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This study is a synthesis of ethnographies conducted in both North American and Australian cross-cultural and interethnic classrooms. It establishes nine assertions about culturally relevant teaching in such settings. It argues that both the understandings and classroom practices included in these assertions provide teachers with potential starting points, informed by current best practice, for praxis—reflecting upon their own practices within a framework of participatory democracy for all.

For more than 30 years, ethnographers have been investigating teaching in cross-cultural and multiethnic settings. In so doing, they have accumulated a wealth of knowledge about what teachers do—teachers' practice. As a result, we know much about what works and what does not work with Native American, Australian Aboriginal, Hispanic, Latino, Hawaiian, Asian American, African American, Mexican American, and Torres Strait Islander students. An ethnology, or synthesis, of these studies was made. It consists of nine assertions about culturally relevant pedagogy and so provides two outcomes useful for practitioners working in cross-cultural or multiethnic classrooms.

One outcome is a theoretical perspective on how we need to think about teaching in such settings. I contend that we need to rethink what we are doing as teachers of these students who are an increasing percentage of the school populations we teach. This rethinking will not dramatically change the way we teach, but it will give us a clear framework for beginning to understand the various groups of students we teach and, thus, for teaching them better. This framework avoids victim blaming, although it fully encompasses the social context of both schooling and family life, and informs classroom processes designed to maximize learning for all our nations' children—not just those from the groups that traditionally have succeeded in our schools.

The other outcome is a series of informed and tentative starting points for the classroom processes of teachers who want to reflect on issues of social justice, particularly as it relates to ethnicity and culture (which, of course, overlap both class and gender). I claim that the starting points are informed because they derive from a variety of research projects.
across time, geographic locality, and cultural groups. I claim that they are tentative because they are not all-encompassing. They need careful checking in specific cultural contexts, and some are not without disconfirming evidence. Accordingly, there is a need for teachers to check the practices against their own notions of good teaching and against the specific context in which they teach.

This reflection on practice is the basis of the first part of the title. Practice is the starting point: what the teachers in the reviewed ethnographies did that worked, or failed to work, as well as what the individual teachers have discovered works and does not work for them. When teachers reflect on practices, not only against the assertions of the ethnology but also against the notion of social justice, then they engage in a practice-theory dialectic that is not only personally empowering but empowering for students as well. There is an ongoing dialogue between teacher theory and classroom processes.

While the framework to inform our conceptualization of teaching needs dramatic rethinking, the teaching processes identified in the ethnology already exist. Some teachers already do culturally relevant pedagogy. The tragedy is that too few teachers have been exposed during their teacher education programs to appropriate conceptualizations of teaching for students from groups that we as a society have marginalized and normalized. Few teachers have “stumbled on” (to borrow a notion from Highwater 1981.ix) adequate resolutions of the dilemmas they confront in cross-cultural or multiethnic teaching situations.

This article provides some starting points for current teachers, pre-service teachers, and teacher educators, to reconceptualize teaching and to modify teaching processes to systematically improve schooling for all our nations’ children. It does so by way of nine assertions derived from a synthesis of more than 70 interpretive ethnographies of classrooms. The classrooms selected for this synthesis were either cross-cultural, where the teacher came from one cultural group and the students came from another, or multiethnic, where the classrooms contained students from two or more cultural groups. The resulting ethnology is an extension and revision of my earlier ethnology of just Native American and Torres Strait Islander classrooms (Osborne 1991).

Some Assumptions and Some Terminology

I assume that quality schooling for all is a necessary condition for an ongoing participatory democracy. I also assume that democracy is internally under threat when it continues to escalate inequality and divisions in society. Statistics clearly indicate that the vast majority of students from non-Anglo cultural/social groups in Western nations are not receiving quality education and that inequality continues to expand rather than contract.
I assume that nearly all teachers are concerned about their students and under the right circumstance would do everything possible to maximize the learning of all their students. I am also aware that teachers are constrained in many ways: by class size, work intensification (Apple 1986), societal expectations that although demanding are unclear, standardized tests, sponsored technicism rather than professionalism, and timetabling, among others. Later, I will suggest that, while these constraints are real and greatly impact on the classroom processes used by teachers, there are ways that teachers can change their classroom processes (where needed) and tackle the wider constraints. The goal of these changes and struggles is to create a society firmly founded not on growing inequality, as is the current situation, but on principles of social justice, which is so crucial to the long-term survival of participatory democracy.

I also assume that curriculum has been, and is being, constructed to serve particular interests (Young 1971), currently a narrow set of white, Anglo-Saxon, male capitalists and professionals (Connell 1989:125) and those who have been hegemonized accordingly. Curriculum comprises the content, the classroom processes involved in engaging that content, the assessment and wider social practices in which they are daily worked out (Connell 1989:122). All these aspects of curricula need to be tackled if there is to be a new and broader set of interests to be served. Since I have already argued that students from some groups (ethnic, class and gender-based groups) do far better in schools than others, what I mean by reconstructing curriculum is a redistribution of power in society to incorporate this wider set of interests. Accordingly, tinkering at the edges of content, classroom processes, assessment, or wider social practices will have no substantive influence on social justice to serve participatory democracy. This substantial reformulation of curriculum on all fronts needs to be internal to individual schools, for reasons which I describe elsewhere (Osborne et al. n.d.).

The enormity of the ongoing task that teachers face often leads to a “discourse of despair” (Pinar and Bowers 1992:169). Accordingly, I want to stress that there is good information about which classroom processes provide useful and informed starting points for teachers to begin a dialectic reformulation. This may involve adapting their own classroom processes, their understanding of teaching, and their curriculum in culturally relevant ways. I choose to limit the source of information to ethnographies because of the richness of their descriptions and analyses of classroom life.

What, then, is “culturally relevant pedagogy”? Ladson-Billings (n.d.:3–4) argued that it rests on these propositions: students must experience success, students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence, and students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the existing order. She reached these conclusions after a lengthy interpretive ethnography with seven
effective teachers of African American students. These teachers were nominated as exemplary by members of the local African American community, and this status was subsequently confirmed by their school principals. While it is implied in her proposition about maintaining cultural competence, I prefer to include "natal" before cultural competence because students acquire cultural competencies in several cultures: peer, school, sporting, street (McLaren 1993), and popular (Giroux and Simon 1989). But what we are talking about is a sense of pride, pride in one's constantly changing but ethnically (and class-, gender-) based subjectivity (Weiler 1988).

Before turning to the nature of culturally relevant pedagogy, one last point needs elaboration. I use the term students from marginalized and normalized groups in preference to current buzzwords like ethnic minority, at risk, linguistic minority, culturally different, and linguistically disadvantaged because they all appear neutral and objective and because they mask the process, historical and current, of the exercise of power. Native Americans, African Americans, Australian Aborigines, and Torres Strait Islanders, among others, were once at the centers of their cultural worlds. By a variety of forms of force they have all been marginalized by Western nations. Their practices were not understood but were belittled and degraded. Their worldviews were ignored and even used against them. They were excluded from Western political processes, provided with inferior schooling, health care, sanitation, and social services, and dealt with paternalistically. They were seen as inferior and needing to become civilized as defined by Westerners. (Wax 1976 provides a delightful description of Oglala Sioux students reading Anglo teachers as barbarians in Oglala terms, and this highlights the power of representations like this by inverting the definition of civilized.) The historically derived images, textual constructions, and explanations of "their failure" in our system of schooling continue today. In other words, the dilemmas we face today in schooling all "our nations' children" were created and are being created currently by distorted images and understandings of how the dilemmas originated. As a society, we pushed these people to the margins and came to see that as their normal condition. I believe it is crucial for haoles to acknowledge such realities as an essential foundation for reconceptualizing teaching and our classroom practices.¹ The dilemma is not benign and is a sad outcome of history. It is intensely political, and while rooted in the past, its politics are worked out daily in our classrooms and in our wider societies. So the dilemma needs tackling.

An Ethnology of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

For several reasons, the ethnology is organized in two sections and partly in note form. The first section deals with the understandings that inform the second, which summarizes the classroom processes. Both sections are partly in note form to ensure maximum coverage in mini-
mum space and to highlight the tentative "starting point" nature of the assertions. This format also allows readers to quickly identify studies of particular marginalized and normalized groups and to examine these studies in the light of their current teaching contexts. Taken together, the assertions assist in building holistic, rather than reductionist, approaches to culturally relevant pedagogy. For example, the understandings may be at odds with a particular school's ethos and practices, but teachers, having accepted these broader understandings, may begin to make small changes in their classrooms and simultaneously begin to work at changing school policy and practices. New teaching processes must be supported by school renewal if social justice, and hence participatory democracy for all, is to be achieved.

Conversely, while accepting a broad understanding of culturally relevant pedagogy, individual teachers may find some classroom processes at odds with their current classroom processes. In such a case, it is important that they to attempt those changes consonant with their personal notions of good teaching, to persevere with these changes, to allow ample time to adjust, and to modify what still needs modification. Hence, the assertions dealing with classroom processes are not meant to be prescriptive or reductionist, and so they avoid a top-down imposition of "the correct way." Rather, they should be read as informed starting points for action, starting points that might be extended and refined over time.

Space precludes quoting the original researchers' words used to construct the assertions, but they are reported elsewhere (Osborne et al. n.d.). I have chosen rather to show that a large number of ethnographies inform the assertions so that generalizability is maximized. The references to specific contexts provide those who want more information on such contexts with some places to begin looking. Furthermore, I must stress that the way the original article is included within my synthesis may not sit comfortably with the original authors. Indeed, I may well have omitted key components of some of the original ethnographic accounts. This is a price that needs to be paid when searching for commonalities. Once a reader has the general frame, then delving into individual studies can extend, clarify, and even redefine the more general assertion. This again is praxis.

Some Fundamental Understandings

Each assertion begins with a basic statement and is followed by a list of studies that provide the evidentiary warrant for it (Erickson 1986). I also provide instances of contrary analyses to highlight the necessarily partial and incomplete nature of the synthesis and the need to be reflective about its applicability to specific contexts.

Assertion one: Culturally relevant teachers need not come from the same ethnic minority group as the students they teach.
Confirming Evidence

- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grades one and two
- Erickson and Mohatt 1982: Odawan, grade one
- Osborne and Coombs 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade eight
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, grade three
- Kleinfeld 1975: Inuit and Native American, secondary
- Dumont 1972: Cherokee, grades five and six
- Dumont and Wax 1976: Cherokee, secondary
- Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991: Chicano and Hispanic students in multiethnic schools
- Ladson-Billings 1990, 1992a: African American, elementary
- Osborne 1989a: Zuni, elementary; Torres Strait, secondary
- Hornberger 1990: Southeast Asian, African American, Ethiopian, grade four
- Abi-Nader 1990: Hispanic, secondary

Disconfirming Evidence: Some haole teachers “fail.”

- Osborne 1983: Zuni, one of three haoles less effective
- Kleinfeld 1975: Inuit and Native American, secondary, three types of haoles ineffective (traditionalists, sentimentalists, and sophisticates)
- Lipka 1991: Yup’ik, grade five
- Rosenfeld 1976: African American and Puerto Rican, kindergarten through grade six
- Spindler 1987: reviews of Harlem, grade one, black urban slum school and Mopass Residential School
- Lomotey 1990: African American, elementary
- Wolcott 1974: Kwakiutl, one room, 6–16 year olds

I read the above studies to show that, while some haoles do not teach students from marginalized groups well, others do. This is important for three reasons. First, the number of teachers coming from groups that we have marginalized and normalized is decreasing despite increasing numbers of school students from those groups (Charleston 1992; Kailin 1994; Zeichner 1992a, 1992b, 1993). If haole teachers can teach students from marginalized groups in culturally relevant ways and if teacher education programs, both in-service and pre-service, can help increasingly greater percentages of haole teachers to do so, then over time more students from marginalized groups will succeed at school and become fully represented in pre-service teacher education programs. This, in and of itself, is desirable (but see Osborne 1989a on ethnicity per se).

Second, haole teachers often express concern about whether they can teach children and adolescents from marginalized groups effectively. “Does the community want me to teach here? What kind of teacher does this community want or need? Which cultures do I need to know about in order to teach in this multiethnic school?” These self-doubts are understandable and reasonable. Assertion one indicates that it is possi-
ble for at least some haoles to "get it right." The remainder of this article provides some starting points about how to do so.

Third, those teachers who are being successful with students from groups that we have marginalized and normalized must be acknowledged and celebrated. This assertion does that. Besides, it gives others who have not been reported in systematic studies an opportunity to check their own understandings and classroom processes against one reading of this set of studies and so confirm their own pedagogy.

Assertion two: Socio-historico-political realities beyond the school constrain much of what happens in classrooms and must be understood well by the culturally relevant teacher.

Confirming Evidence
- Wolcott 1974: Kwakiutl, across grade levels
- Dumont and Wax 1976: Cherokee, secondary
- Wax 1976: Oglala Sioux, secondary
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, elementary
- Erickson 1987: Overview of ethnic group underachievement
- Macias 1987: Papago, preschool
- McDermott 1987: Overview of ethnic group "failure"
- Ogbru 1987: Overview of involuntary minority group underachievement
- Wilson 1991: Lakota Sioux, high school
- Finnan 1988: Southeast Asian, multiethnic, elementary and secondary
- Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991: Chicano, Hispanic, multiethnic schools
- Trueba 1989: Hispanic, secondary
- Suárez-Orozco 1987a: Chicano, Hispanic, multiethnic schools
- Folds 1987: Aboriginal homelands schools
- McLaughlin 1989: Navajo, elementary and secondary
- Trueba 1988a: Southeast Asian, elementary and secondary
- Fordham and Ogbu 1986: African American, secondary
- Lomotey 1990: African American, elementary school principals
- Smith-Hefner 1993: Khmer female high school "dropouts"
- Osborne 1983, 1989b: Zuni, elementary

Disconfirming Evidence: None, although several studies failed to make mention at all:
- Phillips 1972: Warm Springs, elementary
- Sindell 1974: Mitassini Cree, grade one
- Kleinfeld 1975: Inuit and Indian, secondary
- Erickson and Mohatt 1982, Mohatt and Erickson 1981: Odawan, grade one
- Van Ness 1981: Athabaskan, elementary
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, grade five

I contend that this failure to impress on pre-service teachers the centrality of these socio-historico-political realities—which vary from nation to nation, state to state, and even neighborhood to neighborhood, over time—leaves them ill-equipped to understand society and the
communities that they work in and, hence, ill-equipped to serve the needs of all our nations’ children. For many of us, the supposedly neutral and objective preparation that we received while becoming teachers ignored the social forces in society at large, and so inequality and racism (to name just two central issues) were never critically examined and we were taught to believe myths like “we are a classless society,” “standardized tests are neutral and objective,” and “all who want to can do well at school.” And so we went into schools not understanding that there were other subjectivities among our students, being uncritical of our own subjectivities, and being perpetuators of nothing but the cultural capital (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977) legitimated by our own schooling. All other realities were either ignored or pushed to one side, and any who held those realities were blamed as lacking—in ability, motivation, or appropriate family support.

As teachers, we must come to grips with these socio-historico-political realities so that we can engage student subjectivities and expose them to wider objectivities via texts and analyses of others’ (and their own) subjectivities. We can then count on what all our students bring to school as a resource to be tapped, critiqued, and extended. This leads naturally to the third assertion.

Assertion three: It is desirable to teach content that is culturally relevant to students’ previous experiences, that fosters their natal cultural identity, and that empowers them with knowledge and practices to operate successfully in mainstream society.

Confirming Evidence

- Osborne and Sellars 1987: Torres Strait, grade three
- Osborne and Coombs 1987: Torres Strait, year eight
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grade one
- Lipka 1991: Yup’ik, elementary
- Tharp 1989: Navajo, elementary
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, elementary
- Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991: Chicano and Hispanic, all year levels
- Trueba 1989: Chicano, secondary
- Wilson 1991: Sioux, successful elementary classes, unsuccessful secondary classes
- McCarty et al. 1991: Navajo, kindergarten through year nine
- Trueba 1988a: Review of minority success and failure at all levels
- Gilmore and Smith 1989: Native Alaskan, secondary
- Moll and Diaz 1987: Hispanic, grades four and five and junior high
- Trueba 1988b: Spanish, Hmong, Lao, Vietnamese, Chinese
- Gray 1990: Aboriginal, elementary
- Gibson 1987: Nonimmigrant and migrant minorities, all grades
- Lucas et al. 1990: Latino, high school
- Hudsmith 1992: Aboriginal, elementary
- Gibson 1987: Punjabis in multiethnic high school
• Suárez-Orozco 1987a, 1987b: Central American immigrants, Hispanic and Mexican American, multiethnic schools
• Macías 1993: Success among Korean, Laotian, Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Hmong immigrants and refugees
• Gay 1978: Multiethnic and desegregated schools
• Clark 1991: African American, secondary

Disconfirming Evidence
• Barnhardt 1982: Argued that successful Athabascan teachers' social interactions were far more important than "well-written curriculum" (1982:161)

Many other studies did not discuss the content of curriculum:
• Au and Jordan 1981: Hawaiian American, elementary
• Dumont and Wax 1976: Cherokee, secondary
• Erickson and Mohatt 1982; Mohatt and Erickson 1981: Odawan, grade one
• Jordan 1985: Hawaiian American, elementary
• Ogbu 1987: Overview of involuntary minority group failure
• Philips 1972: Warm Springs Indian, elementary
• Wax 1976: Oglala Sioux, secondary
• Wolcott 1974: Kwakiutl, all levels
• Macías 1987: Papago, early childhood
• McDermott 1976, McDermott and Aron 1978, McDermott and Gospodinoff 1979, McDermott et al. 1978: Haole, African American, Puerto Rican, grade one

I believe the above provide incontrovertible evidence that teachers should begin with the subjectivities of the students from the groups that we have marginalized and normalized. This is consistent with the work of cognitive psychologists Piaget, Bruner, and Vygotsky. But this means, rather than simply focusing on the way children think, starting with what they know about their own lives and how they see them. This avoids labeling as preoperational, or operating in an iconic mode, and engages content and processes important to the child. When it comes to implementing the adage of "starting where the child is," practice falls well short of theory. This is particularly the case when a teacher's subjectivity does not match the child's. This occurs across class, gender, and ethnic lines, as the work of Weiler (1988) attests. It is so easy, indeed almost automatic, for teachers to run with students' class-, gender-, and ethnically based subjectivities that match their own and to silence those that do not. While Weiler's work was with feminist teachers, I contend that exactly the same forms of exclusion occur daily from nonfeminist teachers, male and female.

To counter the silencing or exclusion of subjectivities that do not match the teachers', we need to be aware of our own subjectivities first. By subjectivity I mean the ways of making sense of the world that emanate from our ethnic, gender, and class backgrounds. Getting in touch with our own subjectivities is not easy because so much of each
person's subjectivity is "out of awareness" and taken for granted (Hall 1973). Indeed, while coming to grips with their own subjectivities, which involve classism, sexism, and racism, students in our teacher education program often become angry, disillusioned, and hurt by the process (Osborne 1994). But without the outcome of these processes—increased self-awareness—it is difficult to imagine how teachers can tap into, or even recognize, student subjectivities. Besides, merely legitimating student subjectivities is not enough. We need to expose those subjectivities (and ours) to broader objectivities as Connell (1989), McLeod (1986), and Weiler (1988) have argued.

Assertion four: It is desirable to involve the parents and families of children from marginalized and normalized groups.

Confirming Evidence
- Lucas et al. 1990: Latino, secondary
- Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991: Mexican, Mexican American, Salvadoran, Chilean and Puerto Rican, elementary
- John-Steiner and Smith 1978: urban multiethnic schools
- Clark 1991: African American, secondary
- McLaughlin 1989: Navajo, elementary and secondary
- Williams 1987; African American, secondary
- Kalantzis et al. 1990: multiethnic Australian high schools
- Schoepfle et al. 1985: Navajo, elementary

Disconfirming Evidence: No studies were found that showed schools that involved parents were ineffective.

This issue of parental involvement has not been investigated widely by interpretive ethnographers. Those who have investigated the issue have comprehensively supported it, as has Cummins (1986). But finding time to work with parents, to engage in mutually educative dialogue (Kalantzis et al. 1990) can be difficult for teachers. They already face enormous pressures to do what they currently do, as mentioned previously. Hence, what is required is a reconceptualization of the teacher’s role to include time for extensive liaison with parents and to work toward a new form of authority along the lines suggested by Giroux (1989). This authority is rooted in the community, which must work hard to sustain participatory democracy.

Time could be reserved for such liaisons in the way it is at Zuni, where two days are made available prior to the commencement of classes for a teacher to visit each child in the family’s home. This is relatively simple to do in a small pueblo, and it ensures contact on the parents’ home turf, giving the teacher basic insight into the layout of the community, as well as into the students’ families. Other strategies could be employed to link community and school. Wiggington’s Foxfire approach (1985) and visits
from elders and experts in crucial aspects of community life can be incorporated into school life. This can augment assertions two and three. Assertion four implies reconceptualizing authority but runs counter to prevailing notions of teacher as expert. It means incorporating parents’ knowledge of their own children in concert with the teacher’s knowledge of the same children. It also means legitimating parental knowledge of many aspects of community life and even the subjects taught in school alongside the knowledge the teacher brings to these areas. The end product is one of authority being located in the community—of which both parents and teachers are part—and participatory democracy being practiced within the school as a microcosm of society. Working side-by-side with parents, community representatives, and other teachers, teachers can address the social conditions of teaching and can negotiate school practices, funding policies, and even curriculum content to enhance quality schooling for all our nations’ children in specific locations and contexts. Teachers, parents, students, and others can then be transformative intellectuals working together to create the kind of tomorrow they want (Giroux 1989).

Assertion five: It is desirable to include students’ first languages in the school program and in classroom interactions.

Confirming Evidence
- Lucas et al. 1990: Latino, secondary
- McLaughlin 1989: Navajo, elementary and secondary
- McCarty et al. 1991: Navajo, kindergarten through grade nine
- Osborne and Francis 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade one
- Gay 1978: multiethnic desegregated schools
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grades one and two
- Ladson-Billings 1992c: African American, grade six

Disconfirming Evidence: No studies showed that use of the students’ home language was detrimental to school achievement and notions of ethnic identity.
- Folds 1987: Argued that imposed bilingualism was resisted by Aboriginal communities but, if the introduction of bilingualism is based on community input, this problem would not arise.

Although only a few ethnographies investigated the language of instruction or the use of home languages to aid understanding and foster ethnic pride, those that did were supportive of the use of students’ home languages. This seems commonsensical and is strongly supported by a variety of other forms of research into bilingual education (including Cummins 1978, 1986; Garcia 1993; Rosier and Holm 1980). It then becomes individual teachers’ responsibility to find ways to include natal languages in the classroom and to work with other teachers and parents to have them included in the school’s formal program. Lipka analyzed how Manokotak school district and the University of Alaska, Fairbanks,
collaborated to introduce Yup'ik language into their school and showed that the process was not simple, as "issues of power and ideology surfaced" (1994:71). But the school developed a Yup'ik first-language program.

Some Classroom Processes

With the above understandings as a framework from within which to work as both a classroom teacher and as an educator in the community (Giroux 1989) to modify schooling, it is now appropriate to provide some assertions about how culturally relevant pedagogies work in one's classrooms. While there are several facets to these processes, they relate closely to each other.

Assertion six: Culturally relevant teachers are personally warm toward and respectful of, as well as academically demanding of, all students.

This notion of warmth plus rigor originated from Kleinfeld's (1975) contrast between unsuccessful traditionalists, sentimentalists, and sophisticateds. Kleinfeld referred to those who were only warm and friendly as sentimentalists who were quite unsuccessful. Warm demanders established rapport in culturally sensitive ways first. They also ensured that students knew what was expected of them and then worked hard to push students academically. To this I have added Ladson-Billings's notion of doing all this out of respect for the students.

Confirming Evidence
- Kleinfeld 1975: Inuit and Native Americans, boarding high schools
- Dumont 1972: Cherokee, grades five and six
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grades one and two
- Lipka 1991: Yup'ik, elementary
- Vogt et al. 1987: Hawaiian American, elementary
- Ascher 1982: Urban minority, secondary
- Wilson 1991: Sioux, elementary
- Abi-Nader 1990: Hispanic, secondary
- Hornberger 1990: Hispanic, East Asian, elementary
- Trueba 1988a: Hispanic, secondary
- Trueba 1988b: Hispanic, Hmong, Lao, Vietnamese and Chinese, grades one through five
- Lucas et al. 1990: Latino, secondary
- Dillon 1989: African American, secondary

Disconfirming Evidence: No studies found personal warmth, respect, and academic demand, used together, to be incompatible or ineffective although Kleinfeld's inclusion of "continuing to call on [nonresponders to questions]" (1975:327) seems to contradict subassertion 8.3 (below).
Kleinfeld 1975: Warmth alone was found to be ineffective.

Assertion six is very strongly supported by the evidence. It seems simple to begin by being warm toward and respectful of the students that we teach before making academic demands of them. Part of the warmth and caring means scaffolding the work (Bruner 1983) to ensure that the student does the work and that over time the academic demands are raised. There are two main reasons for this apparently simple construct not being employed in many cross-cultural and multiethnic settings. One has to do with teacher education, and the other has to do with images in the wider society.

Teacher education has been based largely on psychology for the last fifty years. That paradigm, with all its variations and subfields, has tended to categorize students into “very able” and “less able” groups, to look for the origins of these two broad groups and the subgroups within them, and to set up testing mechanisms to identify who belongs to which category in order to maximally benefit from various types of school programs. The categorization and mechanisms for placing individuals within these categories has been developed from Western perspectives and paradigms. Those who do not belong to the Western (and predominantly masculine and middle-class) subculture have generally not done well in the categorization stakes. They tend to cluster in the less able categories by scoring lower on the categorizing tests than others. It is a short step to seeing them as inferior. This step is even easier to make when their ways of behaving in the classroom do not match what the teacher expects (of students from his own cultural background).

A classic case of this was identified by ethnographer Merridy Malin (1990) while working with a multiethnic first-grade class that included five Aboriginal students. Naomi, one of the Aboriginal girls, excelled at several tasks the teacher, Mrs. Eyers, set. She knew what was expected in terms of task accomplishment, explained the task to others, and finished the task perfectly. But because she did not immediately defer to the teacher’s time expectation, Naomi was criticized by the teacher and eventually became a recluse and a misfit in the classroom. Mrs. Eyers’s unwillingness to see Naomi’s undoubtedly first-class performance was clearly a case of not understanding Naomi’s home culture, which encouraged autonomy, close observation, and independence in even a five year old. Once again, a student subjectivity was squashed by a competent and caring teacher who was out of touch with a student’s home life and subjectivity.

Images in wider society are also consonant with the perception of people from groups that we have marginalized and normalized as inferior. At least since the advent of social darwinism we have learned that some racial groups, namely haoles, because of superior technology and supposedly superior civilization, are higher up an evolutionary scale than other groups. This, in turn, has given the politically powerful an opportunity to highlight the failures of some groups, while at the
same time ignoring the successes from those same groups. So the images of failure for some groups are sustained. This fits neatly with low success rates by those very same groups in our schools.

The problem, then, is seen as residing in those groups. So we can blame the victims (Ryan 1971) for lacking ability, motivation, appropriate home background, and the like when the real cause has been, and continues to be, society's ongoing marginalization and normalization of these groups. Dealing with both our own education and the images that surround us in society, then, makes being warm toward, as well as respectful and academically demanding of, these students more complex than it first seems (Deyhle 1987). Nevertheless, a commitment to social justice demands that we do so.

Assertion seven: Teachers who teach in culturally relevant ways spell out the cultural assumptions on which the classroom (and schooling) operate.

This can be done in a variety of ways, including brainstorming with students, contracts, and exposition. It ensures that all students are clear about what is going on in their classroom.

Confirming Evidence
- Kleinfeld 1975: Inuit and Indian, secondary
- Philips 1972: Warm Springs, elementary
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grades one and two
- Macias 1987: Papago, preschool
- Hudsmith 1992: Aboriginal, elementary
- Garcia 1988: Latino, Mexican, elementary
- Ladson-Billings 1990: African American, grade six
- Hornberger 1990: Hispanic and Southeast Asian, elementary
- Trueba 1988a: Mexican American, secondary

Disconfirming Evidence: None, although very few accounts mention the strategy at all.

Although the issue of the cultural assumptions underlying individual classes and schools is not dealt with in a large number of interpretive ethnographies, it is strong in the studies that do report it. The reason for its relatively infrequent mention could be that few teachers employ this teaching strategy. If this is the case, then it seems to be an important place to start reforming classrooms and schools. After all, anthropologists have been highlighting the notion of out-of-awareness aspects (Hall 1973) of cultural scenes, like schools and classrooms, for more than twenty years. The majority of students coming into a school and classroom that have a culture quite different from their own (whether that culture be ethnicity-, gender-, or class-based) clearly need assistance to negotiate this new, sometimes hostile, culture.

But helping teachers to become aware of the assumptions upon which their classrooms operate is complex. As was the case with discovering one's subjectivity, this process also requires substantial reflection and
time. Moreover, the process may be somewhat discomforting as we discover that we do not actually do what we think we do or say we do. Three powerful ways to engage in critical reflection about the social justice and out of awareness aspects of our teaching are (1) the keeping of journals and sharing them periodically with a trusted colleague (Dietz and Seerman 1994); (2) doing action research (Zeichner 1993); and (3) engaging in teacher research (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1993). Once again, each of these ways of reflecting on one’s practice requires time and possibly periodic release from teaching duties to be done properly. Teachers, parents, and administrators may need to join forces to obtain funding for such fundamental initiatives.

The next assertion, with its five subassertions, requires no such time release or special funding. Teachers can manage classrooms in culturally relevant ways, without financial cost, simply by reorganizing in small ways the way they operate in the classroom.

Assertion eight: There are five components of culturally relevant classroom management: using group work, controlling indirectly rather than confrontationally, avoiding “spotlighting,” using an unhurried pace, using the home participation structures of the children.

Subassertion 8.1: Culturally relevant teachers tend to use group work rather than to foster individual competitiveness.

Confirming Evidence
- Philips 1972: Warm Springs, elementary
- Osborne and Francis 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade one
- Osborne and Bamford 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade three
- Delgado-Gaitan 1991: Chicano and Hispanic, elementary
- Trueba 1989: Chicano, high school
- Tharp 1989: Navajo, but only same-sex groups of three, elementary
- Ladson-Billings 1990, 1992b: African American, grade six
- Garcia 1988: Latino, Mexican American, elementary
- Hudsmith 1992: Aboriginal, elementary

Disconfirming Evidence: These studies qualified the assertion:
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, grade three; mixed-sex groups did not work well.
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grades one and two; some topics boys could not discuss in front of girls.
- Tharp 1989: Navajo, elementary; some Navajos were quite uncomfortable working independently.
- Jones 1991: South Pacific Islander high school girls’ (and their parents’) subjectivities were not disposed to group work.

Subassertion 8.1 has some strong support, but also some studies showed that care was needed with its blanket application to all settings. I read this subassertion as being entirely consonant with tapping student subjectivities (as I have shown is the case with university students
[Osborne 1994]), with the social construction of knowledge (implicit in assertions two and three), and with considerable research from educational psychology (see, e.g., Johnson and Johnson 1975 and Glasser 1986).

To ameliorate the effects of the dilemma identified by Jones (1991) where South Pacific Islander girls and their parents were not in favor of progressivist forms of teaching (discussion, group analysis, etc.), I suggest that assertion seven (spelling out the cultural assumptions related to the approach to the girls and to their parents as a basis for mutually educative dialogue [Kalantzis et al. 1990]) might be employed.

**Subassertion 8.2: Culturally relevant teachers tend to avoid using direct, overt management strategies and to use indirect, private forms of control.**

**Confirming Evidence**
- Erickson and Mohatt 1982: Odawa, grade one
- Van Ness 1981: Athabascan, elementary
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, grade three
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grades one and two
- Osborne and Bamford 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade three
- Osborne and Francis 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade two
- Osborne and Sellars 1987; Torres Strait Islander, grade three
- Kleinfeld 1975: Inuit and Indian, high school
- Ladson-Billings 1990, 1992b: African American, grade six
- Dillon 1989: African American, secondary
- Clark 1991: African American, secondary
- Garcia 1988: Latino, Mexican American, elementary

**Disconfirming Evidence: None.**

Avoiding overt, direct control is quite strongly supported by the evidence, and it also seems to be in harmony with the use of group work. While other groups get on with their work, the teacher can respond to student requests and work with an individual or with a group to ensure that they are tackling their assigned task(s) appropriately. If the students' subjectivities are engaged, there will be little need for teachers to control behavior overtly, and when they do, it can be directed quietly and privately at an individual in terms of a gentle reminder about the cultural assumptions upon which the class operates. Indirect control, then, is directly related to spelling out cultural assumptions and giving clear prior instructions to ensure students are clear about what is required.

While spelling out assumptions sounds very teacher centered, it is possible to clarify expectations (with regard to both instructions and assumptions) by negotiating them with students. Furthermore, the teacher, too, can be held responsible by the students for the way the classroom operates. I saw this in operation in two Santa Barbara classrooms where the school year began with brainstorming what a good
student does/is and a good teacher does/is. This resulted in a chart hung at the front to be referred to, and adjusted where necessary, throughout the school year.

Subassertion 8.3 is closely related to avoiding overt control. It relates to "spotlighting" individual performance or behavior. But unlike control that has notions of sanction attached, "spotlighting" refers to asking for public performance of a skill or task as well as to publicly rewarding or praising individuals.

**Subassertion 8.3: Culturally relevant teachers tend to avoid excessively "spotlighting" individuals, that is, calling on them to make public performances, particularly in elementary settings.**

Confirming Evidence
- Van Ness 1981: Alaskan Athabascan, elementary
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, Hawaiian American, elementary
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grade one
- Philips 1972: Warm Springs, elementary
- Osborne and Francis 1989: Torres Strait Islander, grade one
- Osborne and Sellars 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade one
- Erickson and Mohatt 1982: Odawan, grade one
- Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991: Chicano, Hispanic, elementary
- Harris 1980: Aboriginal, elementary
- Osborne and Francis 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade one, choral answering

Disconfirming Evidence
- Osborne 1983: Zuni, grade two teacher (but carefully supported "spotlighting", see below)
- A reviewer pointed out that many students from some groups such as African Americans love to perform in class, citing Expressively Black (Gay and Baber 1987).

There is support for not singling out individuals for public performance particularly in small-scale, remote, cross-cultural settings: Native American, Aboriginal, and Torres Strait Islander. At Zuni, Osborne (1983) reported that the grade-two teacher sought public performances from individuals in her class. But she provided support strategies for those who needed it by offering the use of a partner (Osborne 1983:226), providing a tape-recorder as an incentive to speak publicly and as an opportunity for self-correction prior to performance (1983:227), and permitting scripts to minimize risk of failure (1983:227). All the studies related to elementary settings, but it seems logical to recommend avoiding spotlighting individuals in higher grades for those who are nervous about responding or who are newly arrived immigrants just learning English. Group work (subassertion 8.1) minimizes audience size and risk, and the strategies employed by the teacher at Zuni to encourage public performance can lead students to develop public performance
skills, particularly when the cultural assumptions underpinning their place are spelled out (assertion seven) and the task can be related to emerging cultural needs in the home community, like the need for articulate spokespersons to speak on behalf of the community with developers, oil and mining company officials, and politicians (Kleinfeld 1979).

Choral answering was mentioned by Osborne and Francis (1987) and Philips (1972). While encouraging overt participation by minimizing individual risk may make it difficult to identify students who are not able to perform the task appropriately, both suggested that this strategy reduces spotlighting. Furthermore, absence of spotlighting can seem, at first glance, like reducing academic demand (assertion six). But as shown above, public performance can be introduced gradually to ensure that high academic standards are eventually achieved. Praise and reward are probably best offered privately to individuals or publicly to groups.

Conversely, it is also possible that some ethnic groups, such as African Americans, are quite comfortable with public performance and that some ethnic groups are quite comfortable with some kinds of public performance but not with others. A reviewer reiterated the African American example mentioned above but also pointed out that oratory is highly regarded in some Central American cultures. Once again the need for praxis is highlighted, as teachers consider whether spotlighting and public performance are appropriate because some students from generally reticent groups may be comfortable speaking out and performing.

**Subassertion 8.4: Culturally relevant pedagogy may involve moving at an unhurried pace, particularly in the lower grades.**

**Confirming Evidence**
- Osborne and Coombs 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade eight
- Dumont 1972: Cherokee, grades five and six
- Wolcott 1974: Kwakiutl, multigrade
- Osborne and Sellars 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade three
- Erickson and Mohatt 1982: Odawan, grade one

**Disconfirming Evidence**
- Osborne and Francis 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade one (some parts of the lesson were quite rapid, others were more unhurried)

This subassertion flies in the face of much of the hustle and bustle of elementary classrooms, often reified with terms like “workmanlike atmosphere” or “high task-orientation” and closely in tune with the very brief “wait times” common in classes taught by Westerners. Although it is not reported in a large number of ethnographies, it seems that unhurried pacing could be a useful point of reflection for teachers working in remote cross-cultural settings where students may be using English as their second, or even third, language.
This unhurried pacing does not need to conflict with the academic demand component of assertion six. For example, quality answers to questions may be possible only if sufficient wait time is provided. Similarly, it may take considerable time to get groups working, but the quality of the finished work may be significantly greater than that achieved by students working on individual projects.

**Subassertion 8.5:** Particularly in early grades, culturally relevant teachers tend to use participation patterns similar to those used by students in their homes and communities.

**Confirming Evidence**
- Philips 1972: Warm Springs, elementary
- Au 1980, Au and Jordan 1981: Hawaiian American, elementary
- Vogt et al. 1987: Navajo, grade three
- Erickson and Mohatt 1982: Odawan, grade one
- Osborne and Bamford 1987: Torres Strait Islander, grade three
- Hudsmith 1992: Aboriginal, elementary
- Lipka 1989: Yup'ik, elementary
- Heath 1983: African American, working class, elementary

**Disconfirming Evidence:** None.

These studies show unambiguously that, if children are allowed to use the communication patterns that they have acquired at home and/or in their local communities, they are likely to actively participate more in class and, hence, learn more. Teachers' ability to use these home/community participation structures depends on their knowledge of the local community (assertion two), either directly or by way of in-service. Subassertion 8.5 clearly relates to assertion five by supporting the child's natal language and the way it is used outside of school. Nor does this imply that standard forms of English should not be taught, modeled, and encouraged; it does mean not putting down the student's home language to achieve these ends.

The task of accepting various home communication patterns in a classroom with many ethnicities represented is very complex. Clearly no pre-service teacher education program can prepare a teacher for the wide range of language configurations that exist in many of our schools. Nevertheless, a program could raise the real possibility of multiple languages in a future classroom so that teachers who find themselves in such situations may seek solutions built from looking at patterns of communication out of school. It could also develop skills to discover these patterns and even provide practice teaching experiences to develop such skills. Upon appointment, teachers so trained could then generate their own relevant knowledge base and develop teaching strategies suited to their own sites. Once again praxis would be operating.
Very few ethnographers have focused on the content of the final assertion, but it is becoming a topic of investigation, one that I believe is crucial.

Assertion nine: Racism is prevalent in schools and needs to be addressed. Some recent studies show that it can be tackled.

Confirming Evidence
- Willis 1977: Secondary-school working-class lads were both racist and sexist.
- Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba 1991: Chicano, Hispanic; tension between social/ethnic groups jeopardized learning.
- Walker 1988: Secondary-school inner-city lads were racist and sexist.
- Rosenfeld 1976: African American, elementary
- Trueba 1988: Hispanic, secondary
- Wilson 1991: Sioux students in multiethnic secondary

Disconfirming Evidence: The other studies did not report on racism (or sexism).

Racism, like sexism and classism, is a form of oppression. It must be acknowledged and must be tackled by teachers and their students. Unfortunately, it is difficult for the oppressor to understand how oppression operates (Freire 1972). Accordingly, it is crucial that teacher educators confront this issue in their pre-service programs. Zeichner (1992a, 1993), Ladson-Billings (1991), Kailin (1994), and Osborne (1994, 1995) have documented a variety of ways to accomplish this in pre-service teacher education programs.

For the classroom teacher, there is some evidence that a critical literacy approach can overcome racism in the classroom (McLeod 1986). Working in an inner-city London school, McLeod found that by legitimating student subjectivities and exposing them to wider objectivities racial discord faded and interracial respect developed; also, students began to take control of their own learning, and content mastery exceeded teacher expectations. Other approaches might be used, but if social justice for a participatory democracy for all is the core of schooling, then racism (and classism and sexism and all three together) must be addressed. The task is not easy, as Weiler's 1988 study showed with respect to sexism, which on occasion overlapped both classism and racism.

Beyond the Classroom and the Individual Teacher

In the preceding pages, I have suggested starting points for teachers to reflect about social justice both in their understanding of schooling and in their classroom processes. Clearly, the ambitious task outlined must extend beyond individual teachers in individual classrooms. There must be concerted efforts outside the classroom to modify curriculum content, assessment, and wider social practices (Connell 1989). That may
mean teachers working together to change school policies or school district policies. To gain sufficient support to guarantee these changes, they will probably need to work with other key interest groups: parents, elders, community leaders, and university academics. And to find time to do this liaison and lobbying is difficult. Space limits preclude elaboration of these issues here, but they are being written about (Aronowitz and Giroux 1993; Connell 1989; Gilliom 1993; Giroux and Simon 1989; McLaren and Giroux 1989; Mohlman et al. 1982; Osborne et al. n.d.; Peronne 1991; Zeichner 1992a, 1993).

Conclusion

The tentative ethnology of culturally relevant teaching outlined briefly in this article, and elaborated more fully in Osborne et al. n.d., is consonant with the model of culturally relevant pedagogy being developed by Ladson-Billings around Collins's (1991) four notions: concrete experiences as a criterion for inquiry, dialogue to assess knowledge claims, the ethic of caring, and the ethic of personal accountability. It is also consonant with Henze and Lucas's (1993) notions of good teaching and good language-minority high school classes that identified high expectations, fostering first language and English development, promotion of the development of rigorous content knowledge, active student involvement, and the development of self-esteem. Furthermore, it is consistent with much of the approach advocated by Peronne (1991). It extends all three by considering cross-cultural and multiethnic settings together. As such, it provides potential starting points for teachers to reaffirm or reflect upon their social justice strategies for students from groups we have marginalized and normalized. In so doing they enhance participatory democracy for all.

Barry Osborne is Associate Dean of Education at James Cook University of North Queensland, Cairns Campus.

Notes

Acknowledgments. This article is a modified version of a paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education, in November 1995 at Hobart, entitled "Teaching across Cultures: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as a Starting Point."

1. I used to use the term I first learned about at Zuni: Anglo, meaning all non-Zunis. But I now choose to use the term haole (Hawaiian for other). This is inclusive of Westerners from non-Anglo backgrounds, some of whom are uncomfortable with Anglo.
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