy*
        7.4 (1996) 3-14.

Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper. 2000. "Beyond 'Identity.'" *Theory and Society* 29.1: 1
        -47.

Burbules, N. C. 2000. "The limits of dialogue as a critical pedagogy." In P.P. Trifonas (Ed.),
        Revolutionary pedagogies, Cultural politics, instituting education, and the discourse of theory. New York:
        Routledge.

Callan, Eamonn. 1997. *Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy.*
        Oxford: Clarendon Press.

de Gobineau, Arthur. 1856. *Inequality of Human Races.* Philadelphia: J.P. Lippincott.

Dewey, J. 1944. *Democracy and education.* New York: The Free Press. (Original work published in
        1916).

Dewey, J. 1954. *The public and its problems.* Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press. (Original work
        published in 1927)

Dewey, J. 1958. *Experience and nature.* New York: Dover Publications, Inc. (Original work published
        1925).

Dewey, J. 1991. *How we think.* Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books. (Original work published in
        1910).

Dewey, J. 1981. "The structure of experience." In J. J. McDermott (Ed.), *The philosophy of John
        Dewey, Two volumes in one.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Egan, K. 1992. *Imagination in teaching and learning, The middle school years.* Chicago: The University of
        Chicago Press.

Eisner, E. W. 2005. *Reimagining schools, the selected works of Eliot Eisner.* New York: Routledge.

Fitzgerald, Garrett. 1999. "Toleration or Solidarity?" In Mendus (ed.) 1999, 13-25.

Floyd-Wilson, Mary. 2003. *English Ethnicity and Race in Early Modern Drama.* Cambridge:
        Cambridge University Press.

Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. Continuum:
        New York.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979/1996. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." Repr. in *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader*, edited by W. Sollors, 425-59. New York: New York University Press.

Goldberg, David Theo. 2002. *The Racial State*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gould, Stephen Jay. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.

Gutmann, Amy. 1987/1999. *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gutmann, Amy. 1994. "Introduction." In Gutmann 1994, 3-24.

Gutmann, Amy (ed.). 1994. *Multiculturalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

hooks, bell. 2005. "Representations of Whiteness in the Black Imagination." In *White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism*, edited by Paula S. Rothenberg, 19-24. New York: Worth Publishers.

Hughes, L. 1974. *Selected poems of Langston Hughes.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1959).

Ignatieff, Michael. 1999. "Nationalism and Toleration." In Mendus (ed.) 1999, 77-106.

James, Henry. 1883. "Tommaso Salvini." *Atlantic Monthly*, March.

Kateb, George. 1992. *The Inner Ocean: Individualism and Democratic Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kennedy, Helena. 1999. "The Politics of Intolerance." In Mendus (ed.) 1999, 107-118.

Kymlicka, Will. 1989. *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Leistyna, Pepi, and Arlie Woodrum. 1996. "Context and Culture: What is Critical Pedagogy?", in *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy*, edited by Pepi Leistyna, Arlie Woodrum, and Stephen A. Sherblom, 1-7. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series, No. 27. Harvard Educational Review: Cambridge, Mass.

Levinson, Meira. 1999. *The Demands of Liberal Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MacIntyre, Alisdair. 1984. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

MacMullen, Ian R. 2005. *Faith in Schools? Autonomy, Citizenship, and Religious Education in the Liberal State.* Dissertation, Harvard University.

Mamdani, M. 2002. *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mendus, Susan. 1989. *Toleration and the Limits of Liberalism.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Mendus, Susan. 1999. "My Brother's Keeper: The Politics of Intolerance." In Mendus (ed.) 1999, 1-12.

Mendus, Susan (ed). 1999. *The Politics of Toleration in Modern Life.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mill, John Stuart. 1859/1991. *On Liberty and Other Essays.* Edited by John Gray. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neruda, P. 2003. "Keeping Quiet." In S. M. Intractor & M. Scribner (Eds.) *Teaching with fire, Poetry that sustains the courage to teach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Neuberger, Julia. 1999. "Religious Toleration in the UK: Is It Feasible?" In Mendus (ed.), 119-132.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994 [1986]. *Racial Formation in the United States*, 2d ed. New York: Routledge.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sacks, Karen Brodkin. 1994. "How Did Jews Become White Folks?" In *Race*, ed. Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, 78-102. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Sandel, Michael. 1982/1998. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice.* 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sherif, M. et al. 1961/1988. *The Robbers Cave Experiment: Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation.* Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Sollors, Werner. 1990. "Ethnicity." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sollors, Werner (ed.). 1996. *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader.* New York: New York
   University Press.

Talisse, Robert. 2005. *Democracy after Liberalism: Pragmatism and Deliberative
   Politics.* London: Routledge.

Tatum, B. 2005. "Breaking the Silence. In *White Privilege: Essential Readings on the
   Other Side of Racism*, edited by Paula S. Rothenberg. New York: Worth Publishers.

Taylor, Charles. 1994. "The Politics of Recognition." In Gutmann 1994, 25-73.

Teagle Foundation. 2006. "Outcomes and Assessments: A Bibliography." Accessed July 2006.
   http://www.teaglefoundation.org/learning/resources.aspx

Weinstock, D.M. 1999. "Democracy, Value and Truth: Saving Deliberation from
   Justification." At http://www.philo.umontreal.ca/textes/Weinstock_Deliberation.pdf

Williams, Bernard. 1999. "Tolerating the Intolerable." In Mendus (ed.) 1999, 65-75.

Zelinsky, Wilbur. 2001. *The Enigma of Ethnicity: Another American Dilemma.* Iowa
   City: University of Iowa Press.

Section VI: Bibliography

This bibliography represents intersections between educational studies, cultural studies, the humanities and current or classical research and theory in the social sciences. The works are divided into categories that pertain to how ethnicity, broadly defined, may be approached in higher education. The bibliography is divided into texts on general theory, identity in the Americas, pre-modern questions of identity, identity in middle-eastern cultures, and finally, pedagogical issues.

GENERAL THEORY

Aronowitz, Stanley. *How Class Works, Power and Social Movement.* New Haven: Yale University Press,
   2000.

Delgado, Richard and Stefanic, Jean, eds. *Critical White Studies, Looking Behind the Mirror.* Philadelphia:
   Temple University Press, 1997.

Glazer, Nathan. *We are all Multiculturalists Now.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Guinier, Lani and Torres, Gerald. *The Miner's Canary, (The Nathan Higgins Lecture Series); Enlisting Race, Resisiting Power, Transforming Democracy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Gutman, Amy. *Multiculturalism, Examining the Politics of Recognition.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith. *Ethnicity.* Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Johnson, Allan G. *Privilege, Power, and Difference.* Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Pub, 2000.

Kromkowski, John A., ed. *Annual Editions in Race and Ethnic Relations 05/06.* Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2006.

La Belle, Thomas J. and Ward, Christopher R. *Ethnic Studies and Multiculturalism.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Montagu, Ashley. *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race.* Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1997.

Shanklin, Eugenia. *Anthropology and Race.* Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 1994.

Sollers, Werner. *Theories of Ethnicity, A Classical Reader.* New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Wartenberg, Thomas E., ed. *Rethinking Power.* Albany: State University of New York, 1992.

Yang, Philip Q. *Ethnic Studies, Issues and Approaches.* Albany: State University of New York, 2000.

ETHNICITY IN THE AMERICAS

Anzaldua, Gloria. *Borderland, La Frontera.* San Francisco: 1987

Anaya, Rodolfo A. *Aztlan: Essays on the Chicano Homeland*, Ed. El Norte Pbulications. Albuquerque: U New Mexico P: 1989.

Alexie, Sherman. *The Business of Fancydancing: Stories and Poems.* Brooklyn, N.Y.: Hanging Loose Press.1992

---. *Old Shirts & New Skins.* Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center University of California Los Angeles.1993

Anzaldúa, Gloria, and Ana Louise Keating. *This Bridge We Call Home: Radical Visions for Transformation.* New York: Routledge: 2002.

Brown, Michael K. *Whitewashing Race: The Myth of a Color-Blind Society.* Berkeley: University of California Press: 2003.

Bulosan, Carlos. *America Is in the Heart; a Personal History*. Seattle: University of Washington Press: 1973.

Burns, Allan F. *Maya in Exile*: Guatemalans in Florida. Philadelphia: Temple University Press: 1993.

Crozier-Hogle, Lois, Darryl Babe Wilson, and Jay Leibold. *Surviving in Two Worlds: Contemporary Native American Voices*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.

Dávila, Arlene M. *Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a People*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001.

Du Bois, W.E.B., *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Penguin Books, 1989.

Fox, Geoffrey E. *Hispanic Nation: Culture, Politics, and the Constructing of Identity*. Secaucus, N.J.: Carol Pub. Group, 1996.

Galang, M. Evelina, and Eileen Tabios. *Screaming Monkeys: Critiques of Asian American Images*. Minneapolis: Coffee House Press.2003

Gonzalez, Juan. *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America*. New York: Viking, 2000.

Gracia, Jorge J. E., and Pablo De Greiff. *Hispanics/Latinos in the United States: Ethnicity, Race, and Rights*. New York: Routledg, 2000.

Haizlip, Shirlee Taylor. *The Sweeter the Juice*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Hart, Dianne Walta. *Undocumented in L.A.: An Immigrant's Story*. Wilmington, Del.: SR Books, 1997.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Jensen, Robert. *The Heart of Whiteness: Confronting Race, Racism, and White Privilege*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights, 2005.

LaGuardia, Dolores, and Hans P. Guth, eds. *American Voices: Culture and Community*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006.

Lamphere, Louise. *Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Moaveni, Azadeh. *Lipstick Jihad: A Memoir of Growing up Iranian in America and American in Iran.* New York: Public Affair, 2005.

Nam, Victoria. *Yell-Oh Girls!: Emerging Voices Explore Culture, Identity, and Growing up Asian American.* New York: Quill, 2001.

Olmos, Edward James, Lea Ybarra, and Manuel Monterrey. *Americanos: Latino Life in the United States.* Boston: Little Brown, 1999.

Roediger, David R. *Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to Be White.* New York: Schocken Books, 1998.

---. *Working toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs.* New York: Basic Books, 2005.

Rosenblum, Karen E., and Toni-Michelle C. Travis, eds. *The Meaning of Difference: American Constructions of Race, Sex and Gender, Social Class, and Sexual Orientation.* Boston: McGraw-Hil, 2006.

Pratt, Mary Louise, "Criticism in the Contact Zone: Decentering Community and Nation" in *Critical Theory, Cultural Politics, and Latin American Narrative*, ed. Steven M. Bell, et al. **(**Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993).

Renato, Rosaldo and William Flores. "Identity, Conflict, and Evolving Latino Communities: Cultural Citizenship in San Jose, California." In *Latino Cultural Citizenship, Claiming Identity, Space and Rights.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.

Sánchez, George. *Becoming Mexican-American: Ethnicity, Culture and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles* 1900-1945. New York: Oxford University Press. 1993.

Stavans, Ilan. *The Hispanic Condition: The Power of a People.* New York, NY: Ray, 2001.

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M., Mariela Páez, and David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies. *Latinos: Remaking America.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2002.

Suro, Roberto. *Strangers among Us: Latino Lives in a Changing America.* New York: Vintage Books, 1999.

Wise, Tim J. *White Like Me: Reflections on Race from a Privileged Son.* Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press, 2005.

PRE-MODERN IDENTITY--EUROPE

Ray, J. "Beyond Toleration and Persecution: Reassessing Our Approach to Medieval *Convevencia.*" *Jewish Social Studies* 11.2 (Winter 2005): 1-18.

Bartlett, Robert, "Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (Winter 2001): 39-56.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. "On Saracen Enjoyment: Some Fantasies of Race in Late Medieval France and England," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (Winter 2001): 113-146.

Devisse, Jean. *The Image of the Black in Western Art: From the Early Christian Era to the 'Age of Discovery',* 2 volumes (New York: William, Morrow and Company, 1979).

DeWeever, Jacqueline. *Sheba's Daughters: Whitening and Demonizing the Saracen Woman in Medieval French Epic* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998).

Glick, Thomas. F. "Convivenica: An Introductory Note." In *Convivencia: Jews, Muslims, and Christians in Medieval Spain* (New York, 1992): 1-7.

Goldenberg, David M. "The Development of the Idea of Race: Classical Paradigms and Medieval Elaborations," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 5.4 (Spring 1999): 561-71.

Gyug, Richard, ed. *Medieval Cultures in Contact.* Fordam Univ. Press, 2004.

Hall, Jonathan. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hall, Jonathan. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Hardman, Phillipa, "Introduction: The Matter of Identity in Medieval Romance," in *The Matter of Identity in Medieval Romance* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2002): 1-8.

Heng, Gerladine, "The Romance of England: *Richard Coer de Lyon*, Saracens, Jews, and the Politics of Race and Nation," in *The Postcolonial Middle Ages*, ed. J.J. Cohen (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

Isaac, Benjamin. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

Jordon, William Chester. "Why Race?" *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (Winter 2001): 165-73.

Kruger, Steven F. "Conversion and Medieval Sexual, Religious, and Racial Categories," in *Constructing Medieval Sexuality*, eds K. Lochrie, P. McCracken and J.A. Schultz (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

Lewis, C., *Cultures in Conflict: Christians, Muslims and Jews in the Age of Discovery* (1995).

MacDougall, Hugh A. *Racial Myth in English History* (Hanover, N.H.: University of New England Press, 1982).

Malkin, Irad (ed.). *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity.* Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 5. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Menocal, Maria Rosa. *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain.* (Little, Brown and Co., 2002).

Race and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages. A Special Issue of *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (Winter 2001).

Romm, James, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).

Tomasch, Sylvia and Sealy Gilles, eds *Text and Territory: Geographical Imagination in the European Middle Ages.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).

MIDDLE EASTERN CULTURES

Clark, Robert L. A. "Queering Orientalism: The East as Closet in Said, Ackerly, and the Medieval Christian West," *Medieval Encounters* 5 (1999): 336-49.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome, ed., *The Postcolonial Middle Ages* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

Fuchs, Barbara. *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Idenities* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 2001).

Hall, Stuart, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora" in *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Padmini Mongia (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996).

Lewis, Bernard, "The Other and the Enemy: Perceptions of Identity and Difference in Islam," in *Religionsgespräche im Mittelalter: Herausgegeben von Bernard Lewis und Friedrich Niewöhner* (Wiesbaden, 1992).

PEDAGOGY

Banks, James A. *An Introduction to Multicultural Education.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1999.

Chavez, Rudolfo C. and O'Donell, James, eds. *Speaking the Unpleasant, the Politics of (non) Engagement in the Multicultural Education Terrain.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Darder, Antonia, Marta Baltodano, and Rodolfo D. Torres. *The Critical Pedagogy Reader.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003.

Delpit, Lisa. *Other People's Children, Cultural Conflict in the Classroom.* New York: The New Press, 1995.

Dews, C. L. Barney and Law, Carolyn L., eds. *This Fine Place so Far from Home, Voices of Academics from the Working Class.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995.

Florio-Ruane, Susan. *Teacher Education and the Cultural Imagination, Autobiography, Conversation and Narrative.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2001.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum, 1993.

---. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.1998.

Gussin Paley, Vivian. *White Teacher*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Grumet, Madeleine R., *Bitter Milk, Women and Teaching*. Amherst: Uof Massachusetts P, 1988.

Hooks, Bell. *Where we Stand: Class Matters*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

---. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York:

    Routledge, 1994.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. *Crossing Over to Canaan, The Journey of New Teachers in Diverse Classrooms*. San
    Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

Landsman, Julie. *A White Teacher Talks about Race*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 2001.

Liston, Daniel and Garrison, Jim, eds. *Teaching, Learning and Loving, Reclaiming Passion in Educational
    Practice*. New York: Routledge Falmer, 2004.

Luke, Carmen and Gore, Jennifer, eds. *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Luke, Carmen, ed. *Feminisms and Pedagogies of Everyday Life*. Albany: State University of New York,
    1996.

Maher, Frances A., and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault. *The Feminist Classroom: Dynamics of
    Gender, Race, and Privilege*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.

Mayberry, Maralee and Ellen Cronan Rose. *Meeting the Challenge Innovative Feminist

    Pedagogies in Action*. New York: Routledg, 1999.

Martin, Jane R. *Coming of Age in Academe, Rekindling Hopes and Reforming the Academy*. New
    York: Routledge, 2000.

McIntyre, Alice. *Making Meaning of Whiteness, Exploring Racial Identity with White Teachers*. Albany: State
    University of New York Press, 1997.

Nieto, Sonia. *The Light in their Eyes, Creating Multicultural Learning Communities*. New York: Teacher's
    College Press, 1999.

Shor, Ira and Freire, Paulo. *A Pedagogy for Liberation, Dialogues on Transforming Education*. New York:
    Bergin and Garvey, 1987.

Trifonas, Peter P. *Revolutionary Politics, Instituting Education, and the Discourse of Theory.* New York: Routledge, 2000.

Tokarczyk, Michelle M. and Fay, Elizabeth A., eds. *Wording-Class Women in the Academy, Laborers in the Knowledge Factory.* Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.

Walkerdine, Valerie. *Schoolgirl Fictions.* London: Verso, 1990.

Weiler, Kathleen, ed. *Feminist Engagements, Reading, Resisting and Revisioning Male Theorists in Education and Cultural Studies.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

—. *Women Teaching for Change, Gender, Class and Power.* New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1988.

Weiss, Lois, ed. *Class, Race, & Gender in American Education.* Albany: State university of New York Press, 1988.

Weiss, Lois and Fine, Michele, eds. *Beyond Silenced Voices, Race, Class and Gender in United States Schools.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Willis, Paul. *Learning to Labor, How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Wink, Joan. *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the Real World.* Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon, 2005.

Higher Education: Politics and Equity

Aronowitz, Stanley. *The Knowledge Factory, Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2000.

Bowen, William G., Kurzweil, Martin A. and Tobin, Eugene M. *Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education.* Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2005.

Giroux, Henry A. and Giroux, Susan S. *Take Back Higher Education, Race, Youth and the Crisis of Democracy in the Post-Civil Rights Era.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Karabel, Jerome. *The Chosen, The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale and Princeton.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005.

Margolis, Eric, ed. *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

DOCUMENTARIES AND FILMS

American Experience: Scottsboro--An American Tragedy .PBS Home Video, 2000.

American Experience: The Massie Affair . PBS Home Video, 2004.

Murder on a Sunday Morning. Dir. Jean-Xavier de Lestrade. Centre Nacional de la Cinematographie.

Salt of the Earth. Dir. Herbert Biberman. Independent Production Corporation and the

International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, 1954.