

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHING

Theory, Research, and Practice

GENEVA GAY

FOREWORD BY JAMES A. BANKS

2000

**TEACHERS
COLLEGE
PRESS**

Teachers College, Columbia University
New York and London

CHAPTER 3

The Power of Caring

She routinely begins her classes with declarations to the effect that "I believe in collaborative teaching and successful learning for all students. This course is designed to ensure these. We are going to work hard; we are going to have fun-doing it; and we are going to do it together. I am very good at what I do, and since you are going to be working in partnership with me, you are going to be good, too. In fact, as my students, you have no choice but to be good." These declarations are at once a promise and a mandate, an ethic and an action. They set in motion an esprit de corps, an ambiance, an instructional style, a set of expectations that are directed toward high-level student achievement. The message intended for students is "I have faith in your ability to learn, I care about the quality of your learning, and I commit myself to making sure that you will learn."

INTRODUCTION

These declarations set the tone and contours for the discussions of caring presented in this chapter. They also meet Webb, Wilson, Corbett and Mordecai's (1993) criteria that caring is a value and a moral imperative that moves "self-determination into social responsibility and uses knowledge and strategic thinking to decide how to act in the best interests of others. Caring binds individuals to their society, to their communities, and to each other" (pp. 33-34). The interest of concern here is improved achievement, and the "community" is underachieving students of colors and their teachers.

This kind of caring is one of the major pillars of culturally responsive pedagogy for ethnically diverse students. It is manifested in the form of teacher attitudes, expectations, and behaviors about students' human value, intellectual capability, and performance responsibilities. Teachers demonstrate caring for children as *students* and as *people*. This is expressed in concern for their psychoemotional well-being and academic success; personal morality and social actions; obligations and celebrations; commu-

nality and individuality; and unique cultural connections and universal human bonds. In other words, teachers who really care about students honor their humanity, hold them in high esteem, expect high performance from them, and use strategies to fulfill their expectations. They also model academic, social, personal, and moral behaviors and values for students to emulate. Students, in kind, feel obligated to be worthy of being so honored. They rise to the occasion by producing high levels of performance of many different kinds—academic, social, moral, and cultural.

Conventional wisdom, personal experience, theoretical assertions, research findings, and best practices attest to the effect of genuine teacher caring on student achievement. They suggest that the heart of the educational process is the interactions that occur between teachers and students. These interactions are major determinants of the quality of education children receive (U. S. Civil Rights Commission, 1973). Unfortunately, all teachers do not have positive attitudes toward, expectations of, and interactions with students of color. Racial biases, ethnic stereotyping, cultural ethnocentrism, and personal rejections cause teachers who don't care to devalue, demean, and even fear some African American, Latino, Native American, and Asian American students in their classrooms. These devaluations are accompanied by low or negative expectations about their intellectual abilities, which have deleterious effects on student achievement (Good & Brophy, 1994; Harry, 1992; Oakes, 1985).

While most teachers are not blatant racists, many probably are cultural hegemonists. They expect all students to behave according to the school's cultural standards of normality. When students of color fail to comply, the teachers find them unlovable, problematic, and difficult to honor or embrace without equivocation. Rather than build on what the students have in order to make their learning easier and better, the teachers want to correct and compensate for their "cultural deprivations." This means making ethnically diverse students conform to middle-class, Eurocentric cultural norms.

Because positive and negative teacher attitudes and expectations have profound effects on student achievement (Good & Brophy, 1978, 1994), attention is given to both in the analysis below. This seems a reasonable direction to take because culturally responsive teaching should first confront existing instructional presumptions and practices before it proceeds with the more regenerative aspects of reform. It should simultaneously deconstruct and transform, critique and create, correct and direct, reflect and project. Therefore, this chapter examines four key topics: (1) the concept of caring; (2) predominant teacher attitudes and expectations toward ethnically and culturally different students; (3) how teacher expectations affect their instructional behaviors and students' achievement; and

(4) how negative attitudes and expectations can be modified to make them more compatible with the mandates of culturally responsive pedagogy. Ideas and insights gleaned from research, theory, and practice are woven together throughout these discussions. These are further augmented by personal experiences of teachers who cared and students who were cared for.

CONCEPT OF CARING

Caring interpersonal relationships are characterized by patience, persistence, facilitation, validation, and empowerment for the participants. Uncaring ones are distinguished by impatience, intolerance, dictations, and control. The power of these kinds of relationships in instructional effectiveness is expressed in a variety of ways by educators, but invariably the message is the same. Teachers who genuinely care about students generate higher levels of all kinds of success than those who do not. They have high performance expectations and will settle for nothing less than high achievement. Failure is simply unacceptable to them, so they work diligently to see that success for students happens.

Caring Is Concern for Person and Performance

Mercado's (1993) research illustrates how beliefs about students shape the instructional behaviors of teachers. She is convinced that the academic accomplishments of the middle school Latino students with whom she and her colleagues worked resulted as much from the ethic of caring the instructional team demonstrated as from promoting literacy and academic learning. A common theme that emerged from interviews with African American students about their experiences in segregated schools was the interpersonal caring of the teachers and administrators. They remembered these schools as "homes away from home," places where they were nourished, supported, protected, encouraged, and held accountable. The students recalled their teachers having faith and conviction in the students' abilities; being demanding, yet supportive and encouraging; and insisting that students have high aspirations to be the best that they could be. The teachers and administrators did not limit their interactions with students to merely teaching subject matter. They demonstrated concerns for the students' emotional, physical, economic, and interpersonal conditions as well. In so doing, a *consistently* caring climate was created that made students more willing to participate in learning tasks and encouraged higher levels of achievement (Jones, 1981; Siddle-Walker, 1993; Sowell,

1976). Consequently, "the psychological and tangible attention revealed in the interpersonal relationships . . . contributed strongly to [the students'] academic and life success" (Siddle-Walker, 1993, p. 75).

Results of research in more contemporary classroom settings (M. Foster, 1994, 1995, 1997; Howard, 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1994) indicate that effective teachers of African American students demonstrate the same kind of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. M. Foster (1995) found that these teachers "concern themselves with the complete development of children" (p. 576) and model multidimensional caring in their personal behaviors and instructional practices. They are explicit about teaching and modeling personal values that they view as foundations of learning and living. These include patience, persistence, and responsibility to self and others. They also foster the development of student interests, aspirations, self-confidence, and leadership skills. Their instructional practices incorporate skills for self-determination in a society that perpetuates institutional racism while proclaiming equality for all (M. Foster, 1995).

Caring Is Action-Provoking

As these descriptions indicate, there is much more to interpersonal caring than teachers merely exhibiting feelings of kindness, gentleness, and benevolence toward students, or expressing some generalized sentiments of concern. In fact, these attitudes without concomitant competence-producing actions constitute a form of academic neglect. When teachers fail to demand accountability for high-level performance from ethnically diverse students under the guise that "I don't want to put them on the spot in case they don't know how to do the academic tasks," they really are abdicating their pedagogical responsibilities. This is not real caring. A most effective way to be uncaring and unconcerned is to tolerate and/or facilitate academic apathy, disengagement, and failure. To avoid doing this, teachers must thoroughly understand their own and their students' perspectives and experiences (Noddings, 1992, 1996). Learning is contingent on their cultural inclusion and confirmation in the educational process. The attitude that drives this kind of caring "accepts, embraces, and leads upward. It questions, it responds, it sympathizes, it challenges, it delights" (Noddings, 1996, p. 29). Thus, caring in education has dimensions of emotion, intellect, faith, ethics, action, and accountability.

These attributes are further refined by Tarlow's (1996) study of caring in families, schools, and voluntary agencies. She describes caring as an ongoing, action-driven process of "supportive, affective, and instrumental interchanges embedded in reciprocal relationships" (p. 81). A caring person is sensitive to, emotionally invested in, and attentive to the needs and

interests of others. Caring has elements of both reciprocity and community because the "caring process . . . confronts the person cared for, calling out to him or her to reciprocate . . . [and is] an acknowledgment of and respect for the meaning of the group" (pp. 80-81).

Ladson-Billings (1994) found evidence of the kind of caring Tarlow describes in her study of successful teachers of African American students in an urban elementary school. When she asked the students in one of the classes what they liked about it, they responded, "the teacher." In elaborating on this choice, they explained that she listened to and respected them, encouraged them to express their opinions, and was friendly toward them both in and out of class. The African American students in Hanley's (1998) study of knowledge construction through dramatic preparation and performance spoke with similar convictions. They unanimously and enthusiastically declared that good teachers are respectful of them, care about them, provide choices, and are tenacious in their efforts to make the information taught more understandable for them. Conversely, poor teachers are those who don't listen, don't care, are too hurried and harried to persist in facilitating learning, and are unconcerned about the general well-being of students. These are very revealing comments. The students feel a need to have a personal connection with teachers. This happens when teachers acknowledge their presence, honor their intellect, respect them as human beings, and make them feel like they are important. In other words, they empower students by legitimizing their "voice" and visibility.

Caring Prompts Effort and Achievement

Personal anecdotes of individuals in many walks of life, reflecting on their school days, provide variations of the same theme of the importance of teacher caring to student achievement reported by Ladson-Billings, Foster, Hanley, and other researchers. Long after leaving school, they remember fondly, and in graphic detail, those teachers who cared, and painfully those who did not. They may not recall the content these teachers taught, but their human impact is indelibly imprinted in their minds. Thirty-five years after high school, Johnny is still fond of telling how much he feared, but respected, his eleventh-grade social studies teacher because "she was hard on you, and you couldn't run no game on her. She knew everybody, and she didn't make you feel stupid even if you didn't know the answers. That's why I made sure I got her homework done even when I wouldn't do it for anybody else." This teacher and Johnny had the same last name, and she would often tell him, "People with our name always do the best they possibly can." This connection

further motivated him to exert greater efforts on learning tasks than he otherwise might have. His cousin Betty, who attended the same school at the same time as Johnny, has very different memories of another teacher. Many years later, this teacher's name still provokes negative responses from her, such as, "That dog. I hated him. He was evil, and didn't care nothing about nobody. You couldn't talk to him. He thought he was bad, and acted like he was a king or something. All he wanted to do was flunk everybody."

These stories add other important dimensions to caring—or the lack thereof—as a necessary feature of effective teaching for students of color. In addition to respecting the cultural backgrounds, ethnic identity, and humanity of students, teachers who care hold them accountable for high-quality academic, social, and personal performance, and ensure that this happens. They are demanding but facilitative, supportive and accessible, both personally and professionally. And they do not have to be of the same ethnic groups as students to do this well. Some of the teachers in Ladson-Billings study were European Americans. So were Johnny's and Betty's teachers, while they are African Americans. St. John (1971) described these kind of teachers as "child-oriented" and "interpersonally competent." This orientation was expressed in the instructional interactions as kindness, adaptability, and optimism. These teachers also had little faith in test scores as good indicators of student ability; they used other indicators of success. They produced greater gains in reading improvement, attendance, and classroom conduct for African American students than teachers who were more task-oriented.

Kleinfield (1973, 1974, 1975) found similar characteristics among the effective teachers of rural Athabaskan Eskimo and Indian students she studied. She described these teachers as "warm demanders." They created classroom climates of emotional warmth, consistently and clearly demanded high-quality academic performance; spent time establishing positive interpersonal relationships between themselves and students, and among students; extended their relationships with and caring for students beyond the classroom; and communicated with students through nonverbal cues, such as smiles, gentle touch, teasing, and establishing a "kinesthetic feeling of closeness" (1975, p. 322). Academic demands were complemented with emotional support and facilitative instruction, a coaching and cajoling rather than a dictatorial style of teaching was used, and reciprocal responsibility for learning was developed. This emotionally warm, personally caring, and interpersonally supportive instructional style had a substantial positive effect on the intellectual performance of students, as indicated by increases in verbal participation in classroom discourse and improved levels of cognitive understanding. Kleinfield attri-

butes the success of the teachers in her studies to two major factors: (1) congruency between their styles of teaching and the cultural socialization and interactional styles of rural Eskimo and Indian students, and (2) the instructional style of the teachers, not their ethnic-group membership.

Vida Hall's success with African American students in an urban high school further validates Kleinfield's conclusions and illuminates the power of caring in teaching. She was one of those "warm demanders," as confirmed by former students and her own personal reflections. Vida achieved levels of performance with students other teachers thought were almost unteachable long before multicultural education or culturally responsive teaching was initiated. A high school social studies teacher, she taught students in the full spectrum of "A," "R," and "L" (advanced, regular, and low-achieving) classes. She was notorious for "taking no stuff" and for being "hard but fair." Vida insisted that students in her classes perform to the best of their abilities and consistently conveyed to them that they were capable of doing much more than they imagined. She refused to accept unfounded excuses for incomplete or undone work. "I can't do" was taboo in her classes.

When this explanation was offered by students, Vida responded with gentle but firm insistence, "Of course you can. Now, tell me what I need to do to help you out. Do I need to review the instructions or go over the content again? Do you and I need to spend some time one-on-one together? Do you need to work with another student in class? Or do I need to let the coach know that you are spending so much time with athletics that it's interfering with you completing your social studies assignments?" These were not threats or intimidations; rather, Vida was proposing different avenues to take to remove obstacles to student achievement. And she stood in readiness to aggressively pursue any or all of them to ensure that her students were successful. When they succeeded she applauded them, while simultaneously cajoling them to reach for even higher levels of achievement.

Concern for and commitment to helping students be the best they could did not end at the threshold of Vida Hall's classroom door. She held similar high expectations for their social behavior and personal decorum outside the classroom. Many times she diffused potentially confrontational situations among her students in the hallways and cafeteria by stepping up to them and saying, "Aren't you in my _____-period class? Using fisticuffs to solve problems is beneath your dignity. You are better than that." Nor was she above setting some boundaries for her students about how young men and women were expected to "carry themselves." A frequent comment of hers, upon observing behaviors in students she considered socially unacceptable, was "Young men [or women] don't

behave that way." In more than 40 years of teaching, she recalled few occasions when students became belligerent and hostile in the face of these chastisements.

Both Vida and her former students attribute this incredible record to the fact that the students knew what she expected of them and that she was "in their corner." As their teacher, she deserved to be honored as she honored them. They worked hard to meet her expectations. The result was reciprocal and complementary achievement for the students and the teacher. The achievements were of many different kinds. Some of her greatest success did not get the best grades in class, or the highest scores on standardized tests, but they shone brightly in other ways—by demonstrating good manners, being respectful, having high positive self-concepts, persisting in their academic efforts, and even improving their school attendance.

Caring Is Multidimensional Responsiveness

Obviously, then, caring is a multidimensional process. Its essence, according to Berman (1994), is *responsiveness*, which is contingent on understanding people in context. Speaking more specifically about teaching, Bowers and Flinders (1990) suggest that being responsive is understanding and acting on, in educationally constructive ways, cultural influences on the behaviors and mental ecology of the classroom. Hence, for teachers to do culturally responsive teaching, they must be competent in cultural diversity and committed to its inclusion in the educational process. Sullivan (1974) made this observation 25 years ago when he proposed that it is not enough for teachers merely to like ethnically different students. Instead, "the challenge is to effectively teach them within a cultural context" (p. 56). To do this well, they must have *commitment, competence, confidence, and content* about cultural pluralism. These five C's (as Sullivan called them) are as applicable today as they were then.

Within the context of culturally responsive teaching, when acted upon these various aspects of caring place teachers in an ethical, emotional, and academic partnership with ethnically diverse students, a partnership anchored in respect, honor, integrity, resource sharing, and a deep belief in the possibility of transcendence; that is, an unshakable belief that marginalized students not only can but *will* improve their school achievement under the tutelage of competent and committed teachers who *act* to ensure that this happens. Marva Collins (1992) developed a "creed of caring" that helped to guide her interactions with students at the Westside Preparatory School in Chicago, which she founded. Called "Into My Heart," it is a personification of the ethics and power of caring. Part of it is quoted to

illustrate how general principles of caring are manifested in Collins's personal creed of behavior with students. It may inspire readers to give expression to their own commitment to caring for culturally diverse students. Collins says, in part:

I discourage being average. I believe all of my students can learn if I do not teach them too thoroughly that they cannot. . . .

I will teach them to think for themselves. . . .

I will teach them to have the fortitude to build their own bridges. . . . to be courageous enough not to run from everything that is difficult, but to face unflinchingly the problems of life and see them. . . . as challenges of living.

I shall encourage them to never rest on their past laurels. . . . to [know] that excellence is a non-ending process, and that they will never arrive in the land of the done.

I [believe]. . . . my students will become like stars that will light the world with excellence, with self-determination, with pride. (pp. 260–262)

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS MATTER

Before a genuine ethos of caring can be developed and implemented on a large scale, educators must identify and understand current noncaring attitudes and behaviors, and how they can obstruct student achievement. This understanding will help to locate places and spaces in classroom interactions that need to be changed and to determine which aspects of caring will be most appropriate to expedite student achievement.

By virtue of being unilaterally in charge of the classrooms, teachers control and monopolize academic interactions. They decide who will participate in what, when, where, and how (Goodlad, 1984). These decisions, and their consequences, are direct reflections of teacher attitudes and expectations. As Page (1987) explains, teachers' "perceptions are potent and assume a life of their own: they furnish a rationale for curriculum decisions and thereby provide the conditions for their own re-creation" (p. 77). Students who are perceived positively are advantaged in instructional interactions. Those who are viewed negatively or skeptically are disadvantaged, often to the extent of total exclusion from participation in substantive academic interactions.

Influences on Expectations

Disparities in classroom interactional opportunities are affected by many different variables, most of which have little to do with the intellectual abilities of students. Of utmost importance among them are racial identity,

gender, ethnicity, social class, and home language. Even physical appearance can affect teacher expectations of students. In their meta-analysis of pertinent research, Kitts, Patterson, and Tubbs (1992) found that physically attractive students received higher grades, higher scores on standardized tests, and more academic assistance; they were also considered to be more friendly, attentive, popular, and outgoing, as well as better-behaved. The effects were greater on social than academic skills assessments. However, distinctions among these domains of schooling are not clearly demarcated, and effects in one can easily influence the other.

Culture also influences student and teacher expectations as well as how they engage in classroom interactions (Boggs et al., 1985; Boykin, 1994; Pai, 1990; Philips, 1983; Shinn, 1972). Social etiquette and rules of decorum about appropriate interactions with teachers and other students can hinder participation for some students and expedite it for others. Consider the following three examples of impediments. Immigrant students from traditional cultures with a rather rigid hierarchical social structure enter U.S. classrooms. They have been socialized to be passive and deferential in interactions with teachers and to treat teachers with respect at all times. U.S. education promotes a more fluid relationship, with students encouraged to engage actively with teachers. The immigrant students may appear to be overly quiet, accommodating, and reluctant to engage freely in instructional interactions, despite repeated invitations and enticements. In reality, these expectations may be very disconcerting and baffling to students new to the United States. They also may be overwhelmed by the gregarious style of other students. After their efforts to pull them into the interactions continue to fail, teachers stop trying and leave these students alone. Their learning opportunities and achievement potential are thus minimized because of a mismatch in cultural expectations about student-teacher relationships and interactional styles.

Another compelling example of cultural intrusion on quality interactions between students and teachers involves African Americans. The energy and exuberance with which highly culturally affiliated African Americans invest their interactions (what Boykin [1986] calls "verve") is troublesome to many teachers. They may view this behavior as impulsive, overemotional, and out of control. Consequently, much of their classroom interaction with these students is of a disciplinary and controlling manner, directed toward getting them to "settle down" and "spend more time on task." The students are often reprimanded for undesirable behaviors more than they are instructed on academic learning. High-level achievement is seriously constrained under these conditions.

The third example is a personal one, and more positive. Its cultural nuances are subtle, but the achievement results are somewhat more ex-

plicit. The situation occurred while I was an undergraduate. The instructor of one of my classes had the reputation of being a "grill king." He would select a student to probe and keep him or her on the "hot seat" for the entire duration of the class, except for an occasional diversion here and there to allow others to make brief comments about something the targeted student had said. He told us repeatedly that he wanted us to think about what we were learning rather than merely regurgitating textbook information. His teaching style lived up to this expectation, for he probed, cajoled, and, with rapid-fire questions, challenged us to critique, analyze, interpret, explain, reflect, extend. Today we would probably say he was a liberator, transformative, or constructivist teacher because he was committed to freeing our minds from the restraints of rote memory and helping us become articulate critical thinkers. At the time, I was too consumed with dread at the prospect of my time in the hot seat to think about this. I agonized for the greater portion of the semester about what would happen when I was called on. Would I be able to think? What did thinking mean? Would I be able to say anything? Would I sound and look stupid?

This was the first time I could recall any teacher demanding that I think and refusing to let me abdicate this responsibility. I needed to be prepared, so I tried to practice thinking beforehand. But I was trying so hard to get myself to think that I couldn't think about anything but thinking. I was traumatized as much by how the professor went about probing and prompting students as by the prospect of this thing called thinking. If two or three other students could have joined me in the spotlight, they would have deflected some of the attention away from me and made everything easier to bear. But that was not to be. This professor believed firmly in students being "lone riders" through the thinking journey. Finally, my time came. I don't know what I said, but evidently I did *think*. I met the professor's expectations. The conversation flowed rather smoothly, and he complimented me on being so well prepared and clear in my explanations. I was in a state of shock that I had pulled it off—I had actually *thought* about something. This was a teacher who genuinely cared about his students' learning; he insisted that we think; he held us accountable for demonstrating critical thinking; and he was diligent in his facilitation of this skill development.

Holliday (1981, 1985) used a "transaccional, theoretical perspective" to explain how disjunctures in the frames of reference of schools and the home cultures of ethnically different students can generate negative teacher expectations, which in turn can compromise academic achievement. She contends that social competence is a prerequisite for academic opportunities; that is, students must be able to comply with the procedural or managerial rules and regulations that surround the educational process

before they are granted permission to participate in its substantive dimensions. An example of this is denying students an opportunity to read or participate in story-time because they did not raise their hands or wait for permission from the teacher before speaking out. In this situation, the speaking out is a management issue, while reading is an academic opportunity. The punishment does not fit the crime.

Over time, negative teacher attitudes and low expectations can cultivate "learned helplessness" among African American students (Holliday, 1981, 1985). If told too often for too long that their contributions and competencies are not worthy, students will stop being intellectually engaged in classroom interactions. Phillips (1983) found similar results for Native Americans at the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon. Many of the achievement problems of the students in her study derived from the interactional and procedural protocols of teaching rather than the substantive content of what was taught. How teachers talked to students interfered more with their academic engagement than the topics being discussed. Biklen and Pollard (1993), Klein (1985), the AAUW Report (1995), and Grossman and Grossman (1994) report that teacher expectations are also affected by the gender of students, leading to disparities in the quality of learning opportunities provided to males and females. Gender interactions, then, are other crucial "sites" where academic achievement is either facilitated or obfuscated.

Good and Brophy (1994) have compiled one of the most comprehensive summaries of research on teacher expectations and related classroom behaviors, and the effects of these on student achievement. In an earlier edition of this review, these authors noted that "many students in most classrooms are not reaching their potential because their teachers do not expect much from them and are satisfied with poor or mediocre performance when they could obtain something better" (1978, p. 70). Goodlad's (1984) national study of schooling, and Oakes's (1985, 1986a, 1986b) analyses of the effects of tracking on learning opportunities substantiate these findings and provide additional explanations.

An important ingredient for achievement that is missing in most of the classrooms Goodlad observed was the kind of engagement in learning activities demanded by Vida Hall's, Marva Collins's, and my undergraduate college professor's ethos of caring described earlier in this chapter. He characterized the classes as being void of intellectual energy and excitement, lacking "exuberance, joy, laughter, abrasiveness, praise and corrective support of individual student performance, punitive teacher behavior, or high interpersonal tension" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 112). Students' interactions with each other and with teachers were characterized by "neutrality . . . considerable passivity . . . and emotional flatness" (p. 113).

Another problem in effectively teaching students of color is the discrepancy in the quality of instruction that occurs in high and low curriculum tracks, as revealed by Oakes. This is particularly troubling because of the overrepresentation of Latinos, African Americans, and Native Americans in low-track curriculum options and low-status classes. These "emotionally flat" and "intellectually dull" classrooms result from instructional strategies that emphasize teacher dominance, didactic and large-group teaching, a narrow range of learning activities, workbook assignments, and very little interactive dialogue (Good & Brophy, 1994; Goodlad, 1984).

Persistent Trends in Expectations

Five other specific trends in teacher expectations have emerged from research and practice that support and explicate these general conclusions. They offer some important insights for the changes needed to improve the achievement of ethnically different students. First, *teacher expectations significantly influence the quality of learning opportunities provided to students.* Values and beliefs do not necessarily translate to behavior, but expectations do. Many teachers profess to believe that all students can learn, but they do not expect some of them to do so (Good & Brophy, 1978, 1994). Therefore, they allow students to sit in their classes daily without insisting on and assisting their engagement in the instructional process. This behavior is justified with statements to the effect that "you can't teach these students because they are not motivated to learn."

Teachers may believe in gender and ethnic equity yet do nothing to promote it in their classroom instruction. This lack of action is justified on the basis of not having enough time and the issues not being appropriate to the subjects they teach. They may bemoan the inadequacies of textbooks' information on the contributions of women and ethnic groups but continue to use them without providing any compensating material. Some teachers are adamant about the individual differences of students, while simultaneously declaring intentions to treat all of them the same and disavowing the importance of ethnicity, culture, and gender in pedagogical decision making.

If teachers *expect* students to be high or low achievers, they will act in ways that cause this to happen. Good and Brophy (1994) refer to this as the "self-fulfilling prophecy effect." This concept was popularized by Rosenthal and Jacobson in their 1968 landmark study (*Pygmalion in the Classroom*) of teacher expectations on the learning opportunities and outcomes of students. It means that teachers' assumptions about students' intellect and behavior affect how they treat students in instructional inter-

actions. Over time, these treatments strongly influence the extent of student learning.

The mere existence of a generalized expectation does not lead to the self-fulfilling prophecy, nor is it something that happens incidentally or instantaneously. It requires *focused beliefs* and *deliberate and systematic action* over a period of time. According to Good and Brophy (1994), six steps are involved in the creation of a self-fulfilling prophecy: (1) The teacher expects specific achievement from specific students; (2) the teacher behaves toward students according to these expectations; (3) the teacher's behaviors convey to the students what is expected of them and are consistent over time; (4) students internalize teachers' expectations, and these affect their self-concepts, achievement motivations, levels of aspiration, classroom conduct, and interactions with teachers; (5) over time students' behavior becomes more and more attuned to what the teacher expects, unless they engage in deliberate resistance and change strategies; and (6) ultimately, students' academic achievement and other outcome measures are affected.

A second trend indicates that *teacher expectations about students are affected by factors that have no basis in fact and may persist even in the face of contrary evidence*. And teachers are "more likely to be affected by information leading to negative expectations than information leading to positive expectations" (Good & Brophy, 1994, p. 95). This is true even when the information derives from prejudices or stereotypes. Thus, some students are more susceptible to negative teacher expectations than others because of biases associated with the ethnic groups to which they belong.

Two of my friends tell a gripping story about a situation involving their teenage son that illustrates this point. Randy is African American, a high school senior well over 6 feet tall. He routinely meets four of his male friends (also African Americans) in the schoolyard at the end of his day to visit and socialize as they wait to be picked up by their parents. One day, while waiting for him to end his visit, Randy's father watched a teacher approach the group. He threatened the young men with disciplinary action and police intervention if they didn't disperse immediately. The students were baffled by these reactions since they were simply visiting, not doing anything wrong. In fact, all were good students and had no disciplinary records, and some were on the school's basketball team. What prompted this teacher's reactions? Randy's parents were convinced the motivation was negative attitudes toward and expectations about African American young men. The father speculated, "In his mind, that teacher saw potential gang members and a bunch of Black trouble-makers. He didn't bother to see that these guys were team members and were exhibiting good behavior. They weren't even being loud or rambunctious."

Assumptions about connections among the intellectual capability, ethnicity, gender, and classroom adjustment of students attest to the tenacity of teacher expectations, even in the face of contrary evidence. This third trend was partially demonstrated by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) in their study *Pygmalion in the Classroom*. They told teachers some students had higher IQs than others when, in reality, there were no differences. The teachers expected the students with the supposed higher IQs to perform better in reading, and they did. In situations where teachers expect boys and girls to perform equally as well, they do, even though there are real ability differences between them. Palardy (1969) found this to be the case with reading achievement. Some teachers expect the schoolwork of students who speak African American and working-class dialects to be of lower quality than that of students who speak mainstream Standard English, and they tend to assess their performance accordingly (Bowie & Bond, 1994; Grossman & Grossman, 1994).

Many teachers expect Japanese, Chinese, and Korean American youth to always be studious, high-achieving, and obedient students. They are surprised to find that some individuals from these groups having serious learning difficulties (Osajama, 1991; Wong, 1980, 1995). Conversely, many teachers expect Latinos and African Americans to be low achievers and disciplinary problems. When they demonstrate high performance, teachers who expected otherwise are awed, suspicious, or declare them to be "overachievers." Some African American professionals lament being complimented with "you speak so well" or "you are so articulate" in circumstances in which coherent speech is a normal occurrence, not deserving of special note. Their response, in thought if not deed, is, "Why is my competence surprising? What did you expect?"

Classroom discipline is often expected to correlate strongly with student ethnicity, gender, and intellectuality. For instance, some teachers expect students of color and males to create more classroom management problems than European Americans and females, and for reverse correlations to exist between discipline and achievement (McFadden, Marsh, Price, & Hwang, 1992; Mickelson, 1990). Low achievers are expected to create more disciplinary problems than high achievers. Sheets (1995b) found that high school teachers sometimes behaved in ways that instigated disciplinary problems for African Americans and, to a lesser degree, Latinos. This was done by not allowing students to explain potentially problematic situations, giving them harsher punishments, and punishing them for some infractions that were ignored when committed by European and Asian Americans.

The achievement effects of these expectations are exponential. As teachers' expectations for higher achievers increase, so does student performance, while the performance of low achievers becomes even worse

when teachers have low expectations. This cycle is particularly dangerous for low achievers because it can "confirm or deepen the students' sense of hopelessness and cause them to fail even where they could have succeeded under different circumstances" (Good & Brophy, 1994, p. 114). This process may explain what Holliday (1985) means by "learned helplessness" and account for the cumulative failure that some students experience in schools.

A fourth pattern of expectations that emerges from educational research, theory, and practice is that *teachers tend to have higher universal academic achievement expectations for European Americans than for students of color, with the exception of some Asian Americans*. Students from these ethnic groups are expected to do better in all subjects, tasks, and skills. These expectations are apparent as early as preschool and continue through college. In a study of teachers in 144 elementary and secondary schools in San Francisco, Wong (1980) found that teachers expected Asian American students to be more academically capable, emotionally stable, and cheerful compared to European American students. These expectations were the same for the third-, sixth-, eighth-, and eleventh-grade teachers who participated in the study. Washington (1982) studied teacher perceptions of the ethnicity and gender of students in grades 1 and 4. Both African and European American teachers viewed Black males most negatively and White females most positively. Black males and, to a lesser degree, Black females were perceived as being uncooperative, immature, and destructive; as not applying themselves; as having academic and social adjustment problems, and as needing to improve their physical appearance. By comparison, White female students were perceived as being cooperative, high-achieving, well adjusted to school, physically attractive, and possessed of winning personalities. When individual students do not conform to these expectations, they are acknowledged as "exceptions to the rule," but no modifications are made in the rule itself.

Finally, *teachers' expectations and sense of professional efficacy are interrelated*. Teaching efficacy stems from the beliefs teachers hold about their abilities to positively affect the academic achievement of particular students. It influences teachers' choices of activities, the efforts they exhibit, and their persistence in the face of obstacles and challenging situations (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Miller, 1991; Pang & Sablan, 1995). Teachers who have low performance expectations for students do not feel very efficacious about their own competencies with those students. But they attribute student failure to lack of intellectual ability and poor home environments rather than to the quality of their teaching. They also spend little time helping low-achieving students and may even ignore them entirely. These behaviors are justified on the basis that the students are unteachable

anyway. Ashton and Webb (1986) explain further that teachers with a low sense of efficacy avoid learning activities they feel incapable of facilitating and are consumed with thoughts about their own inadequacies or limitations. These preoccupations create stress, divert attention from instructional to personal issues, and further reduce teaching effectiveness.

Conversely, teachers with strong self-confidence and feelings of efficacy in their teaching abilities have high achievement expectations for students. Furthermore, their teaching behaviors reflect these expectations. They use a greater variety and range of teaching strategies; hold themselves and their teaching accountable for the achievement of difficult learners; are more persistent in their efforts to facilitate learning; and spend more time in planning for instruction and professional development activities to improve their teaching quality than low-efficacy teachers (Miller, 1991). Teachers with a strong sense of efficacy also "choose challenging activities and are motivated to try harder when obstacles confront them. They become engrossed in the teaching situation itself, are not easily diverted, and experience pride in their accomplishments when the work is done" (Ashton & Webb, 1986, p. 3).

A significant number of the pre- and inservice teachers in the Pang and Sablan (1995) study felt they could not effectively teach or influence African American students in their classrooms. These attitudes were supported by beliefs that poor discipline in the home and lack of interest in academic success are the main reasons for the achievement gaps that exist between African and European American students. Ashton and Webb's (1986) research revealed positive correlations between teachers' sense of efficacy and the mathematics and communications, but not reading, skills of low-achieving students. They attributed these results to teachers' feeling more efficacious about teaching some subjects than others, thereby affirming their contention that teacher attitudes about efficacy are situation-specific. The "situations" to which they are directly connected include subjects or skills to be taught, as well as the ethnic identity and ability level of students. These troubling results led Pang and Sablan (1995) to posit that "teacher efficacy is an important construct in student achievement, and teacher educators need to seriously examine what teachers believe about their ability to teach children from various underrepresented groups" (p. 16).

These studies suggest that some part of the failure to learn that unsuccessful teachers attribute to students results from their own low levels of efficacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986). This is as much of a deterrent to effective teaching as students who consider themselves incapable of learning, whether that perception is based in fact or the distorted impositions of others. Thus, changing teachers' attitudes, expectations, and feelings of

efficacy is as imperative to the design and implementation of effective culturally responsive teaching as is increasing their knowledge about and commitment to cultural diversity and mastery of related pedagogical skills.

THE ABSENCE OF CARING

Caring teachers are distinguished by their high performance expectations, advocacy, and empowerment of students as well as by their use of pedagogical practices that facilitate school success. The reverse is true for those who are noncaring. Their attitudes and behaviors take the form of low expectations, personal distance and disaffiliation from students, and instructional behaviors that limit student achievement. Just as caring is a foundational pillar of effective teaching and learning, the lack of it produces inequities in educational opportunities and achievement outcomes for ethnically different students. These are apparent in the disparities in teachers' instructional interactions in classrooms. Unfortunately, many students of color encounter too many uncaring teachers at all levels of education from preschool to college. The consequences of this "pedagogical noncaring" are so profound and numerous that they need to be exposed as a necessary part of the process of implementing culturally responsive teaching.

Quantitative and qualitative variables are used in research and practice to examine relationships between teachers' instructional expectations and interactions with ethnically different students. Common among them are the number and kind of contacts with students initiated by teachers; the types of academic questions and intellectual tasks given to whom; amount of wait-time allowed for student participation; praise and criticism, cues and prompts, and elaborations teachers apply to student responses; and contacts students initiate with teachers. The results of these analyses indicate that significant discrepancies exist in favor of European Americans in both the quantity and quality of interactions uncaring teachers have with students by race, ethnicity, gender within ethnic groups, social class of individuals and schools, and intellectual ability.

Research on tracking (Anyon, 1981, 1988; Good & Brophy, 1994; Goodlad, 1984; Oakes, 1985, 1986a, 1986b; Oakes & Guiton, 1995; Persell, 1977; Rist, 1970), or the assignment of students to courses and curriculum options by ability grouping, has been especially helpful in revealing differential patterns of teacher interactions with students. These patterns are established early and persist largely unchanged over time and circum-

stances of schooling thereafter. They are powerful barriers to academic success for the students who are not perceived positively. Differential teacher interactions with ethnically different students should be understood as both obstacles to and opportunities for culturally responsive pedagogical interventions.

Teacher Interactions and Student Ethnicity

The patterns of teachers' interactions with African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans are similar enough to allow for a composite presentation. The only major difference among them is in the magnitude, not the kind, of treatment. Teacher interactions with various Asian American groups are less clear because of the overall paucity of research on them. Students of color, especially those who are poor and live in urban areas, get less total instructional attention; are called on less frequently; are encouraged to continue to develop intellectual thinking less often; are criticized more and praised less; receive fewer direct responses to their questions and comments; and are reprimanded more often and disciplined more severely. Frequently, the praise given is terse, ritualistic, procedural, and social rather than elaborate, substantive, and academic. General praise of personal attributes is less effective than that which is related to task-specific performance in improving the learning efforts and outcomes of students (Damico & Scott, 1988; Good & Brophy, 1994; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; U. S. Civil Rights Commission, 1973).

Jackson and Cosca (1974, p. 227) observed that Mexican American students in the Southwest "receive substantially less of those types of teacher behavior presently known to be most strongly related to gains in student achievement" (p. 227). In a study of teachers working with preschoolers, Guilmet (1979) made similar observations. He concluded that "a situation exists in which Navajo children, who are more in need of the teachers' and aides' help, receive less attention than the Caucasian children who are more prepared for learning in the public school environment" (p. 262).

The middle- or upper-class status and specific ethnic identity sometimes produce more positive learning opportunities for students. One case of this is the "model minority" status ascribed to many Japanese, Korean, and Chinese Americans. These students are exposed to instructional opportunities and interactions that are directed toward high-quality academic achievement. Schneider and Lee (1990) studied the relationship among sociocultural factors, interpersonal interactions, and academic success among East Asian middle schoolers. Their results indicated that East Indian students were assigned to top-level classes and thus

academically advantaged. Teachers tended to challenge these students with more intellectually demanding and exploratory topics, creative homework assignments, and engaging classroom work. Students in top-level classes also were less likely to be academically distracted or off-task because of disruptive behaviors from their classmates. The combination of these factors produces high levels of achievement.

When qualitative analyses are added to negative quantitative teacher expectations and interactions with students of color, results are even more devastating. African, Latino, and Native American students routinely are asked lower-order cognitive questions; given answers more frequently instead of being encouraged and prompted to find solutions for themselves; and have more managerial than substantive interactions with teachers (Grant, 1984; Oakes, 1985; Oakes & Guiton, 1995). For example, European American students may be asked to answer divergent, thought-provoking questions in instructional discourses, while African American and Latino students are asked single-answer, convergent ones. Or their engagements are limited to exchanges such as, "Did you understand the answer _____ gave?" and "Do you have any questions about the instructions for doing the assignment?" Another difference in the quality of instructional discourse is the amount of probing teachers use with students from various ethnic groups. European American students, especially males, are encouraged more to try harder at answering questions and explaining their ideas more clearly; they are given hints and cues to facilitate this performance; and they are rewarded for their intellectual pursuits (Sadker & Sadker, 1982; AAUW, 1995). Ethnic-minority students tend to be applauded more for following procedures, for adapting to institutional rules and regulations, and for being "nice" (Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Oakes, 1985).

Teachers who exhibit these kinds of behaviors offer several justifications for not being as pedagogically persistent and intellectually focused with students of color as with European Americans. One is that they do not want to embarrass students who do not know answers to questions. Another is that students who have limited English proficiency are hard to understand, and probing them too much might make them reluctant to participate in, or cause them to withdraw from, classroom discussions. They also take so much time to formulate responses that other students become impatient and rude. Some teachers claim lack of prior experience and not knowing how to relate to students of color. They are intimidated by these students' presence in their classrooms. Other teachers pose "distribution of limited resources" arguments for not engaging certain students in instructional interactions. If too much teaching time and effort

are devoted to poorly prepared and unmotivated students, the more intellectually capable ones who are interested in learning will be short-changed. Consequently, some students are simply ignored, as long as they are not disruptive. When disruptions do occur, the easiest course of action is taken by removing these students from the classroom.

Anecdotal reports are replete with stories of disproportionate numbers of Latino, Native, African, and some Asian American students sitting in hallways or principals' offices. Or they are socializing, grooming themselves, and sleeping in classrooms when instruction is going on, without some teachers being concerned about the inappropriateness of these behaviors. Ignoring, silencing, and physically removing students from the "sites" where teaching occurs epitomizes noncaring.

Teacher Interactions and Student Gender

Research on the education of girls and women indicates that teachers interact differently with male and female students but that ethnicity is a critical intervening variable. Stated differently, male and female students from the same ethnic groups do not receive comparable opportunities to participate in classroom instruction. When the unit of analysis is all girls, European Americans have better-quality interactions with teachers than Latinos, Native Americans, and African Americans.

Most of the research available that substantiates these general interactional patterns involves European American students. It reveals that males are treated preferentially. They have more interactions with teachers regardless of type—academic or social, intellectual or managerial, positive or negative, verbal or nonverbal, student- or teacher-initiated. As Streitmatter (1994) explains, "Males dominate the classrooms both in the positive sense as learners, as well as in a negative sense as behavioral problems" (p. 128). The magnitude of this ratio varies somewhat by the nature of the communication. It is greatest in disciplinary encounters and smallest in instructional interactions (Good & Brophy, 1994). European American males also initiate more contacts with teachers; receive more encouragement, feedback, and praise; are cued, prompted, and probed more; are rewarded more for academic accomplishments; are asked more complex, abstract, and open-ended questions; and are taught how to become independent thinkers and problem solvers. By comparison, females initiate less; receive less academic encouragement, praise, prompts, rewards, and expectations for success; have less total interactional time with teachers; are asked more simple questions that require descriptive and concrete answers; are disciplined less frequently and less severely; and are re-

warded more for social than for academic accomplishments (Good & Brophy, 1994; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1982; E. Scott & McCollum, 1993; AAUW, 1995).

Given the magnitude of these academic disadvantages, Masland's (1994) reaction to them is understandable. She declares, "It is nothing short of amazing that females succeed in school at all. After reading the research and studying the reports from female students themselves, one is struck by the resiliency and tenacity that it takes to persevere in an environment that is so demeaning and adverse" (p. 22). The same can be said, with even greater reason, about Native Americans, African Americans, Latinos, and female students of color, especially those who are poor.

Teacher interactions with African American females are similar to those with African American males, but more negative when compared to their European American counterparts. Even when their actual achievement is equal to or greater than that of African American males, they still receive less and lower-quality opportunities to engage in instructional interactions (Damico & Scott, 1988). For example, in the assignment of classroom managerial tasks, European American females receive "trusted lieutenant duties and special high prestige assignments" (Grossman & Grossman 1994, p. 90), but African American females are given duties that involve low-status social responsibilities. In their study of peer-assisted instruction, Damico and Scott (1988) observed teachers asking African American females to help other students with nonacademic tasks, while European American females were directed to give academic assistance.

These types of instructional disparities can have long-term negative consequences on achievement. They create a kind of intellectual dependency that causes females to be less assertive, confident, and skillful in the kind of analytical thinking, problem solving, and decision making that are associated with academic success in higher education, careers, and adult leadership roles. An additional negative effect occurs for African American females. They develop low self-esteem and strong feelings of powerlessness and hopelessness about being able to control their academic destinies. These feelings, in turn, diminish learning efforts and time-on-task, which subsequently leads to low academic achievement (Grant, 1984; E. Scott & McCollum, 1993).

Informal classroom observations conducted in 1996 and 1997 by a group of students enrolled in the teacher education program at the University of Washington, Seattle, indicate that many of the traditional patterns of classroom interactions with students by ethnicity and gender still prevail. In some instances, the teachers were unaware of discrepancies in their instructional behaviors and were inclined to deny any existed. In other situations, efforts were made to counteract traditional trends, but

by merely reversing the discrepancy patterns. Girls were then given more pedagogical attention than boys to accomplish "gender equity" in learning opportunities. Some teachers were oversolicitous toward ethnic-minority students, especially when the subject of instruction was something about the ethnic group to which they belonged, because they wanted to make them feel "accepted."

Neither of these strategies is desirable or effective in meeting the criteria of culturally responsive teaching and improving academic achievement. Male students dislike being ignored, excluded, or "bashed"; female students may develop inflated notions of self-importance; and students of color may resent and resist being put in the spotlight by having to be experts on themselves. Simply "reversing the order of things" in teacher interactions may backfire and cause the students it is intended to benefit to become even further marginalized. As a result, academic achievement, social development, and classroom discipline can suffer.

Teacher Interactions and Student Ability

The interactions of uncaring teachers with low-achieving and high-achieving students are consistent with trends established for ethnicity and gender. High achievers are offered instructional opportunities similar to those offered European American males, and the treatment of low-achievers is similar to that of students of color and females. Research on teachers' instructional interactions with low- and high-achieving students in reading, English, and math provide specific support for these general conclusions. Brown, Palincsar, and Purcell (1986) report that teachers interrupt poor readers more often than good readers and give mostly graphemic/phonemic helping cues to poor readers while giving semantic/syntactical ones to good readers. Instruction with good readers emphasizes comprehension skills, such as inferring meaning from, thinking about, criticizing, and evaluating text. Much of the teaching time with poor readers is devoted to drills on pronunciation and decoding, as well as establishing procedural rituals such as turn-taking and hand-raising.

In her studies of 300 high- and low-track English and math classes in 38 schools, Oakes (1985) found instructional discrepancies between high- and low-ability classes similar to those reported by Brown and colleagues. In the high-level English classes students were taught how to analyze narrative texts, write thematic essays and research papers, think critically, and expand their vocabularies. Teaching in the low-track classes emphasized grammar, rote drill and memorization of facts, simplistic workbook exercises, filling out application forms, and memorizing facts

and other low-level comprehension skills. The high-track math classes focused on concept mastery, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning, while low-track ones taught basic facts and computational skills. Similar instructional differences by social class in social studies teaching were revealed by Anyon (1981). In the working- and middle-class schools she studied, students were taught blind patriotism, obedience to laws, and uncontested compliance to the decisions of leaders. In upper-middle-class and wealthy schools, students were taught critical and analytical intellectual skills, as well as how to be social and political change agents to create the kind of society they desired rather than merely adjusting to the existing one.

Instructional interactions at the school level have also been used as the unit of analysis in examining relationships between teaching behaviors and student achievement. This was the focus of research conducted by Page (1987) and by Oakes and Guiton (1995). Their findings paralleled those of Anyon. Page's ethnographic study of regular and low-track classes in two high schools—one characterized as having an ethos of academic excellence, the other as promoting "pedestrian competence" (p. 87)—revealed significant differences in curriculum and instruction, both by class and school. The student population in the schools was almost totally European American. In the regular classes in the first school, students were perceived by teachers as high achievers and were taught to think critically, broadly, and enthusiastically about traditional academic subjects considered to be important to their present and future educational success.

The resulting instruction was focused, purposive, academically demanding, exploratory, spontaneous, and engaging. In comparable classes in the "pedestrian" school, the teachers were more perfunctory in performing their jobs and showed little enthusiasm or investment of self. They placed more emphasis on discipline, keeping order and control, punctuality, and practical education than academic pursuits. Students in low-track classes in the pedestrian school were treated more like their peers in the regular classes than like those in the low-track of the "academic" school. The differences were more a matter of degree than kind. At the academic school, low-track students were seen as "troubling anomalies" to the norm, were considered "irremediably basic" (p. 94), were entertained with a curriculum of puzzles and games; their teachers acted more as caretakers than as instructors. Although academic neglect was apparent for the low-achieving classes at both schools, it was somewhat more genteel for the "academics" than the "pedestrians."

In their study of tracking decisions in three comprehensive high schools, Oakes and Guiton (1995) found patterns of teacher expectations

and instructional behaviors virtually identical to those reported by Page. However, the sites where their study took place were quite different. At one the students were racially and socioeconomically diverse; at another they were primarily middle- and upper-middle-class European and Asian Americans; at the third the students were mostly low-income African Americans and Latinos. Oakes and Guiton observed schools with many high achievers providing greater access to a better quality and variety of courses, as well as an overall atmosphere of high academic performance expectations.

This general pattern of expectations and behaviors by kind of school was further evident in four more specific practices:

- Academically able students took vocational courses that taught key-boarding or accounting, skills considered beneficial for college preparatory students, while students in low-achieving schools took mechanically orientated vocations courses, such as auto and wood shop.
- The school with predominately Asian and European American students was perceived to be highly motivated and achieving. To accommodate the students, it offered a college-oriented curriculum. By comparison, the curriculum offerings in the school with the high African American and Latino population were disproportionately vocational.
- Teacher perceptions of students' suitability for different curriculum tracks were influenced by race, ethnicity, and social class. Asian American students, considered to be highly motivated and academically capable, were identified with high track, college-prep, and advanced-placement academic courses. Latinos were perceived to be best suited for low-track academic and remedial courses and vocational programs. Performance expectations for European Americans were lower than those for Asian Americans but higher than those for students of color. African Americans were considered slightly more academically capable than Latinos.
- Students in schools where high achievement was expected had the best-planned curricula and the best-qualified teachers, and they were given more time and consideration by counselors.

These disparities in quality of instructional expectations and interactions are perceived by uncaring teachers as a consequence of variability in student intellectual ability. They find it difficult to tease out distinguishing attributes of ethnicity, gender, social class, and intellect. In some instances, teachers are not consciously aware of discrepancies in their expectations for and interactions with ethnically different students. To move from "noncaring" to "caring" pedagogical philosophy and practice, more teach-

ers need to develop a heightened awareness of their instructional dispositions.

MOVING TOWARD CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE CARING

In working with students of color, more teachers need to exhibit culturally responsive caring and to be "tough" and "take no stuff," like the individuals introduced earlier in this chapter; that is, "tough" and intractable in the sense of having high performance expectations and diligence in facilitating their achievement. This style of teaching is anchored in caring, commitment, cultural competence, and an understanding that school performance takes place within a complex sociocultural ecology and is filtered through cultural screens both students and teachers bring to the classroom. Caring (in the form of teacher expectations and their attendant instructional behaviors) is too pivotal in shaping the educational experiences and outcomes of ethnically different students to be taken for granted or left to chance. Nor should it be assumed that constructive caring about, and pedagogical responsiveness to, cultural diversity will emerge naturally from the professional ethics or personal altruism of teachers. Instead, it must be deliberately cultivated.

Acquiring a Knowledge Base

Teachers need to begin the process of becoming more caring and culturally competent by acquiring a *knowledge base about ethnic and cultural diversity in education*. This can be derived from the rich bodies of social science, educational, and literary scholarship on ethnic groups' histories, heritages, cultures, and contributions. A recent publication by G. Smith (1998), *Common Sense About Uncommon Knowledge*, may expedite the identification of this knowledge base even more so. He has culled from the scholarship 13 wide-ranging components of multicultural education that he considers essential for inclusion in teacher education. Among these are ideological foundations; learning styles; sociocultural contexts of human growth and development; essentials of culture; experiential knowledge; and principles of culturally responsive curriculum design and classroom instruction. Another valuable resource in reconceptualizing and transforming the professional preparation of teachers for culturally responsible pedagogy is *Preparing Teachers for Cultural Diversity*, edited by J. King, Hollins, and Hayman (1997). The contributing authors to this book place cultural diversity in historical perspective; identify critical dimensions of cultural diver-

sity for teacher education; and suggest a variety of culturally sensitive pre- and inservice teaching processes and strategies.

Personal and Professional Self-Awareness

The recommendations suggested by Smith (1998) and King and colleagues (1997) include a wide range of content and pedagogical knowledge that teachers need to become competent and caring culturally responsive instructors for ethnically diverse students. However, this knowledge alone is not sufficient. It should be complemented with careful *self-analyses* of what teachers believe about the relationship among culture, ethnicity, and intellectual ability; the expectations they hold for students from different ethnic groups; and how their beliefs and expectations are manifested in instructional behaviors. These examinations are necessary and viable if Good and Brophy's (1994) contention is correct that most teachers are unaware, in any systematic way, of what they do while in the act of teaching. One cannot start to solve a problem until it is identified and understood. If teachers do not know how their own cultural blinders can obstruct educational opportunities for students of color, they cannot locate feasible places, directions, and strategies for changing them. Therefore, a critical element of culturally responsive teaching is *cultural self-awareness* and *consciousness-raising* for teachers.

Spindler and Spindler (1993, 1994) and Bennett (1995b) offer models that are useful in facilitating the development of this awareness. They are techniques for teachers to study their own classroom behaviors as they are occurring. The Spindler and Spindler model is called "cultural therapy." It is a process for bringing individuals' own cultural identities to a level of cognitive consciousness; deconstructing one's cultural embeddedness (Bowers & Flinders, 1991; Schram, 1994) in perceptions; analyzing why the cultural behaviors of others are perceived as objectionable, irritating, or shocking; and making explicit unequal power relationships and interactions in classrooms. Its purpose is to empower teachers through self-knowledge, the creation of a systematic basis for self-renewal, and the development of greater appreciation for the fallibility of presumed cultural universality.

Cultural therapy combines personal awareness with professional analysis and cultural knowledge with instructional action. It includes explicating culturally patterned assumptions, values, and roots that drive expectations, communications, and behaviors; identifying culturally determined mechanisms for the expression, defense, and protection of "the enduring self"; recognizing cultural conflicts in the classroom between

diverse students and teachers; and understanding the various kinds of *instrumental competencies* and *situational self-efficacy* required for school success for students, such as social etiquette, study skills, interactional rules, bureaucratic protocols, and high-level achievement in high-status subjects and skills.

Cultural therapy is beneficial to the implementation of culturally responsive teaching because it helps teachers to "see" more clearly the imprints of culture in their own and their students' behaviors—or to understand that "behavior is largely a matter of communicating in culturally prescribed ways" (Bowers & Flinders 1990, p. xi) and that people internalize patterns of thinking and behaving prescribed by their own cultural socialization. Cultural therapy also makes teachers more receptive to the notion that they may misread some of the behaviors of their culturally different students and, as a result, mistreat or disempower them, personally and pedagogically (Spindler & Spindler, 1994). For example, they come to realize that students who do not rise eagerly to expectations of individual competition in academic tasks are not necessarily unmotivated and uninterested in learning. They may simply be culturally cued to demonstrate motivation and academic competition in other ways, such as in cooperative group arrangements. These "cracks" in the sense of certainty about their own cultural claims and mechanisms, or what Bowers and Flinders (1990) call "taken-for-granted" assumptions of reality, are windows of opportunity for acknowledging the presence and legitimacy of cultural frames of reference in the classroom other than those of the teacher. Therefore, the purpose of cultural therapy is to alleviate the suffering caused when one's cultural biases are implicitly or explicitly forced upon others.

Bennett's (1995b) model emerged from the Teacher as Decision Maker Program at Indiana University, which emphasizes decision making and reflective practice in preservice teacher preparation. Both of these emphases are prominent in caring, culturally responsive teaching. Referred to as the "Teacher Perspective Framework," it is designed to develop skills in pedagogical self-awareness, self-analysis, and self-reflection. Preservice teachers are asked first to declare their personal perspectives on teaching philosophies by selecting from among seven conceptual options, and then to study their instructional actions to determine if assumed and actual behaviors are congruent. Self-recorded observations of teaching behaviors are accompanied by periodic self-reflections and interviews to further heighten awareness and understanding of teaching modes. If in congruencies are apparent, the teachers are challenged to explain and resolve them. This resolution may require making another conceptual choice or adapting behaviors to fit better with ideals. Although the Teaching

Perspective Framework was not designed specifically for analyzing the perspectives of teachers on the cultural behaviors of self and others, it can be adapted for this purpose.

Dialogues About Culturally Diversity

In addition to engaging in self-reflections about their expectations and interactions with cultural diversity in classrooms, teachers need to discuss them with others. These dialogues should be informative and analytical, and they should involve individuals who are in positions of authority and/or expertise to help teachers make better sense of their behaviors and improve them. Ideally, they will include professional peers and supervisors, as well as students, and participants in the dialogues will be multiethnic. The discussions should be inquiring and collaborative in nature, with the participants working together to share perceptions and expose their deep thinking on the topics under consideration. In this instance, the focus of analysis will be teacher expectations for and interactional styles with students from different ethnic groups and how these affect performance. The purpose of these dialogues is not merely to engage in cathartic "emotional massaging" or "psychological bashing," but for the participants to learn how to talk about ethnic and cultural differences, acquire a heightened level of cultural sensitivity and critical consciousness, reevaluate cultural assumptions underlying behavior, and identify themes, ideas, and issues that have generative potential for pedagogical renewal. Intergroup dialogues can be used to facilitate these discussions.

Schoem, Frankel, Zuniga, and Lewis (1993) describe how dialogues were developed and used in the Program on Intergroup Relations and Conflict at the University of Michigan. The intent was to help college students learn about different ethnic groups' cultures and experiences, deconstruct racial myths and stereotypes, and combat racism. The technique involves several different progression stages of learning. Zuniga and Nagda (1993) identify these as (1) creating a learning atmosphere conducive to cross-racial discussions and the constructive confrontation of misinformation and conflict; (2) examining ethnic-group membership and cultural identity; (3) critically analyzing impressions and stereotypes people from different ethnic and racial groups have about each other; (4) exploring connections among attitudes, feelings, values, and behaviors; and (5) building alliances, coming to closure, and engaging in action for social change.

These kinds of examinations and dialogues can be both intimidating and empowering. They should be led by individuals skilled in conducting group discussions about ethnic and racial issues. One of the major chal-

lenges for the facilitator is getting the participants talking in constructive and mutually supportive ways. Many participants may want to find safety in silence and may resist sharing genuine beliefs and feelings for fear that they will be accused of being racists. Group leaders may overcome this hurdle by creating some "personal distance" for the members to begin to actively engage with the issues. Educational and commercial films and videos that depict issues of ethnic and cultural diversity in education can provide this stimulus and opportunity. There are many excellent examples on the market. Among them are *The Color of Fear* (Mun Wah, 1994), *Rosewood* (Peters & Barone, 1997), *Eye of the Storm* (1970) and its sequel *A Class Divided* (1986), *Stand and Deliver* (Menendez, 1988), *Something Strong Within* (Nakamura, 1994), *Ethnic Notions* (Biggs, 1987), *Eyes on the Prize* (Hampton, 1987), *Ruby Bridges* (Palty, 1998), *Skin Deep* (Reed, 1995), *Race the Sun* (Kangaris, 1996), *Valuing Diversity* (1987), *The Wedding* (Burrett, 1998), and *Smoke Signals* (Estes & Rosenfelt, 1998).

Written stories and scenarios, as well as films and videos, can be very provocative prompts to initiate and focus intergroup dialogues among teachers on ethnic diversity. They are available in various genres, including fiction and nonfiction, essays and novels, poetry and prose, autobiographical and biographical documents. Illustrative of these are *The Joy Luck Club* (Tan, 1989), *A Man's Life* (Wilkins, 1982), *Let the Circle Be Unbroken* (M. Taylor, 1981), "Incident" (Cullen, 1970), *Father Song: Testimonies of African-American Sons and Daughters* (Wade-Gayles, 1997), *Tearing the Silence: On Being German in America* (Hegi, 1997), *I Am Joaquín* (Gonzales, 1972), and *Fitting In* (Bernardo, 1996).

Teachers also can use video recordings of their own classroom behaviors to develop awareness and understanding of how they interact with ethnically different students. After recording segments of instruction, they can view the tapes critically and analytically to discern differences in their expectations and behaviors by the gender and ethnicity of students. These analyses should be both quantitative and qualitative. In the first category teachers might simply count the number of times they have any kind of verbal and nonverbal contact with students from different ethnic and gender groups during the course of a lesson. These contacts could include how many questions asked of whom; praise, prompts, or guidance given; and discipline imposed. The qualitative assessments will require deeper analyses and may be more challenging and disconcerting.

In conducting these analyses, teachers might consider working with a colleague, supervisor, or external consultant who is more informed about cultural influences on classroom behaviors. The focus of attention should be on discrepancies in the *quality* of interactions teachers have with different students by ethnicity and gender. These might include

what kinds of questions are asked of boys and girls, of Latino, African, Native, Asian, and European Americans; who is praised and who is criticized; to what extent experiences and perspectives of different ethnic groups are woven into instruction; which students are encouraged to think deeper and extend, clarify, or refine their verbal contributions; which students are ignored by the teacher; what subtle ways teachers signal students that they are, or are not, expected to be masterful, high-level achievers? Once these interactional patterns are discerned and clearly understood, teachers can begin to design strategies for changing them, the first of which is to abort the negative and accelerate the positive. The next step will be to learn how to modify instructional interactions so that they are responsive to some of the cultural orientations of students from different ethnic groups. Some strategies for doing this can be gleaned from the information presented in Chapters 4-7.

CONCLUSION

Out of these processes of self-awareness and self-renewal, reflection and introspection, deconstruction and reconstruction should emerge teachers with expectations and interactions, knowledge and skills, values and ethics that exhibit the power of caring, individuals like those introduced earlier in this chapter. They will be more inclined toward and effective in implementing culturally responsive teaching because they now know that this is an unavoidable moral mandate for educating ethnically different students. And they will join the ranks of other teachers who are already moving forward on this agenda with conviction and effectiveness, such as those M. Foster (1997) writes about in *Black Teachers on Teaching* and embodied by Mable Bette Moss, who says:

My students know that they have to learn something every day, even if it's just a little bit. . . . They also know that if they don't know something or didn't learn something it's not their fault. . . . When the children tell me they can't do something, . . . I will say, 'I know you can't do it now, but we'll work together and soon you will be able to do it on your own. . . . I want them to just keep persevering until they can. I have a lot of patience. (quoted in M. Foster, 1997, pp. 172-173).

Genuinely caring teachers are academic taskmasters. All students are held accountable for high academic efforts and performance. It is not uncommon to hear these teachers making declarations to students to the effect that "there is no excuse for not trying to learn," "you will never

know what you can do unless you try," and "I can't do" is unacceptable in my classroom." Their performance expectations are complemented with uncompromising faith in their students and relentless efforts in helping them meet high academic demands. The results are often phenomenal. Students who others feel can only reach minimal levels of academic and social achievement produce stellar performance for caring, culturally sensitive teachers. The success of these teachers demonstrates that the idea of caring as essential to instructional effectiveness is not merely a truism; it is a fact. When combined with pedagogical competence, caring becomes a powerful ideological and praxis pillar of culturally responsive pedagogy for students.