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ABSTRACT

This study sought to create a holistic picture of Ethnic Studies as it relates to education through the voices and experiences of scholars who bridge Ethnic Studies and education. It examines Ethnic Studies through the conceptual lens of Safety Zone Theory (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). At the heart of Safety Zone Theory (SZT) is the concept that historically the U.S. federal government (and to an extent society as a result of this governmental framing) has designated certain elements of minority cultures as “safe” and other elements as “divisive.” SZT was originally applied to examine federal Indian education policy in the U.S. In this study, I expand that application to other minority and immigrant cultures within the United States. This research is significant because despite the minority population growth in the United States public school curricula typically only make reference to such groups and their histories a minimal side note (Loewen, 2007; U.S. Census, 2013; Zinn, 2003). For example, in 2010 the Arizona state legislature declared Ethnic Studies illegal on the grounds that it allegedly promotes “anti-American sentiments” (A.R.S. §15–112).

Using Seidman’s (2013) three-part interview protocol, leading figures in the field of Ethnic Studies as it relates to education were interviewed to gain their perspectives on the “life story” of this field. Again following Seidman’s (2013) protocol, narrative profiles were crafted for each participant. The profiles were analyzed individually for emerging themes; this was followed by a cross-case analysis. This multilevel qualitative analysis yielded a larger narrative of Ethnic Studies that helps us to understand its past and envision its future. My hope is that this research impacts future policy on Ethnic Studies and current curricula, particularly in states and school districts making decisions
on the importance and need of Ethnic Studies as a part of the curriculum. Also, the research can aid preservice teachers and principals in learning to see the fullness of their students, the places they come from, and the value and funds of knowledge that they bring to the classroom. I also hope that this is the beginning of more studies on the impact of individual stories and the stories as a collective in regards to race and ethnicity.

Demographics within the United States are changing at a rapid pace, and school is children’s introduction to society. As a mini-society/community, there is a responsibility to model what they are going step into in real life.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background and Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to better understand the role of Ethnic Studies in U.S. education over time using a key source: the narratives of its founders and experts in the field. Through these narratives, we learn the important and nuanced ways in which contemporary Ethnic Studies, as a field of study and practice, is related to its origins and past. To illustrate this point, I use the metaphor of a quilt to frame the life story of Ethnic Studies, in which the “patches” from different timeframes and its application in different regions of the United States may look very dissimilar but become coherent and beautiful when we are able to see the overall patterns. It is the patterns that this study seeks to illuminate and understand. Applying Lomawaima and McCarty’s (2006) Safety Zone Theory, I examine the ways in which Ethnic Studies has been positioned at different times and places as “safe” or “dangerous” in U.S. education. In this regard, the 2010 banning of Ethnic Studies in public schools by the Arizona state legislature and the 2015 decision of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) to require Ethnic Studies for graduation present two opposite and yet telling cases. Why would one school district deem it as a necessity and another government entity as something that should be banned? I explore those two cases as two “barometers” of the positioning of Ethnic Studies within public schooling in contemporary U.S. society.

The present study utilized critical personal narratives (Barone, 2010; Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995; Mutua & Swadener, 2004)—the telling of the “life stories” of the field by its founders and leaders—as a primary methodology. This approach to Ethnic Studies
examines the field, an interdisciplinary academic discipline, with an emphasis on its origins and development within schools of education. Definitions of Ethnic Studies have changed over time, resulting in great variation in how Ethnic Studies has been conceived and practiced. For example, within some post-secondary institutions, Women and Gender Studies is an included discipline. Broadly, Banks (2012a) and Yang (2000) define Ethnic Studies as a discipline inclusive of a number of fields, such as African American Studies, Chicano/a Studies, Native American Studies, Mexican American Studies, and Asian American Studies. These varying fields of study and various personal backgrounds of the subjects have a huge impact on how Ethnic Studies has been framed and identified and, hence, on what Ethnic Studies will become in the future.

Ethnic Studies as an academic discipline began as a student movement in 1968 (Banks, 2012a; Hu-DeHart, 1995). However, in spite of some enduring impacts of the student movement, many policymakers, teachers, and preservice teachers today still do not understand exactly what “Ethnic Studies” is and its place in education (Banks, 2012a; Yang, 2000). This is critical when considering the shifting demographics and increasing cultural diversity throughout the United States (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013) and also substantiates the need for better understanding of ethnicity in general in the country (Schoorman & Botgotch, 2010).

Ethnic Studies in the United States manifested during a time of civil unrest and social change in the 1960s, particularly the Civil Rights Movement, as well as the Chicano/a Movement and the American Indian Movement, which were all concurrent with Women’s Liberation movements (Banks, 2012a; Ratvitch, 2000; Sleeter, 2011). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 resulted from the Civil Rights Movement. The act made
segregation illegal in public places and in any institution or organization that received federal funding in the United States. Using Safety Zone Theory (SZT), this study seeks to better understand how Ethnic Studies was “tolerable” and even supported in the context of these 1960s social movements, and yet—at least in some parts of the nation—is being repressed today. I also seek to better understand the influences of these processes on public school curricula.

In summary, the struggle for legitimacy and the need for Ethnic Studies continues from its origins to the present day. This study seeks to understand how Ethnic Studies has evolved over time, the individuals who have led and “peopled” the field, the challenges faced, and the possibilities that lie ahead. Ethnic Studies faces a constant challenge around the question of the need for it in a multicultural world. As this argument goes, since the world is already multicultural and pluralistic, Ethnic Studies has “done its job” and is no longer necessary (D’Souza, 1991; Ravitch, 2000). Many times U.S. society is seen as a post-racial society, with the election of Barack Obama used as evidence (Hill Collins, 2009). This argument also contributes to the idea that there is no need to discuss or learn about minority cultures or race in general. Another post-racial ideology is that it is more important to teach about an overall imagined “American culture” rather than smaller “subcultures” (Anderson, 2014). In contrast to these views, one of the assumptions of this study is that, in order to avoid repeating historical errors when encountering these changes, it is necessary to keep one eye on the past and one eye on the future and, thereby, create a bridge to a more equitable future and a society that is not afraid to face difficult historical societal issues rather than sweep them under a rug as if they do not exist.
The following section focuses on three issues: demographic changes, recent education policies about Ethnic Studies in both the state of Arizona and within the LAUSD, and Ethnic Studies and standardization. Then I will present my research questions and introduce my conceptual framework, Safety Zone Theory (SZT). Next will be a discussion of the context of the study and an overview of the methodology, which will lead to the synthesis and the significance of the study for education, policy, and practice. I will conclude with an outline of the dissertation chapters.

**Statement of the Problem**

There are three primary issues addressed in this section: 1) the rapidly changing demographics in the United States, including statistics on race and ethnicity in education; 2) the recent Arizona legislation banning Ethnic Studies and the recent passing of the Ethnic Studies graduation requirement by the LAUSD; and 3) how Ethnic Studies is framed within the standardization movement in education. Current trends and issues of Ethnic Studies in a sample of states within the U.S. are discussed in the Review of Literature.

**U.S. Demographics**

Demographics in the United States are shifting at a rapid rate. The influx of immigration was at an all-time high in the year 2000 (it has lowered in fluctuation between 2000 and the present, but over the past 15 years in general it is the highest it has been in recent history) (Migration Policy Institution, 2014; U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Demographically throughout the world, minority populations (non-White ethnicities) are growing at a faster rate than White populations (Banks, 2012b, U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). The demographics of the United States parallels these statistics (see Figure 1). For
the first time in history, non-Hispanic White births are no longer the majority in the United States (Tarvisnise, 2012). The significance of this is that, while the majority of the world’s populations are non-White ethnicities, the concentration of power both economically and globally is not within those populations; rather, it stands with the Western European White populations of the world (Banks, 2012b). This is compelling in that this creates a societal norm that those who do not have much economic and global power must “deserve” what they lack and that this disparity does not need to be examined nor altered. Recently, some have started using the phrase “global minority” in reference to Western European White populations (Dahlberg, Moss, & Pence, 1999). This is important because the reality of these demographic changes is starting to be recognized by a wider world audience.

These demographic shifts are experienced differently in different regions of the U.S. In general, there is an increase in birth rates and children throughout the U.S. (Mather, 2012) (See Figure 2). In the South, one quarter of public school students are of African American descent, and 20% of students are of Latin American descent. In the Southwest, one quarter of public school students are of Latin American descent (Mather, 2012). By 2020, in some parts of the United States there will be a majority minority population (Mather, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). A recent news article states that because the Latin American population is growing at such a high rate it is changing the White/Black paradigm that has existed in the United States (Mendoza, 2013).

These rapid demographic changes point to the fact that greater attention needs to be paid to the cultural relevance and responsiveness of school curricula (Gay, 2010; Howard, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Another implication of the demographic shift is
that the number of youth ages 0–18 is growing, which results in a greater number of students in schools (see Figure 3). As a consequence, there is greater diversity of students in schools than there has ever been in U.S. education history. Most importantly, in the face of these statistics and demographic changes there is still a large achievement gap between White students and minority students (U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

The combination of immigration shifts and age shifts makes examining what is being taught in schools all the more relevant and important (see Figure 1). Banks (2013) discussed the conflict that Black high school students and young adults sometimes experience between nationality (being American or, more accurately, U.S. citizens) and ethnicity (i.e., being Black). The conflict takes place within many minoritized students (Banks, 2013). Further complicating the issue, the majority of elementary and secondary teachers are White, and as the previous statistics reflect, the race and ethnicity of students are changing (Banks, 2013). Teachers need to have an understanding of the backgrounds of the students they are teaching, and the curriculum should better reflect students’ funds of knowledge and heritages (Gonzales et al., 1995; González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). Teachers need to be able to evaluate their own perspectives and their own influences on race and ethnicity as a way of being able to help their students (Engan & Barker, 1994). The discipline of Ethnic Studies creates an environment to explore these issues for both students and teachers as they simultaneously go through this internal conflict respectively (Ford & Quinn, 2010).
Figure 1. Percentage of children ages 0-17 in the United States by race and Hispanic origin, 1980-2012 and projected 2013-2050-Child population rates categorized by race and ethnicity.


NOTE: The acronym NH refers to non-Hispanic origin. The acronym NHPI refers to the Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander population. Each group represents the non-Hispanic populations, with the exception of the Hispanic category itself. Race data from 2000 onward are not directly comparable with data from earlier years. Data on race and Hispanic origin are collected separately. Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race. Population projections are based on Census 2000 and may not be consistent with the 2010 Census results.
Figure 2. States rates for growth of child populations, categorized by percent changes (increases or decreases) in child population, 2000-2010
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The Case of Arizona: A.R.S. §15–112

The case of Arizona is important because it is an excellent example of how the larger social-political and economic context of public schooling shapes policymakers’ (and ultimately the public’s) “safe” versus “dangerous” perceptions of programs, such as Ethnic Studies. In 2010, the Arizona State Legislature banned all Ethnic Studies programs in public and public charter schools (also known as HB 2281), which they claimed taught anti-American sentiments. In March 2013, an appellate court in southern Arizona upheld three of the four specific parts of the law. The four components of the law were: 1) classes that “promote the overthrow of the federal or state government or the constitution,” 2) classes that “promote resentment toward any race or class,” 3) classes that “advocate ethnic solidarity instead of being individuals,” and 4) classes that are designed for “a certain ethnicity” (A.R.S. §15–112). The fourth part of the law was not
upheld because the court said it was too vague. Also, it is important to note that this particular Mexican American class and program were created as a result of the Civil Rights laws to encourage more active participation among minorities of the community (in this case Mexican American students), and the school district itself was under a federal Office of Civil Rights desegregation order for over 30 years (Tucson Unified School District [TUSD], 2016). Another significant note is that this law (A.R.S. §15–112) was very focused on the program in Tucson and did not have as much of an impact on any other school district to date. Recent studies showed that there were vast academic improvements with the students who participated in the program in Tucson and in the Ethnic Studies program in general (Cabrera, Milem, Jaquette, & Marx, 2004; Franciosi, 2009). This is a powerful finding and shows that Ethnic Studies can help students to do better academically in school and in turn to be more informed citizens. The 9th Circuit U.S. Appellate Court is revisiting the law itself in the near future. The school district has recreated the Mexican American department without the option of Mexican American Studies—specifically the history of the Mexican-American relations—as a result of the ban (TUSD, 2014). The curriculum has changed and is now based in the theory of culturally relevant pedagogy in a more generalized sense of the concept (Gay, 2010; TUSD, 2014).

Arizona’s ban of Mexican American Studies is a telling case of the need to examine Ethnic Studies with different lenses. As previously discussed, demographic data show that one in four public school students in the southwestern part of the United States are of Latino/Hispanic background. The law suggests that unless the history that these students are taught is race and ethnic neutral, it has no place in American schools.
American history is culturally diverse, and, historically, that diversity has been either muted or very limited (Banks, 2013). As the demographics change in the United States, a goal of this study is to help in changing that historic tradition.

**Los Angeles Unified School District and Ethnic Studies**

In 2015, in a stark contrast to Arizona, Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) passed a ruling to make Ethnic Studies a high school graduation requirement (Caeser, 2014; Gilbertson, 2014). As mentioned previously, this is significant because LAUSD is the second largest school district in the United States, and it is the second district in California to have this requirement. An important fact to know is that it was high school students who led to this change in the curriculum and policy decision (Gilbertson, 2014). The specifics of its implementation have not been determined, and there is an estimation of its implementation costing $3.9 million. However, the exact cost will not be calculated for a few years (Galatzan, 2014; Gilbertson, 2014). This case was followed, along with that of Arizona, during the course of the research.

**Ethnic Studies within the Common Core**

Finally, it is important to position Ethnic Studies within the current movement of national standards. As Christine Sleeter (2005) notes, standardization tends to run directly counter to local, ethnic, and cultural histories. Nonetheless, this is a powerful force in U.S. education policy with which Ethnic Studies must contend. In recent years, standardization has taken the form of the Common Core, a national standardized curriculum guideline that has been adopted by 46 states, four U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia as of 2014 (McCarty & Anderson-Levitt, 2013; Shapiro, 2014).
As previously noted, Ethnic Studies curricula tend to lie within English and History departments on both the secondary and post-secondary levels, though for the purposes of this analysis the focus is on the secondary level as it relates to national standards. In 2010, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) began creating the *College, Career, and Civic Life (C3) Framework*, with a primary purpose of responding to the topics of social studies that were missing from the Common Core (McCarty & Anderson-Levitt, 2013; NCSS, 2010). The goal of the framework is to support state departments of education in establishing state-specific standards within the disciplines of geography, history, civics, and economics (NCSS, 2013). This phenomenon will be discussed in the study’s interviews. Given the powerful role of standardization in state and federal education policies, it is important to critically examine these standards as they apply to Ethnic Studies. The next section addresses my research questions and more details of my conceptual framework—Safety Zone Theory—and how it informs this exploration of Ethnic Studies.

**Research Questions**

The research questions are as follows:

1. What are/were the experiences of academic leaders in the field of Ethnic Studies as this field developed in the U.S.?
   a. What are these scholars’ understandings of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?
   b. How have they experienced the development of the field?
   c. What are their observations of how Ethnic Studies has been implemented in U.S. schools?
d. What is their vision for the future of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?
e. What are their perspectives of the larger state and federal policy context of Ethnic Studies?

The goal of my research question was primarily to capture the experiences of the experts of the field. The sub-questions address different areas of those experiences from the development of the field, to the practice over time, to its future, and finally policies that are being implemented about Ethnic Studies. Below in my conceptual framework, I go into more detail on these questions as they relate to Safety Zone Theory and what this study is doing.

**Conceptual Framework**

My conceptual framework is based on Safety Zone Theory as presented by Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) in their book “To Remain an Indian”: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education and McCarty (2013) in her book Language Planning and Policy in Native America: History, Theory, Praxis. As the titles imply, this theory was originally used to examine the history of Native American education in the United States. Lomawaima and McCarty traced the development of federal American Indian policy by pointing to discernible patterns in which that policy constructed some cultural differences as “safe” and hence was tolerated, or even promoted, in schools serving Native American studies (e.g. Native arts and crafts), while other cultural differences (e.g., Native American languages during the 1800s and early 1900s) were deemed so dangerously different as to be officially proscribed. For example, creating a separate Native American school system was deemed “safe” by the federal...
government, but the students were not allowed to speak their Native languages at school because that was deemed unsafe. Figure 4 is a diagram from McCarty’s book showing how these areas are distinct, but the borders between them tend to be fuzzy.

*Figure 4 Safety Zone Theory.*

Adapted from *Language Planning and Policy in Native America* by T.L. McCarty, 2013, Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters [Kindle version].

In this dissertation, I drew heavily from the safety zone concept to investigate Ethnic Studies and the different ways race and ethnicity are addressed and not addressed in education. Based on the laws passed in Arizona and a recent federal law (*Parents involved in Community Schools vs. Seattle School District No. 1, 551 U.S. 701, 2006*) regarding race in education, my argument is that some forms of teachings related to race and ethnicity are considered “safe” for schools, such as the sharing of food from another
culture in Black History Month or Hispanic History Month. However, other forms of difference and, as illuminated by the TUSD case, Ethnic Studies itself, many times are deemed “unsafe” for schools, as bringing more attention to working to consciously make a district more diverse by changing the district lines. Other examples would be the prohibition of Native American children speaking their own language in federal boarding schools, which wasn’t that long ago in history, and the restrictions on Spanish-speaking bilingual students in U.S. schools today. I go into more detail about my conceptual framework as it relates to the study in my Review of Literature in Chapter 2.

Study Context and Methodology

Recent Ethnic Studies research has focused on the political issues surrounding the “ban” on Ethnic Studies within the Tucson Unified School District in Arizona (Cabrera, Meza, & Rodriguez, 2011; Cabrera et al., 2014), including whether Ethnic Studies enhances academic achievement among students who take the courses (Sleeter, 2011) and whether Ethnic Studies enhances race relations (Banks, 2013; Sleeter, 2011). I hope to take a different approach than previous studies in order to look at Ethnic Studies by focusing on “making meaning of individuals’ experiences” (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 115). Hatch & Wisniewski’s (1995) study uses life story methodology, which “draws on individuals’ experiences to make broader contextual meaning” (p. 115). This study sought to produce findings that are practical to a wide range of readers, such as the public, students, and teachers, as well as those within the post-secondary academic community.

Using data gleaned from in-depth phenomenological interviews, the study constructed six personal narratives that, together, tell a “life story” of Ethnic Studies.
Interviews were undertaken using several forms of communication, such as face-to-face, Skype, telephone, and email. Each of these methods of communication had their advantages and disadvantages. Face-to-face was the preferable means of communication in order to capture body language and cues. The disadvantage was the cost of travel, as the majority of these scholars are not local. Second, Skype or another teleconference interface was a useful method because it has many of the same features of being face-to-face with a subject. The disadvantages might be limited computer knowledge of both parties, varying comfort levels of talking on the computer, and a reliance on working technology. The third preferred method is to conduct a telephone interview because it is a common method of communication outside of face-to-face. The disadvantage is the lack of seeing body language and the limited ability to recognize subtle intonations in the conversation. And finally, email is a valid method of communication because the subjects have time to craft their responses. The disadvantage is that it can come across as a one-sided conversation. Email was used primarily for follow-up communication, such as clarifications after the interviews.

Using the method of in-depth interviews allowed me to create a holistic perspective that reflects the perspectives of the founders and scholars of the field. These individuals have helped shape, refine, and define Ethnic Studies, which makes them the most appropriate to discuss such issues. Individuals’ understandings and narratives of Ethnic Studies are the unit of analysis. One of my research questions also addressed state and federal policy surrounding Ethnic Studies, in hopes of eliciting stories related to such topics. Banks (1995) wrote that two of the major problems in the field of multicultural education (which, in his framework, is inclusive of Ethnic Studies) were 1) the gap
between theory and practice and 2) the lack of consensus within the scope of the field. One of the goals of the study is to examine the gaps between theory and practice in Ethnic Studies and also to compare the original intent of Ethnic Studies to the goals of Ethnic Studies in this present day. A long-term goal would be to establish clarification of the definition of Ethnic Studies, which would allow it to be studied more thoroughly and understood by a wider population.

**Summary, Synthesis, and Significance**

My intention was to create a collection of narratives concerning the evolution of Ethnic Studies as a scholarly field and a field of practice within education—including the accomplishments and challenges—using personal narratives of Ethnic Studies scholars. Ethnic Studies scholars include university scholars who have worked from the beginning to create Ethnic Studies as students themselves or who have studied under those who were students during the time of its creation. The ultimate goal is to provide a holistic picture of Ethnic Studies in the United States in the 21st century. An important feature to note is that just in the last 50 years Ethnic Studies has changed. I will be using the Safety Zone Theory as my conceptual framework of analysis. The three-prong analytic approach stemming from the Safety Zone Theory will consist of 1) policy, 2) experience, and 3) practice. The goal from this is to create a life story of Ethnic Studies and to determine what gives “life” to Ethnic Studies is the people of that field.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

Chapter 1 provided an introduction to the issues surrounding Ethnic Studies. It includes the statement of the problem, my conceptual framework and an overview of the methodology.
The second chapter provides a literature review and conceptual framework of many recent concepts of race and ethnicity in the United States. It goes on to discuss the difference and similarities of Ethnic Studies and multicultural education and the evolutionary development of multicultural education from Ethnic Studies. Next is a discussion of specific Ethnic Studies groups and their individual histories. This is not a comprehensive list of the different groups, but it is a description of some of the main groups. The chapter ends with current trends and issues with Ethnic Studies throughout the United States and more details regarding my conceptual framework.

Chapter 3, Design and Methodology, describes my interviews, the coding of the interviews (pattern coding, value coding, and line-by-line coding), and leads into two analysis chapters. Chapter 4 provides analysis of participant narratives of experience and policy. This analysis presents the works of the individual interviewees, their contributions to the field, and their personal stories as it relates to the field. Given that their individual stories influence their perspectives and their contributions to the field, it is important to tell their stories as closely as possible to the original telling and, at the same time, explain how their stories relate to the literature. The section at the end of the collective narratives includes what I learned from the interviews and the crafting of the narratives, which leads into the cross-case analysis.

The fifth chapter presents findings of the cross-case analysis of interview narratives. In this section of the analysis, I discuss common and divergent themes in the data as they relate to my research questions and conceptual framework.
The sixth and final chapter provides a synthesis of findings, conclusions, and implications. In this chapter, there is a final summation of my findings and the resultant conclusions and implications for policy and for education and Ethnic Studies as a field.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The purpose of this literature review is to provide a critical examination of research on Ethnic Studies as it relates to my study. As already mentioned, Safety Zone Theory (SZT) was utilized as a way to define elements of Ethnic Studies and to give insight into different ways it is perceived. Before getting into the details of Ethnic Studies, I would like to briefly look at how others have defined ethnicity and race in research. Examining how ethnicity and race have been researched in the past can shed light on how different Ethnic Studies groups were formed and why issues of Ethnic Studies have been categorized as taboo the same as issues of race and ethnicity. Next, I will provide a historical background on Ethnic Studies itself and briefly discuss its evolutionary and overlapping relationship with multicultural education. In that evolutionary cycle, I show how elements of Ethnic Studies became less important and have changed over time and how multicultural education tends to be considered the safer way of teaching diversity. Then, there will be a discussion on current issues and trends of Ethnic Studies in education. This will be followed by a brief description of how my conceptual framework creates a way to examine this phenomenon. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the gaps in the literatures and how my study seeks to fill in those gaps.

Race and Ethnicity

What are race and ethnicity? One of the purposes of this study is to examine what Ethnic Studies is as the study of race and ethnicity. To understand the heart of Ethnic Studies, it is important to examine how race and ethnicity have been conceptualized in
United States society. It is significant to look at how these concepts came to be defined as they are in the present in order to explore the implications for their future. I first provide a brief historical timeline and then three schools of thought on ethnicity that have developed over time. There are numerous other perspectives and ideas about ethnicity that are not included here. I have chosen to examine ethnicity theory in three ways. 1) First of all, to show that concepts of race and ethnicity have a long history in the United States and how the meanings of these concepts are rapidly changing and have changed over time. 2) People tend to believe that their perspective is the only reality; however, there are multiple perspectives and realities that are different but also intersect with each other. 3) There is a reason why White people feel excluded from conversations on race and that is because historically White has been set up as a relatively empty cultural category and creates this idea that a “true American” has little to no cultural ties (Goodman, Moses, & Jones, 2012).

Ethnicity theory is a popular view of race that began in the 1940s with the goal of combating the ideas of innate racial biological differences (Omi & Winant, 2015). From the late 19th and early 20th centuries, however, anthropological and sociological research had been working to debunk the biological basis of race (Boas, 1931). Boas (1931) argued that the races have been in contact with each other for years, and, therefore, the idea that race can be delineated concretely is not the reality of our society. As already stated, recent demographics support this argument now more than ever (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Scholars of that time did prove that ideas of sociobiological differences were in fact not true (Boas, 1931; Omi & Winant, 2015). But yet, these very wrongful ideas still permeate our society and many people’s beliefs about race and ethnicity. One
obvious position where this takes place is in the blood quantum laws for Native Americans, but it also shows up in the idea that race and ethnicity are fixed and unchangeable concepts (Yang, 2000). Though the concept of sociobiological differences was debunked, it permeated the culture of the time and still permeates our culture through stereotypes and prejudice.

In the beginning of the American colonies, the first laborers were indentured servants, but over time that changed and physical difference became much more significant (Goodman et al., 2012). Goodman et al. (2012) also state, “Soon a new social structure emerged based primarily on skin color, with those of English ancestry at the top and African slaves and American Indians at the bottom” (Loc. 773). This historical social structure again was the beginning of our current society’s view of race and ethnicity, and it is the reason that learning about ethnicity and race became important to all people, both minorities and non-minorities alike.

Finally, from these notions of race and ethnicity, Ethnic Studies was created as a way of helping to understand different people’s place in society beyond negativity, as a lower subclass, and to overcome the limitations that society puts on people and their place in society. The next section is on three schools of thought on ethnicity and an integrated fourth approach, and the concepts discussed relate to what I just discussed in the previous paragraph.

Schools of Thought on Race and Ethnicity

Theories of ethnicity are concepts and interpretations of race (Omi & Winant, 2015). Yang (2000) wrote that three schools of thought on Ethnic Studies and ethnicity have developed over time: 1) the Primordialist school, 2) the Constructionist school, and
3) the Instrumental school. The Primordialist school of thought maintains that, “Ethnicity is an ascribed identity or assigned status, something inherited from one’s ancestors” (Yang, 2000, p. 43). By that logic, ethnicity is a fixed identity. This school of thought gives great weight to the sociobiological factor in determining ethnicity. The problem is that it does not explain why identities of individuals and groups change over time or why new ethnic identities emerge when old ones disappear. This is a way that early social scientists viewed race and ethnicity. For example, the idea of race and ethnicity as a biological and fixed concept was used with the concept of social Darwinism, a 19th-century position that argued for a biological social hierarchy where those of the White (English-speaking) race were at the top and those who were not and could not assimilate smoothly into White society both physically and culturally had less value (Ignatiev, 2009).

The Constructionist school dominated scholarly thinking on race and ethnicity in the 1970s. This school of thought made three arguments: 1) ethnicity is a socially constructed identity, 2) ethnic boundaries are flexible or changeable, and 3) ethnic affiliation or identification is determined or constructed by society (Yang, 2000). This was basically the exact opposite of the Primordialist school of thought. This school ignored the ancestral basis of ethnicity and deemphasized the limitations of social construction theory. An example of a problem with this theory is that it justified the concept of the continuation of the “culture of poverty.” Another example is that the issues of race and ethnicity are the reason majority minority cities and areas of the country statistically tend to have a higher poverty and crime rate over other parts of the city (Smedley, 1998). It is passed on culturally, and there is nothing anyone can do to change...
his or her cultural ties (Smedley, 1998). It can be argued that the Primordialist school and the Constructionist school are two different sides of the same coin. There are aspects of both of these orientations that can attribute inequities of race and ethnicity as uncontrollable features of society.

The Instrumental school of thought framed ethnicity as an instrument or strategic tool for gaining resources. An extreme version of this concept posits that the main purpose for wanting to be part of an ethnic group is to obtain a comparative advantage over other groups. The limitation to the school of thought is that ethnic membership does not always equal more materialistic gain and is not always chosen by rational thought. Examples of the success of this idea have been shown with many ethnically White first and second generation immigrants, such as Jewish American communities and Italian American communities (Brodkin, 1998; Ignatiev, 2009). But on the negative side are high poverty high minority clusters. The reason this model has not worked for all minorities equally goes back to views of race and ethnicity in this country. Many minorities did not move here willingly or for a better life for themselves. For Native Americans, it was their land first, and they were put on reservations and forced to move by the federal government. Over the years, the government has subsidized for the move, but the starting line for them in more material gain was completely different. African Americans came here as slaves, and their descendants were slaves. When the Reconstruction began with the ending of slavery, they had to start with what they had. Again, the starting line was not the same. In recent years, there has been improvement and more opportunity for non-White minorities in the United States; however, the history
of inequality should not be forgotten or erased but used as a platform for society to be better than it ever was.

There exists another integrated approach that makes four specific propositions: 1) ethnicity is partially based on ancestry, which does include some physical and cultural characteristics and national origins; 2) ethnicity is constructed by society (and communities); 3) there are costs and benefits associated with ethnic group membership, but these are only partially determined by affiliation or identification; and 4) while ethnic boundaries are relatively stable, they can change from time to time (Yang, 2000). Of these three schools of thought and integrated approaches, the integrated approach provides the basis for my position. With the changing demographics in the United States, what constitutes ethnic group membership is bound to change in ways that are yet to be imagined; therefore, there needs to be some flexibility in how ethnicity is defined and understood.

These concepts have changed over time and given way to Ethnic Studies and other positive ideas about race, such as pluralism, multiculturalism, and more, but at the same time there have been some negative results too, such as a push to do away with the idea of race and ethnicity completely. The logic of doing away with the idea of race and ethnicity completely supposes that this present society (and future societies) will be beyond race and ethnicity and become a colorblind, colorless society (Hill Collins, 2009). As a result of all of the concepts previously discussed, there is a need for Ethnic Studies for everyone regardless of their race. Teaching Ethnic Studies gives perspective to different people’s experiences of life. Similar to the concepts of race and ethnicity, Ethnic
Studies and multicultural education need to be examined in order to define what really is being taught within the curriculum.

**Ethnic Studies and Multicultural Education**

This section begins with the history of Ethnic Studies and its relationship with multicultural education. Many of the studies previously mentioned and discussed in more details as we continue were better categorized as multicultural education rather than Ethnic Studies because multicultural education was an evolutionary outgrowth of Ethnic Studies (Banks, 1995). The reality is that there are overlaps of issues and topics that fit within both Ethnic Studies and multicultural education. Below is a flow chart that shows the progression of Ethnic Studies as a field. Many would add global education at the end (Banks, 2012b).

*Figure 5.* The Evolutionary Transition of Ethnic Studies to Multicultural Education.

![Flow chart showing the progression of Ethnic Studies to Multicultural Education.](image)


First, the two dominant reasons for researching and teaching Ethnic Studies are as follows: 1) prejudice reduction (Banks, 2001) and 2) to improve academic achievement of students of color who historically have performed not as well academically as White students (Sleeter, 2011). The research tended to evaluate different aspects of these two justifications.
As previously mentioned, multicultural education was generally accepted as an outgrowth of Ethnic Studies (Banks, 1991; Giroux, 2000; Grant, 2011; Grant & Tate, 1995; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). The areas this study reviewed and analyzed were in the Ethnic Studies circle and include the parts that overlap with multicultural education. The distinction between the two is important in viewing the historical trajectory of Ethnic Studies, and it becomes very important in the stories of my participants. Next is the history of Ethnic Studies, which is one of the key differences between multicultural education and Ethnic Studies. Ethnic Studies has a historical origin story, whereas multicultural education was more of a conceptual framing than a specific stand-alone curriculum. One of my interviewees distinguished Ethnic Studies as something different than multicultural education, which will be discussed in detail in both Chapters 4 and 5.

**History of Ethnic Studies**

Ethnic Studies was born in the context of social movements of the 1960s, particularly the Civil Rights Movement and the sub-movements that came out of it, such
as the Chicano/a Movement and the American Indian Movement, which were concurrent with Women’s Liberation Movements. The 1960s was a time of civil unrest and social change (Banks, 2012a; Ravitch, 2000; Sleeter, 2011). From the Civil Rights Movement came the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which made segregation in public places and within any institution or organization that received federal funding illegal in the United States. Ironically, this is one of the bases for the ban on Ethnic Studies in the Tucson Unified School District, because the Arizona legislature argued that the Ethnic Studies class being taught was teaching students to self-segregate. Their argument is based on a limited view of the Chicano/a Movement, which I will describe in more detail later in the section marked Chicano/a Studies.

Ethnic Studies emerged in 1968 as a result of simultaneous student movements at two universities, the University of California Berkeley and California State University San Francisco (CSUSF). The student movements were demanding that the university include more minorities from the admissions level to the faculty level. A group called the Third World Liberation Front (TWLF), which consisted of various ethnic-specific student groups—the Black Student Union (BSU), the Mexican American Students Confederation (MASC), the Philippine American Collegiate Endeavor (PACE), the Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action (ICSA), and the Asian American Pacific Alliance (AAPA) (Lye, 2010)—led the charge through protests for the creation of Ethnic Studies. The protest at CSUSF lasted from Fall 1968 until Winter 1969, making it the longest student protest in United States history. While other student movements were taking place, the CSUSF protest had the greatest influence (Banks, 2009; Hu-DeHart, 1993; Lye, 2010; Nance, 2008).
The TWLF’s protest hinged on several demands, but their core belief was that all “third-world” students have the right to an education. They demanded open admissions because they believed that standardized testing in the college admissions process was culturally biased (Banks, 2009; Hu-DeHart, 1993; Lye, 2010). In addition, they demanded that education be relevant to minority students. They believed that the best way to achieve this was the creation of Ethnic Studies departments and programs that would study and work to resolve the social issues of the United States’ third-world peoples (Lye, 2010). Finally, they demanded the right to have Ethnic Studies classes taught by third-world professors and for those professors to have the right to set their own curriculum and hire their own faculty (Hu-DeHart, 1993, 1995; Lye, 2010). These essential tenets became the basic framework for Ethnic Studies programs on the post-secondary level. Though Ethnic Studies started out as a collaborative effort, once it was established it became more and more departmentalized and disparate (Schlund-Vials, 2011).

While Ethnic Studies found its inception at the post-secondary level, as time progressed it was incorporated into some elementary and secondary schools (paralleled to programs being started in higher education). Research shows that Ethnic Studies classes (both on the post-secondary level and the secondary level) in schools with a high concentration of minority students can help improve grades and decrease student dropout rates (Sleeter, 2011). One such study investigated the effects of participation in the Tucson Mexican American Studies (MAS) program. There was a positive correlation between students’ participation in the program and in both the passing of the AIMS (Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards) exams and graduation rates (Cabrera, Meza,
Branches of Ethnic Studies

I will now briefly discuss a few of the major branches of Ethnic Studies and their historical origins. This list is in no way exhaustive. The goal of this section is to discuss the relationship between specific social movements and different branches of Ethnic Studies. There could be a study on each of these groups, but for this study I am just covering the highlights of each field. Some recent issues that affect all branches of Ethnic Studies are 1) widespread department financial cuts, 2) a push toward making these branches more interdisciplinary under the umbrella of American Studies, and finally, as I already mentioned 3) the question of its place with so many similar but different concepts surrounding issues of ethnicity and race.

Black Studies/African American Studies. Ethnic Studies scholars credit luminaries such as W.E.B. Du Bois, George Washington Williams, Carter G. Woodson, and Charles Chestnutt as among the founders of Ethnic Studies in African American history—also known as Black or Pan-African history. These scholars had a desire for both Blacks and Whites to learn about Black history (Banks, 2004; Butler & Schmitz, 1992; Chestnutt, 1899; Du Bois, 1903; Sleeter, 2011; Williams, 1882). This is important because this has been an issue with Ethnic Studies for years; its critics believed that it was designed and taught primarily for minority students. As I will show in the chapters that follow, my argument is that historically Ethnic Studies was never intended only for minority students and that all races and ethnicities can learn from each other.
Carter G. Woodson was the creator of Negro History Week in 1926 (now known as Black History Month). He also began one of the first professional associations that included Black people, the Association for the Study of African American History (Banks, 2012a). It is important to note that Du Bois (1903) discussed the concept of the color line that racially divided society in his book The Souls of Black Folks. He asserted that Blacks had to learn to be on both sides of the color line. They had to learn how to act, talk, and be with other Black people and also how to act, talk, and be with White people. However, this cooperative attitude did not always prevail on the White side of the color line, which dictated the rules of society. Therefore, one of the predominant goals of Ethnic Studies is to overcome the concept (and practice) of the color line (Banks, 1995).

The color line has a physical aspect to it because it deals with race, but it also has a conceptual aspect. A major defining aspect of the color line is the idea that there are parts of society that are meant primarily for White people and other parts that are meant primarily for Black people. This can be seen historically in de jure (legal) segregation and in contemporary society in de facto segregation. Thus, though the color line is an older concept, it is still present today. One modern distinction is that it is no longer a line only dividing race. Now it is much more likely to divide along socioeconomic lines and issues of immigration. Many contemporary racial issues stem from the idea that issues of race and ethnicity are unsafe and will be offensive if discussed in a public forum. When Ethnic Studies is taught correctly in schools, it can help to overcome the proscribed ideas that race and ethnicity are unsafe to talk about.

Increasing numbers of White scholars entered the field of Black Studies in the 1940s, ’50s, and ’60s due to growing numbers of courses in Black Studies at
predominantly White institutions. As a result of the Civil Rights Movement, Black students started attending more predominantly White institutions in the Midwest, East, and West (Banks, 2012b). As evidenced earlier, the initial demand for Ethnic Studies was a direct result of African American students during the Civil Rights movement striving for equity in universities. But it was only with collaborative efforts from other groups that it became a reality (Banks, 2012a; Hu-DeHart, 1995; Lye, 2010; Sleeter, 2011).

There are still segregated school systems in the South in smaller towns. Ethnic Studies creates an opportunity to learn something about minorities that one may not learn at home, especially in these very segregated school districts and residential areas. Some current notable scholars in Black Studies are Patricia Hill Collins and Cornel West.

**Chicano/a Studies (Mexican American Studies).** In addition to the Civil Rights Movement, the Chicano/a Movement of the 1960s influenced and was part of the founding group of Ethnic Studies. Like Black Studies, Chicano/a Studies has a long history predating the Civil Rights Movement. It began as a result of initial contacts between the Americans and Mexicans, stemming from the wars and border disputes of the 19th century. Typically, the initial contact is not discussed in textbooks. This area of Ethnic Studies has become increasingly important in recent years due to population shifts in the United States. Chicano/a Studies, like Black Studies, dealt with a minority group with low achievement scores and low graduation rates. The term Chicano/a was self-selected as a result of the Civil Rights and student protests of the 1960s. Because of its activist origins, Chicano/a Studies had been criticized as reflecting anti-American sentiments. The criticism had been frequently leveled at every existing branch of Ethnic Studies but especially in this branch because nationalism was a key component in
gathering students and people together and in creating political mobility during its origins (Muñoz, 2007).

Increasing immigration from multiple Latin American countries is redefining and challenging Chicano/a Studies. Originally the focus was centered on Mexican Americans. The question was: did it expand and change to include people from other Spanish-speaking countries who did not have the same history? Given the reality of current anti-immigration sentiments, there is a serious need for this area of study to bring understanding to the demographic shift taking place in the United States. A wider understanding of the cultural and historical contributions made by these cultures is an added benefit.

American Indian/Native American Studies/Indigenous Studies. Another significant branch of Ethnic Studies is Native American Studies. Many eminent scholars have built a body of scholarship on the topic of Native American Studies/American Indian Studies, but there is an argument among Native American scholars that Native American Studies/American Indian Studies should not be included as Ethnic Studies because they are not an ethnic group in the same manner as other ethnic groups in the United States (Champagne, 2005). The argument is that to consider Native Americans as an ethnic minority is to trivialize their sovereignty (Champagne, 2005). Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) puts it this way, it is not that “race and racism are unimportant” in understanding Native peoples’ experience concerning the U.S., but rather “to emphasize that Native peoples were colonized and deposed of their territories as distinct peoples – hundreds of nations – not as a racial or ethnic group” (p. xiii). Proponents of American Indian Studies as Ethnic Studies can help with understanding what it means to be
Indigenous in U.S. society and help to keep the curriculum as a priority in education (Deloria & Lytle, 1984). Many times because Native American populations are so small in numbers they tend to just not be included both culturally and overall as a significant population. There are definitely many internal arguments within Native American tribes and groups on what and who defines who they are and who they are not. Native American Studies is included in this study in order to recognize that while, in terms of Native peoples' history of colonization and the distinct government-to-government relationship of tribes to the federal government, Native Americans possess a status unlike that of any other U.S. ethnolinguistic groups, they still face similar conflicts and problems as other U.S. minorities.

Another important aspect of Native American Studies is language. There have been many studies on the relationship between language and learning in Native American culture. McCarty, Romero, and Zepeda (2006) wrote about the place that language occupies in the experiences of Native American youth, their thoughts on the relationship between language and performance in school, and what it would mean to their culture if their language completely disappeared. In contemporary times, there are several conferences, organizations, and university programs throughout the world working to revitalize Native languages. A few examples are the National Indian Education Association Convention, the Stabilizing Indian Language Symposium, and the International Conference on Revitalization of Indigenous and Minoritized Languages.

In the context of the Civil Rights Movement, the American Indian Movement (AIM) was started in 1968 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The purpose of it was a to support the Indian people of Minneapolis, but it soon spread to other cities, which launched it into
a national organization (Davis, 2013; Smith & Warrior, 1996). Since the AIM had urban origins, the Movement had no real connection with the Indian reservation community (Smith & Warrior, 1996). Another major event in the AIM was the Indigenous takeover of the abandoned prison island of Alcatraz in 1969, and it was (and still is) an influential part of American Indian Studies. During this takeover, AIM created and declared the Alcatraz Proclamation, which compared the conditions of the reservations to Alcatraz the prison (Smith & Warrior, 1996). Another major event in the AIM was the takeover of Wounded Knee in 1973. This was labeled as a “military” takeover, but in fact was just a large amount of college students (Smith & Warrior, 1996). The goal of the AIM was similar to the Civil Rights Movement, namely, to express and expose the injustices that Native Americans had suffered and were suffering and to specifically address treaty violations (Champagne, 2005). There were some significant differences from the needs of other minorities within the United States, such as a push for federal recognition of tribal sovereignty. Other major goals of the American Indian Movement were self-determination for Native Americans and international recognition of federal treaties with Native Americans. Many American Indians during the height of the Movement in the 1960s and 1970s started their own schools, similar to African Americans and women in the previous century. As mentioned previously, there are major cultural differences with American Indians, such as the blood quantum theory and how their sovereignty makes them different than other ethnic minorities in the United States.

**Asian American Studies.** Asian American Studies is another branch of Ethnic Studies that sometimes is placed on the periphery of Ethnic Studies within academia. The student movement in 1968 was credited as being the start of Asian American Studies. A
criticism of prior Asian American history was that it tended to focus primarily on those Asian groups who were directly affected by immigration and the Exclusion Acts, but not all Asian Americans adequately fit into those categories (Wang, 1981). Again, as previously mentioned regarding the intra-racial differences within African Americans and Spanish-speaking Americans, there were many differences with Asian Americans as well. One of the major issues that Asian American Studies fights is the idea of the “model minority,” which is harmful to people who do not fit the stereotype (Lee, 2009). While I am referring to Asian American Studies here, is danger of stereotype cuts across all race and ethnicities.

These departments, majors, and subjects have been fighting from their inception for relevance in academia (as have all Ethnic Studies programs), but this is especially relevant to Asian American Studies. Schlund-Vials (2011) observes that their department at Boston University recommended to students to either double major in Asian American Studies or minor in it, but to make sure to have more than just a degree in Asian American Studies. As the demographics in the United States change, these issues will only increase in relevance to our evolving society.

**White or Whiteness Studies.** In conclusion, something that cannot be ignored or overlooked is White or European American Studies and where it fits in regards to Ethnic Studies. This goes back to how Whiteness has been defined historically and socially. White is typically defined as a normalized or naturalized racial/ethnicity category (Goodman et al., 2012; Omi & Winant, 2015). Ethnic Studies calls into question the normality of White and Whiteness. Whiteness Studies argued that race and ethnicity
affects all people, and White has been viewed as a superior privileged class that comes with social and historical benefits, which is again is problematic for everyone.

Because of this viewpoint, White and Whiteness in contemporary settings can be viewed in a negative light (Clark, 2015). When it discussed, it is seen as dangerous and that a liberal agenda attached to them (Sleeter, 2005). The detachment of White and Whiteness Studies from Ethnic Studies reinforces the idea that issues of race and ethnicity only affect non-White minorities (Goodman et al., 2012). With immigration shifts throughout the world, White or European American culture needs to be addressed. The failure of it being addressed gives power to the idea that race can become invisible and does not exist. For example, in the northeastern part of the United States there is a large Italian American population who considers themselves a White ethnicity, as does a large Jewish-American population in the same region. There is more to White and Whiteness that conceptually needs to be addressed. There are many studies that show that most curricula tend to convey White/dominant culture bias and information (Hill Collins, 2009). David Gilborn, Zeus Leonardo, and Richard Delgado are a few scholars who have done research on concepts of White and Whiteness. There are universities who have added American Studies to their Ethnic Studies program as a way to address all the different races and ethnicities throughout the United States, including those considered White. This does not take away the reality of privilege that comes with race but opens up the discussion to areas of commonality in order to show that Ethnic Studies is not just for minority students.

White and Whiteness must be included in the discussion of Ethnic Studies because until recently the concepts have been poised as an issue of either/or, and many
opponents to Ethnic Studies argue that Ethnic Studies only places White and Whiteness in a negative light (D’Souza, 1991). As mentioned previously, race and ethnicity in the United States is not cut and dried. There are many overlaps, and with the changing demographics it is becoming more and more important to have a more holistic view of it from multiple perspectives, including the perspective of Whites. White and Whiteness are some of the hardest concepts to teach within Ethnic Studies curriculum, especially when it is first introduced to students who may have never heard these ideas in their lives and when they are resistant to it (Sleeter, 2001).

Current Issues and Trends in Education Regarding Ethnic Studies

Public schools that offer Ethnic Studies coursework at the secondary level are rare in the United States, although there are some notable exceptions (Sleeter, 2011). The Philadelphia School District requires all students take African American history in order to graduate, which reflects the majority African American population in this district. Polish Americans, which is the next highest minority population in that district, are also pushing to have their history taught in those schools (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 2013). Another example of an Ethnic Studies department is at Berkeley High School (BHS) in Berkeley, California, which has an African American department (BHS, 2014). The University of California systems offer dual credit for high school students who take Ethnic Studies classes at their university as a social studies elective. Before the State of Arizona banned all Ethnic Studies programs in public and charter schools, Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) ranked at the top with one of the largest Ethnic Studies program in the country (Lacey, 2011; TUSD, 2014).
California is presently considering creating a statewide Mexican American Studies requirement for their students (Caesar, 2014; CA AB 1750, 2014; Plana, 2014). Early in 2014, the first school district in California, El Rancho Unified School District, took the initiative and added the requirement that graduating students in the year 2016 and beyond are required to take an Ethnic Studies course (Caesar, 2014; Plana, 2014). This action brought the debate of Ethnic Studies in all California schools to the forefront of conversation (CA AB 1750, 2014). Following El Rancho’s initiative, LAUSD has also added a graduation requirement (Gilbertson, 2014). This is significant because LAUSD is the second largest school district in the United States (LAUSD, 2014). In 2016, a new bill was introduced in California making Ethnic Studies a state graduation requirement. This bill requires superintendents to establish a model curriculum by 2017–2018 (Ethnic Studies Now, 2016)

Texas is divided on the issue (Plana, 2013a). Recently, the Texas State Board of Education tentatively agreed to allow bids for supplemental Ethnic Studies (Mexican-American Studies, African-American Studies, American Indian Studies, and Asian American Studies) material for electives beginning in 2016–2017 (Stutz, 2014; TEA News, 2014). Simultaneously, the Texas Legislature made the decision to limit Ethnic Studies as an undergraduate history elective requirement at their state universities (Carrero, 2013). A few lawmakers within the Texas Legislature argued that Ethnic Studies courses should not be included as a required comprehensive United States history course in state’s post-secondary schools (Carrero, 2013). Their justification was a 1955 law that stated that students must take a comprehensive United States history course as their basic social studies undergraduate requirement. Recently, teachers in Texas have not
been waiting for the Texas Board of Education to approve Ethnic Studies textbooks. In July 2014, The Texas Board of Education claimed textbooks were too expensive to be purchased. Because of a law in 2011, schools can purchase textbooks without the Board of Education’s approval. There are about 50 schools in Texas that implemented a Mexican American Studies program this past year within their schools without official textbooks (Plana, 2014).

New Mexico also currently is divided on the issue of Ethnic Studies (Plana, 2013a). Democratic Representative Antonio Maestras introduced a resolution to the state legislative body affirming several books that were banned in Arizona saying that these books had positive effects in schools and promoted diversity (NM House Memorial 95, 2013). On the opposing side, New Mexico Republican Representative Nora Espinoza opposed the books as “divisive” and “hate books” (Parker, 2013). The one common bond in all of these states is Ethnic Studies is being brought to the forefront of state education systems, and the effects of the decisions being made will effect students for many years into the future, especially in regards to the demographics previously mentioned.

Gaps in the Literature

As previously mentioned, there is not very much literature on Ethnic Studies in isolation. The literature includes concepts of Ethnic Studies and multicultural education. This is problematic in that policy is being made about Ethnic Studies, and there are very few studies specifically on Ethnic Studies. The present research seeks to fill that specific gap. Ethnic Studies has changed since its origin. Contemporary Ethnic Studies focuses on intersectionality and social justice but, at the same time, stays committed to its origin of teaching about ethnic minorities and where they fit within their country (Schoorman &
Botgotch, 2010). An argument that has come from the literature is that areas of intersectionality have always been a part of the study of race and ethnicity (Goodman et al., 2012).

The research also showed that demographics are one of the ways that teachers and preservice teachers conceptualize ideas of multicultural education and Ethnic Studies (Ford & Quinn, 2010; Schoorman & Botgotch, 2010; Wright & Tolan, 2009). Many teachers recognize that Ethnic Studies has significance within their schools in regards to students where English is their second language (Schoorman & Botgotch, 2010), but they have trouble internalizing and being self-reflective when it comes to Ethnic Studies and multicultural education (Ford & Quinn, 2010; Wright & Tolan, 2009). The reality is that background does affect how these concepts are recognized for everyone. For White teachers teaching in schools that have majority minority populations, this can be a difficult concept, especially when the students themselves have been taught from a young age that their race and ethnicity does matter and it is negative for them (Ford & Quinn, 2010; Marri, 2009). There is a disconnect in ideology about ethnicity and race.

Another area that needs to be addressed is the idea that multicultural education nullifies Ethnic Studies. Yes, we live in a multiethnic, multicultural, pluralistic society, but dealing with and acknowledging historical origins of race and ethnicity can address many issues and problems of recent times. For example, the Chicano/a Movement was started with riots and political organization (Muñoz, 2007). Students in Tucson were being taught about their origin. There was a fear that teaching the students about the origins of the Chicano/a Movement would cause a repeat of violence and riots (A.R.S. §15–112). Because of this fear, the idea is that it is safer to teach a multicultural
curriculum that includes everyone and makes everyone equal, but the reality is history shows that has not always been in actuality for all people. Multicultural education is needed but not to nullify the individual stories of culture and race.

Another example of this is the recent upraise of police brutality cases (Bosman, Schwartz, & Kovaleski, 2014). The historical relevance was sorely missing from the story that the media weaved and created for the public. Having Ethnic Studies available to all students in Missouri prior to this could have helped give a clearer understanding of the racial component of the situation. This is a very simplistic analysis on police brutality, and in this situation the relationship between the police and minority communities should be examined and analyzed beyond race and ethnicity. Understanding the racial tension and history of Ferguson, Missouri is a very good beginning to reconciliation. One of the goals of the study was to create a list of other possible resolutions to issues of race and ethnicity through exploring Ethnic Studies scholars’ experience and practice and the policies surrounding Ethnic Studies.

**Conceptual Framework**

In this next section, I describe in greater detail how I am using my conceptual framework to study this phenomenon. Figure 8 is my adaptation of a diagram of SZT by McCarty (2013).
I hypothesize that Ethnic Studies is deemed “unsafe” because its origins were in the marches and protests of the Civil Rights, the American Indian, and the Chicano/a movements, which were full of tension and made a lot of people uncomfortable because the social movements were conceptually hard to understand. Arizona’s law making Ethnic Studies illegal is a prime example of how it has been proscribed as dangerous and unsafe for secondary school students.

Federal law and the high court decisions have philosophically had similar arguments as the Arizona State Legislature. In a 2007 Supreme Court case, Parents Involved in Community School v. Seattle School District No. 1 (551 U. S. 701), the Court concluded that school districts could not purposely move students within the district to
different schools in order to limit racial/cultural isolation. Race could not be a factor in a systematic change even if the goal was to create more diversity. A ruling of this nature is significant because Supreme Court decisions are the “law of the land”; this ruling explicitly dictates that race is not a compelling factor in school district decision-making.

On a national scale, there is a push toward the post-racial assertion that our society has moved beyond race and ethnicity (Hill Collins, 2009). As such, research on Ethnic Studies presents the additional challenge that the field is viewed as unnecessary, unsafe, and ethnocentric in nature for students and society. Safety Zone Theory affords a way to approach these topics that are deemed “unsafe” and “safe” through in-depth interviews of Ethnic Studies scholars.

This study will adapt the three-pronged approach that Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) utilized by focusing on policy, practice, and experience. The three perspectives will be briefly introduced here, and then I will go into more detail for each in the next paragraph. The first perspective is policy, as is reflected in current education policies regarding Ethnic Studies and several social issues regarding ethnicity. The second perspective is that of practice, as described by Ethnic Studies scholars through their scholarship experiences. The third perspective is the Ethnic Studies scholars’ personal lived experiences with Ethnic Studies. The reason I have chosen these three perspectives is because policy, research, and experience are foundational in having a new understanding of what Ethnic Studies is and how it is being defined as safe and unsafe.
These three perspectives in themselves created what was considered safe and unsafe in Ethnic Studies to society. In creating a picture of Ethnic Studies, what was not being taught in Ethnic Studies was just as important as what was. The three perspectives were chosen because they seem to be the most influential viewpoints when it comes to race and ethnicity. Research shows that many families self-segregate (Grant, 2011; Simpson, 2004). The Midwest had and still has the highest concentration of White people in the United States (Grant, 2011). Because of old residential clauses and covenants, many minority groups lived in clusters separate from other ethnicities (Grant, 2011). But if recent statistics are correct, this historic separation is not a realistic view of the future social interactions of students in the United States. If schools’ goals are to prepare
students for the future, then even in majority White communities there is a need for teaching Ethnic Studies and the history of people of different ethnicities.

As mentioned in the previous section on Safety Zone Theory, Ethnic Studies as a whole tends to be deemed “unsafe” or “dangerous.” According to Arizona law, teaching students about the United States’ turbulent history of race relations is considered “un-American” and teaches “resentment” (A.R.S. §15–112, 2013). Up until recently, the solution to this predicament was to gloss over or completely ignore the controversial issues (Loewen, 2007). Due to the world changing and demographic shifts among students, there needs to be alternative solutions outside of what has already been done.

In summary, the literature review started with many concepts of race and ethnicities (but not an exhaustive list) and moved on to the differences and similarities between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education, as well as the origin of Ethnic Studies within the university and the individual origins of each group, which are not one is the same. The final section examined current issues and trends in Ethnic Studies as well as current general issues of race and ethnicity in the United States as they relate to Ethnic Studies. As I have shown, there are elements of all of these categories that many believe should be hidden and not talked about openly. There are strong opinions on both sides of the debate, there are many people who never thought about it, and there are those who want to stay willfully ignorant to these issues. This leads to the next chapter, which describes the methodology of the study.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The goal of this study is to better understand a “big picture” view of Ethnic Studies through oral histories and reflections from some of its founding and leading scholars. A life story narrative, as stated before, “draws on individuals’ experiences to make broader contextual meaning” (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995, p. 115). The purpose of using this methodology and analyzing Ethnic Studies through Safety Zone Theory (SZT) was to gain broader contextual meanings of the data. SZT provided clear foci through which to examine the data: policy, experience, and practice. In eliciting the life story narratives, I used Seidman’s (2013) phenomenological interview protocol. The phenomena to be explored directly were the experiences of key individuals in the discipline of Ethnic Studies as this discipline relates to education. Through individual narratives, the study investigated policy surrounding Ethnic Studies, experience in Ethnic Studies, and the practice of Ethnic Studies. In this investigation of Ethnic Studies, the key people to interview were experts of the field who have been studying and researching and are at the forefront of Ethnic Studies research.

The research questions were as follows:

1. What are/were the experiences of academic leaders in the field of Ethnic Studies as this field developed in the U.S.?
   a. What are these scholars’ understandings of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?
   b. How have they experienced the development of the field?
c. What are their observations of how Ethnic Studies has been implemented in U.S. schools?

d. What is their vision for the future of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?

e. What are their perspectives of the larger state and federal policy context of Ethnic Studies?

Participants

Six Ethnic Studies scholars were interviewed. Specifically, in consultation with my committee, I identified a group of leading Ethnic Studies scholars within the broad field of education. I sent an email inviting them to participate in a 90-minute interview and possible brief follow-up interview. The expertise, experience, and availability of these scholars were the primary criteria for selecting them, given that the goal of the study is to create a life story of Ethnic Studies based on their experiences and expertise. An important criterion for this study was also that they were academic scholars who have been instrumental in the field—whose work is centered within both Ethnic Studies and education and has included core contributions to the present state of the field.

The participants represented a variety of Ethnic Studies scholars; the primary focus of my interviews was their relationship with Ethnic Studies and education. Using Seidman’s (2013) interview protocol, the goal was to capture their personal stories of Ethnic Studies, which included how they got introduced into the field, their influences in the field, and their predictions on the future of the field and social issues that surround the field. The goal was to have six stories. I contacted these individuals in two ways: 1) through in-person introductions and 2) through email introductions. The majority of these
scholars would categorize themselves as multicultural educators, though they all have a relationship with Ethnic Studies. As mentioned in my literature review, I discussed the areas where Ethnic Studies and multicultural education overlap and areas that are primarily focused on Ethnic Studies. Specific scholars who were interviewed include: Antonia Darder, Patricia Halagao, K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Juan Mendoza, Sonia Nieto, and Christine Sleeter. Juan Mendoza is a pseudonym used for his own personal needs for confidentiality. Below is a chart of my participants, with some background information on each of them, and Appendix B is an annotated bibliography of their work. As Hatch and Wisniewski (1995) wrote, “Life history and narrative offer exciting alternatives for connecting the lives and stories of individuals to the understanding of larger human and social phenomena” (p. 113). This was the primary goal of the study. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of Ethnic Studies, the scholars represent various areas of disciplinary expertise that intersect with Ethnic Studies, though each scholar’s work is centered on education. Their diverse backgrounds did contribute to their positions. It created a distinct pattern for each of them in their stories.
### Table 1

*An Introduction to My Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age (at time of interview)</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Where they were born and grew up</th>
<th>Disciplinary background (both undergraduate and graduate)</th>
<th>Current positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonia Darder</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Puerto Rico/ South Los Angeles</td>
<td>Social Work/ Psychology/ Critical Theory/ Education</td>
<td>Professor at Loyola Marymount University-Los Angeles/ Professor Emerita at the University of Illinois Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Halagao</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Philippines/ Michigan/ Stockton</td>
<td>Multicultural Education/ Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Professor at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Tsianina Lomawaima</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Muskogee/ Creek/ White</td>
<td>Oklahoma/ Kansas</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Professor at Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Mendoza</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>Mexican American/ White</td>
<td>Oregon/ Arizona</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies/ Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor at a Southwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Nieto</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>Puerto Rico/ New York City</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor Emerita-University of Massachusetts and Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Sleeter</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Professor Emerita-California State University-Monterey Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods

A qualitative life story study was conducted. The study focused on exploring the anatomy and collective history of the field of Ethnic Studies as a way to connect secondary and post-secondary level practices with the original conceptualization of Ethnic Studies (Nagasawa, 2010). Using narrative analysis, the goal of the study was to capture participants’ ideas and individual experiences (Coulter, 1999). Defining narrative analysis, stories emerge as the data are collected and coded through a rigorous and artistic analytic process (Coulter, 1999). This is a key understanding of what narrative analysis is and how it differs from other forms of narrative research. This study used a modified version of Seidman’s (2013) three-part interview to capture the voices/life stories of the interviewees.

This research paralleled Sonia Nieto’s (2005) study of multicultural education. Her study was an anatomy of the field, which related directly to the goal of this study to discuss Ethnic Studies at its deepest parts, too, with respect to its origin and current trends. Nieto (2005) used personal narratives to describe the concepts and issues of multicultural education, and in a similar way, this study will describe Ethnic Studies. And finally, both studies use individual stories and common themes and categories, which were analyzed using (constant) comparison and identification of shared and divergent themes (Glaser, 1965; Glaser & Strauss, 2012).

Life stories gleaned through narrative analysis have been used to explore many subjects where individual stories are important parts of presenting a rich and full account. Given that every individual’s story is unique, the life story of Ethnic Studies provided a broad, overarching narrative. The goal of life stories was not to give the impression that
these stories are absolute but rather a means for researchers to capture the uniqueness of individual voices and begin to form a collective perspective on Ethnic Studies that reflects diverse perspectives and experiences. It was not intended to serve as a statement of truth for all. Life stories are meant to give a concrete voice on the subject, but they are, nonetheless, considered individual viewpoints (Barone, 2010).

Participants were interviewed based on a modified form of Seidman’s (2013) phenomenological three-interview series. Seidman’s technique involves three, 90-minute, semi-structured interviews. For this study, the interviews were adapted to one 90-minute interview. I made this modification because my interviewees had very limited time given that they are leading scholars in their respective multiple fields. One thing that was missing as a result of this modification was the opportunity to provide participants time to reflect on the information presented in the previous interview. One way to address this limitation was to provide interview questions to participants prior to the interviews, giving them time to reflect before the interview. The conversational nature of the interviews was part of narrative analysis. The conversations created the stories from the participants’ recollection of the field. The semi-structured nature of the interviews also gave opportunities for reflection.

The three parts of Seidman’s interview protocol include: 1) a focused life history, 2) details of experience, and 3) a reflection of those experiences. The goal of the first part of the interview, focused life history, was to establish “the context of the participants’ experience” (Seidman, 2013, p. 20). In practical terms, this part of the interview is meant to establish the circumstances that brought the participants into the field of Ethnic Studies in order to let them create the setting surrounding their story. This is important in
contextualizing Ethnic Studies within individual participants’ lives and also has the benefit of helping to establish rapport and background to the story. This was critical in the data gathering process because one of the key elements of this study was that everyone has a story and that story is valuable and important. The interview protocol for this study can be found in Appendix C.

The goal of the second part of the interview, details of experience, was to “allow participants to reconstruct the details of their experience within the context in which it occurs” (Seidman, 2013, p. 21). This encouraged the participants to go deeper into their experiences than they did with the first interview segment by focusing on recalling their story with as many details as possible and elaborating on how Ethnic Studies has been implemented in practice.

Finally, the goal of the third interview segment was to “encourage the participants to reflect on the meaning their experience holds for them” (Seidman, 2013, p. 21). The third part of the interview was closely linked with the first two segments and gives participants an opportunity to share what their experiences mean to them personally. All three parts of the interview create an individual “story” of Ethnic Studies. Each part was equally important, both to the individual narrative being told and to constructing a larger “life story” of Ethnic Studies. This served the main objective of the study: to capture both the individual stories and to weave those individual stories together to capture a more complex comparative story in order to better understand Ethnic Studies as a field and as it related personally to the participants of it. As stated in the Chapter 2, one of the goals of Ethnic Studies was to overcome stereotypes and limitations that society put on people, and in telling the stories of the people who helped shaped the field, these stories become
the stories of the field itself. They are stories of how they overcame the stereotypes and obstacles society put in front of them. It is how they learned to adapt and become something new from the cards that life dealt them. All in all, their stories, all levels—from their time growing up, to them in their jobs, to the conferences and professional groups that they started, to pioneering their individual fields of study—are important to the story. The qualitative research software NVivo for Mac was used to help organize the interviews and transcriptions.

First, I made sure the interview questions answered and addressed my research questions. The relationship between that is in Appendix D. Once the interviews were completed were played through multiple times. I transcribed one of the interviews by hand using the HYPERTranscribe software, but then had the rest transcribed for me by an online transcription company. I went through the transcriptions and edited them for grammar and meaning and then sent the transcriptions to the interviewees a member check and to confirm meaning since these were their words. There were no big edits to the transcripts from the interviewees. Mainly there were small changes for clarity purposes. Once I got the transcriptions back, I first hand coded the transcription by going line-by-line and coding themes and topics using different colored highlighters. Simultaneously, while doing this I decided to separately use Value coding to code the transcripts to help separate out what was a belief, a value, and an attitude, and it helped to see basic similarities and differences. Value coding is coding for statements that show values (V), attitudes (A), and beliefs (B) (Saklanya, 2013). According to Saklanya (2013), value is defined as “the importance we attribute to oneself, another person, thing, or idea” (p. 111). An example of a value in regards to Ethnic Studies is this idea that Ethnic
Studies is telling the story of the disenfranchised and those whose stories have been muted. This gives value to working in the field of Ethnic Studies and in dealing with Ethnic Studies in educational settings. An attitude is defined as “the way we think and feel about ourselves, another person, thing or idea” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 111). While it was difficult to code in this way because many of these concepts were very similar and overlapped, analyzing in this way helped to see the patterns. It was important to keep their stories as close to how they were originally shared. I am defining my first-level coding as Value coding, line-by-line coding, and creating a contact sheet for each interviewee. In the next paragraph, I give more details as to what the contact sheet consisted of.

Returning to the line-by-line hand coding, I organized in vivo text into a contact sheet, as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), for each interviewee; it included the page number, salient points (in their own words and summarized), my first-level coding of one word themes and categories, and finally my own memoing. An example of the contact sheet is in Appendix F using the data from my pilot interview. After I did that for all of my participants, I inserted those quotes/salient points and one-word themes into the NVivo for Mac qualitative software. From there, I created nodes or another level of coding that took some of those one-word codes and merged them into other codes. I also created sub-codes and overlapped some of the codes that spoke to more than one themes. Additionally, I created cluster graphics in NVivo to compare the common words used in each interview—in comparison to each other and all the interviews together. This helped me to identify emergent concepts, patterns, and themes. From there, using the line-by-line hand coding and the patterns that emerged from the software, I hand wrote the narratives
and crafted the stories using their own words. Then, for the cross-case analysis I used the narratives that were crafted and the coded data itself to show the emerging themes and categories together and organized in such a way to answer my research questions.

An example of something that was discovered through the coding and analyzing process was that (based on my conceptual framework), I searched for concepts and topics that could be categorized as more “socially acceptable” and “safe,” and others that are considered dangerous and more proscriptive. For example, in my pilot study, the professor said one of the hardest things to teach students are concepts about Whiteness and White privilege. The unspoken part of what makes these concepts difficult to teach is that in order to get tenure the students need to give good evaluations of the professor, and if they are offended by the topic they can give a bad evaluation rather than critiquing the concept itself. While some of these concepts were addressed in the first-level coding, some of them required more than one listen to really get what was being said, and some came from the comparison of stories and deeper levels of coding. In other words, other participants said the same thing in different wording. That particular teaching concept became a code and sub-codes and had deeper meanings.

After coding the interviews, I created story maps to craft the narratives from the data. I also summarized and put the data into logical storylines by hand writing the initial stories. Though I crafted and organized the narratives, which included editing them from an oral conversation to a written form, the narratives are as close to those words as possible. I made sure that the narratives specifically focused on my research questions as they related to the interview questions: 1) Experiences and Development of the Field, 2) Implementation of Ethnic Studies, 3) Future of Ethnic Studies, and 4) Perspectives on
Policy (see chart in Appendix D that shows the relationship between the research questions and the interview questions).

It is important to give attention to the individual stories and to the patterns that emerge from the stories as a collective. To present the interview data, I did as Seidman (2013) suggested and “developed profiles of the individual participants and grouped them in categories that made sense” (p. 121). To create the profiles, I highlighted sections of the interviews that would be pieced together as suggested by Seidman (2013) in order to create the individual life stories. I retold the narratives using the first person voice of the participants. The crafting and organization of the narratives were my own, but as much as possible I attempted to keep the exact words of my participants making this a mutual creation (Seidman, 2013). I then conducted a cross-analysis of the interviews in relation to my research questions, the theoretical framework, and the literature. The narratives growing out of this two-part analysis process are reflected in the two chapters that follow.

While life stories are a part of Seidman’s three-part interview, life history research is also a methodology; it is part of narrative research (Polkinghorne, 1995). Using narrative research in the analysis of Ethnic Studies allows for researchers to draw further conclusions to consider the valuing of Ethnic Studies and help them to imagine the ideal and the possible (Barone, 2000; Coulter & Smith, 2008). “It [the use of stories] can even stir action against the conventional, the seemingly unquestionable, the tried and true” (Barone, 2001, p. 736). This study hoped to do just that in regards to Ethnic Studies. The history of race and ethnicity and the current politics of the U.S. has created a tension between peoples’ real life stories and the dominant heteronormativity story.
According to Atkinson (1998), a life story is “the story a person chooses to tell about the life he or she lived told as completely and honestly as possible, what is remembered of it, and what the teller wants others to know of it, and usually as a result of a guided interview by another” (Loc 128). Atkinson (1998) also states that life stories “a way of meaning making, identifying life influences, and interpreting experience, there may be no better method than the subjective narrative of the life story to help the researcher understand a life from the insider’s point of view” (Loc 206). As stated previously, a goal of the study was to make meaning for a number of different audiences. Some specific audiences are government officials, educational practitioners within all levels of education, students, and parents.

**Pilot Interview**

On December 3, 2014, I conducted a pilot interview with an Assistant Professor at a large university in the Southwest. The professor asked to remain anonymous. The total interview was 39 minutes of recorded conversation. During the semi-structured interview, I both recorded and took written notes. Before the interview began, we went over the purpose and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements of the interview. The interview itself was conversational and flowed from topic to topic using the interview protocol as a guide. Some of the questions were combined because the answers were redundant, and some of the questions were changed because they did not fit the flow of the conversation. Later, I went through and transcribed the interview using the software HYPERTranscribe. I wrote some memo notes on the side as I transcribed and then went over the whole transcription from beginning to end, taking note of themes and concepts within the individual interview and creating an individual story. Once the transcription
was written as a whole, I sent the copy of the transcript back to see if the professor wanted to add or take away from the transcript. I then created a story map from the information given in the interview. An example of that story map is in Appendix E.

In conclusion, the purpose of the pilot interview was to see how I needed to amend the questions, to see if they created rapport with interviewees, and to practice transcribing the interview and doing primary analysis to see what themes might have emerged. The pilot interview fulfilled those needs. It helped me to see how some interview questions were redundant and these were combined in the final interview protocol, since they were asking similar things. The questions flowed from one to the next creating a conversational discussion rather than an interrogation, especially of people’s life stories. Finally, I had the opportunity to pilot a preliminary analysis of the pilot interview categorizing the information into themes, specific aspects and anecdotes, and create a story map to help with keeping the stories in chronological order.

Parameters of the Study

There were several parameters to the study, such as limitations that come with using narrative methodology, having a small sample, and aspects of trustworthiness and rigor. The limitations that come with narrative methodology, specifically life stories, occur because they were colored by the individuals’ memories and epistemic and ontological stances of reality. This did not necessarily need to be considered a limitation when using an interpretative paradigm such as critical theory and narrative analysis. The goals of this type of research were to give voice to individual people, to show that not everyone’s version of reality is the same, and to reflect the nuances and diversity of perspectives on a complex curriculum and cultural issue. While the viewpoints and
opinions of the founders of Ethnic Studies were similar to current Ethnic Studies’ practitioners, at the same time, I expected that there would be differences based on their experiences and the timeframe. One way I attempted to overcome this limitation was by having a robust literature review that included prominent works by my interviewees and other leading scholars in the field.

The sample size was small at six people, but that was a manageable size for a study that aims to go into depth conceptually with the interviewees. Though no claims of generalizability are made, quality was gained. Generalizability was not a primary goal of this study. “Experiences are more influential than logic and make people want to experience new things” (Barone, 2010). Developing a thick description of these people’s experiences presented the opportunity to introduce viewpoints that may not be seen as clearly using quantitative research. Another example of this was stated in this quote: “Life history and narrative offer exciting alternatives for connecting the lives and stories of individuals to the understanding of the larger human and social phenomena” (Hatch & Wisniekski, 1995, p. 113). The results of this study were a qualitative piece that verbally expresses many statistics that were proven by quantitative studies. The goal of it was to fill in some of the blanks, which leads to the next section on trustworthiness and rigor. One of the major points of Ethnic Studies is the focus on the individual stories of people, which cannot be generalized as a whole.

Finally, for qualitative work, trustworthiness and rigor are factors that need to be discussed. Qualitative research triangulation and member checking are the primary ways to test for trustworthiness and rigor (Creswell, 2013). Qualitative validity refers to the researcher checking for the accuracy of the findings by employing certain procedures,
while qualitative reliability indicates that the researcher’s approach was consistent across different researchers and different projects (Creswell, 2013). McCall and Wittner (1995) raised an excellent point that something to look out for in life story and life history research was whose voices were being heard and whose voices were being muted in a story. While some points of opposition to Ethnic Studies in this study were discussed, they were not to be the main focus of the study, so in many ways those voices will be less obvious than those who support Ethnic Studies. It was important to discuss these opinions in giving background to the issue but not necessarily in detail for the study. Creating narratives of the voices of opposition to Ethnic Studies may be the focus of future study but was beyond the scope of the present research.

Assumptions

There were several assumptions that, as the researcher, need to be acknowledged and made explicit. First, the term “Ethnic Studies” means different things to different people. It has drastically different meanings in different states and local contexts; yet, I, the researcher, believed there was a connection between its original intent and the present versions. Having original founders/early Ethnic Studies scholars and current practitioners as participants kept the study from being limited by what Goodson (1995) called the “tyranny of the local” and the “specificity of the personal” (p. 89). The “tyranny of the local” and “specificity of the personal” can happen when personal stories were superimposed on society as general thought and ideas. The two phenomena take place when someone too close to an idea or a source cannot see outside of their area of expertise and opinions and therefore create a story based on limited ideas. The “tyranny of the local” and “specificity of the personal” are a persistent and ongoing issue within
the study of Ethnic Studies for people who are both for and against Ethnic Studies. The goal of this study required people who were/are close to the field in order to truly examine where the field was going. The interdisciplinary nature of Ethnic Studies is a safeguard against these two phenomena.

Also, I firmly believe that Ethnic Studies has an important place in the United States education system now and in the future. This is an assumption that is made and presented throughout this study. I further believe that the stories collected in the study will be significant to future Ethnic Studies because for years there has been an overarching definition of what it was to be an American, and for many years it has been defined as White master narrative (Banks, 1995). Ethnic Studies is important because the demographics in the United States are changing, and what it means to be an American should change in a similar fashion, even though historically that has not always been the case.

Finally, my background and personal experiences with Ethnic Studies influenced the assumptions and ideas I bring to the subject (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). In the 1990s, as a 10th grader, I took an African American history class at a medium-sized Midwestern U.S. school. The teacher was White, and the majority of the large class was White as well. The race of the teacher is significant because traditionally based on the protests of 1968, Ethnic Studies was viewed by many as best taught by minorities for minorities. In my school, Ethnic Studies was taught as a history elective. The class focused on White and Black relations and how they developed over time in the United States. It also discussed the slave trade, pre-Revolutionary war relations (in which there was a small discussion of Native American relations), the post-Revolutionary war leading into the
American Civil War, post-Civil War leading to Black/slave laws, Jim Crow laws, and simultaneously, the Abolitionist Movement. The Civil Rights Movement to the current time (which was then 1995) was the finale. Given that this was a history class, the topics discussed, while having linkages to contemporary issues of the 1990s, were viewed as just that—historical events—with the goal of teaching students of all races about African American history and a slightly different way of viewing history. Three years later at a major public university, many of the book references used in that 10th grade history class were again used to teach similar topics at the post-secondary level. A significant part of what was being taught through Ethnic Studies courses was helping students to find themselves in history beyond negative views. It helped me to see that my family and self-history mattered. Other students will be able to understand these concepts too and recognize this as one of many perspectives in history. I believe this influenced the analysis in that it created a personal understanding of Ethnic Studies separate from the research and even separate from the responses of my interviewees. It also built rapport with my interviewees. I shared my story with each of them so they had understanding on my interest in the field and to help them understand part of the objective of the interviews.

In the next chapter, I present narrative profiles of each of the participants, informed by Seidman (2013). The chapter begins with the details of how these narrative profiles relate to my research questions, adds more details on how Seidman defines narrative profiles and analyzing data in this way, and then includes a second introduction of my participants. The chapter ends with my reflections from the interviews and a few relationships between the data given through the interviews and the literature.
CHAPTER 4

WITHIN-CASE ANALYSIS: LIFE STORIES OF ETHNIC STUDIES FOUNDERS AND SCHOLARS

There are many reasons that research on Ethnic Studies in the United States is important to the field of education and beyond. As discussed in Chapter 1, policies are being made about Ethnic Studies throughout the U.S., the demographics of children in the United States are changing at a rapid pace, and education has become increasingly standardized with reactionary accountability policies reflecting national and state level testing. The latter is in direct contrast to the individual stories of people, groups, and local histories (Sleeter, 2005) that are reflected in the history of the U.S. and, by extension, Ethnic Studies.

In Chapter 3 my analysis was explained briefly, here I sought to go into a few more details into how I created the narratives for this section and how it related directly to my coding. Informed by Seidman’s (2013) protocol for crafting narrative profiles, in this chapter I crafted the individual stories constructed through my interviews with the focal scholars in this study as first-person narratives. My interviewees were Antonia Darder (Loyola Marymount University), Patricia Halagao (University of Hawai‘i at Manoa), Juan Mendoza (a professor at a university in the Southwest), K. Tsianina Lomawaima (Arizona State University), Sonia Nieto (University of Massachusetts Amherst), and Christine Sleeter (California State University Monterey). Appendix B contains a brief introduction to their individual work in the field. I chose to put their stories alphabetically, both in the chapter and in Appendix B, for organizational purposes and I use footnotes throughout this chapter to link their life stories to the larger Ethnic
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Studies world without interrupting the flow of the narratives. Seidman (2013) explains that narrative profiles are one of the most consistent ways to “present the participant in context, to clarify his or her intentions, and to convey a sense of process and time, all central components of qualitative analysis” (p. 122). He continues with saying that crafting the narratives in the language of the participants using the first person “I” in the narrative can keep the interviewer from falling into the trap of trying to give their own meaning to the interviewees’ experiences. He says, “In creating profiles it is important to be faithful to the words of the participants and to identify in the narrative when the words are those of someone else” (Seidman, 2013, p. 124). This is the same logic as narrative analysis that I explained in Chapter 3. This gives voices to the individual stories that make up the field and practice of Ethnic Studies. I adapted Seidman’s technique using value coding, line-by-line coding, and pattern coding in order to create the narrative profiles. I started with value coding because it helped to understanding the data through that lens of attitude, beliefs, and values, which is very important to Ethnic Studies. I line-by-line coded the transcripts to help create the organization of the narratives and how they related to each of my research questions. Pattern coding was done after putting the information in NVivo for Mac (2013) qualitative software and putting codes together, creating new codes, and pulling out the nuances of the data as whole. As much as Ethnic Studies is an academic field, it is also personal and this was a way of capturing the personal in an organized way.

Using narrative profiles, this chapter presents a within-case analysis of each interview. Each narrative is divided into four sections, which reflects the research questions guiding this study: 1) Experiences and Development of the Field, 2)
Implementation of Ethnic Studies, 3) Future of Ethnic Studies, and 4) Perspectives on Policy. There is a closing statement and reflection for each narrative that sums up the main points of the individual narratives, and the chapter concludes with my reflection on the narratives overall. This leads to the next chapter, a cross-case analysis discussing the similarities and differences between the interviews.

Antonia Darder

Figure 9 Antonia Darder


Experiences and Development of the Field

I am of Puerto Rican descent and because of that I am very mixed ethnically. My mother was from the Canary Islands/Africa, and my father was Catalan [Spain]. We immigrated from Puerto Rico when I was a small child. Our coming to the United States was very much tied up politically and directly related to the colonization of Puerto Rico. We first moved to Chicago but ultimately settled in Los Angeles—though I did not grow up in the glamorous part of LA, but a barrio in southwest LA. All in all, I grew up poor, and I remember most of my teachers were White. My first memory of having a teacher
who was not White was in 1st grade. She was African American, and she was one of very few who seemed to “get” me in a real way—to be able to relate to my everyday struggles. She made me feel more engaged as a person rather than a thing. I had no Latino/a teachers growing up as a child. These experiences as a child shaped a lot of how I thought about the educational experiences and the problems that were at work in relationship to children’s lives in school. There was an aggression, and besides that one teacher there was a sense that we were not as smart as other students.

It was not until I was in community college that I had my first Chicano instructor, which was an amazing experience for me to see someone who looked like me in a role of authority. But ultimately, it was during my master’s program that I took a class entitled Culture and Cognition, and that was when I first learned that I had a culture, a culture that was legitimate. This class articulated what I already had known, that narrative understanding and that culture were linked to—that what I had experienced was considered a deficit. And I always had to catch up or try to act or talk like these people. Minority teachers gave me a sense of connection, understanding, and brought their experiences of survival with them.

I eventually taught Ethnic Studies courses, psychology courses, and education courses. In all of them (no matter the subject), I brought my clear sense of self as cultural being located in a particular way, contending with very specific forms and structures of inequality. The experience of being minority is validly important to understanding the struggles both physical and mental.
Implementation of Ethnic Studies

Ethnic Studies has its roots in a community foundation and a community struggle that arose out of the Civil Rights Movements and the struggles of those movements. Ethnic Studies cannot be separated historically from that struggle. Ethnic Studies is how you bring in issues around diversity into the classroom—issues such as subordination and domination, and how for those of us who come from subordinated cultures, how we navigate the tension between the dominant/subordinate experience. I bring to my classrooms the acknowledgement that every student in my class has a history or a culture from which they emerge, and it is just a parcel of who they are in the larger world spectrum. Another thing I bring with my teaching is a very deep understanding of oppression and the tension between that oppressed/oppressor dialectic, as well as that oppressed/oppressor contraction that exists in the world. I have taught education classes, Latinos and cultural studies classes, theories of biculturalism, culture and cognition, etc. I have come into these classes with a sense of myself as a cultural being, located in a particular way, contending with very specific forms of structures of inequality.

Multicultural education is one way that Ethnic Studies is implemented. Multicultural education has its origin in Ethnic Studies. Multicultural education tries to incorporate both content as well as pedagogy. There is a neoliberal multiculturalism that acknowledges difference but does nothing to change the relationship to the structures of power and to give opportunities to participate in real decision making and in an epistemological shift—how we think about the world and how we think about institutions and particularly how think about education.
Ethnic Studies have never been just about the academy but about the university and society. Cultural difference is amorphous. Professors need to be involved in the kind of intellectual formation that asks students to be fully present to themselves as subjects of history, as cultural beings, understanding that part of their commitment must be to engage the issues of oppression within communities, within the institution.

Because both Ethnic Studies and multicultural education have their origins in revolutionary change and politics, what happens in academia is students are taught more of the theory or the language of it than the revolutionary change or political transformation or any real involvement in the deeper community struggles. This was part of why they ended the program in Tucson, because they were trying to connect that community struggle with the classes. They were trying to bring back that very lived experience in a much more organic way, to teach in a much more organic way. Where students were connected to the knowledge that they were constructing, connected to their histories, they began to understand that their current conditions were absolutely linked to a long trajectory of oppression, of racial eyes and economic oppression that had informed who they were today. As students start to learn and as knowledge becomes something that is truly interesting, not something that is divorced of them, students respond in very different ways. It brings them to a place of wanting to take action, which is exactly what Ethnic Studies was supposed to be about. It was not supposed to just be a scholarly field of study.

A sophisticated form of racism and cultural hegemony is to conflict differences and try to pretend that they are all the same. To intellectualize what is happening at a concrete reality is tough for me to process. Ethnic Studies and multicultural education
struggles to preserve its relationship with the community, relationship with the struggle, the relationship to the conditions of the oppression that still persist in this society and in many instances is actually increasing.

**Future of Ethnic Studies**

There are many unconscious microaggressions. As a professor, I went into the academy thinking that I could be a part of the movement to change the academy. I taught courses related to Ethnic Studies, cultural studies, and multicultural education. Thirty years as a professor, post-doctorate, 35 years from my first year of teaching at the college level, I no longer believe that. I believe the best way we can change the academy is through creating as many safe spaces, counterhegemonic spaces, where there is clear politics, an anti-imperialist, anti-racist anti-capitalist agenda. As I got older, I realized how naïve we were because on one hand we talked about the strength of the hegemony and the hegemony operates, but why did they think that it operated in the distance?

Part of the work of Ethnic Studies is how do we break through the dissonance between the lived experience of many of the students and the experience of those who were involved in the formation of the field so that there begins to be a more evolutionary process, but not one that loses the revolutionary intent?

**Perspectives on Policy**

One cannot separate the policies from the politics. Politics makes the future of Ethnic Studies limited. Politics dictate what is good science and irrelevant science. In order to launch a deep revolutionary project of a counter-hegemonic project, people need to have a sense of security in terms of their work, the context in which they're working.
They tend to have to raise a significant amount of funding for their research; because of this, the university context of the issues is very limiting.

Another question is the most impoverished, how could they be left off the table in terms of Ethnic Studies? In terms of education, how can we leave policies related to standard of testing off the table with respect to their impact in terms of assimilative curriculum and assimilative discourses within education that attempt to strip our children of any real sense of history and their culture and language?

Identity politics has been a double-edged sword in this battle. On one hand, it gave a sense of belonging related to issues of culture, race, gender, sexuality. On the other hand, what has happened is there is a loss of connection that forms of oppression are interconnected and linked to deeper structures of oppression that are both political and economic.

Conclusion—Reflections on Ethnic Studies

In conclusion, there are several key points I would like to reiterate about Ethnic Studies. Having faculty and instructors of color was huge for me. They brought with them their struggles and their realities to the classroom, and it made me feel like I can do this too. I was finally a person and not just a thing. It is so important that there is a direct linkage between the struggle/oppression/history and what is Ethnic Studies in the present.

My life vocation is this work in relationship to overcoming oppression, racism, all of the forms in all its manifestations, struggling to bring a discourse that asks people to question the structures, to question the attitudes, to question how they think about the world and understand how we think about the world, which is directly related to what we do in the world.
Patricia Halagao
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Experiences and Development of the Field

I am a second generation student of Ethnic Studies, mainly influenced by multicultural education. I was born to Filipino parents in the Philippines who immigrated to the United States when I was 6 months old. We first moved to Michigan and then Stockton, California, which is where I spent the majority of my childhood. My dad was an ear, nose, and throat doctor, and my mother was a pediatrician. We immigrated to the United States during the time of Martial Law in the Philippines\(^1\). While we were economically privileged, culturally and ethnically within the United States we were

\(^1\) See Martial Law in the Philippines (2016).
disadvantaged. School came naturally to me, and I was involved in the “normal” social and academic clubs, such as yearbook club and tennis. My ethnicity and culture were not treated as an asset in my school; therefore, I just assumed it wasn’t. I knew my ethnic background, but it didn’t have great value or relevance to my time in school mainly because people like me did not show up in the curriculum too much.

My first real experience with Ethnic Studies was in college. I told the career advisor that I wanted to go into anthropology, and she suggested I start a Filipino club. So I did. I started the first Filipino Club at Occidental College in Los Angeles. I also lived in the first multicultural dorm at the college. The idea of having a multicultural dorm set up to experience cultural differences and similarities was revolutionary at the time. It just wasn’t done, so it was neat being a part of that inauguration. I also began the first study abroad trip to the Philippines. It helped me to understand and get a grasp on my cultural and ethnical identity.

Post-college my first professional job was as a teacher in the Oakland Public School system through Teach for America in 1992. I was offered the position as a first grade Sheltered English teacher. I had no clue what “Sheltered English” was at the time, and the principal who offered me the position didn’t give a super-explicit description of what it was. He told me it was just teaching to students who were learning English. So I taught Sheltered English to students who were largely Southeast Asian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Latino students in a 95% African American school. They put a lot of students with “foreign sounding” names in my class. It was while I was teaching these classes that I decided to incorporate their ethnicity and culture into the lessons. I organically brought their histories into the classrooms because I thought it was important.
For me personally, Filipino Studies really was not a formal part of my life in academia until I was in graduate school. I had thought broadly in terms of culture and ethnicity up until that point, but never about how it related to me and my research. My advisors at the University of Washington while I was getting my PhD were Geneva Gay\(^2\) (who specialized in multicultural education and teacher education), James Banks\(^3\) (he also specialized in multicultural education), and Walter Parker\(^4\) (whose specialty was social studies education). Geneva Gay and James Banks’ classes helped me realize why I felt like I was invisible in the curriculum. It was during this time that I also took several Filipino Studies courses with Fred and Dorothy Cordova,\(^5\) the grandparents of

\(^2\) Geneva Gay is a Professor at the University of Washington Seattle. One of her most known books is *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Practice, & Research*, but in addition to that she has written numerous articles on multicultural education and teacher education as it relates to issues of race and ethnicity. (See University of Washington College of Education Geneva Gay, 2016)

\(^3\) James A. Banks is the Kerry and Linda Killinger Endowed Chair in Diversity Studies and is the founder of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington Seattle. Some have called him the grandfather of multicultural education. He has written numerous pieces on both Ethnic Studies, multicultural education, and most recently global education. (See University of Washington Center for Multicultural Education James Banks, 2016)

\(^4\) Walter Parker is a Professor at the University of Washington Seattle and his areas of expertise are in social studies education and political science. He has written numerous pieces on democratic education, democracy and social studies education, and civic education. (see University of Washington College of Education Walter Parker, 2016)

\(^5\) Fred and Dorothy Cordova were activists for Filipinos since the 1950s in Seattle. Their career started out with journalism, and in 1957 they founded the Filipino Youth Activities (FYA, which is a drill team that consist of marchers, a drill team, and percussionists with a focus on traditional Filipino musical traditions). Dorothy was the Director for Demonstration Project for Asian Americans. It holds a collection of oral histories of west coast Asian Americans. Later they helped to
Filipino/Filipina American Studies. They opened up my thinking to a whole new world—a whole new aspect of my identity and self.

**Implementation of Ethnic Studies**

Ethnic Studies is specific to the ethnicity being discussed but can be more powerful through multicultural education, which expands it to everyone and in saying that Ethnic Studies is specific to the ethnicity being discussed, it is not only a single subject study, but it has a purpose of going deeper into the histories and issues of ethnic groups. Histories and issues of race and ethnicity are important to everyone, not just ethnic and racial minorities, though it does help minority children to see themselves in the curriculum. One of the differences between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education is that Ethnic Studies has an important historical and political origin story and is interdisciplinary and, therefore, dealt with a lot of content. Multicultural education incorporates both content and pedagogy and is a way to introduce issues of diversity into what is considered a “normal” classroom curriculum. In saying that, I also realize that multicultural education has been institutionalized and dampened in many ways, so there is a need for a critical perspective with it. Critical perspective (specifically Critical Race Theory) and multicultural education go hand and hand with each other. One way that multicultural education enhances the goals of Ethnic Studies is that it helps people to understand universal concepts and issues and tries to organize looking at things from multiple perspectives.

As stated before, I did not see the implementation of Ethnic Studies until I got to college and graduate school. I finally could see myself in the curriculum. It was an enlightening experience for me. Using that knowledge, I was given to learn the fundamentals of race and ethnicity in the broad terms of multicultural education as my master’s thesis project. I created a curriculum for schools in the Seattle School District and a school in Bellevue, Washington, titled Pinoy Teach. Pinoy Teach was a way to teach not only Filipino American students, but also students of all races and ethnicity with an emphasis on Filipinos and Filipino American history. Filipino history was a vehicle to teach, though the majority of the students we were teaching were not of Filipino descent. The motto of the program was “Knowledge is power, yet teaching is empowerment.” Preservice teachers would go in teams and teach in mainstream middle schools. We were in 11 schools. Another objective of the program was for the preservice teachers to harness their enthusiasm and their knowledge and their passion and bring them to the classrooms. What made the program effective was that concepts being taught in the program could work with people with multiple and diverse racial and ethnical backgrounds. The program emphasized conceptual thinking, critical thinking, and connections. Pinoy Teach ended when I moved from Washington (state) to Hawai‘i, but the program lives on in the heart of its participants. A few years after the program ended, I did a study on the outcome of students, and many of them are still teaching principles and reflected on the way the curriculum changed their view of themselves.

For me, Filipino American Studies was the branch of Ethnic Studies where I found myself. In Filipino American Studies, I believe that while the focus is on Filipinos
in the United States at this present time there needs to be a link to the past. In conclusion, it must be viewed in light of the larger sociocultural context in which it takes place.

**Future of Ethnic Studies**

I see Filipino Studies becoming more interdisciplinary. One of the struggles of Filipino Studies is that it tends to be lumped into Asian American Studies, and the specifics of it is all but forgotten behind the bigger Asian countries with larger populations like Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etc. While I have a desire for it to not be forgotten, I think the only way for it to gain validity and to become more “normal” is for it to gain recognition within the greater curriculum—for educators to see and recognize the relationship between the Philippines and the United States. Filipino Americans represent the second largest Asian ethnic group within the United States and the third largest group immigrating to the United States. Despite the numbers it still tends to be pushed to the side or considered unimportant within the curriculum. It is encouraging to see scholars working within the field and revitalizing the curriculum. It is amazing that we have our own SIG (Special Interest Group) within the AERA (American Educational Research Association). When I started, there were many fewer people even interested in the subject. It is encouraging seeing the different research and studies happening and where it is going. They are very interdisciplinary.

Another part of the future of Ethnic Studies is the need to have a link to the local community and to have a community of scholars supporting each other’s work. All Ethnic Studies programs and classes face the challenge of ignorance. The fact is that there is no curriculum available and people just not knowing the different stories of minorities. Most people do realize that Filipinos have a long history and contribution to
American history, though they do not know the specifics. One of my first projects in my Filipino Studies class at the University of Washington was to do an oral history of my great-great uncle. I found out he was one of the first Filipino doctors in Central Valley California and was a labor leader for the Filipino American Agricultural Labor Association.\(^6\) This is my personal history, but there is so much more. Another interesting part of Filipino history is the different waves of Filipinos who came to the United States, especially the professional waves that came as a result of the terms of the Martial Law in the 1960s.

Being in Hawai‘i, I find the history of colonialism in the Philippines and with the Indigenous people of Hawai‘i are similar in story. There needs to be more intersectionality between groups of people, creating larger opportunities to learn both about an individual heritage and the linkages between people. I believe if we integrate culture and ethnicity into the curriculum more regularly than differences in histories and backgrounds will be seen as less of a threat to standardized curriculum. The history is hard to swallow and is not very nice, and it puts a lot of people in a not so pretty light all the time. But that is history and to gloss over it does not help anyone. I also believe that teachers need be open-minded and have a disposition for caring for who their students are and wanting to get to know them and finding value in what they have to offer and their backgrounds as diverse and different as they are.

\(^6\) The Filipino American Agricultural Labor Association (FAALA) was founded in 1938 and was a huge part of the farmers’ strikes in California in the 1950s and 1960s. They opened membership to Mexicans and other minorities. Cesar Chavez gets most of the credit for the farm labor movements in California, but he was not alone in his fight for better wages and better work conditions. See The Filipino American Agricultural Labor Association (FAALA) (2014).
Perspectives on Policy

I have a unique view of policy because I have a governor-appointed position on the Hawai‘i State School Board. In this position, I am creating and reviewing education policies. In creating policies that deal with race and ethnicity, many times they have to be married with other policies that help them to effect all students and aspects of education. One aspect of policy that I am currently working on right now is working multilingualism into English language learner (ELL) policies. Filipinos make up the largest language group in Hawai‘i. The goal is to focus the policy around looking at language as an asset versus a deficiency and to figure out what do these students need in order to achieve at school. Given there are so many opinions and thoughts on Ethnic Studies, it is hard to create a specific Ethnic Studies curriculum. But I believe Ethnic Studies with education can be a vehicle of change in dealing with issues of race and ethnicity in education, and not just leaving it in relation to education but working with a lot of different fields. It makes the topic more normalized and mainstream, and people can realize that though their stories are different there are many similarities.

When I teach standards within education, I teach the standards as guidelines to the curriculum, not the goal of the curriculum itself. They are a minimum requirement of teachers. Specifically, with Common Core I believe that they should be interpreted to fit the context of the classroom. They were never meant to be prescriptive. Their real goal was real-world applications, which includes social studies and Ethnic Studies.

Conclusion—Reflections on Ethnic Studies

To summarize the key points, while Ethnic Studies does help minority students to find themselves in a curriculum where they are otherwise pushed to the side, it also
teaches all students the differences and similarities of people who have a different background than themselves. I learned about Ethnic Studies later in my schooling, and I believe it would be a great benefit for student teachers to learn much earlier on, especially as they work with students of multiple cultural backgrounds. There is so much intersectionality between different people that cannot be ignored and brings greater light to everyone’s stories.

K. Tsianina Lomawaima
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Experiences and Development of the Field

For me, I did not get any “formal” teaching as a child growing up about my race and ethnicity. My dad was part Muskogee/Creek Nation, and we later found out after he passed away in 2002 that he was also part Cherokee. When my dad was 8 or 9 years old,
he and his brother were court-ordered to a federal Indian boarding school, Chilocco. As a result of being taken to boarding school, my dad was not raised in a traditional cultural Creek community. He did not see his mother again until he started running away from the school when he was 14 or 15 years old and never spent an appreciative amount of time with her after that. Soon his mom—my grandmother—left Oklahoma, which was common with Native Americans during the Depression, to look for jobs in Wichita, Kansas. My father eventually ran away from Chilocco and did not come back. He worked his way around the country. He worked his way through high school as a member of the National Guard, which was federalized, and he served in World War II. After the war, he moved back up to Kansas and met my mother, who was from a German Mennonite community north of Wichita. Growing up, we moved a lot. I went to multiple schools. I consider myself “homeschooled” by my parents in a sense, because I would come home and tell my dad what I was taught at school. He would tell me if that was the whole story or completely off. He was self-educated, especially about anything pertaining to American history or Native history. He helped me to be more critical with what I was learning at school rather than just accepting everything I was being told.

I soon went off to college and then continued into graduate school, though I was pretty clueless as to what graduate school really was. I was in the Anthropology Department at Stanford. My focus was in heritage language. For my dissertation, I did an oral history of the Chilocco Indian School. I interviewed my dad and about 60 people

---

7 The Chilocco Indian School was a federal Indian boarding school near Ponca City, Oklahoma close to the border of Oklahoma and Kansas. It was open from 1884 to 1980. The goal of the school was assimilation of its students into U.S. society. (See Lomawaima, 1994, and Lomawaima, 2016.)
who had been at the school from the late 1910s until the mid-1940s. The majority were from my dad’s cohort, which was there between 1920-1930.

This led to my first job placement at the University of Washington. The Anthropology Department and the American Indian Studies Center were administratively linked at the time, and my appointment was in the Anthropology Department. So in addition to those classes, I taught classes about American Indians. I was at that position for six years until my husband, Hartman Lomawaima, was recruited by the University of Arizona as the Associate Director of the Arizona State Museum. I moved there with him and we worked as a team. At the University of Arizona, I was appointed in the American Indian Studies program. I was there for 20 years, and I even headed the program for some time while I was there. It was during this time that I felt more alive in American Indian Studies and Indigenous Studies more broadly than in anthropology.

**Implementation of Ethnic Studies**

The first thing that needs to be established is the difference between Ethnic Studies and Native American Studies. While there are many similarities and the struggles are very similar, there are some major differences. Native nations predate Europeans coming to the United States. Because of this, people of Native nations have an inherent sovereignty to engage in government-to-government, sovereign-to-sovereign relations with Britain, France, Holland, Russia, and then later in time, the United States, Canada, and Mexico. That political sovereignty, then, is absolutely fundamental and a part of our existence and the meaning of our existence, as well as the means of our existence.⁸

---

Because of the inherent sovereignty of Native peoples, it actually can change the relationship on the university level between the department/programs and the university. In many contemporary universities, American Indian, Native American, Indigenous Studies, First Nations in Canada, whatever the name, can be found structurally and administratively linked to other Ethnic Studies groups, but more often they are not—although there’s certainly some shared goals in contributing to curriculum, contributing to education of a diverse student population within universities. It is a dangerous thing actually for Native Studies to be lumped into Ethnic Studies because it is a way of very actively erasing, denying, marginalizing the particular sovereignty that’s at stake for Native nations.

Teaching American Indian Studies has brought me face to face with the political realities of what I call a deeply entrenched U.S. willful ignorance. It’s not accidental ignorance. This works in all areas of ethnicity and race, but for me it has been specifically about Native people and Native histories. Dealing with willful ignorance is a very different pedagogical process than dealing with people who just haven’t learned yet. The students who just have not learned about other cultures come to college often expecting to learn new things. They are well-prepared to learn things that directly contradict everything they’ve been taught their entire lives to be true. Figuring out what is the most effective way to teach these concepts that are new is a challenge and an iterative process. Support from colleagues becomes very important to consult, discuss, and even ventilate with them.

9 See Lomawaima, (2012).
One practical way I’ve seen the practice of American Indian studies is through a small conference that I was a cofounder of, the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA).\(^\text{10}\) It is smaller, which makes it very personal. There are a handful of sessions specifically on issues of Indigenous people. That support of the research has been very important to me, and it is encouraging seeing what others are doing, especially with this ongoing battle of not only legitimacy and the matter of being acceptable versus unacceptable, but also visibility versus invisibility.

Linking how Indigenous Studies has been taught with the future of it, there is need to realize that it takes more than being of a certain race or ethnicity to teach it. While having minority professors and instructors is very important in providing role models for students of that particular background, there is a need for more than that. There is a need for understanding the intellectual value of Indigenous Studies and how it can contribute to multiple aspects of human society, environment, or whatever the topic of study might be. This is what we within the field push towards, and yes, it has changed over time, but there is still work to be done.

**Future of Ethnic Studies**

The future of Indigenous Studies is honestly unknown. Right now there is a push of neoliberalism politically that makes American Indian Studies and Ethnic Studies under intense scrutiny, which isn’t new because this has been the continual struggle from these programs’ birth in the 1960s. But it does make the constant battle tiresome and progress

\(^{10}\) NAISA was founded in 2007 and has a prestigious journal, *Native American and Indigenous Studies* (NAIS) published by the University of Minnesota Press. Other cofounders of NAISA were Robert Warrior, Robert and Jean O’Brien, J. Kehaulani Kauanui, Jace Weaver, and Ines Hernandez-Ávila. See NAISA, 2016.
seems so slow at times. Originally departmentalizing Indigenous Studies was the goal, and we got that in some ways. They have become disciplinary areas within the university, but the danger is what some have called the “ghettoization of Ethnic Studies”. We have these departments, but they sometimes create an environment for the more traditional fields such as the history or English departments to feel like they do not have to do anything because Ethnic Studies, in a broad sense of the term, is taking care of it. Indigenous Studies has a different intellectual center of gravity than mainstream disciplines, that in a best-case scenario go hand in hand with collaboration with and curricular integration and research integration across the mainstream disciplines.

Perspectives on Policy

Policy for American Indian/Indigenous Studies is a little different because the relationship between the federal government and Native people is based on laws on so many levels. The policies that are created encompasses so much Native people’s lives—all kinds of area beyond just the law. There is a huge corpus of stuff that impacts lives in a myriad ways every day, and issues of Indigenous Studies really does impact people’s lives—how we make sense of it, how we utilize it, and how we resist it.

On the state level, the Arizona statute banning Ethnic Studies and specifically targeting and criminalizing the Mexican American Studies program is very concerning. There are at least three states that require a teaching of Native American studies at the high school level, but right now in general there is a political grandstanding on conservatives tied up with the ways in which conservatives are taking a stand in being “conservative.” As a result, high school education in particular has been targeted as an
appropriate opponent or adversary for a conservative political stance, which does impact Indigenous studies.

Something that is promising that is happening, and I believe will continue to happen, is the intersectionality between Indigenous Studies and other fields of study. It is overlapping and braiding in interesting ways with fields such as environmental history and women’s history. Settler colonial studies is another huge development that influences the work of Indigenous scholars. It connects the world, especially English-speaking settler-colonial states, such as Australia, New Zealand, U.S., and Canada.

**Conclusion—Reflections on Ethnic Studies**

As stated in the beginning, the concept of sovereignty is what distinguishes Native American/American Indians/Indigenous studies from other Ethnic Studies groups. Because of this, there is definitely still need for it. Not only is the battle a battle for acceptability, but it is also a battle to not be erased.

There is hope because it is amazing to see Indigenous intellectualism and intellectual history being done now that 20 years ago was not on anyone’s horizon. There is a huge florescence of the student of Native literatures and the production of Native literatures and writings that are out there now. There has been a powerful development within history and Native history that has had significant influences on the writing of American history and more generally the conceptualization of American history, which is still highly contested but is making a huge difference.
Juan Mendoza

Experiences and Development of the Field

I was born in New York but raised in Corvallis, Oregon, a small town near Salem. I come from a racially mixed background. My dad was Chicano—well, half Chicano and half Native, but he did not know much about the Native part, and my mother was White. My dad had a PhD in education and my mother had a master’s in social work, so though I am from a minority background I came from a higher socioeconomic background. My parents divorced when I was 5 years, and so I would spend the school year in Oregon, a majority White community, and the summers in Tucson with my dad. Because I am very fair-complexioned, I was given access to this “White” world, and I learned very quickly that people who cared about me as an individual would say very very racist things. And I was forced to reconcile this very deep and hurtful issue at a very young age. My mother, who was definitely a middle-class White feminist, would point out things my friends would say to me. My dad would tell me stories of when he was a part of the walks and protests in the 1960s in Orange County, California. One year for Christmas he gave me Paulo Friere’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.\(^\text{11}\) I also remember being one of few Latinos at Bend High School who helped organize and administrate a statewide mentoring conference for Latino high school students. So my work within Ethnic Studies started very early in my life.

---

\(^{11}\) *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is one of Paulo Freire’s most famous books. Freire was raised in a poor community in Brazil and went on to law school but worked as a secondary school teacher teaching Portuguese. See Freire (2007).
I started out as an engineering major at a school in northern California, because everyone going to school near the Silicon Valley is going to be an engineer and work in the Silicon Valley, too, I assumed. I was the naïve college student who thought college was all about getting into a career so one could make a ton of money afterwards. But after a year, I realized that it lacked social and meaningful relevance to me, so I did what every college kid does and bounced from major to major until I finally landed and finished as an Ethnic Studies major. At the time, I believed everyone should do Ethnic Studies, but now I realize that engineers, doctors, lawyers, scientists, etc. with an Ethnic Studies orientation is probably a more realistic and needed view of society.

**Implementation of Ethnic Studies**

So as I stated, I saw Ethnic Studies implemented both on the formal level and informal level throughout my childhood and early adulthood. While my research is strongly informed by Ethnic Studies, I do not see myself as a part of Ethnic Studies since my disciplinary background is education and my focus is on concepts of White and Whiteness. I believe that one of goals of Ethnic Studies is and has always been understanding how much we do not know about other cultures and having the humility to engage along those lines and the different issues that are raised while in that place. Students of color have heard overtly racist statements or have overtly racist historical lineages and memories.

One of the most obvious implementations of Ethnic Studies is through multicultural education. I believe multicultural education needs to be applied through critical lenses. Without a critical lens, all we have are fiestas, foods, U.S. holidays, and it creates a very “kumbaya” way of viewing the world. Critical multiculturalism means
very specifically that it is centered around inequality, oppression, and social stratification. Another way to distinguish between the different terminology and how it is practiced is a form of cultural tokenism, and history shows that cultural tokenism just does not work. It makes everyone frustrated because teachers are trying to teach what they do not know, and it gets trivia in kids’ heads because they do not care because it does not have any real bearings on their lives.

Now Ethnic Studies by itself is almost synonymous with critical multiculturalism. Not exactly the same but very much alike, because Ethnic Studies is critical in the sense that it first and foremost came out of the struggle the 1960s. It was one of those things that wasn’t asked for; it was demanded as a result of continual monoculturalism and exclusion of minorities in the curriculum. And at the same time, there is nothing inherently wrong with having Ethnic Studies that specifically focuses on one particular ethnic group. In multiculturalism, you have to decide who you are going to focus on because it’s multi-focused. In Ethnic Studies, it is okay to say I’m going to focus on Chicano Studies because we live in the Southwest and it is relevant to the students who are here. In Ferguson, Missouri, obviously the Ethnic Studies curriculum would be a bit different than it was here in Arizona. The students would not understand why they were taught about Latin culture in a majority White/Black community. It should change depending on the demographics of the community. It needs to be tailored for the needs of the kids in that area.

San Francisco and Los Angeles Unified School districts are making Ethnic Studies a graduation requirement. I think the biggest things we are going to have to deal with moving ahead with these laws is the critical component of Ethnic Studies. There is a
chance that the more Ethnic Studies is scaled up the more the critical component will be scaled down. The only way I’ve seen Ethnic Studies effectively engaged is when it does center inequality, racism, and all the things that make people feel uncomfortable. There is a need to be called out if we are going to talk about racism in a real meaningful way. When someone calls you out, it does not mean the person is jumping on you; it means they are challenging you to be a better person in your everyday practice. And in many respects, despite social discomfort, it is one of the sincerest acts of love.

**Future of Ethnic Studies**

We see change happening and people going back and revisiting the issues of the Civil Rights Movement. One of the things that is happening now is to reframe the issues of the social movements of the 1960s from an intersectionality paradigm. With this reframing, we have potential to be better and to do more impactful work today than what was done in the 1960s. This is the direction in which Ethnic Studies is going. The people in the '60s talked about it being a localized struggle. And yet at the same time, it went beyond the local, but there was no name for it at the time.

Some continual issues that Ethnic Studies are battling are issues of colonialism. It affects minorities in different ways, but it has an equal effect for everyone. Here at the University of Arizona, we are surrounded by Indian Country, and we are on Indian land. And yet how the land grant state university was placed on that parcel of land is not widely known. It is one thing to have your culture demeaned; it is completely different to have your culture just erased. It’s as if you are not important enough and you don’t even exist. There are controversies over Native mascots, buildings named on campus after overtly White supremacists. While things are changing slowly—and yes these historical
facts are a part of our history as a country—we cannot continue valorizing these issues if we want real change in our society. I find it funny when people are like, “What’s the big deal? Why are you so concerned about these issues?” The problem is “if it is fine” and “no big deal” then nothing will ever change, but the amount of resistance being given is exactly the reason why it’s a big deal.

**Perspectives on Policy**

Standardization is the way of policy right now, and it is the antithesis of Ethnic Studies. Ethnic Studies must be locally defined in terms of what people are offering; and as it gets scaled up, there must be some core principles. There is extraordinarily promise in the sense that people are understanding that we have an increasing multicultural society and we can either deal with it and address our divisions and our inequitable social relations or we are going fail as a country. When we talk about educational disparities, Ethnic Studies is never brought up as a policy-oriented component of addressing that. The reality is Ethnic Studies is real education, and that statement should not be a radical statement. Ethnic Studies needs to scaled up from a policy perspective, especially as a critically important and holistic method of addressing persistent educational and equality gaps. While it is not a silver bullet fix, it is a very important component that has not been currently utilized to the fullest. Ethnic Studies also needs to be addressed more on the localized level and articulated in the policies in this way. There are specific parts of Ethnic Studies that need to be addressed differently depending on the demographics of the area in which it is being taught. It takes pedagogical skills to teach these specifics. One cannot just get anyone to teach these classes.
What made Tucson unique in the program was that they fully acknowledged teaching Ethnic Studies as a skill. They had amazing teachers with the understanding of pedagogical practice and classroom management, and they had knowledge of Ethnic Studies approaches to their specific area. They knew the area of study, whether it was literature, government, history, etc., and they knew the Chicano Studies component with all of it. They used their positions as teachers as a way to facilitate dialogue in the classes and to create a bridge from the community to the classroom. Ethnic Studies should become a track component within the Teacher Education program.

Conclusion—Reflections on Ethnic Studies

All in all, Ethnic Studies as a component to multiple areas of study is the most effective way for teaching and for having a lasting influence on society. There is a connection between the past, the present, and the future of Ethnic Studies, and those connections cannot be diminished or minimized. One of the greatest challenges that Ethnic Studies faces right now is—as it is scaled-up and implemented as graduation requirements, such as in San Francisco and Los Angeles—that the critical and controversial aspects of it will be watered down to “not offend” the masses. Though there is momentum and opportunity in new ways to really have Ethnic Studies as an integral part of academia on multiple levels (K-16), there is no foregone conclusion in this battle. We will see what happens.
Experiences and Development of the Field

I am Puerto Rican, and grew up in Brooklyn. I received public aid for all of my schooling except my bachelor’s degree. I went to public schools K-12th grade and grew up in a poor immigrant community. We moved quite a bit when I was child. Our first neighborhood was a community of European immigrants, Italians, Russians, Ukrainians, and the Puerto Ricans were coming. The neighborhood shifted to have a majority of Puerto Ricans, Hasidic Jewish, and African Americans over time. Eventually we moved to another neighborhood in Brooklyn that was largely African American and Puerto Rican.
Rican. Finally, we moved to a majority Jewish working middle-class neighborhood. It was here where my parent bought their first house. At age 13, this was the first time I saw people living in houses and not apartments. We were the first Puerto Ricans in the neighborhood. This step up for our family and the neighborhood culture was pretty foreign to me, but I acknowledge I got amazing educational opportunities through this move.

My sister and I were two of three Puerto Ricans in my entire school. A friend of mine helped transition from lower class to middle class. I took no formal Ethnic Studies classes as a child. Everything I learned about my culture was at home. We lived like Puerto Ricans, meaning we ate the food, we celebrated the holidays. Up to a point. For example, in Puerto Rico, especially at the time, but even now, January 6th is a very big day. It’s the Three Kings Day. That’s the day kids would get gifts. Once my parents moved to the states, I don’t know we just never did that. We never followed that custom. It was only when I married a Spaniard—you know my husband—we started to celebrate January 6th. We had all the food, and we had the family. The family was the basis for everything. My father was the patriarch of the family, so we’d always gather first in our apartments, when we lived in apartments, and then in our house. All the cousins and uncles and aunts who were in the States would gather in our house. I would say I didn’t have any formal schooling about Puerto Rican history when I was growing up, but we lived the culture as far as we could. We spoke Spanish at home. We learned about family, to cherish family of course. We heard stories that they would tell us, but they never sat down and said, like, you have to learn about your history.
From childhood, I wanted to be a teacher. I worked as a bilingual teacher in the Bronx when bilingualism was just beginning in 1968. During this time, I took a class at New York University on Puerto Rican history and culture. I was working on my master’s degree. The school I worked for had received a grant for all teachers to pursue their master’s degree for free. After taking the class, I taught myself more about the history and its relations to my students at Public School 25. Later, I taught four different Ethnic Studies classes at Brooklyn College, and I went back and got my PhD in teacher education. At Brooklyn College, I was in a joint program with the School of Education and Ethnic Studies program that was set to prepare bilingual teachers.

**Implementation of Ethnic Studies**

I was a part of the Latino Civil Rights Movement. Brooklyn College fought to name its own Ethnic Studies chair. When I started teaching, I saw that something was missing. Here I was teaching African American and Puerto Rican kids, and there was nothing about them in the curriculum. And so little by little, I started to find resources that added them into the curriculum. They call it teacher radar and you sort of know what needs to happen. I started to incorporate some things into the curriculum. I was slowly becoming a multicultural teacher even though I didn’t have the words for it yet. The kids changed how I thought about everything and were another introduction for me into Ethnic Studies.

I see multicultural education as a broader thing than Ethnic Studies. I see it as inclusive as a lot of different things—human rights education, Ethnic Studies, social justice, a lot of different aspects. I think that Ethnic Studies by itself, for me, would not have been enough. When I walked into my first course on multicultural education, I said
this is what I've been looking for, my first doctoral course. Because although I was thrilled and empowered to be in a Puerto Rican studies department, I knew that I was looking for something more, something broader. I was very concerned, not just about Puerto Rican kids, I was thinking about how I grew up but also my neighbors, my friends who were African Americans, they were from the Caribbean. My best friend was from Bermuda while I was growing up. I was concerned about more than just Puerto Ricans. That’s when multicultural education spoke to me.

Some important aspects of Ethnic Studies are about voice and self-determination, who gets to speak and makes the decisions and choices, who is paid attention to. The whole field when I was in the Puerto Rican Studies department from 1972–1975 was about recognition and acceptance and credibility, which made it really hard to be there. Ethnic Studies at the beginning did not have a track record like philosophy, political science, or other of the other traditional disciplines. It did not have creditability. In fact, the four out of eight of us who were in the department did not even have our doctorates yet at the time. Four of us within the Puerto Rican Studies were what one would call “EuroRicans”—Puerto Ricans who were born or raised in the United States. We shared similar working class backgrounds, our parents had not had access to higher education, we were the first in our family to go to college, and me I was the not only the first one to go to college but to graduate from high school. The other four in the department were raised in Puerto Rico and were more middle class and had more opportunities and more experiences with academia. They were the ones with the doctorate. We came together and helped to establish the Center for Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College, which is a
part of the City University of New York system. We called it the Centro. The Centro still exists, and they engage in research projects, community based projects, and so on. They also helped to give the field of Puerto Rican Studies legitimacy. In 1973, the Puerto Rican Studies Association was created as the first Puerto Rican professional society. There is a conference every two years and a research journal.

Here I was in the Puerto Rican Studies Department, and sometimes it would bring tears to my eyes when we would go to an activity and we’d see a dance group. I thought, wow, I never knew that existed; or I would read one of the seminal pieces of literature in Puerto Rican Studies, a series of sketches, literary sketches called A Puerto Rican in New York in and the Sketches by Jesus Colon. I’ve read those and I would get tears in my eyes because it was about Puerto Ricans. He was a newspaper reporter and began writing in the 1920s, and so this was a compilation to the 1950s of his previous articles from his newspaper. I thought, wow, I never heard of any of this stuff. I never saw it. I did not know it existed.

Just to think that there were organizations that were working on behalf of the community and that there were people who made a difference in my community—we never heard that. There weren’t too many teachers, but apparently there were some teachers. There were some doctors. There were people who were fighting for the community and many organizations, but we had never heard of them.

---

12 See The Center for Puerto Rican Studies (the Centro) (2016).

13 See The Puerto Rican Studies Association (PRSA) (2016).

14 See Facing History and Ourselves (2016).
I think that could go too far to the other extreme where all you see is positive and you don’t look critically at anything. To learn critically as well, especially for young people, it is so important to see themselves being represented and chosen. When I was a kid, I never saw a book that had a Puerto Rican character. Ever. When I was at the bilingual school, the principal and the two assistant principals were Puerto Rican, and staff was about a third Puerto Rican, a third African American, and a third other. All were bilingual. The principal put in everyone’s box a copy of an issue that came out from the Council of Interracial Books for Children. The council no longer exists, but it was wonderful in that it highlighted books for children with progressive and multicultural and multiethnic themes. They did this whole issue on Puerto Ricans and children’s books. I was astounded, I couldn’t believe it. They reviewed 100 children’s books with Puerto Ricans, and I said, "What?" I had never seen. Ironically, most of them were racist and sexist, homophobic, classist, and imperialistic. There were some that were good. The irony is that I became so enamored of that field, then I started subscribing to the bulletin; it was called the Bulletin of Council on Interracial Books for Children.

One issue, they asked for people who were interested in doing book reviews to send in a sample of their writing, and I decided to send something in. I did and they contacted me right away, sending me books, and I started to do all the book reviews on the books about Puerto Ricans. I ended up actually editing two of their issues in the coming years. That became a very important place for me. They were very multiethnic.
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and multicultural and very antiracist and that was a wonderful organization. It was one of the few places I got to see Puerto Ricans.

**Future of Ethnic Studies**

Ethnic Studies has always been about counter-story. History books are written about the winners not the losers, and often minorities have been on the losing side of history. For example, Puerto Ricans are quoted as being granted citizenship in 1917, but they don’t say that the two elected houses of government in Puerto Rico voted against citizenship. There are some people who are ignorant of all these of things, though not their fault, except once they know that they’re ignorant then they have to do something about it.

I believe the Ethnic Studies of the future will look more multiethnic. Even now, Puerto Rican Studies is no longer just Puerto Rican Studies; it is now inclusive within Caribbean studies, which also includes Latino, Dominican, etc. studies. I believe that a more multiethnic look is reflective of our more multiethnic society. There are so many intersectionalities between different ethnicities and races that are very important and need to taught.

**Perspectives on Policy**

Standardization is a two-edged sword because it can lead everyone to saying the same thing and thinking the same thing, or it can lead to some sort of higher standard. It really depends. I am a little afraid with standardization it means that everybody follows the same exact curriculum, the same material. It also takes away a lot of creativity on the part of the teachers. Ethnic Studies benefits everyone. It opens up our minds and our perspectives. There is a fear of other people’s perspectives when thinking is challenged.
Conclusion—Reflections on Ethnic Studies

In conclusion, Ethnic Studies has grown in legitimacy and credibility over the last 40 years. There are more young scholars working within the field, but that being said does not mean it is wholly accepted everywhere. In the early '80s and '90s there were a lot of critiques because I think people got scared as it started gaining legitimacy. They started claiming that political correctness was taking over everything, and they started pushing back, focusing on a Eurocentric perspective.

In the past, I have said we should not have multicultural education; we should just have education that should be all multicultural. If I was an overly hopeful person, I would say we shouldn’t have Ethnic Studies, but I don’t see that coming for a long time. Until that happens, I think the place of Ethnic Studies is very important to keep because it is those people in those fields who are going to keep producing knowledge that will be important to those fields and ultimately everyone no matter their racial and ethnical background.

I have an Ethnic Studies perspective in the multicultural education/teacher education work I do. It is part of our reality. We don’t live in a White-only world. We don’t live in a Dick and Jane world. We live in a complicated, interesting, exciting and challenging world, and we need to teach about that.
Christine Sleeter

Figure 13 Christine Sleeter


Experiences and Development of the Field

I did not have to think about race and ethnicity in a substantive way growing up. I grew up in a White middle-class family in Medford, Oregon. My dad was an OB/GYN doctor, and my mother was trained in medical social work though she chose to stop
working once she got married and started having children. It was not until I started teaching school in Seattle, Washington, that I realized how little I knew about race and ethnicity. I had graduated in a teacher education program for teaching in urban schools, but Ethnic Studies was not a part of the requirements. Teaching in a school where there was no racial/ethnic majority took me out of the environment I had grown up in. It was during this time that I started dating someone who was African American, and I had many African American teacher colleagues who I had grown close to. For the first time in my life, I realized that it was privilege to not have to think about race and ethnicity in any essential way. So I started reading about what I did not know, starting with Ralph Ellison’s Invisible Man,⁶ books by Richard Wright,⁷ and some Chicano history texts.

Graduate school was a big time in my life where I started having a more formal education on race and ethnicity. During my master’s program at the University of Washington, we were required to take a value clarification course. It was taught by Mako Nakagawa;¹⁸ she had survived the Japanese internment camps during World War II and touched upon issues of race and ethnicity. I also took what was classified as a “Black Studies” class at the time with James Banks, but it really wasn’t one. For my PhD at the University of Wisconsin, Carl Grant¹⁹ was my advisor, and I took a number of classes
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with him that were cross-listed between Black Studies, Multicultural Education, and Women’s Studies.

I have a unique perspective in being involved and a part of Ethnic Studies programs being established in the United States. My first university teaching job was at Ripon College in Wisconsin. I was assigned a full-time position in the Multicultural Education Department, which was rare in the 1990s, so I was grateful to have the appointment. About a year or two into the position, I was on a committee to hire someone in minority student affairs. The person we hired was an African-American man from southern California. His area of study was African American language and their connections to Africa. He had a desire to reframe student affairs as well as start an Ethnic Studies concentration or minor on campus. I worked with him to begin that program. We worked on the curriculum framework—the themes and threads that would connect Ethnic Studies with Teacher Education (both of our specialties). Once it was established, I became the interim director of Ethnic Studies. I felt a little weird being White and the director of Ethnic Studies. I knew that the history was so important to the discipline. I made sure it was only a temporary appointment.

Then soon after this we were looking for someone to teach African American history, and unfortunately the whole History Department was White males. I found an African American professor whose PhD was in sociology, and when asked if he had the background to teach African American history, his response was, “I’ve been African American my whole life.” I went on sabbatical when he started, and I decided to audit the course. This was my first formal not cross-listed Ethnic Studies course. I learned so much of what I did not know. It felt a bit weird because all the students were African American,
student age, and then there was me. I read the books and participated as much as I could, though I did not have to write the papers. After taking this class, sharing the department, and becoming directly engaged with the department and other Ethnic Studies departments and people around the state, I started seeing that I had more of a home in Ethnic Studies than I had been aware of before this time.

Over time, I developed a relationship with the Tucson folks, Augustine Romero and Julio Cammarota. They told me about and let me experience what they were doing in their program. This was the first full-blown Ethnic Studies program I had seen on the K-12th grade level. They also had a summer institute, which they invited me to join, and I got to see their program in deeper levels.

At the beginning of the time when the program in Tucson was being attacked, I was asked by someone I didn’t know from the National Education Association to write a review of the impact of Ethnic Studies on U.S. schools. The person who was asking did not have a great understanding as to what Ethnic Studies really was. She told me as she was explaining the concept, “Ethnic Studies. Those programs designed to help students to feel better about themselves and about other people...” My response was, “Here’s a different definition. Do you want me to write about Ethnic Studies, which are classes that deal directly with race and racism and power issues? Is that the way you want me to looking at?” Her response was “yes.” It is amazing how people even close up with Ethnic
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Studies do not understand what it is. Writing the review on the impact of Ethnic Studies in U.S. schools was my first piece on Ethnic Studies.

**Implementation of Ethnic Studies**

The implementation of Ethnic Studies is multifaceted. Its origin was in university student protests during the time of the Civil Rights. Another important feature of those protests was that the student groups were working with the community in creating what they wanted in the curriculum. That community connection is vitally important to Ethnic Studies. Community is where Ethnic Studies all started. Most recently, some critical moments in Ethnic Studies have been the birth and the banning of Ethnic Studies in the Tucson Unified School District, the ongoing struggles of Ethnic Studies, and also the victories within several California school districts, namely the Los Angeles Unified School District and the San Francisco Unified School District.

Developmentally, multicultural education came out of Ethnic Studies. I think of multicultural education in terms of how your head is oriented, how your curriculum is oriented. Multicultural education has to have an Ethnic Studies core. If multicultural education does not address the core issues in Ethnic Studies, then it is missing the boat. Issues related to race, ethnicity, class, gender, and disability are connected issues. Sometimes scholars have trouble connecting forms of oppression and discrimination rather than fragmenting them. I believe all multicultural education and Ethnic Studies should be critical discourse. As time has progressed, both multicultural education and Ethnic Studies sometimes can become purely an academic discipline, becoming disconnected from the community and getting routed more into higher education, and the issues that they were created to deal with get ignored.
There are several key elements of Ethnic Studies. It has historical backbone. Knowing the history gives a historical trajectory to the issues, such as how racism was institutionalized. Also the connections between the institutionalization of racism and the class structure. The institutionalization of racism and class structure was historically created and must be examined from that perspective. Another key element of Ethnic Studies is its beginnings with the social movements of the 1960s [the Civil Rights Movement, the Chicano Movement, the American Indian Movement, etc.]. To truly understand the purpose of Ethnic Studies, one must examine how those movements worked at the time, how they were organized, what difference they made on society, and the ongoing struggles. Another important element is for White students to understand their own historical cultural background. I have started recently a theoretical framework of critical family history, which seeks to help White students to see their sociocultural background as it fits within a larger social-cultural context. In saying this, I believe everyone should learn Ethnic Studies. In this country, it is not for someone else. It is for us all. We all need to grapple with race and racism and our own relationship to the racial structure and our identity. Students of color will grasp the concepts faster, but really seeing ourselves in the giant structure that has been created is huge and hard.

**Future of Ethnic Studies**

The ongoing battles of Ethnic Studies are battles that exist into the future. The battle for legitimacy is an ongoing war. In addition to the battle of legitimacy, there is a battle of resources between departments, and those two battles together puts Ethnic Studies in a very tough place within academia. Ethnic Studies is dealing with topics and issues that have been skirted under the rug for years and still are considered controversial.
in nature, which makes it a very hostile environment to survive in. And then there is, as a result of this idea that we live in a post-racial society, the question on even the necessity of Ethnic Studies. These are the issues that Ethnic Studies, present and future, will be fighting.

On the positive side, I believe cross-racial, cross-ethnic dialogue and bridge-building are tools in the belt of Ethnic Studies. Ethnic Studies is also a way to deal with interracial issues, such as Black-Brown conflicts, Brown-Asian conflicts, White-everybody conflicts. The hierarchies of privilege can end up getting recreated so easily, especially when people are under pressure and when resources are scarce. Another thing important to the field’s continued success is scholars who have pushed issues, framed the field, and have really grounded themselves in working with communities.

**Perspectives on Policy**

The ongoing framing of curriculum at the K-12th grade level and then the marginalizing of Ethnic Studies on the university level tends to keep Ethnic Studies on the margins. It makes it hard to get stuff published, and the stuff that is published is hard to stay in print. As a university professor, you continue to have students who have gone through K-12 and half of their college career and for the first time in their lives learn about race and ethnicity, which should have been taught from kindergarten. But something that must be understood is that not everything is set in stone. Though policies have created this vortex of information that is limited, it does not mean it will always be like that. Demographics in the United States are changing, and these old issues that have been ignored are coming to the surface once again.
Over the last several years, I have become involved with the defunct program in Tucson, though there are efforts being made to revitalize it, and through the California chapter of NAME (the National Association Multicultural Education), the passing of legislation to create an Ethnic Studies in California on the state level. Recently a bill making Ethnic Studies a state requirement for high school graduation was brought before the state legislature but not signed off on by the governor.

Conclusion—Reflections on Ethnic Studies

To summarize the main points of my reflections on Ethnic Studies, the history of Ethnic Studies is important to the field. The history of Ethnic Studies includes the past struggles and current struggles. Issues of race and ethnicity affect all people, not just minorities. We all live in this society that has been entrenched in these inequities and problems, and to think that because White people have not had to deal with much of this directly is a travesty. It affects all of us. In saying that, one way to make that practical is to find where we fit in the larger sociocultural—to truly explore our positionality.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I crafted narrative profiles for each of my participants. Each of the narratives were grounded in my research questions, which regarded 1) Experience and development of the field, 2) Implementation of the Field, 3) The Future of Ethnic Studies, and 4) Perspectives on Policy. In this summary of the narratives, my goal is to show some of their key points, which will be explored further in the next chapter.

Experience and Development in the Field
Some of the key points in the section on experience and development of the field were the unique and distinguishing features of each of the narratives. First of all, all of my participants stated that their formal education of their ethnicity and race was not in the classroom in both elementary and secondary school. So there technically was a lack of standardization in how they were taught about race and ethnicity. For example, Lomawaima discussed how she learned about her father’s ethnic background at home. Another example is from Darder who lived in a barrio in Los Angeles where various Latin American/Hispanic people were forced to live. A distinctive feature was their views on what it meant, both personally and in general, to have minority teachers in the classrooms. An example of this is from Darder as she discussed what it meant to her to have a minority teacher in the classroom. With the exception of Juan Mendoza, all of their formal educational experiences of race and ethnicity were while they were getting their PhD. They also learned through their own personal teaching experiences. An example of this comes both from Sleeter in her experiences teaching in Title 1 schools in Seattle, and from Halagao in her early years of teaching Sheltered English in Title 1 schools in Oakland. Another feature of this group is how they came to the United States and their unique ethnic backgrounds. For example, Nieto and Darder both immigrated from Puerto Rico, and were established on opposite sides of the country. Halagao was brought here as a baby, and was raised in northern California. Mendoza had the unique experience of being raised in both Oregon and Arizona, states that had very different large populations. Lomawaima has a unique heritage of Indigenous and German Mennonite cultures, and moved a lot while growing up which also influenced her
perspective in life. Another important topic to mention is the distinction Lomawaima (and the literature) makes between Native American/Indigenous studies and Ethnic Studies, in general. According to her (and the research), sovereignty is what distinguishes American Indians from other ethnic minority groups.

Another unique feature of this group is their socioeconomic backgrounds. The majority of them came from middle class backgrounds, but some of them had lower class backgrounds. Skin color and how it was a point of access to the “White” world as stated by Juan Mendoza. Something else that comes out of the narratives is the different generational experiences as a result of age differences. Geographical locations are another distinctive feature of the narratives. The geographical locations really set the historical stage of the sociocultural experiences of the participants as I already stated specific examples of this previously.

This specifically is a discussion of informal/out of school learning. Something that was not discussed in the interviews for the most part was the role mothers played in their learning about race and ethnicity, but the influence of their parents and community in general was discussed. Mendoza revealed that his mother (who was White) was a feminist and using those concepts she would remind him on how hurtful the things his friends would say. He also discussed how his father would tell him about the protests in Orange county and bought him Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed for Christmas. Darder’s mother’s experiences greatly influenced her perspective not only on race and ethnicity, but socioeconomics and the blatant policies of the government for the poor and disenfranchised. Nieto mentioned that her and her husband would bring their daughter out to the protests with them. Lomawaima mentioned that her father taught her about
Native American culture, and his own experiences with boarding school, and how much that impacted his family relationships constituted several lessons in and of themselves. She also stated that she moved with her family a lot growing up, and that is a unique cultural influence.

In contrast to the out of school experiences were the in-school experiences. For Darder it was first having a teacher of color, period. Again, it was a reminder of what she (and her classmates) could do with their lives. Nieto wanted to be a teacher her whole life. Mendoza got to experience Ethnic Studies throughout his educational experiences from helping to start a club in high school and to protesting on the front lawn in college. As an Ethnic Studies major he learned more of the formal history behind it all.

Overall, these were the distinctive patterns and features that came from the narratives about the experiences and development of the field. I will go into greater detail on these features and patterns in the next chapter. Again, the experiences and development of the field were put together as one for the narratives because it was impossible to disconnect them.

**Implementation of the Field**

The key points that were found in the discussion on the implementation of the field were that Ethnic Studies has a community foundation and a community struggle that cannot be divorced when talking about it. An example of this discussion comes from Darder as she stated that one of the problems for young researchers and higher education institutions in general is this disconnect and lack for understanding of what the fight of Ethnic Studies has been about. This leads to subtopics of community and struggle. Another point is the distinction between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education.
Another key topic that flowed between all the narratives was that Ethnic Studies is important to students of color for finding a sense of belonging but is vitally important for everyone in society to learn, especially when it comes to learning about people who come from different ethnic backgrounds than themselves. For example, Halagao stated that she didn’t really think about the value that her ethnicity brought to education until she was in college and really not until she was getting her PhD. An extremely important distinction was the difference between Ethnic Studies and Indigenous Studies. Though some of the pedagogical issues are similar and the same, the dimension of sovereignty puts Native Americans in a different category than other United States minorities. Finally, a key strand that cut across all the interviewees was the good and bad of the institutionalization of Ethnic Studies (and multicultural education as its offspring). One example of the institutionalization of Ethnic Studies comes from Lomawaima in her discussion of how many Ethnic Studies programs are “ghettoized” in the margins of institutions. A current example of this is has been the ongoing battle for funding for San Francisco State University’s Ethnic Studies department (Barba, 2016).

The Future of Ethnic Studies

After discussing how Ethnic Studies was (and is) implemented, we moved on to the future of Ethnic Studies—from the past to the future. There were several topics that came up in this conversation. First of all, current politics have created an unknown future for Ethnic Studies. Lomawaima, Darder, and Mendoza gave specific examples of that. Second, there is a desire for a “normalization” of Ethnic Studies. Halagao and Nieto discussed this and both stated critical multicultural education could be a vehicle for this. And, finally, the future depends on scholars continuing the work of Ethnic Studies
despite the continual struggles. The continued struggle was a subtheme of this topic. Darder gave an example of this. The themes and subthemes that came from the discussion about future of Ethnic Studies is elaborated further in the next chapter.

**Perspectives on Policy**

The final section of the narratives was perspectives on policy. One theme is how Ethnic Studies is impacted by the current politics. This took the conversation in multiple directions, including identity politics, academia and the pressures they put on new scholars regarding “good science versus irrelevant science” as Darder put it, and loss of the connection between the struggle and Ethnic Studies as it currently is. Many of my participants briefly discussed Common Core and No Child Left Behind policy implications. Examples of this came from Halagao and Mendoza. All of my participants mentioned both the banning of Ethnic Studies in Arizona and the different districts in California making Ethnic Studies a graduation requirement. For Indigenous Studies, Lomawaima discussed how the policies govern so much of everyday life of Native people. Mendoza said that Ethnic Studies needs to be scaled up on the policy level, and several other participants said similar things. Finally, there was a discussion about how Ethnic Studies benefits people of all races. This example was discussed specifically by all of my participants.

**Conclusion**

There were many topics discussed in the narratives. Using multiple coding methods helped to narrow and make obvious a few of them. The most important were the connection between Ethnic Studies and its historical foundation in civil rights struggles; its beginnings in being directly connected with the community and their struggles and
how that changed over time once it became institutionalized within the university; the
continued fight for legitimacy, value, and recognition; and the place of Ethnic Studies in
society as a whole.

Before moving on to the next section, I would like to briefly discuss what was
chosen to be included and excluded in the narratives. There was not much from the
interviews that was excluded from the stories presented here. We discussed how up the
2016 presidential election might affect Ethnic Studies. The other part that I have omitted
involved conversations about my own personal narrative and participants’ thoughts on
that. The reason this was excluded was because while there is great relevance to the topic
it did not seem directly relevant to the purpose of this study.

In the next chapter, I discuss the relationship with my theoretical framework of
SZT and Ethnic Studies and my coding methods in creating the codes and finding the
themes and subthemes. I also use more interview data that is not found in the narratives.
Finally, the chapter is written as a conversation between my research questions, my
literature, and myself.
CHAPTER 5
CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

The overall goal of this chapter is to discuss the interviews in relation to the research questions and the literature—to show how the interviews address the questions and how they are informed by the literature, in particular my theoretical framework of Safety Zone Theory (SZT). In addition, what was brought up that did not fit within the umbrella of SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) will be discussed. What was missing is as important as what was there. This chapter concludes with a summary of the main points, which leads into the final chapter that covers the synthesis, implications, and conclusion.

This is where my use of value coding, pattern coding, and line-by-line coding helped to derive the interpretations of this analysis. The line-by-line and pattern coding specifically, both by hand and using NVivo for Mac (2013) qualitative software, helped me to see more distinctly the similarities and the differences between each participant. Value coding created a way to both codify and distinguish individual themes. Something that must be pointed out is that the themes and categories discussed here can relate to more than one research question. The questions I used to group the themes and categories were chosen because I found them to be the most salient, and some of the topics will be explored in more than one question. In general, the themes and categories discussed here came about using my coding methods (see example in Appendix E).

This chapter addresses similarities and differences between the interviewees, as their responses address my specific research question and sub-questions and as they relate to my theoretical framework, SZT. I used Seidman’s (2013) interview protocol because it
addressed the three prongs of SZT: policy, practice, and experience. The research questions were organized to address those three areas, and then the interviews followed the same model (see Appendix D for the relationship between the research questions and the interview questions). The chapter is organized by the research questions, and the main question will be addressed at the conclusion because the answer is overarching and many pieces of it are addressed through the subquestions. The findings recapitulate overall findings leading to the synthesis, implications, and conclusion.

What Are These Scholars’ Understanding of Ethnic Studies as a Field of Study and Practice?

There are several topics being explored in this question—specifically, the origins of Ethnic Studies as understood by my participants, and situating those experiences into the broader sociohistorical timeline. I open with the retelling of the history of Ethnic Studies in the 1960s and exploration in the specific demands of the students’ protests at the time. In doing this, several subtopics are raised: 1) standardization, 2) minority teachers, and 3) the political nature of Ethnic Studies. The next few paragraphs go into greater detail on the different meanings of these subtopics. Topics that were raised that did not fit into the student protest of 1968 but are discussed in addition to the historical timeline of Ethnic Studies were 1) childhood, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds; 2) learning about race and ethnicity through teaching (their own teaching); and 3) community. These topics are introduced in this section briefly but are used as a link to the next question and are further elaborated on there. While other topics, such as the distinction between Native American/Indigenous studies and Ethnic Studies, the differences between multicultural education and Ethnic Studies, and the generational
differences of my participants, can fit under this question, I chose to put them under other categories. To help parse out some of the themes and categories, I use headings to guide the discussion. The overall understanding of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice is that it began as an academic discipline through the protests of the 1960s.

As stated in Chapter 2, Ethnic Studies had its origin in student protests of the 1960s, fueled by the Civil Rights Movement, but also all the different social movements at the time, such as the Chicano/a Movement, the American Indian Movement, and others (Banks, 2012a; Ravitch, 2000; Sleeter, 2011). All of the scholars interviewed agreed with the literature that asserts that Ethnic Studies began with the protests of 1968 simultaneously at UC Berkeley and San Francisco State University (Lye, 2010). My participants gave faces and names to the people of the 1960s and the by-product of their charge in the creation of Ethnic Studies. The demands that were made originally for Ethnic Studies in 1968 were for open admissions, because they believed that standardized testing created cultural biases in the college admissions process (Banks, 2009; Hu-DeHart, 1993; Lye, 2010). While open admissions and cultural biases of high stakes testing were not discussed during the interview, standardization of curriculum and the persistent achievement gap were.

**Standardization**

There are several ways to discuss the multiple meanings of standardization in regards to Ethnic Studies. Standardization can be discussed as the standards that curriculum is created around and seeks to fulfill (McCarty & Anderson, 2013). In terms of Ethnic Studies, it can be discussed as a new phenomenon; still, thus far, there has not been a need for standards in Ethnic Studies. The other side of that is the lack of a
standard system of teaching Ethnic Studies. My participants mentioned several policies regarding standardization, such as No Child Left Behind, Common Core, new multicultural education textbooks designed to help teachers “put culture” into their classrooms, and teacher education requirements. Standardization is important to the conversation of Ethnic Studies as more and more schools make it a graduation requirement, such as the different school districts in California and other parts of the United States. They have to create some standardization to measure the curriculum. Christine Sleeter has been a part of the curriculum development in California. McCarty and Anderson-Levitt (2013) discuss where ethnicity and culture are located in the Common Core standards—primarily in English and History. They also discuss how the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) created a framework to respond to topics missed within the Common Core standards. According to Mendoza, “Standardization is the antithesis of Ethnic Studies. That is, Ethnic Studies has to be locally defined in terms of what people are offered.” This agreed with Sleeter’s assertion that standardization makes curriculum and material the same, and both can run into conflict with local histories as well as individual ethnic and cultural histories (Sleeter, 2005). In her interview, Nieto linked this concept of standards with goals of the curriculum. She stated:

It’s a two-edge sword because standardization can lead to everybody saying the same thing, thinking the same thing. Or it can lead to some sort of higher standards. It really depends. I’m a little afraid of standardization if it means that everybody follows the same exact curriculum, same materials. I think that it also leaves out a lot of creativity on the part of teachers. Not to mention authority. I think it’s a two edge sword.
Darder stated it this way:

The most impoverished, how could those be left off the table in terms of ethnic studies? Education, how can we leave policies related to standards of testing off the table with respect to their impact in terms of assimilative curriculum and assimilative discourses within education that attempt to strip our children of any real sense of history and their culture and language?

Halagao stated similarly to Nieto that she sees standards more as “guidelines” than being “prescriptive.” She went on to say that, “They’re kind of a minimum [set of guideline] in some sense that every teacher needs, but teachers need to be about exceeding standards not meeting standards. It can serve as a barrier [in this sense].” According to her, standards can be a way of setting the bar for teachers.

The statements made by Mendoza, Darder, and Sleeter (Sleeter, 2005) touched upon the importance of the local and community to Ethnic Studies. This is a topic that is elaborated upon in another section. Sleeter stated (during the interview):

The whole Common Core stuff and No Child Left Behind, that all completely pulled the attention away from efforts to develop multicultural curriculum. It just completely supplanted what had been happening before. Teacher ed requirements try to build diversity in, but I think most of the time it’s more of an add-on.

This is in reference to Bank’s (2003) perspectives of multicultural education. The base level is the additive approach—to insert culture into lessons in a very safe and non-threatening way, such having a Cinco de Mayo food celebration or eating Irish food for St. Patrick’s Day or only discussing major African Americans in history during Black History Month. This also is discussed in my conceptual framework of SZT. Sleeter also
stated that because there is no requirement for Ethnic Studies in schools there have been good Ethnic Studies and multicultural textbooks that have come and gone mainly because they didn’t sell enough due to the emphasis on Common Core and standardized curriculums. She continued and said, “You have wonderful classic texts that endure, but you also have a whole lot of stuff that goes by the wayside, gets forgotten, and then people are starting learning at the beginning, because it’s not well institutionalized in education.”

Lomawaima took a different perspective on standardization in relation to Native American Studies and Ethnic Studies respectively. Lomawaima had a very unique perspective. She defined standardized curriculum as Common Core operating on the K-12th grade levels. She classified American Indian/Indigenous Studies as a research field operating and existing on the higher education level and in scholarly publications. She believed that because “these levels (unfortunately, perhaps) do not overlap or intersect much.” She continued to say that the Common Core:

has not had much influence on the developments in Indigenous Studies.

Indigenous Studies—as an intellectual arena—is not much influenced by the kind of standardization you are referring to [“influenced” in the sense of setting research questions or agenda] … Indigenous Studies scholars are concerned about standardization issues, and the broader issues of whether educational curricula attend to Indigenous peoples or issues at all, or in meaningful, contemporary settings.
Minority Teachers of Ethnic Studies and in General

Finally, participants affirmed that these programs were best taught by minority teachers (Lye, 2010). This topic went in three different directions through my interviews. First, Darder and Nieto, who were in the university in the 1960s and 1970s, expressed how important it was to them to see instructors who looked like them for the first time in their lives. Repeating a quote from the narratives, Darder stated:

The importance of minority teachers was that they brought a sense of connection, understanding, and their experiences of survival with them. I think that what these teachers brought, just by the way they were, just through the very nature of their survival, especially, as I think about in the ’50s and early ’60s in Los Angeles. For them to have survived and to be able to be teaching meant that they came with that dimension to their character and to their being, which in many ways, whether they thought about it or not, they brought to teaching kids of color.

“Experiences of survival”: To her they were successful professionals, and they gave hope to her own success. Chikkatur (2013) discussed this idea in current times in teaching Ethnic Studies. It was while Nieto was teaching that she came to the realization that there were not only teachers, but also doctors and journalists and many others fighting to make a difference in the community. She stated:

Here I was in the Puerto Rican Studies Department, and sometimes it would bring tears to my eyes when we would go to an activity and we’d see a dance group. I thought, wow I never knew that existed. Or I would read one of the seminal pieces of literature in Puerto Rican Studies, a series of sketches, literary sketches called A Puerto Rican in New York in and of the Sketches by Jesus Colon. I’ve
read those and I would get tears in my eyes because it was about, he was a newspaper reporter and writing things about Puerto Ricans. They had started writing in the 1920s, and so this was a compilation to the 1950s of his previous articles in from his newspaper. I would think, wow I never heard of any of this stuff. I never saw it.

Just to think that there were organizations that were working on behalf of the community and that there were people who made a difference in my community, we never heard that. There weren’t too many teachers, but apparently there were some teachers. There were some doctors. There were people who were fighting for the community, and too many organizations that were fighting for the community that we had never heard of them.

Nieto’s statement touches upon the topics of community and struggles. I will elaborate on this in another question.

Lomawaima and Mendoza took a different perspective on this topic and spoke about how there was more to it than just having instructors of color in the classroom. This took the topic in a separate direction with a discussion about teachers in general and teachers teaching Ethnic Studies. Lomawaima stated:

Linking how Indigenous Studies has been taught with the future of it, there is a need to realize that it takes more than being of a certain race or ethnicity to teach it. While having minority professors and instructors is very important in providing role models for students of that particular background, there is a need for more than that. There is a need for understanding the intellectual value of Indigenous Studies and how it can contribute to multiple aspects of human society.
environment, or whatever the topic of study might be. This is what we within the field push towards. And yes, it has changed over time, but there is still work to be done.

She admitted the importance of having minority professors and instructors as role models for minority students, but she also emphasized the need for more linking the intellectual value of Indigenous Studies with wider societal place. Adding to this frame of reference, regarding the instructors who were teaching the Ethnic Studies courses in Tucson that were banned, Mendoza stated:

We need to fully acknowledge that teaching ethnic studies is a skill, and it’s a very, very difficult skill to work on because the way that it was manifested in Tucson—first of all, you had just amazing teachers with the understanding of basic pedagogical practice, classroom management, things like that. That’s one skillset already taken care of. Then they had the knowledge of an Ethnic Studies approach to their specific area. They have to know the area, whether it’s literature, government, history. Basically, they had to be excellent instructors. They had to know the Ethnic Studies, the Chicano studies component of it, and they had to know this. Then they had to also use their position as teacher as a way of facilitating both a dialogue and a bridge from the community into the classroom.

He identified several different points about the complexities of teaching Ethnic Studies that were similar to Lomawaima’s discussion of the needs of teaching Indigenous Studies. He also touched upon the wider societal and disciplinary linkages between Ethnic Studies and other academic disciplines. And finally, he, like Nieto, made a link between Ethnic Studies and the community.
Instructors of color weren’t within the discussion with Halagao directly because she didn’t have any Filipino instructors until she was working on her PhD. It was during that that she felt the impact of the classes about race and ethnicity had on her and how Ethnic Studies gave her a sense of belonging and a new understanding and value of her ethnic background. She had the opportunity to take classes from Dorothy and Fred Cordova, and it impacted her view of what Filipinos brought to United States history. Her background in multicultural education and her life experiences caused her to focus more on the linkages between issues of minority and race, with both minorities and non-minorities alike. And for Sleeter, it was an integral part of her teaching experience as the chair of a Multicultural Education department. Until her appointment at Ripon College and then the University of Wisconsin, she didn’t see herself as having a role in Ethnic Studies as a White person. She stated:

Then I became the interim director for a year of Ethnic Studies. That was really interesting because then I had to start thinking more intentionally about the curriculum. Another professor and I had worked out a framework for the curriculum. It was interesting also because he came from more of a Black Studies background, and I came from my Teacher Education background. The fact that we were thinking about the curriculum similarly and what the themes would be, the threads would be, what the courses needed to be, then it was like, “Okay, I guess I maybe wasn’t giving myself enough credit for having some idea of what I was doing.”

She took the conversation in another direction on the importance of the historical foundation of Ethnic Studies. Again this is dissected further in another question.
The Political Nature of Ethnic Studies

My interviewees all affirmed that Ethnic Studies began in a highly politicized and contested way (Banks, 2009; Hu-DeHart, 1993; Lye, 2010). It could be because of these origins that Ethnic Studies is categorized as threatening the status quo and needs to be proscribed in conservative political environments, such as Arizona (A.R.S. §15–112; Zubrzycki, 2016). This was a part of all of the conversations with the interviewees. Halagao said, “Ethnic Studies has a political bent to it—both historical and political.” She said this as she was distinguishing the difference between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education (this distinction is disserted further in my third question). Lomawaima said, “Indigenous Studies, programs, or centers or departments—whatever form they might take—are perceived as being much more politically situated than let’s say a chemistry department or a math department.”

Darder stated:

Ethnic Studies itself and multicultural education actually has its roots in a community foundation, community struggle. Both of those have areas of study actually arise out of Civil Rights struggles. They can’t be separated historically. But what happens over the years in each of those areas has a lot to do with people entering into the academy, then ways in which folks would learn the language, then the teaching of students was more of teaching the theory of it or the language of it. Then these students would learn this language but have no experience in relationship to revolutionary change or political transformation or any real involvement in the deeper community struggles from whence Ethnic Studies and multicultural education emerge.
She raised several sub-topics in this conversation. She discussed Ethnic Studies and multicultural education as having the same foundation in the community and in the struggles of community. She also stated that part of the problem of academia is trying to teach students the ideas, the language, and the theory behind Ethnic Studies and multicultural education without the students having any experience in relationship to the struggles that they came from. Sleeter stated that she believes four key lessons to be learned through and about Ethnic Studies are:

The history (understanding that the institutionalization of racism within the United States), social movements (how they have worked, how people have organized them, the differences made, and the on-going struggle), the arts (helps to make the tough issues and topics easier to understand and swallow), and for White students to understand their own backgrounds.

Nieto had different but similar thoughts on this:

The issue of counterstory is huge, because it means the history books are written by the winners, not by the losers. Puerto Ricans often been on the losing side of history. Most history books in the United States don’t say, for example, Puerto Ricans, they say that Puerto Ricans were, quote, granted citizenship in 1917. But they don’t say that the two Houses, the two elected Houses of government in Puerto Rico voted against citizenship. They don’t say that. Those stories are important to get out.”

This is different from Sleeter’s comments in that it is specifically about Puerto Ricans and their history, but in general is it an agreement. Sleeter spoke from her own background including the idea of where White students’ perspective fit in this larger
sociocultural context. Counterstories, as she said, aren’t popular, and right now with the current political climate in the United States, the struggle of legitimacy and value still exist. Counterstories by definition are stories that oppose the dominant story being told (Yosso, 2006). That is one of the primary goals of Ethnic Studies to tell those counterstories. Mendoza stated:

My generation was one of the last ones to really have a strong connection to the Civil Rights Movement in a sense that even mine and my friends’ parents weren’t directly involved. They could talk about it, and it was part of the collective consciousness. The people who I worked with a generation later, their parents came up in the late ’70s, and it was more of an idea as opposed to pragmatic reality. Then with everything that happened post 9/11, incredible regressive politics and racism really rearing its ugly head with the Obama Administration and so much amazing activism going on contemporarily whether it’s Black Lives Matters, the Dream Defenders, United We Dream, locally Scholarships A to Z. Just a ton of amazing dedicated people out there and much led by youth movement again.

We’re seeing change happening and people going back and revisiting. I think one of the cool things that’s happening right now, and I’ve had some discussions with activists from the ’60s, is that especially from an intersectional paradigm, we have the potential to be better and do more impactful work today than back then.

He makes reference to the generational differences and experiences that are the whole objective of this study, creating a quilt with patches through time, geography, and
culture. Though the politics have changed, there is still a connection from the origins of Ethnic Studies and what it is presently.

The next section will be a discussion of how my interviewees experienced the development of the field in their own lives and overall in general. Some specific things that influence that is their informal and formal Ethnic Studies backgrounds, their disciplinary differences, their age differences, and the opportunities that were given to them as they taught over time.

**Final Thoughts on the Understanding of Ethnic Studies as a Field and Practice**

One of the original thoughts in starting this project was that childhood and socio-economic background had an influence in the understanding of the Ethnic Studies and its practice. Five of the six participants had not taken a formal Ethnic Studies course from kindergarten through undergraduate school. At the same time, five out of the six participants learned at home about their sociocultural background. This leads me to my next question on how each of my participants experienced the development of the field in their own way. The research showed that Ethnic Studies was viewed as multidisciplinary and varied depending on the location of it taking place. My participants and their varying fields validated this assumption and made clear why this was an important part of Ethnic Studies.

Darder and Lomawaima used the term neoliberal to describe the current anti-Ethnic Studies politics. Neoliberalism is a political ideology centered on deregularization in society resulting in the promotion of more privatization as a way to maximize profit and lower government spending. An example from education is the privatization of
schools and the creation and promotion of publicly funded yet often elite and segregated charter schools.

One final theme that came out of the discussion regarding the participants’ understanding of Ethnic Studies as a field and practice was a conversation on their scholarly influences within the field, which led to a discussion of the different professional groups that they were a part of and helped established. An extension of this was the importance and value in their current practices of the different branches of Ethnic Studies (and related fields) that each of my participants have gained support through colleagues. All interviewees mentioned the value and belonging that came through working with and around fellow researchers, as well as the encouragement it brings to have young scholars “pick up the baton” and take the scholarship to new places. This leads to my next question, where I will go into further detail regarding my participants’ experience of and roles within the development of the field.

**How Have They Experienced the Development of the Field?**

What stood out most with this question from the data was the different experiences that my participants had based on the generational differences. Another strand that stood out was the relationships that these scholars had with prominent mentors within the field.

**Generational Development of the Field**

In this section, I explore how these participants both experienced the development of the field and influenced that development. For organizational purposes in section excerpts from narratives will be generally listed based on periods of in which each participant became involved with Ethnic Studies. This is the most logical way to discuss
Ethnic Studies as it has developed over time. The order is Sonia Nieto, Christine Sleeter, Antonia Darder, Tsianina Lomawaima, Patricia Halagao, and, finally, Juan Mendoza.

**Sonia Nieto.** Sonia Nieto and her husband, Angel Nieto, participated in the protests for Puerto Rican Studies in the 1960s in New York. Through her teacher education training, she taught at one of the first bilingual schools in the United States, located in Brooklyn. Lessons of ethnicity and culture naturally became a part of her school lessons. She said:

As soon as I started teaching, I saw that something was missing. Here I was teaching African American and Puerto Rican kids, and there was nothing about that in the curriculum. And so, little by little, I started to...they call it teacher radar, and you sort of know what needs to happen. I started to incorporate some things into the curriculum. I was slowly becoming a multicultural teacher even though I didn’t have the words for it yet. I wanted to mention that because the kids changed how I thought about everything too and my intro to Ethnic Studies.

While she was teaching, she was working on her master’s degree at New York University, where she took her first formal Puerto Rican Studies class. Later, her faculty appointment was at Brooklyn College (which is a part of the City University of New York) in both the School of Education and Ethnic Studies in the 1968. “The whole field, when I was in the Puerto Rican Studies Department, that was 1972 to 1975, it’s just trying to get, not only recognition and acceptance, but credibility. That was hard.” It was also during this time that the department of Puerto Rican Studies helped to establish the Center for Puerto Ricans Studies (the Centro) at Hunter College. Professor Nieto went on to say:
One of the things that made it hard was that it didn’t have a track record like philosophy, political science, or one of the other disciplines. It’s not a discipline; it’s an interdisciplinary field that feeds a lot of different areas. It didn’t have the credibility; it didn’t have the track record. Even if you looked, there were eight of us faculty in the Department of Puerto Rican Studies when I was there, four of us did not have doctorates.

She was a part of getting the department of Puerto Rican Studies established within Brooklyn College, which still exists. At the same time, she was one of the founding members of the Puerto Rican Association, which has a conference every two years and a scholarly journal.

Christine Sleeter. Generationally, Sleeter represents the tail end of the generation of Nieto. She studied under James Banks, Geneva Gay, and Carl Grant—all of whom were leaders in the field as it was emerging. What distinguishes Christine Sleeter from other participants is the fact that both her parents are White, and the fact that she grew up in a White middle-class neighborhood in Medford, Oregon. It was when she started teaching in an urban school in Seattle that she realized there was so much she didn’t know or had experienced about ethnicity and race, and even her teaching program didn’t offer a class to deal with issues of race and ethnicity in the classroom. She stated:

I hadn’t really thought about, actually growing up, race, ethnicity, within the U.S. in any substantive kind of way until I trained as a teacher to teach in Seattle. The only substantive thing that I’d done before that was spend a summer in Japan, which isn’t the same, but it actually helped dislocate me out of the environment that I grew up in, put me in somebody else’s environment where I didn’t know
anything and had to learn how to learn from the people around me and be in a minority and all of that.

One observation that she made was the lack of any cultural-based course for a teaching degree in the inner city. When she was getting her master’s and finishing off the courses to get her teaching certification at the University of Washington, she took a course taught by James Banks (though it was really taught by one of his students) on teaching inner-city children. At that time, it was listed as a Black Studies course, but content wise she didn’t consider it a truly Ethnic Studies course. She didn’t take any formal Ethnic Studies classes until she was in her PhD, and they were cross-listed with other subjects, such as Women’s Studies. She got into multicultural education as this “second” wave or developmental evolution of Ethnic Studies (Banks, 1995). Her first African American studies class (that was not cross-listed) was after her appointment as a professor in multicultural education, and she was a part of getting an Ethnic Studies department started at the university. She was on sabbatical and decided to take a class. She was the only non-traditional student and White person among the rest of the class who were African American college-aged students. She said about the class:

That was fun. I got the books and read them. I didn’t have to write the papers, but I participated in other ways. That’s probably the main actual, formal ethnic studies class that I’ve ever actually had. It was that experience of both sharing the department and becoming real directly engaged with the department and then with other folks in Ethnic Studies around the state that I started seeing where I actually have more of a home in Ethnic Studies than I had been aware of before that.
Over the years she was one of the co-founders of the National Association of Multicultural Education (NAME), and she has worked with educators throughout the state of Wisconsin in getting multicultural education implemented within the curriculum. Though she is retired currently, she has still been working with the California chapter of NAME and getting the Ethnic Studies curriculum started there.

Antonia Darder. Darder’s mother took her family to the mainland United States as a result of Operation Bootstrap,\textsuperscript{22} which was an economic social push to improve the economy of Puerto Rico and the United States. They forced Puerto Ricans to migrate to the mainland United States, they sterilized the women for populations control, and it overall was a dim time in modern United States colonization. Being from Puerto Rico, Darder stated that she had a very mixed ethnic heritage. It was important to her to see minorities as teachers; this helped her realize that she wasn’t alone in her struggle, as she put it, “for survival.”

This brings up the point that Ethnic Studies is more for minority students than non-minority students. While I believe there is a place for minority students within Ethnic Studies that can give them a sense of belonging, I also believe that Ethnic Studies is for non-minorities too. It is a place to allow them to learn about cultural backgrounds and ethnicities that are different than themselves.

Darder’s initial focus was on mental health and education; she later received her PhD in education. It is impossible to separate the personal experience of race and racism

\textsuperscript{22} See Operation Bootstrap (2016).
when teaching these concepts. It makes the curriculum more than memorizing a book.

She went on to say:

My life vocation is this deeper work in relationship to overcoming oppression, racism, all of the forms in all its manifestations and struggling to bring a discourse that asks people to question the structures, to question the attitudes, to question how they think about the world and understand how we think about the world is directly related to what we do in the world.

She taught Ethnic Studies classes. Darder also points out the importance of learning to take action with the lessons being taught (and learned), not just limiting the curriculum to the classroom. It didn’t start out like that, and for it to continue and lose its purpose, it must continue with the link between curriculum and action, which as already stated takes place within the community. She also said:

As students start to learn and as knowledge becomes something that is truly interesting, not something that is divorced of them, students respond in very different ways. It brings them to a place of wanting to take action, which is exactly what Ethnic Studies was supposed to be about. It was not just supposed to be a scholarly field of study.

K. Tsianina Lomawaima. Lomawaima came from a working class family. Her father was part Muskogee/Creek, and her mother was White, and she moved a lot with her family growing up. Lomawaima was an Anthropology major at Stanford. When she joined the faculty at the University of Washington in the Anthropology Department, she assumed an administrative position linked to American Indian Studies. It was this administrative structure that facilitated her direct involvement in American Indian Studies
through teaching an Intro to American Indian Studies course. But it was her next position at the University of Arizona, in which her primary appointment was in American Indian Studies rather than anthropology, that she focused specifically on American Indian Studies and Indigenous Studies more broadly. Over the course of her career, she became one of the founding members of NAISA (Native and Indigenous Studies Association). This is one of the first professional associations of its kind that brought international multidisciplinary fields together around a Native and Indigenous Studies focus. It is a place to see how others were (and are) studying and applying their research.

Another part of her experience in the development of the field was the distinction between Ethnic Studies and American Indian Studies. Focusing on her definition of Ethnic Studies versus Indigenous Studies was one of the first parts of the discussion with her. She also distinguishes the difference between Indigenous Studies and American Indian Studies. Indigenous Studies is the broader of the two that brings together Native/Indigenous people in their stories of struggle and sovereignty in their respected parts of the world. She also discussed how settler-colonialism is a huge part of American Indian Studies. Her words were:

The position of Indigenous peoples is in some ways similar, but in some really fundamental ways very different than so-called ethnic minorities within the population of the U.S. as a nation. We have Native nations that predate the U.S., that predate interaction with various European nations. Peoples with inherent sovereignty then engage in government-to-government, sovereign-to-sovereign relations with Britain and France and Holland and Russia and all the rest and then at some point, at a particular point in time, U.S. and Canada and Mexico.
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That political sovereignty then is absolutely fundamental and core to our existence and the meaning of our existence, as well as the means of our existence. What gets played out in the classroom pedagogically or in the studies program is in some ways, like I say, it’s linked to other so-called Ethnic Studies like African American Studies, Asian American Studies, etc.

It also has this very different foundation of existence as sovereign nations, which puts Native nations on a very different footing vis-a-vis the U.S. as a nation and its own nation-building trajectory of development. It’s why in many places contemporarily in university structures or institutions you see American Indian, Native American Indigenous Studies, First Nations in Canada, whatever the name is. They’re sometimes structurally administratively linked with other ethnic studies groups and very often not. That was in many places a very conscious set of decisions.

This distinction both shows why Lomawaima’s account is so important to this research on Ethnic Studies, and why at the same time there are important differences between Native American and Ethnic Studies. She continued:

…there’s certainly some shared goals in contributing to curriculum, contributing to education of a diverse student population within universities. People have, I think, correctly seen it as a dangerous thing actually for Native Studies to be lumped into Ethnic Studies because it is a way of very actively erasing, denying, marginalizing, whatever the particular sovereignty that’s at stake for Native nations.
Native nations have an extremely small population within the United States; they make up about 9.7% of the population in the 2010 census (U.S. Census, 2016). These statistics support the concerns stated by Lomawaima.

**Patricia Halagao.** Halagao came from a middle class Filipino American background. Her parents moved here as a result of martial law in the Philippines, and the United States was recruiting professional immigrants to come in the 1970s. She too was in the “second” (or even “third”) wave of Ethnic Studies focusing in multicultural education similar to Sleeter. She received her PhD at the University of Washington and studied under Geneva Gay, James Banks, and Walter Parker. She lived in the first purposeful multicultural dorm at Occidental College in Los Angeles. As her first teaching job, she taught Sheltered English to multiple immigrant children for whom English was their second language. For her, multicultural education was the introduction to issues of race and ethnicity. She said many of the classes she took were more focused on issues of Blacks and Hispanics, but she could see the correlation between those issues and Filipino issues. For her these classes had value and helped her to understand the Filipino culture in a new way as it applied to herself and others. She stated:

I guess I had thought broadly in terms of even other ethnic groups in some ways until I had the space and the time to kind of really research my own. It’s not like Filipino American studies at that time was very prevalent. I made it a point after kind of learning fundamentals in terms of multicultural education to really pursue learning more about my own history and then created a program called Pinoy Teach.
Based on her master’s thesis, she began the Pinoy Teach program in a few schools in Seattle and Bellevue, Washington. They taught Filipino studies and concepts of multicultural education to preservice teachers who in turned brought these concepts into their classrooms. Something significant to note is that the students in these schools were not of Filipino descent, but the principles crossed over cultural lines. She stated:

The idea was, all these students after they take these ethnic studies courses, what do they do with their knowledge? Being in the field of education, I thought we need to create some kind of pedagogy where you harness their enthusiasm and their knowledge and their passion and put them into classrooms and teach ethnic studies. I characterize it more as multicultural education because to me it’s important seeing the connections across different cultures, but then my orientation is rooted in my Filipino lens. I would say, as I started to figure out in my field of education, how to apply all of this, that’s where the Filipino American Studies, multicultural curriculum started coming out.

Currently she is on the Hawai’i Board of Education working with policy, teacher education, and her knowledge of race and ethnicity through Filipino Studies. She points out that since she started in the field Filipino Studies has been added as a Special Interest Groups within the American Education Research Association (AERA). Having a professional organization acknowledge them was very important to her and, similar to the rest of my participants, gave a sense of validity and community to the culture. She, like Sleeter, came into the field from the multicultural education perspective, but she made the connections between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education as different as they are. That connection to Ethnic Studies should be in multicultural education.
Juan Mendoza. The final participant, Juan Mendoza, was an Ethnic Studies major as an undergraduate at a university in northern California. He has an ethnically mixed background. His father is Mexican American and part Native and his mother is White. His parents divorced when he was a child and he grew up in rural Oregon during the school year and Arizona in the summers. He learned at a very early age that race mattered because many of his friends would ascribe honorary Whiteness and would say very racist things in his presence (Hill Collins, 2009). Something that is specific about him is where he fits generationally. He said:

My generation was one of the last ones to really have a strong connection to the Civil Rights Movement in a sense that even though me and my friends’ parents weren’t directly involved, they could talk about it; it was part of the collective consciousness. The people who I worked with a generation later, their parents came up in the late ’70s, and it was more of an idea as opposed to pragmatic reality. Then with everything that happened post 9/11, incredible regressive politics and racism really reared its ugly head with the Obama Administration, and so much amazing is activism going on contemporarily, whether it’s Black Lives Matters, the Dream Defenders, United We Dream, local Scholarships A to Z. Just a ton of amazing dedicated people out there and much led by youth movement again.

We’re seeing change happening and people going back and revisiting. I think one of the cool things that’s happening right now, and I’ve had some discussions with activists from the ’60s, is that especially from an intersectional
paradigm, we have the potential to be better and do more impactful work today than back then.

The significance here was that his connection to the Civil Rights Movement is through his parents (as is my own). This is connected to what all my participants have emphasized in questioning how Ethnic Studies will survive without direct connection to the struggles and fight of the time when it was created.

Mendoza spoke of his freshman year of college when they tried to disband the Ethnic Studies program at the University of California Berkeley, which was the nation’s longest running Ethnic Studies program at the time. He expressed excitement for the classes he took in college, he went on discuss how later through graduate school where his focus was education he realized that he had a desire to position Whiteness and White privilege. He stated this about Ethnic Studies and his position in the field:

In higher ed, the scholarship, there was a vein in the early to mid ’90s, analyses of the campus and college, and a lot of those analyses took the form of looking at the physical infrastructure of the campus and understanding what messages those conveyed to the students. It’s weird really because now I’m taking it from a likeness perspective. That’s actually part of the reason why I don’t consider myself part of Ethnic Studies because the more that I center Whiteness and Ethnic Studies, the more that I recenter privilege. For this I need to make a very clear distinction for it that this was a space that was created for this kind of work and I’m over here.

This cuts to a core argument I am making in this study—that there is a place for Whiteness in relation to Ethnic Studies, and that it’s not a completely separate entity.
Final Thoughts on the Development of the Field

This section is similar to the in-case analysis, but the focus is on how generational differences impacted the way the participants experienced Ethnic Studies. You have the first generation who is participating in the Civil Rights Movement in their unique areas of the United States and in their own unique ways. Then there is the 1.5 to 2nd generation who studied under the professors who gave meaning to Ethnic Studies and multicultural education. These mentoring professors were around the same age range as the first generation, and these 1.5 to 2nd generation took and applied what they learned in so many different ways. One of the primary ways was to link Ethnic Studies to its original mandate while adapting for the societal changes that created a need for a broader focus. Then you have the 3rd generation wave dealing with the aftermath of politics, institutionalization of Ethnic Studies, and multiple new affronts. The next generation is being trained now and is doing things where they are. Ethnic Studies is difficult to map because it is so interconnected with the local community, which guides into the next question.

What Are Their Observations of How Ethnic Studies Has Been Implemented in U.S. Public Schools?

Focusing on the implementation of Ethnic Studies in U.S. public schools, several themes emerged from the data. First, there is not of U.S. public schools with full-blown Ethnic Studies programs. Because of this, the focus for my participants was first on the banning of Ethnic Studies in Arizona and then on the opposite response of the California and individual school districts that are making it a high school graduation requirement within the next few years and the historical core of Ethnic Studies. Other key
conversations were the differences between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education and how Ethnic Studies and teaching issues of race and ethnicity should not be limited to only minority students. The issues and topics affect all people, and they intersect what multiple social issues and topics.

Arizona and California

My participants focused on how Ethnic Studies was practiced in U.S. schools by talking about the situation with Tucson and the state of Arizona. California was mentioned for what they are doing, but much of California is just starting to add Ethnic Studies to the curriculum in the last two to three years whereas Tucson actually had the program for a long time until the Arizona state government banned it in public and charter schools throughout the state (A.R.S. §15–112, 2013). Darder said:

The Ethnic Studies program in Tucson in the high school, what they were trying to do is to precisely bring back that very lived experience in a much more organic way, to teach in a much more organic way, where students were connected to the knowledge that they were constructing, connected to their histories and that they began to understand that their current conditions were absolutely linked to a long trajectory of oppression, of racial eyes and economic oppression that had informed who they were today.

The program in Tucson was one of the largest in the United States before the ban. Arizona creating this ban is significant because it really reinforces a political division and even ideology that didn’t exist in the same way during Ethnic Studies’ inception in the 1960s. There were touches of it there, but not in the way it has been created in recent years. Mendoza went on to state:
From its inception, sedition has been illegal in this country. That’s a completely unnecessary component of the law. Why do they have it in there? Because they’re engaging in a public discourse, not a political one. They’re trying to say that Ethnic Studies is necessarily anti-American, and that’s actually the most radical viewpoint on the issue. You have to treat everyone as an individual. Well you know what, people aren’t treated as individuals. People are judged based upon their skin color, and it creates an inequitable opportunity structure.

In other words, to ignore the history that created our society makes it is impossible to face the reality of what society has become. As stated in the literature review, current events, such as police brutality, protests at universities over racist actions, and most recently different cities in the South getting resistance in tearing down Confederate symbols, are all signs that the racial history of the United States is a reality and really cannot be ignored or even considered only for minorities (Pompilio, 2016). Sleeter stated:

I developed a relationship with the Tucson folks in 2005. They had Augustine Romero, and Julio [Cammarota] and met with me in probably about maybe 2005 or something like that, yeah, 2005, at AERA [spell out], to see if I would be an okay speaker for their summer institute. Then they invited me to the summer institute, and it was there that I got to really see what they were doing with Ethnic Studies at the K-12 level. I was really excited because even though I’d seen little bits and pieces of things, I hadn’t seen that actual full-blown Ethnic Studies program in K-12 anywhere.

Halagao spoke to what has been happening in Hawai‘i. She said:
There’s been several policies that focus on Hawai‘ian education and Hawai‘ian immersion, which is a form of Ethnic Studies, in many ways, to indigenous Ethnic Studies I guess you could say. There has been more of a focus on integrating Hawai‘ian as a host culture as foundational to our schools. There’s some policies in that arena which has opened the door, I think, for other ethnic groups.

Nieto, being retired, made a generalized statement about the current situation in Tucson, but this led to later conversation about expanding Ethnic Studies as a curriculum and knowledge for everyone and the differences between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education. She stated:

I think that’s the benefit of Ethnic Studies for everybody. It opens up our minds, our perspectives. It doesn’t close our minds like some people have said with the Ethnic Studies program, which is really the Mexican American Studies program in Tucson. They say that the kids come back closed minded. I say, “I don’t think so. I think they come back open minded because they are given a different way of looking at the world.” It’s their world, but also it hopefully adds other perspectives, which is what I think is what multicultural education does. It really opens your mind.

Both Halagao and Nieto’s statements lead to the next section on the differences and similarities of Ethnic Studies and multicultural education.

**Ethnic Studies and Multicultural Education**

One way that Ethnic Studies has been implemented in U.S. public schools is through multicultural education. As discussed in the literature review, multicultural education is an evolutionary descendent of Ethnic Studies (Banks, 1991; Giroux, 2000;
Grant, 2011; Grant & Tate, 1995; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). All of my participants clearly distinguished the differences between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education and had much to say about it. When referring to multicultural education, I am referring to those overlapping concepts. Again, as stated in the literature review, multicultural education and Ethnic Studies is like a Venn diagram. Ethnic Studies is one side and multicultural education is on the other. When I say Ethnic Studies is implemented as multicultural education, it is that middle section where the issues are the same. All of my participants agreed that for multicultural education to be effective, it must have an Ethnic Studies core or foundation. In saying that, several of them emphasized the need for multicultural education to be critical in nature, that to have anything but that is not true to its foundation. Halagao distinguished them in this way:

Whereas Ethnic Studies, it goes deeper into particular ethnic groups. Multicultural education also focuses not just on ethnicity, but all aspects on the intersectionality of race, ethnicities, class, gender. In Ethnic Studies, the orientation maybe is not to look at that necessarily as deeply [into the areas of intersectionality].

She continued in saying:

Ethnic Studies definitely has more of a political bent, a very historical and political bent and has dealt a lot with content, which I think is important. Multicultural education, I think, tries to incorporate both content as well as pedagogy and how you bring in issues around diversity into the classroom like the skills and values and knowledge. There’s a different range in multicultural education itself too in terms of being more of a superficial approach to culture to the more critical approach to culture.
All of my participants agreed that multicultural education in practice needed to be linked not only to more current social issues, but also issues of race and diversity and inequality in real ways. Darder went on to say, “Multicultural education tries to incorporate both content as well as pedagogy and how you bring in issues around diversity into the classroom like the skills and values and knowledge.” Multicultural education focuses on how the curriculum is taught more so than the classes individually (Bank, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 2009). So multicultural education can be incorporated into non-ethnic and race-specific designated classes. This is why my participants emphasized the importance of how multicultural education curriculum is taught. Sleeter said:

When I think about multicultural education, and especially when I think about it in terms of how your head is oriented, how your curriculum is oriented, I think about it as having an Ethnic Studies core, an Ethnic Studies base to it. If it doesn’t address the core issues in Ethnic Studies, then it’s missing the boat.

Mendoza elaborated further in saying:

I do want to be very clear that when I have colleagues and friends who are using the term critical multiculturalism, that that has a very specific meaning that centers inequality, oppression, social stratification, in the analysis along the lines of a multicultural future. There’s a difference between that specific terminology. And the way that multiculturalism is practiced is almost a form of cultural tokenism, and the cultural tokenism component just doesn’t work. It makes everybody frustrated because you have people trying to teach what they don’t know. And it’s trying to get the trivia into kids heads that they don’t care about because it doesn’t have any bearings on their lives.
Nieto agreed with other participants, and stated:

The connection between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education, well I see multicultural education as a broader thing. I see it as inclusive of a lot of different things—human rights education, Ethnic Studies, social justice, a lot of different aspects. I think that Ethnic Studies by itself for me, would not have been enough. When I walked into my first course on multicultural education, I said this is what I’ve been looking for. My first doctoral course. Because, although I was thrilled and empowered to be in a Puerto Rican studies department, I knew that I was looking for something more, something broader.

I was very concerned, not just about Puerto Rican kids. I was thinking about how I grew up, my neighbors, my friends were African Americans; they were from the Caribbean. My best friend was from Bermuda while I was growing up. I was concerned about more than just Puerto Ricans. That’s when multicultural education spoke to me. It was having a broader influence, so that’s what I think is the connection.

Lomawaima, distinguishing between Native American Studies and multicultural education, took a slightly different perspective on multicultural education. She stated: Multicultural education can and, of course, has been defined in a variety of different ways by different constituencies or different groups. I think there is one version of multicultural education which begins from a premise that the United States is a given as a nation. It’s a diverse, “diverse” nation and that the different peoples within that need to be “respected.” That’s a particular perspective that
from the view of Indigenous people erases indignity, erases Indigenous sovereignty, just denies the existence of any of that.

That’s not something that we would characteristically want to participate in. I do think there’s different visions of multicultural education that are not so serving of the center state in its agendas... I do think there is a tendency for really good reasons from Indigenous Studies to say multicultural education is something that subsumes difference and different peoples in an overarching national narrative that we position ourselves outside of or against.

This touches on the idea that multicultural education is “dangerous” specifically for Native Americans but also for minorities in general, and all of my participants mentioned that danger. The danger being that multicultural education has become a bit of a cliché and “feel-good” popular term in education; therefore, in many ways, it has lost its effectiveness. As Lomawaima specified for Indigenous peoples, multicultural education is dangerous because it can erase what makes them unique, sovereignty. The pluralistic version of multicultural education teaches that our society is a stew, a mixed salad, and the long time popular a melting pot. The cultures and histories get mixed together to become something new. While there is some truth to that principle that people influence people but at the same time there are unique traits and experiences that cultures, races/ethnicity, and nations bring to the table. All of this leads to my next section on how Ethnic Studies could widened both through multicultural education and in general.

**Widening Ethnic Studies**

With the exception of Lomawaima, all participants saw multicultural education as a way to broaden the goal of Ethnic Studies. Lomawaima agreed in general that more
needed to be done in sustaining the common goals between Indigenous Studies and Ethnic Studies. That goal is to overcome inequality, to teach issues of race and ethnicity in any type of classroom, to bring people with multiple ethnic and cultural backgrounds together, and to give voice to a continued marginalized society. Halagao said, “I think multicultural education has a tendency to kind of look more broadly in terms of commonalities and around universal concepts, universal issues and tries to organize looking at things from multiple perspectives.” This became very specific in terms of one of the long-time battles of Filipinos—not being stuck in the shadows of larger Asian groups. She said, “A key element of Filipino Studies has been trying to not be in the shadows of Asian American studies. If you were to do a search of Asian American history, the focus is on Japanese and Chinese and maybe Korean. Filipinos tend to be invisible.” In terms of ending that invisibility of Filipinos, she suggested that the history be more mainstream and “normalized.” Nieto said:

I have said in the past we shouldn’t have multicultural education; we should just have education. Of course, it should all be multicultural because that’s the way it should be. If I were a hopeful person, and I am, but if I were overly hopeful, I would say we shouldn’t have Ethnic Studies. We should just have studies. I don’t see that coming for a very long time. Until it happens, I think that the place of Ethnic Studies is very important to keep because it’s those people in those fields who are going to keep producing knowledge that will be important in those fields and for the rest of us—no matter what our ethnic backgrounds are. This is why I stay more in the multicultural education, because all of us gain, all us gain when we learn about others.
Final Thoughts on the Implementation of Ethnic Studies in Public Schools

To summarize this section, the discussion of Ethnic Studies in U.S. public schools primarily focused on how it was practiced in Arizona and California schools. One way that Ethnic Studies is implemented on a larger scale is through multicultural education. Though they are not one in the same, they have a very important relationship with each other. And finally Ethnic Studies needs to expand for a society that is expanding. As the U.S. becomes more diverse and cultures mix more, it becomes very important and apparent that there is a need to learn the stories of people. Mendoza put it like this:

There is a need to be called out if we are going to talk about racism in a real meaningful way. When someone calls you out, it does not mean the person is jumping on you; it means they are challenging you to be a better person in your everyday practice. And in many respects, despite social discomfort, it is one of the sincerest acts of love.

What is Their Vision for the Future of Ethnic Studies as a Field of Study and Practice?

It is impossible to talk about the future without linking that future to the past and the present. The primary topic found through the analysis of the data under this question was the relationship of the community and Ethnic Studies. This is explored further in the complex ways that both community and struggle were defined by my participants. The next theme was the effects of Ethnic Studies being institutionalized. And finally, the future was deemed truly uncertain because of the climate of society.

Community and Struggle
Ethnic Studies had its foundation in localized and community issues. My participants define the local community as community struggles, parental wants, and relevant experiences for students. Darder said:

Because both Ethnic Studies and multicultural education have their origins in revolutionary change and politics, what happens in academia is students are taught more of the theory or the language of it than the revolutionary change or political transformation or any real involvement in the deeper community struggles.

Sleeter stated about the Tucson Mexican American Studies (MAS) program, “The community, that’s crucially important, because that’s how Ethnic Studies started and the MAS started in Tucson. It was the parents coming to the school board, the Mexican American parents saying, ‘This is what we want.’” Mendoza said, “It needs to be tailored to the needs of the kids there and what’s most relevant to them in their everyday experience.” Sleeter said, “Hopefully Ethnic Studies can at least serve as a tool for communication and bridge building and coalition building.” Lomawaima said about American Indian programs, “They arose out of student activism, community activism, faculty activism.” Sleeter also said, “Scholars who focused on the issues and framed the field, grounded themselves working with the community.”

The Effect of the Institutionalization of Ethnic Studies

There were two different parts to this idea of the institutionalization of Ethnic Studies. On one hand, because of the lack of the institutionalization of the field there was a question of legitimacy. For Nieto it was about the establishment of the field itself. Nieto, who helped establish what is now called Puerto Rican Studies, said, “When
outsiders looked in, they didn’t perceive us as being really a field. We had to prove that
we had legitimacy.” Mendoza saw it (institutionalization of the field) was keeping the
link between the community and the curriculum. He goes on to say:

I think also that what’s really kept it going exponentially in K-12, and this is more
of a much localized issue, but when the curriculum becomes real, people engage
it. Part of the challenge of Ethnic Studies has always been it came out of
grassroots movements to improve the community, and so an underlying question
that’s always there is how are you using your education to improve your
community. Especially for the structured disempowerment of low-income kids
with color, that’s an amazing statement. ‘Wait, the way that things are in my
community doesn’t have to be that way, and I can be part of that social change?’
Just that one little shift is amazing. Now I think the biggest thing, as I said before
moving ahead, the biggest limitation, and this is where K-12 really does need to
learn from higher education Ethnic Studies, is that higher education Ethnic
Studies has in many respects lost a lot of the critical edge. It’s almost like they’re
fighting for academic legitimacy so much that they forget to have the action to the
community. That’s a very dangerous thing to do because basically it’s like we see
this actually a lot of times in progressive communities, unions are a great
example. They start off as, ‘Yeah, we’re doing this for the working man,’ and
then they end up doing it for the perpetuation of their own legitimacy.

There is a responsibility to both the community and to academia to keep that connection
and to make it more than just talking about issues of race and ethnicity and actually
working with the people who have been basically pushed to the side and ignored in society. This is generational nuance.

The institutionalization of Ethnic Studies is both something to be excited and cautious about at the same time. Mendoza stated:

The big point is that the more that you can get institutional sanction, the more that you’re going to be folks who positively affect change in the large scale. The more that you become part of the institution, the more that you become institutionalized. Despite the professions of the liberal bastions that are institutions of education, in many respects, they function to suppress the sin. They function to suppress radical ideas. To that end, that’s part of the reason why so much of that critical edge has been lost is exactly that. It’s that whole issue of if you go try to change the devil, you don’t change him, he changes you. I’m not saying higher education is the devil, but be careful.

This is reminiscent of Audre Lorde’s (1984) quote (summarized) that one cannot dismantle the master’s house using the master’s tools. As different states and school districts, such as California and the Los Angeles Unified School District, make Ethnic Studies a high school graduation requirement, this is an area for continued critical assessment. Losing the “radical edge” of Ethnic Studies would, in effect, lose the field itself. Darder stated it this way:

Part of the work in Ethnic Studies is, how do we break through that dissonance between the lived experience of many of the students and the experience of those who were involved in the formation of the field, so that there begins to be a more evolutionary process, but not one that loses the revolutionary intent.
Darder also said, “Ethnic Studies was never just about the academy but about the university and society. The university context of issues is very limiting.”

Finally, participants agreed that there is some uncertainty about the future of Ethnic Studies (and related subjects such as Indigenous and American Indian Studies).

Lomawaima stated:

There’s a political retrenchment that seems to be either going on or threatening in this country. I think it’s possible that there’s going to be a significant challenge to Indigenous Studies to survive over the next 10 to 20 years, and I say that as someone who grew up believing in progress, that things always got better.

She also stated:

You know I think this is actually a very difficult question to answer not specific to Indigenous Studies but just because the whole landscape of higher education is so fraught right now, and I think it’s changing very quickly. It’s going to continue to change very quickly and that’s one thing I feel at this point in my career is like I really feel for junior colleagues because I don’t think any of us can predict where higher ed is going.

Paralleling her statement Mendoza said:

When our brothers and sisters call us out for whatever, that’s the direction Ethnic Studies is going in, in this new direction. It’s really daunting but it’s really exciting at the same time. Because from the intersectional paradigm, it creates the conditions necessary to create another larger movement.

His suggestion was that the intersectionality of Ethnic Studies with each other and other socio-cultural groups is what will propel the field forward.
**Final Thoughts on the Vision for the Future of Ethnic Studies**

The future of Ethnic Studies is based in its origin story. Ethnic Studies was about overcoming inequality and helping people to see that their life story mattered and was important even if it was not the dominant White story. It has been based in the community from its origin. Struggle has been at the heart of it from the beginning. Struggle is defined throughout this study—struggle for legitimacy, struggle for a future, struggle to change the dominant White hegemonic order in a currently reactionary system that keeps pushing for a return to something that never really existed. As Ethnic Studies became more institutionalized, in some ways the message was watered down and packaged in the terms and limited understanding of academia. But there is future in that the message of Ethnic Studies is more interdisciplinary now than it ever was in the past, it is gaining ground through academic profession organizations, and it has people continuing to push the issues.

**What are Their Perspectives on the Larger State and Federal Policy Context of Ethnic Studies?**

The main three themes that emerged out of the analysis for this question were that the current reactionary politics dictates Ethnic Studies in many ways, standardization runs counter to Ethnic Studies in many ways, and there is a double-edged side of identity politics.

This dissertation has focused on two major state policies surrounding the teaching of Ethnic Studies: Arizona’s ban on Ethnic Studies in public schools, including public charter schools (a ban that has, to date, impacted only Mexican American Studies in the Tucson Unified School District), and California’s vote to make Ethnic Studies a
statewide graduation requirement (A.R.S. §15–112, 2010; CA AB 1750, 2014). The California bill made it to Governor Jerry Brown’s desk; he vetoed it and said that another advisory board was already working on incorporating Ethnic Studies into state standards (Caesar, 2014). Summarizing David Gilborn (2009), you can’t take the politics out of the policy, and Ethnic Studies exemplifies the ways in which politics and ideology can make policymaking like treading in very murky water. Lomawaima said, “Partly that [politics and ideology] comes out of the very real inception of these programs, not as traditional academic disciplines but as a response to activism—political and social activism. So there is a reality to that political context.” The politics dictate what is considered “good research” and what is not, and unfortunately the politics are not all in favor of Ethnic Studies. Darder stated:

In order to launch a deep revolutionary project of counter-intimate project, people need to have a sense of security in terms of their work, the context in which they’re working; there’s none of that. More and more young professors, in order to even get tenure, have to raise a significant amount of funding for their research.

An example of this comes from the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) website (Institute of Education Sciences, IES, 2016). This is a website created by the U.S. Department of Education that has the purpose of being a research resource for “informed education decision making” (IES, 2016). The website states that the WWC is a “central and trusted source of scientific evidence for what works in education to improve student outcomes” (IES, 2016). Because Ethnic Studies began during the Civil Rights Movement(s), a time of general societal unrest and student protests and because its philosophical moorings are explicitly radical, using critical race theory and counter-
narratives as primary sources of knowledge, Ethnic Studies has been dismissed in some cases as inadequate for “scientific research.” Lomawaima stated:

The acceptability or the non-acceptability or the safety or perceived danger of Indigenous Studies, it is an issue. The particulars of the issue might be different in 1988 at University of Washington than University of California Los Angeles [UCLA] in 2001 versus Australian Catholic University [ACU] in 2015. But I do think it’s always an issue, and it gets framed in some predictable ways, very often in terms of identity politics who can or cannot do this work and the ways in which identity politics are seen as invalidating or making questionable the value or quality of research. So you know it is just Native people being politically correct versus value of scholarship as you know meeting certain standards of method and theory.

A recent study by Thomas Dee and Emily Penner (2016) of Stanford University examined the relationship between Ethnic Studies and academic achievement. They found a positive correlation between Ethnic Studies and overall improvement in students’ grades. One suggestion from Mendoza was that more studies like this are needed to support policies, with the goal of showing that “Ethnic Studies is real education. That shouldn’t be a radical statement.” The research followed this assessment and showed correlation between student achievement and Ethnic Studies (Cabrera et al., 2013; Cabrera et al., 2014). As a governor-appointed member of Hawai‘i’s state board of education, Halagao is working on policy from a slightly different angle. She said, “Trying to focus on a policy that aims at identity, looking at language as an asset versus a deficiency, and looking at equity as well in terms of what these students need in order to
achieve in...I’ve been able to get at the culture and ethnic piece through language for some of these language policies.” Language policies are interconnected with these issues of race, ethnicity, and culture (McCarty et al., 2006). This is especially true within Native culture where language knowledge within these communities is less because less and less people speak the language (McCarty et al., 2006).

**Final Thoughts on the Larger State and Federal Policy Context of Ethnic Studies**

Taken together, the accounts presented here emphasize that policies are being made at the official level, and there is a disconnect between official policy makers and researchers. Darder said, “Politics limits the future of Ethnic Studies.” But the suggestion given by all of my participants was that the intersectionality of Ethnic Studies with education and other fields was a way to sustain the message of Ethnic Studies despite the opposition. The concept of politics is another theme that bled into multiple questions because these questions are interconnected with each other and showed the intersections of the Ethnic Studies quilt.

**Conclusion and Primary Research Question: What Are the Experiences of Academic Leaders in the Field of Ethnic Studies as This Field Developed in the U.S.?**

The conceptual framework undergirding this study stems from Lomawaima and McCarty’s (2006) Safety Zone Theory (SZT). I used SZT to measure the extreme ways that Ethnic Studies has been looked at over time. I examined how certain elements of Ethnic Studies has been considered safe and other parts have been considered dangerous. The data from this study showed how Ethnic Studies has operated both within and
outside the metaphorical safety zone, as it has been constrained—for example by political forces, like Arizona’s ban on Ethnic Studies in public and charter schools, and the continued struggle for legitimacy as a field—and as moments of possibility have enabled the field to gain a foothold and to grow. The data also demonstrated the need for additional theoretical frameworks in understanding the experiences of these six academic leaders as the field of Ethnic Studies has developed. In this section, I highlight participants’ responses to those additional theoretical frameworks.

To state it simply, the answer to my question is the everyday, in and out of school, peer interaction throughout their school careers and beyond, it was the mentor mentee interaction, and so many more specific experiences. As observed previously, Ethnic Studies varies by discipline, age, and background, but has many similarities at the same time. All participants recognized that Ethnic Studies began as a result of the social movements of the 1960s. While each of those social movements—Civil Rights, the American Indian Movement, the Women’s Movement, and others—had distinct agendas, together they created a space of possibility and opportunity (and they are still creating those opportunities). Participants’ individual life experiences made their journey through the field distinctive.

Another part of this is the sharing of counterstories. Again, one of the demands for Ethnic Studies in the 1960s was to have minority stories being included in the university and a place to tell those stories. Up until that point the dominant story being told was assimilation, a lack of culture, and it was a reducing (and completely discounting) the home life and the background that these students had experienced throughout their lives. SZT talks about this being the topics and culture deemed “unsafe”
and needing to be prohibited. The struggle for the value of this still exist almost 50 years later.

Finally, I return to the conversation on the relationship between Ethnic Studies and multicultural education. Thus, to explore Ethnic Studies as it is implemented in U.S. schools is to also examine multicultural education, and the key to effective multicultural education, according to my participants, is that is has an Ethnic Studies core. That is slightly different than the perspective of the literature, which shows that multicultural education is an evolutionary step to Ethnic Studies (Banks, 1995). Rather than my example of a Venn diagram, participants suggested that Ethnic Studies should be more foundational to multicultural education and must continue to have that foundation, which works directly with my theoretical framework of SZT. The specifics of that historical foundation is what had been hidden and proscribed and deemed too political and too controversial and is exactly what makes Ethnic Studies what it is. One thing that percolates throughout the participant narratives as they describe Ethnic Studies from its beginnings to the present day is the fact (and the act) of struggle. Darder said it well when she reflected:

Ethnic Studies itself and multicultural education actually has its roots in a community foundation, community struggle. Both of those have areas of study, actually arise out of civil rights struggles. They can’t be separated historically. But what happens over the years in each of those areas has a lot to do with people entering into the academy, then ways in which folks would learn the language, then the teaching of students was more of teaching the theory of it or the language of it. Then these students would learn this language but have no experience in
relationship to revolutionary change or political transformation or any real involvement in the deeper community struggles from whence Ethnic Studies and multicultural education emerge.

This bridges well to the observation that community involvement is a necessity of Ethnic Studies. It began by college students wanting to be known, seen, and acknowledged for who they were, and it continues to be that struggle to be recognized as legitimate, valid, and more fully a part of the larger societal story. This idea also links to the fact that current policies surrounding Ethnic Studies are guiding its future and what it becomes. Most recently, San Francisco State University is struggling to keep their Ethnic Studies department because of budget cuts (Flaherty, 2016). Given this was one of the two places where Ethnic Studies began in 1968, this represents a potentially huge blow to the field. Arizona making particular interpretations of Ethnic Studies by banning it in public and charter schools is enormous and shows the extent that people will go to prevent what they really do not understand nor value mainly because they just cannot relate to it (Chikkatur, 2013).

There were several things not addressed with SZT that were discussed by my participants, such as their socioeconomic background and the transition into middle-class status over time. Three out of my six participants, Christine Sleeter, Juan Mendoza, and Patricia Halagao, came from middle-class backgrounds. Their parents were professionals and university study was expected of them. This expectation colored their educational experiences. As Halagao put it, her ethnicity was not an asset because she didn’t see herself in the curriculum. Mendoza, spending half his time in two different states, learned at a young age that there was something “different” about him, and his parents gave him
informal lessons of their lives. For Sleeter, it was not something she had to think about in a real way as a child, though her parents taught her a little about differences. The other three who came from lower socioeconomic backgrounds were taught the same lessons about themselves. Darder saw the teacher as the authority and as an example of being able to be successful and have a professional job. Nieto had the unique experience of living in New York where there was a multitude of people with different backgrounds and cultures, and she had wanted to be a teacher her whole life. Lomawaima is a Cultural Anthropologist but found her “academic and intellectual home” in Indigenous Studies/American Indian Studies. The majority of my participants were teacher education majors at some point in their post-secondary education, and they came into the field with the expectation to change the world one child at a time. Much like my own introduction to education on a professional level, they realized that the problems and issues of students go beyond the everyday classroom curriculum. But being in that place of authority and relative power gave the opportunity to notice the cultural and ethnic nuances within the classroom and overall within education.

Another issue not addressed by SZT is where White, Whiteness studies, and framings and debates related to White privilege fit into the mix. Ethnic Studies was created for minority students and for people whose voices have been minimized or silenced. It is clear that race and ethnicity affect everyone in this society no matter one’s race(s). White people have been affected by constructs and concepts of race whether they realize it or not. Sleeter suggested the application of critical family studies, which regardless of one’s racial background, places individuals in a larger sociocultural societal spectrum. In this idea, she is merging what has been separate fields: family studies and
critical race theory with a focus on White, White privilege, and Whiteness. She introduced this theoretical framework through her novel, *White Bread* (Sleeter, 2015). Another theory that can encapsulate both the differences and similarities between people is intersectionality (Crenshaw, 2009; Hill Collins, 2009). Intersectionality theory posits that, rather than individuals taking on different identities depending on the cultural milieu they are operating in, as W.E.B. Du Bois (1907) suggested, we must recognize the multidimensional identities of all people at all times.

Also, there is a certain amount of standpoint theory throughout this study especially as Darder expressed her reality of biculturalism. Standpoint theory is a theory found by Nancy Hartstock. It states that realities are created through life experiences and the dominant culture and perception of reality is limited and fractional in viewpoint (Hartstock, 1983). Similar to Du Bois’s double consciousness standpoint theory also says that people of marginalized groups must be able to survive in the dominant White world even through their true reality is not of a White people.

Finally, the overall goal of the field itself is navigating the experience of what it means to be “American.” This chapter discusses the difference similarities between respondents, and overall seeks to show the broader picture of Ethnic Studies and how they can relate to each other in analysis. One of the arguments that are made against Ethnic Studies is trying to include multiple different viewpoints is impossible because there are too many, but this examination of multiple experiences proves it is possible and relative so multiple audiences.

There is a huge push in our society to be color-blind and fear differences between people (Hill Collins, 2009). The reality is that U.S. society reflects amazing diversity, and
that diversity is what makes this country unique—from the people who were here before this land was colonized, to those who were forced to come to perform manual labor, to more recent forced immigration such as Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico, to martial law that brought certain types of immigrants to the United States, and even the descendants of the colonizers. This leads to my final chapter, which provides a synthesis and discusses the implications and conclusions drawn from this study.
CHAPTER 6
SYNTHESIS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

In this final chapter, I will discuss a synthesis of findings, implications and related recommendations and my conclusions, connecting this discussion to themes from the introduction and across the findings chapters. My overall goal for this study was to better understand Ethnic Studies over time and in various contexts as “safe” or “dangerous” in U.S. education. Two much-publicized examples of this come from Arizona’s banning of Ethnic Studies in public schools and the different districts in California (and other states) making Ethnic Studies a high school graduation requirement. First, I will describe ways in which this study contributes to the metaphorical “quilt” of Ethnic Studies discussed in Chapter 1, then I will discuss implications of my study, focusing on implications for research, practice/praxis, and for policy. Next, I offer recommendations for policymakers, researchers, teachers and students. Finally, I focus on future research and conclude with a personal reflection and a poem by Langston Hughes.

In my introduction I said that I was weaving a “quilt” of Ethnic Studies, and that the stories and experiences of the scholars of the field were the quilt pieces and the goal of this study was to tell the life story of Ethnic Studies. So I return to the quilt metaphor. I believe now, after completing this study, that the life story of Ethnic Studies on a micro-level is comprised in large measure of the stories of the people Ethnic Studies represents, including those who have helped to shape it through their scholarship and activism. On a macro-level is a very colorful pattern of multiple perspectives and experiences that fit together to create something beautiful and new because each piece is a little different. It is a celebration of both differences and similarities, which form structural patterns and
give form and substance to this critical field of study. It is the stories of culture both good and bad and the victories and challenges that connect us as people. We can learn so much from each other in sharing them. On a micro-level, it’s the curriculum being taught from state to state. For example, I moved to multiple states and the curriculum about minoritized cultures was not standard in any way and in fact in some states was non-existent. It’s also preparing teachers in teacher education programs for working with and honoring the cultures of all their students and parents, and helping teachers to recognize the culture that they themselves bring into the classroom.

So for a moment I imagine that I (and participants in this study) embody and reflect the “quilt” of Ethnic Studies. One piece is my story as the only Black student in my 6th grade class in Oklahoma and another piece is my mother growing up in a segregated Southern town in Louisiana. Halagao brings her piece as growing up Filipino in northern California, and yet a different piece is Darder in Los Angeles after her experiences of growing up Puerto Rican during Operation Bootstrap. An additional piece is Nieto and her sister as two of three Puerto Ricans in their school in Brooklyn. Another piece, that might be a quilt of its own is Lomawaima and her father’s experiences in a federal boarding school and her connection, through her mother, to a German Mennonite community and her like Nieto moving a lot throughout their childhood. Offering another quilt piece is Sleeter as she navigates for herself her role in this larger sociocultural context, but also seeks to help White students to understand their Whiteness and its place in the quilt. Finally, we have Mendoza who grew up in rural Oregon and in Arizona, and was bicultural and also navigated the spaces in between those worlds. They fit together beautifully and there are so many more pieces.
Summarizing the study, I interviewed six scholars and founders of the field of Ethnic Studies in education disciplines, using Seidman’s (2013) in-depth interview protocol to explore elements of the field through Safety Zone Theory (SZT) (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Using a SZT lens, I explored three perspectives, reflecting my analysis of the participants’ narratives: 1) policy, 2) practice, and 3) experience. Based on the interviews, I created narrative profiles for each of my participants. Together, the narratives can be likened to the pieces of the quilt of Ethnic Studies. One of the insights of this study was that Ethnic Studies is a representation of diversity. As unique as all of the individual lives included in this dissertation were, they shared a role in Ethnic Studies, and Ethnic Studies had clearly helped shape who they were. SZT relates to this shaping of who my participants are in that some of the challenging parts of history were a part of the molding of their characters and their life stories. The following sections further unpack major findings of the study, building on the cross-analysis of narratives and situating findings in the theoretical framework and literature review.

First, issues of race and ethnicity affected all the participants to different degrees and depending upon context. Nieto’s experience of moving to different neighborhoods in New York City gave her a unique perspective into this concept. She said, “I grew up in a poor immigrant community, a community of European immigrants, Italians, Russians, Ukrainians, and etc. and the Puerto Ricans were coming.” She then moved to another neighborhood “that was largely African American and Puerto Rican, but mostly African American.” Finally, the first middle-class neighborhood they moved into was “majority Hasidic Jews,” and she said this was her first experience of people living in houses versus apartments. These childhood experiences helped her to experience a multitude of races
and ethnicities giving her an experience that few people ever have in their lifetime. Darder said Ethnic Studies is how we navigate “issues, such as subordination and domination, and how for those of us who come from subordinated cultures, how we navigate the tension between the dominant/subordinate experience.”

As stated in the literature review, ethnicity theory as a way to view race has a long history in U.S. scholarship (Omi & Winant, 2015). To reiterate Boas’s (1931) argument (which is as relevant today as it was when he made it in the 1930s), as long as people of different races and ethnicities are in contact with each other, the idea of race cannot be erased completely from our society. My participants for this study were of American Indian and White, Filipino, White, Puerto Rican, and Mexican American and White descent, and I am of African American descent. We all have stories marked by race and ethnicity. My one participant with two White parents became immersed in these concepts of race later in life, and in many ways has had to find the location for herself and her Whitness within the larger sociocultural context. Her experience shows that White is not race-neutral or “normal” (Goodman et al., 2012) – though racial ideologies have made it socially normalized. The larger sociocultural ways the “quilt” metaphor works is the relationship that each story has with each other. Therefore, that is why even as a White person there is a place of belonging within that larger story.

Before moving to the implications and recommendations we need to revisit the distinction between American Indian/Indigenous Studies and Ethnic Studies. Sovereignty and the legal-political relationship of Native peoples to the U.S. government is the key to that difference. As noted by Lomawaima and McCarty (2006), tribal sovereignty predates but is also recognized in the U.S. constitution (i.e., Native peoples possess inherent
sovereignty). Subsequent treaty rights have established these communities as nations within a settler state. Indigenous Studies is the better term to use in that it links Native peoples to a greater sociocultural context throughout the world. The reality is they are a people whose land was stolen from them, and in return they were given parcel of land in comparison to what they once had and citizenship within the settler state. Because of their small numbers, the representation of Native experiences in school curricula and society is often overlooked, distorted, or ignored.

Another construct that divides groups of immigrants voluntary and involuntary immigration. Voluntary immigrants are those who purposely came to this country for a better life. Examples of this would be the colonists, the early European immigration wave of the 19th and 20th century, international students who came to study in the United States, and international professionals who came to fulfill a job need. Involuntary immigrants, according to Obgu, are those who were forced to come the United States not of their own free will. Examples of this would be African Americans, who were brought as slaves; refugees, who came because their countries are at war and they have no home; and though American Indians (and Indigenous communities all over the world have similar stories) were already here they were forced off their lands (or had their lands forcibly reduced) and in some cases forcibly relocated to other parts of the country. One final example of this is economic migrants who come as a result of high poverty (such as some of the Mexican migrates who are willing to face the brutal and extreme Sonoran Desert all year around to cross into the United States). This is a further example of the difference between American Indian experiences and that of other minorities within the United States.
The generational differences in participants’ life experiences and perspectives on Ethnic Studies are important to further unpack. For all generations represented, Ethnic Studies is about inclusion of race and ethnicity (and accurate information about often excluded groups) within a curriculum that has deemed those traits as less than desirable and therefore not included. For the older generations, Ethnic Studies was radical and revolutionary to imagine the possibility. For the younger generations Ethnic Studies is about expanding it further and making it more a reality. Inclusion alone has been fully implemented, but there is at least more than inclusion 50 years later. Examples of this include coursework and scholarship that ask where does Whiteness and White privilege fit, how White teachers and educators can be a part of helping the next generation with these topics. Another aspect of this is what those teachers and educators bring to the table and where they fit in the larger sociocultural context themselves. Demographics are rapidly shifting and globalization, the Internet, and social media have all made the world a much smaller place. From a younger generation standpoint, Mendoza put it well in saying his generation is the last with a direct connection to the social movements of the 1960s. So the question becomes, as Darder stated, how does one pass on the revolution, the struggle, the radicalness of Ethnic Studies to the next generation that is so far removed, temporally, from its origins?

SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) addressed these issues in that there has been a systematic way of tackling issues of race and ethnicity: assimilation. For example, the American Indian boarding schools in the early 20th century were used to assimilate the students into more “Americanized” ways of living through language restrictions, uniforms, and strict discipline. In the next section I discuss implications of the study,
starting with a general summary and then focusing on implications for research, practice, and policy.

**Implications**

In this section, I discuss implications of the study as they relate to: 1) research, 2) practice/praxis, and 3) policy. My theoretical framework of SZT posits that there are elements of culture that are considered safe and socially acceptable and other elements that society considers dangerous and that need to be restricted and even proscribed. Despite the sociocultural limitations set upon elements of culture, my respondents all showed that the different life stories regarding how they related to and interacted with Ethnic Studies were a part of who they are. If not formally taught in school about issues of race and ethnicity, they were taught at home and through life itself. All acknowledged that the history of their individual ethnic and racial backgrounds were stories of challenge, sometimes marked with great struggle. As stated earlier, all but one of my participants had former teaching related to their ethnicity and race through schooling before graduate school. I believe SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) addresses this through the concept of restrictions of what is taught formally and what is not taught formally within schools.

**Implications for Research**

The implications for research derived from findings of this study are far reaching. There needs to be more research on Ethnic Studies as it relates to education. Both Dee and Penner’s (2016) and Cabrera et al.’s (2014) research are significant in that they are utilizing quantitative data; there are not very many large-scale quantitative studies on the measurable impact of Ethnic Studies on students, especially in comparison to students
who have not taken Ethnic Studies courses. This new set of research is about the programs that are being implemented and the quantifiable difference that they are making with student achievement and academics. Dee and Penner (2016) specifically examine the overall academic achievement of students in pilot Ethnic Studies classes in several high schools in the San Francisco School District. In addition to academic achievement another goal of the study was to show whether and how these classes reduce high school dropout rates. As mentioned in the literature review, Cabrera et al.’s (2014) purpose was to examine students in Tucson’s Mexican American Studies classes, focusing on overall GPA and scores on the Arizona AIMS (Arizona’s Instrument to Measure Standards) test. These researchers also point out that up until that study, large-scale quantitative studies on the impact of Ethnic Studies did not exist.

In general, quantitative methodologies often rest on a positivist assumption that there is a single reality which can be “proven” (Creswell, 2009; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Unfortunately, in some circles of thought, quantitative research is disfavored when it comes to race and ethnicity because it has tried to quantify social concepts and people. An example of quantifying social concepts and people is using statistics alone as the factor as to why there is higher crime rates in high minority communities. Another example is the overwhelming amount of Black students misplaced in special education classes. Statistically, it shows that Black children have trouble learning, but there is more to the statistics.

I am contending that there is a need to use quantitative research methods along with qualitative research methods in order to get a more holistic picture of concepts and people (Yang, 2000). As Ethnic Studies expands into new school districts and contexts,
there is an opportunity to utilize quantitative methods in more appropriate ways in
dealing with race and ethnicity. Knowing what is known now—that people are constantly
changing—and seeing how past quantitative research misinterpreted minorities can bring
improvement for the future. I also believe that using both quantitative and qualitative
methods can create a more realistic and comprehensive picture of Ethnic Studies and its
purposes in current times. In addition to more quantitative or mixed methods studies,
there needs to be more qualitative research on Ethnic Studies. The stories of the teachers
teaching the classes, the students enrolled in the classes, and the interaction between
teachers, students, and Ethnic Studies content, need to be captured and shared more
widely. In stating this, I transition to why I used life story methodology for this study,
and how it relates to this wider research field.

In this study, I used a life story methodology, a specific branch of narrative
analysis. This was purposely used as a way to examine the individual and
autobiographical components of Ethnic Studies. The reality is as similar as people’s
stories of race and ethnicity are, they are all unique, and deserve to be heard. Our society
clusters and categorizes people of similar racial and ethnic backgrounds and typically
tries to simplify the complex similarities and differences of people. Two Puerto Rican
participants, Sonia Nieto and Antonia Darder, for example, had very different stories.
Life story methodology works in grasping a larger picture of Ethnic Studies, in a way
quantitative methods cannot fulfill.

Bringing this back to my theoretical framework of SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty,
2006), while quantitative measures can show some of the effects that Ethnic Studies have
on students’ academic achievement, education resilience, and personal affirmation, using
qualitative methods (specifically, life story research) can bring to light the parts of the stories that are not that socially acceptable and challenge White patriarchal heteronormative mindsets, which is exactly why, despite the resurgence of Ethnic Studies, it has been met with serious resistance. One example of resistance is the unspoken societal norm of not openly talking about race and ethnicity. Because of the excess visibility/invisibility tensions of race and ethnicity it makes it very hard to talk to a wider audience about those experiences as they are being experienced (McClelland & Auster, 1990).

One of the greatest issues of race and ethnicity is the unspoken societal norm of not talking about these issues unless one is in the presence of people of similar racial/ethnic background, making it another form of “silenced dialogue” (Delpit, 1988). “Silenced dialogue” refers to an unconscious agreement that limits and prohibits conversations about race and ethnicity and other controversial issues in an open space for fear of offending both the White majority and others. Darder said, “Race and ethnicity are topics that aren’t talked about in public, so people don’t know exactly how to talk about it.” Because of this norm, many people have trouble understanding the perspective of people who have a different background than themselves. The question becomes, what’s the big deal? And the reality is the big deal is specific to the experiences of those particular people/groupings, and just because it has differences does not make one’s experience more or less important or more or less valid than another. The concepts of race and ethnicity are partially fluid in nature (Yang, 2000). They have changed over time, and these changes should be examined and understood in a greater way as time
progresses. This is one justification for an expansion of Ethnic Studies, and the need for more research, policy, and practice on it.

In conclusion, I would like to return to my theoretical framework of SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). First, many times the argument in using quantitative over qualitative methods in doing research is because quantitative is considered “safer” in nature in that it is less flexible to interpretation. But I believe that there is a need for both qualitative and quantitative and that qualitative methods are one effective way to create opportunity for the revelation of controversial topics and themes and concepts. Second, in keeping with SZT, the topics of Ethnic Studies can be deemed unsafe for public discussion. However, with the rapid demographic changes throughout the United States noted in my introductory chapter, and the lingering legacy of racist ideologies and practices, Ethnic Studies is becoming more and more salient for people of all races and ethnicities. These concepts of race and ethnicity need to be faced directly. Next, I will discuss implications for practice and praxis.

**Implications for Practice**

In practice, while there are specific Ethnic Studies classes, many times Ethnic Studies is actually applied or enacted through multicultural education. In review, multicultural education is generally considered an evolutionary outgrowth of Ethnic Studies, but while it has many concepts in common with Ethnic Studies, it needs to have an Ethnic Studies foundation and does not replace Ethnic Studies (Banks, 1995). Multicultural education can bring concepts of equality and inequality to other social issues, such as disabilities, age, sexual orientation, immigration, and more. But as my participants pointed out, it needs to be rooted in concepts of Ethnic Studies and
accurately represent the struggles of the past and the ongoing struggles that were not resolved through the social movements of the 1960s, which continue today. Many have argued that multicultural education can be enacted superficially – for example, through a kind of “food, festivals and tourist” curriculum that omits critical content focused on race and ethnicity. Banks (1995) calls this an additive approach. It adds into the curriculum, but not for the goal of social change and transformation. Rather, this superficial “celebration” of diversity contrasts with education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist (Sleeter & Grant, 1987).

A few examples of this tourist curriculum (Derman-Sparks, 1989) would be a day of eating culturally “traditional” foods on Cinco De Mayo or St. Patrick’s Day. Both of these days have real meaning to the cultural history of Mexican/Mexican Americans and Irish/Irish Americans, respectively, but what is often taught in U.S. schools is a very distorted perspective of celebration and fun. Another problem in the way multicultural education is sometimes practiced is that the curriculum itself has taken the place of Ethnic Studies. That society has moved to place beyond the need of the individuality of Ethnic Studies. The problem with that theory that does not take into consideration the differences between cultures and groups. A significant example of that is the discussion of the distinction between American Indians and other American minority groups raised by Lomawaima in her interview; as she noted, the singular status of Native American peoples as tribal sovereigns makes their experiences distinct from that of other minoritized groups (Lomawaima, 2012). But statistics show that they have similar problems as other non-White minorities in the United States. Does that mean the resolution to these problems are the same? Another example of this is what Halagao
mentioned about Filipinos; though being one of the largest Asian groups in the United States, their experiences are often grouped with those of larger Asian countries such as China, Japan, Korea. Filipinos have their own story that is different than the other groups and the other groups have their own stories, too. There is a place for Ethnic Studies in education in the United States to teach the specifics of these groups—both the differences and the similarities—and how they relate to American history and have been a part of creating these United States.

Lomawaima stated that multicultural education can be dangerous to Indigenous Studies. It can be dangerous to Indigenous Studies for the same reason that categorizing it within Ethnic Studies can dangerous, and all the various reasons that multicultural education itself can be dangerous to true transformative principles. Multicultural education is dangerous to Indigenous Studies because it can be a lumping together of sorts that can take away or misrepresent the inherent sovereignty that American Indians possess. That sovereignty, rooted in their status as Originary Peoples, is a part of their way of life, and to take that away limits who they are. Multicultural education when taught from an additive approach can, in fact, limit to what it was set up to do.

In addition to Ethnic Studies being practiced in terms of critical multicultural education, Ethnic Studies itself needs to be practiced in more schools, and those programs need to be supported. Teaching Ethnic Studies does take skills and pedagogical knowledge that is different than teaching science, art, or even history. These skills need to be taught in teacher preparation and professional development programs. Funding for training and curriculum development is needed, as several of my participants pointed out. Another avenue to discuss is my own experience of having my first African American
history class being taught by a teacher who was White. He still brought out one of the
tenets of Ethnic Studies that my story counted and had value, and added to the larger
sociocultural context. If teacher education programs take seriously the preparation of
teachers (of all races and ethnicities) in how to teach concepts of race and ethnicity – both
as a curriculum in itself and as it relates to various other disciplines – that empowering
practice could transform education as we know it.

The praxis or transformative possibilities that come from this research lie in the
potential of Ethnic Studies education to change our society for the better. As I have
stated, shifting demographics in the United States have already transformed the makeup
of schools. These diverse students (and parents) come to schools with value, and to
incorporate that into the classes rather than forcing a separation between school and home
would add so much to schools, and to students’ learning (Olivos, Jiménez-Castellanos, &
Ochoa, 2011).

I would again like to bring this back to my theoretical framework of SZT
(Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Cursory nods to culture and the concept of
colorblindness and everyone being the same appear harmless, but the way people were
treated in the history by the U.S. government and by each other is not so harmless. The
invisibility of these stories affects both minorities and majorities alike. Value and worth
is attached to these stories. This leads to the next section on the implications of policy.

**Implications for Policy**
As a result of demographic shifts within the United States, policy issues of race and ethnicity are becoming increasingly salient. Ethnic Studies is a viable way to teach students and teachers about similarities and differences of race and ethnicity. Thus, there needs to be a stronger link between research and policies regarding Ethnic Studies. The policies being made will have a long-term effect. Currently, several school districts in California have made Ethnic Studies a graduation requirement, and at the time of this writing there is a bill in the California state legislature to make Ethnic Studies a history elective available statewide (Ethnic Studies Now, 2016). Unfortunately, there has been a long time disconnect between the policymakers, the researchers, and the practitioners. This would be an example where there is a need for them to work together to create something new.

Ethnic Studies was born during a time of social unrest and social revolution within the United States. In many ways, the politics of the present time make enacting Ethnic Studies even more challenging; whereas Ethnic Studies during the time of the Civil Rights Movement had support from both major political parties, Ethnic Studies today is viewed as a left-wing agenda (D’Souza, 1991). It is controversial on many levels, including the view of whether Ethnic Studies constitutes “real” research. Similarly, as stated by Darder, reactionary politics define “good” versus “irrelevant” research. Arizona’s banning of Ethnic Studies in public schools (A.R.S. §15–112) is a case in point; as Cabrera et al.’s (2014) research shows, this was clearly politically motivated in a context of reactionary and racialized politics, making it challenging terrain to navigate.
There are so many implications for policy regarding Ethnic Studies. As my interviewees suggested, one of the major challenges is for policymakers to realize that Ethnic Studies affects all people, not just non-White minorities. As long as it is does not take into consideration, in addition to the histories of non-White minorities, where White people fit in the larger sociocultural history and world, it sets up a division of “us and them,” and is not effective because as already stated issues of race and ethnicity affect all people. While there is place for the individual stories of various ethnic groups subsumed within the overarching rubric of Ethnic Studies, at the same time policy needs to recognize the effect that policy has on all of us.

In conclusion, the concepts of SZT can be seen throughout the policies surrounding Ethnic Studies. Many states have completely avoided the subject of Ethnic Studies for fear of the politics and the unknown that surrounds it. As Lomawaima stated during her interview, unfortunately it is not a matter of Ethnic Studies being “safe or unsafe” but “relevant or irrelevant,” While some current policies are expanding Ethnic Studies in classrooms, at the same time the lack of policies is having a real effect in classrooms too. What isn’t being taught or examined isn’t considered as important as what is. This leads me to the next section: specific recommendations that were derived from my data. After a brief introduction of the recommendations I provide more specific recommendations for policymakers, researchers and scholars, and teachers and students. I conclude with how these recommendations relate to my theoretical framework of SZT.

Recommendations

In this section, I build on my findings to propose recommendations to policymakers, researchers and scholars, teachers, and students. Each of these groups are
directly affected by Ethnic Studies. The recommendations are interconnected and complimentary. Policymakers need to be better informed by the research being done with Ethnic Studies especially as it relates to education. Unfortunately, because of this disconnect between policymakers and researchers, and current conservative resistance to embracing diversity, Ethnic Studies is hindered by the policies that are being created such as the law in Arizona and other states that refuse to consider Ethnic Studies. Inaction is as important as action. Research evidence is often insufficient to transcend reactionary and conservative policies. One of the goals of this study to help bridge that gap, even if in a small way.

Teachers and students are directly affected by the policies within higher education institutions in regards to Ethnic Studies and teacher education programs. Ethnic Studies can work directly with teacher education programs. As classroom demographics continue to change, teachers need support in understanding the “funds of knowledge” of their students and themselves (Gonzalez et al., 1995). Many times teachers do not understand that they bring their own experiences into the classroom, and that their viewpoints may differ from those of their students, especially if the students are minority and teachers are White. All in all, as stated by all my participants, Ethnic Studies needs to have a relationship with the community on all levels.

Finally, I return to my theoretical framework of SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006), in that the recommendations are ways to confront this pattern of some parts of Ethnic Studies being permissible and other parts needing regulations and proscriptions. First, the recommendations for policymakers are to go beyond the current popular reactionary politics and fear of the unknown. Second, the recommendation for
policymakers to care about the needs of the community and to speak for the people who do not have a voice or the socioeconomic to change positions in society. Also, higher education institutions need to incorporate Ethnic Studies curricula to their teacher education programs.

Second, researchers and scholars need to use both quantitative and qualitative research to examine Ethnic Studies on a larger scale. Also, researchers have a responsibility to keep the connection between the community and the research, so that academics are not just talking to each other with their research. That is, there needs to be a balance of theory and practice. As my interviewees pointed out, that connection with the community has been a part of Ethnic Studies from the beginning.

Third and finally, the recommendations for teachers and students relates to the need to prepare teachers for Ethnic Studies better in a more concrete and contextualized way. In the sections that follow I develop each of these three sets of recommendations more fully.

**Recommendations for Policymakers**

Policymakers need to realize that while prevailing political ideologies often dictate what is safe and unsafe, demographics in the United States are changing with or without their “permission.” Issues of race and ethnicity have been concealed for too long and are gaining visibility with recent social movements, including Black Lives Matter and resurgent struggles for civil and educational rights. With more issues of race and ethnicity surrounding incidents of police brutality and misconduct, as the achievement gap widens, and with the increase of non-White minorities within the United States, these issues are increasingly being brought to the surface. The actions of school districts within
states like California (and more recently New Mexico and Texas) show that the communities expect more in the way of responsiveness from their schools.

Policies surrounding Ethnic Studies are being enacted at the level of school districts. As my participants suggested, this gives policymakers a responsibility to find out what Ethnic Studies is and how it relates to the community. As all of my participants stated the effectiveness of Ethnic Studies depends on its relationship with the community. Policymakers are supposed to represent those communities and as the communities change one would hope that policies would reflect those changes (Tintiangco-Cubales et al., 2015).

Policymakers need to consider the research that shows Ethnic Studies has a positive impact on student achievement (Cabrera et al. 2013). The current reactionary politics makes this an ongoing struggle, as my interviewees all stated. Other recommendations for policy from my participants were to focus on language issues and the needs of English learners, to make sure that the Ethnic Studies/multicultural education curriculum is attached to the specific community in which the curriculum is being taught, and finally, to ensure that the policies are directed at all students because Ethnic Studies affects all people, not only minorities.

In conclusion, SZT is relevant to the recommendations for policy in an effort to not repeat the circumstances of what the federal government did to American Indians in the early 20th century. The policies of that time were assimilation and current policymakers have an opportunity to do something new and progressive, rather repeat the mistakes of the past. It is an opportunity to learn from the mistakes of the past in proscribing Native culture, on a wider scale.
So what do we do when the policymakers simply don’t care or dismiss the research? This is a very relevant question since, at the time of this writing, many school boards and states are voting on this exact issue. As my participants shared, it is important for proponents of Ethnic Studies to be linked to the community and also to strategize ways that Ethnic Studies can be incorporated within more generalized curricula without taking away the power of Ethnic Studies and its purposes. This leads to my next section on recommendations for researchers and scholars.

**Recommendations for Researchers and Scholars**

Similarly to policymakers, researchers and scholars also have a responsibility to the community. University-based researchers are rewarded institutionally to publish in academic journals about social issues. However, to hold true to the original intent of Ethnic Studies there needs to be a relationship between the community and the research. Higher education institutions put great value on research that can bring in the most money; because research tends to be funded by the government and corporations, often that research is guided by current political ideologies. Darder is correct in stating that for young researchers and scholars to flourish in the current climate of higher education, there has to be more value placed on the research of Ethnic Studies and communities.

Academia also has a responsibility to its scholars who are incorporating Ethnic Studies in their research and practice. It is difficult to fully integrate when institutions do not show value to the work being done. Ethnic Studies is interdisciplinary and easily can fit into multiple subjects and curriculums. As Mendoza, Halagao and Nieto pointed out, Ethnic Studies is most effective not by itself but when incorporated into other fields.
Another recommendation is for scholars and researchers to use both quantitative and qualitative methods together to examine Ethnic Studies, especially as it relates to education. The results would complement each other, and provide a more fitting picture of the people that Ethnic Studies represents.

Finally, more specifically for scholars and researchers wanting to use life story methodology, I recommend starting with their own stories and listening to the people around them. Being self-reflective can teach more than we may realize, and it can help to give voice to those who – like me as a young student – may not recognize that they have a voice. Self-reflective listening creates an opportunity for getting to know each other in ways that are not necessarily obvious. The president of the University of Miami called it creating a “community of belonging” in a speech presented in April 2016 (Bouchet Leadership Award Medal, 2016). He went to describe a “community of belonging” as “cultivating the free expression of diverse perspectives.” He also stated that, “College is a place where we forge our own identities while coming into contact with diverse communities” (Frenk, 2016). This is a practical real-life exemplar of this recommendation.

In conclusion, my theoretical framework of SZT relates to the recommendation for researchers and scholars in that there are institutional challenges to Ethnic Studies. Value and worth is placed on other more traditional fields and Ethnic Studies is still questioned as to whether it constitutes a “real” academic discipline. Communities, especially the disfranchised, have not had a strong voice in academia, and unfortunately, many times their voices have been placed in a negative light. This is an opportunity to
give voice to communities whose voices have been silenced, to truly show their funds of knowledge, which is what education is supposed to be about.

**Recommendations for Teachers and Students**

Teachers need to be better prepared in Ethnic Studies. Preparation to teach culturally relevant and inclusive content should become a more important part of teacher education programs. Currently, reactionary politics challenge this position and make it a continual battle. With statistics showing that in the coming years there will be an increase in minority students and that the majority of teachers are White, there needs to be better training in understanding cultural, linguistic, gender, and social class differences. If teachers (who typically have a basic social studies training) do not understand why, who, or what they are teaching, efforts to bridge the gap can easily become cultural tokenism – a Cinco de Mayo fiesta, Black History month, Women’s History month – without any personal meaning to the teachers or the students.

For the students, Ethnic Studies would most likely be their first formal education about race and ethnicity. As stated before, minority children get taught in implicit and explicit ways, from an early age, that there is something different about them because of their race/ethnicity. Rather than letting society and chance teach these complex concepts, education systems need to do a better job in preparing students to live in a very diverse world. Also, as my participants recommended, Ethnic Studies needs to linked to the needs of the community. Mendoza stated, “When the curriculum becomes real, people engage it.”

In conclusion, my theoretical framework of SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) is reflected in the fact that the majority of teacher education programs do not include
Ethnic Studies; many do not even include cultural relevant pedagogical classes. Pre-service teachers, therefore, go out into the schools with unrealistic views of their minority students, which sets them up to repeat the errors of the past. As Mendoza stated, one recommendation is to create an Ethnic Studies track within teacher education programs. This also reaffirms what was discussed in the previous section about giving more value to the curriculum and pushing beyond cultural tokenism; such a curriculum needs to be socially reconstructive in nature with the goal of changing the society one classroom at a time.

And, finally, for students this might be their first time engaging in learning about different ethnic or racial groups, or concretely being taught about their own cultural background. Neighborhoods and local communities are very segregated based on past residential patterns (Grant, 2011). School for some students constitutes their first interaction with people of different cultures and races and new curricula. Presently most students do not encounter these ideas and principles until they get to college or the university. If students were taught at younger age about issues of race and ethnicity, they may more easily (and proactively) confront continual issues of race and ethnicity. This leads into my next section on future research.

**Future Research**

There are several areas of future research that can be generated from the findings of this study. Several of these relate directly to SZT in trying to make what has been considered dangerous and in need of proscription valid and more open in order to not repeat past mistakes. First, studies are needed that examine how multicultural education and Ethnic Studies are actually practiced in the classroom. Such studies should examine
curriculum enactment, student views, and successes. We know that Ethnic Studies classes exist, and we know that teachers are incorporating multicultural education into their curriculum. Therefore, such studies would look at how this is working within the classroom. This relates to my earlier argument that some forms of multicultural education are considered “safer” than Ethnic Studies and multicultural education with a critical focus. Another area of exploration is how curriculum relates to the community.

Next, more research is needed on how to teach issues of race and ethnicity from kindergarten through graduate school. The challenge is the idea that if we don’t talk about race and ethnicity then it doesn’t exist. Current events with police brutality, Ethnic Studies programs, and changing demographics provide an opportunity to do something new and progressive about these issues, which could lead to an amazing uncharted territory. The history of race and ethnicity in the United States is not a harmless story and somehow it is repeated in different ways with different people and at different times. The danger of keeping this history secret or forbidding it from being taught is a distorted view of history and the people it represents – and the very real possibility of repeating the errors of the past.

Third, there needs to be more open research on issues of race and ethnicity as it relates to White people and how the idea of White as the normative category has affected people’s view of themselves and non-White minorities. Ethnic Studies from its origin has been about giving voice to the disenfranchised and the voiceless, but race and ethnicity are fluid, and are constantly changing as demographics change. The world is getting smaller in terms of the sharing of information via the Internet and with global flows of
people across multiple borders. Assimilation or giving value to White mainstream culture over other cultures should not be the goal.

Finally, there needs to be more research on and with specific Ethnic Studies groups, their specific issues, and how they are interconnected with each other. Working together as a coalition is how Ethnic Studies began, and it is how it will move forward. As my assumption of using SZT (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) in a wider cultural context, I believe some of the issues and struggles of different groups are similar in nature. One tried and true way to keep people from bringing about change is by keeping them divided and fighting amongst themselves.

**Conclusion/Self-Reflection**

SZT calls for the examination of federal policies surrounding American Indians from the early 20th century to the present time. Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) came to the conclusion that some elements of American Indian culture were considered “safe” and other elements need to be banned and prohibited. Arizona’s ban on Ethnic Studies (A.R.S. §15–112, 2013) is very similar to this type of policy. So again, as asked in my introduction, what leads one state to make Ethnic Studies a valued part of their school curriculum and another to ban Ethnic Studies? Reactionary politics makes Ethnic Studies and the individual stories that fit within Ethnic Studies a challenge. I also believe a certain amount “willful ignorance” keeps people from wanting to learn about race and ethnicity (Lomawaima, 2012). Finally, there is fear of the individual stories conflicting with each other. That is, there is a perceived need for a single truth, but that does not exist in real life.
My interviewees proved correct a hypothesis that I started with, that personal background experiences influence people’s perspectives and views on Ethnic Studies and that everyone has a personal ethnic/racial story no matter what sociocultural background that individual comes from. The challenge with our society is that, due to ignorance about the past, it is difficult to really hear those stories. It is easier to focus on the differences than the similarities and to fear experiences of the unknown. It is my belief that Ethnic Studies is one way to overcome this widespread “willful ignorance,” as Lomawaima put it in during our interview. The research shows that minority students are taught at an early age that race matters and it makes them different, and yet most U.S. teachers are and have been taught in a very opposite fashion (Ford & Quinn, 2010; Marri, 2009). The reality is no one can escape the influence of race, difference and social hierarchies.

Something else I realized while conducting this research was the emphasis on having teachers of color within the schools, not only to teach Ethnic Studies but as classroom teachers in general. My background gives me a slightly different perspective on this. My mother was raised in Louisiana in the 1950s and 1960s, and all of her teachers were Black. But in her school, there was an idea that only a small few students could truly be successful at school. She attended a segregated school that did not desegregate until 1969 or 1970. She eventually moved to Los Angeles, California, where the schools had been desegregated for some time. My father went to school in Los Angeles his whole life. His yearbook pictures showed an ethnically diverse class in every class photo.

I went to school in multiple states, and didn’t have any minority teachers until I was in high school in an Inuit village above the Arctic Circle. That teacher was Inuit. I
didn’t have my first Black instructor until I was a junior at the university. My family was a little different in that my father had an aunt and uncle and another uncle who were teachers. The aunt and uncle taught on the Hopi Reservation, and the other uncle was a teacher in Missouri (and had a school named after him). Following in their examples, I have an aunt and an uncle who taught for 20+ years in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Knowing that my family did all of this gave me personal inspiration to begin a career as teacher, and it was while I was pursing this career goal that I was realized the system itself is broken in multiple ways.

My first memory about race was when I was in kindergarten and for Mother’s Day we were supposed to paint a picture of our mothers. The kids told me after I painted mine that I needed to make my mom more Brown because I was Brown. I was the only Black student in the class. I came home and told my mom, “I’m Brown.” Moving to multiple states after that, it was amazing how the concept of race was apparent throughout my experience, yet defined a bit different in every state. That was something I had to navigate while growing up, and as I stated before, it wasn’t until I took an African American history class in 10th grade that a teacher told me my story mattered and had value.

As noted in my problem statement, demographics in the United States are shifting, and states such as California, Arizona, and many others in the recent past are making laws around Ethnic Studies. School districts are taking the initiative as many state legislatures metaphorically drag their feet on making statewide policy decisions. Issues of racial profiling by the police and other issues of inequality are rising to the surface again, and the achievement gap between minorities and White students has widened. This is the
opportunity to act progressively and proactively in the face of all of this, especially since there is not much literature on the relationship between Ethnic Studies and student achievement (Cabrera et al., 2013; Franciosi, 2009).

So how do I conclude such an expansive conversation? Mendoza stated:

There is a need to be called out if we are going to talk about racism in a real meaningful way. When someone calls you out, it does not mean the person is jumping on you; it means they are challenging you to be a better person in your everyday practice. And in many respects, despite social discomfort, it is one of the sincerest acts of love.

Ethnic Studies spans so many different types of people, different timeframes and generations, and it has an uncharted and unknown future. All in all, people are the story of Ethnic Studies—people make up the fabric, and the pieces, and the beautiful and colorful patterns of the metaphoric Ethnic Studies quilt. For those working in the field, there is always a story as to what brought them there, and the students they teach all have a story, too. We are all part of the metaphorical quilt.

With this perspective in mind, I end with a poem by Langston Hughes (1935), titled, “Let America Be America Again”:

Let America be America again.
Let it be the dream it used to be.
Let it be the pioneer on the plain
Seeking a home where he himself is free.
(America never was America to me.)
Let America be the dream the dreamers dreamed—
Let it be that great strong land of love

Where never kings connive nor tyrants scheme

That any man be crushed by one above.

(It never was America to me.)

O, let my land be a land where Liberty

Is crowned with no false patriotic wreath,

But opportunity is real, and life is free,

Equality is in the air we breathe.

(There’s never been equality for me,

Nor freedom in this “homeland of the free.”)

Say, who are you that mumbles in the dark?

And who are you that draws your veil across the stars?

I am the poor White, fooled and pushed a part,

I am the Negro bearing slavery’s scars.

I am the red man driven from the land,

I am the immigrant clutching the hope I seek—

And finding only the same old stupid plan

Of dog eat dog, of mighty crush the weak.

I am the young man, full of strength and hope,

Tangled in that ancient endless chain

Of profit, power, gain, of grab the land!

Of grab the gold! Of grab the ways of satisfying need!

Of work the men! Of take the pay!
Of owning everything for one’s own greed!

I am the farmer, bondsman to the soil.

I am the worker sold to the machine.

I am the Negro, servant to you all.

I am the people, humble, hungry, mean—

Hungry yet today despite the dream.

Beaten yet today--O, Pioneers!

I am the man who never got ahead,

The poorest worker bartered through the years.

Yet I’m the one who dreamt our basic dream

In the Old World while still a serf of kings,

Who dreamt a dream so strong, so brave, so true,

That even yet its mighty daring sings

In every brick and stone, in every furrow turned

That’s made America the land it has become.

O, I’m the man who sailed those early seas

In search of what I meant to be my home—

For I’m the one who left dark Ireland’s shore,

And Poland’s plain, and England’s grassy lea,

And torn from Black Africa’s strand I came

To build a “homeland of the free.”

The free?

Who said the free? Not me?
Surely not me? The millions on relief today?
The millions shot down when we strike?
The millions who have nothing for our pay?
For all the dreams we’ve dreamed
And all the songs we’ve sung
And all the hopes we’ve held
And all the flags we’ve hung,
The millions who have nothing for our pay—
Except the dream that’s almost dead today.
O, let America be America again—
The land that never has been yet—
And yet must be—the land where every man is free.
The land that’s mine—the poor man’s, Indian’s, Negro’s, ME—
Who made America,
Whose sweat and blood, whose faith and pain,
Whose hand at the foundry, whose plow in the rain,
Must bring back our mighty dream again.
Sure, call me any ugly name you choose—
The steel of freedom does not stain.
From those who live like leeches on the people’s lives,
We must take back our land again,
America!
O, yes,
I say it plain,
America never was America to me,
And yet I swear this oath—
America will be!
Out of the rack and ruin of our gangster death,
The rape and rot of graft, and stealth, and lies,
We, the people, must redeem
The land, the mines, the plants, the rivers.
The mountains and the endless plain—
All, all the stretch of these great green states—
And make America again!
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APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER
My name is Joy Anderson and I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Beth Blue Swadener in the School of Social Transformation at Arizona State University and Dr. Teresa McCarty in the Graduate School of Education at the University of California Los Angeles. I am conducting a research study to create a collection of narratives addressing the evolution of Ethnic Studies as a scholarly field and a field of practice, including accomplishments and challenges, drawing from personal experiences and reflections of Ethnic Studies scholars in education and educational practitioners.

My research questions are as follows:

1. What have been the experiences of scholarly academic leaders in the field of Ethnic Studies as the field has developed in the U.S.?
2. What are these scholars’ understanding of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?
3. How have they experienced the development of the field?
4. What are their observations of how Ethnic Studies has been implemented in U.S. public schools?
5. What are their perspectives of the larger state and federal policy context of Ethnic Studies?

My study seeks to give understanding through contextualizing the historical and practical purpose of Ethnic Studies. Given the rapidly changing U.S. demographics and the changing educational policies surrounding Ethnic Studies this study is very timely and needed.

I am recruiting individuals to participate in a 90-minute interview about Ethnic Studies and education. The interview may be face to face, via Skype, or telephone and may include a shorter follow-up interview. Attached to this recruitment letter is a copy of the interview protocol and I can provide an executive summary of the proposal by request if you would like to read it.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing back to you soon and I will be sending a follow up email within the next two weeks. I can be contacted both via email and via telephone at xx-xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,
Joy Anderson

Education Policy and Evaluation

Arizona State University

Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
APPENDIX B

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF INTERVIEWEES
This is a summary of my interviewees for my study on Ethnic Studies. As mentioned in the main text of this dissertation, Juan Mendoza (a pseudonym) is excluded from this for confidentiality purposes. The summaries include Ethnic Studies scholars across a range of key areas, and the primary focus is their relationship with Ethnic Studies and education. Using Seidman’s (2013) interview protocol, the goal of the study was to capture their personal stories of Ethnic Studies, which includes how they became involved in the field, their influences in the field, and their vision for the future of the field. I made contact with these individuals in two ways: though face-to-face introductions and through introducing myself via email. The majority of these scholars would categorize themselves as multicultural educators with a foundation in Ethnic Studies. As mentioned in my literature review I am discussing the areas where Ethnic Studies and multicultural education overlap and areas that are primarily focused on Ethnic Studies. What these scholars have in common is they all started out working with Ethnic Studies and influencing what Ethnic Studies has become. At the end of this paragraph that references to each scholar’s work can be found in the References section.

**Antonia Darder (Loyola Marymount University)**

Dr. Darder holds the Leavey Presidential Endowed Chair in Ethics and Moral Leadership in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University and is also a Professor Emerita of Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research focus is critical education theory with an emphasis culture and education, culture and power in education, and biculturalism. Some of her seminal pieces are Freire and Education, Culture and Power in the Classroom, Reinventing Paulo Freire, After Race: Racism after Multiculturalism and many more.
Patricia Halagao (University of Hawai‘i Mānao)

Dr. Halagao is an Associate Professor at the University of Hawai‘i Mānao in the College of Education in Multicultural Education and Social Studies Education. She is the co-author of the first Filipino American multicultural school curriculum in the United States. She has co-authored with a number of scholars about Ethnic Studies and multicultural education. She also has worked with Allyson Tintiangco-Cubales about Filipino American education and Ethnic Studies. She current holds governor appointment with the state of Hawaii Board of Education, in which she is a chair of the committee on Student Achievement.

K. Tsianina Lomawaima (Arizona State University)

Dr. Lomawaima works at Arizona State University within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, The School of Social Transformation. Her work has been influential with American Indian Studies and Women’s Studies. She is a cultural anthropologist by trade. Her dissertation was on the Chilocco Indian School in Newkirk, Oklahoma where her dad lived and attended as a child. She went on to publish her dissertation as a book, *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School*. She has written about Native sovereignty and the relationship between it and citizenship at different times. She argues that many times Native sovereignty and citizenship run opposite of each other. She and Dr. Teresa McCarty studied democracy in education in American Indian boarding schools in the early 20th century. It was in this work that my conceptual framework of Safety Zone Theory (SZT) was created.

Sonia Nieto (University of Massachusetts Amherst)
Dr. Nieto is a Professor Emerita at UM Amherst and has been at the forefront of multicultural education. In her book *The Light in Their Eyes* she wrote narratives about multicultural education from the perspective of the teachers. Her research focus is also on teacher education and culture and the interworking of that relationship. She has received 6 honorary degrees from several universities. Her first book (that was co-authored with Patty Bode) *Affirming Diversity* was about how sociocultural factors effect students’ achievement and that teachers need a social justice view of education in order to help their students overcome these challenges.

**Christine Sleeter (California State University Monterey Bay)**

Christine Sleeter has been writing about Ethnic Studies and issues of race and ethnicity in education for many years. An important piece was one that explained different approaches to multicultural education. At one time she was the President and she is one of the founding members of the National Association of Multicultural Education (NAME). One of her most significant recent works is her report on the status of Ethnic Studies in the United States. In it she summarized multiple facets of Ethnic Studies and the significance of each. Another piece she wrote was on standardization and multicultural education and how standardization tends to stifle and limit both local culture and more widespread non-majority cultures in the way it is being taught and focused on. Her research focus is teacher education and multicultural education and the interworking of that relationship. Most recently she has contributed to the future Ethnic Studies curriculum in California and co-authored a piece on Ethnic Studies in the San Francisco Unified School District.
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
INFORMATION FOR INTERVIEWERS: This protocol is a modification of I.E. Seidman’s (2013) three-part interview series, with the three parts condensed into a single 90-minute interview and possibly shorter follow-up interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researchers/ Scholars</td>
<td>Please tell me about your cultural background and how you came to the field of Ethnic Studies [or whatever specific part of ES that they were involved in]—</td>
<td>Please tell me about how you have seen the implementation of ES over time —</td>
<td>Given what you have said about ES (whatever branch), what does ES mean to you as an educator/scholar/researcher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where born and grew up?</td>
<td>• What do you think is the relationship between ES and multicultural education?</td>
<td>• Your future aspirations as a researcher/scholar of ES and with the field of ES in general?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents’ culture, education and professional background?</td>
<td>• What are some critical moments within ES?</td>
<td>• What do you believe are the goals of ES (whatever branch) are now? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Important people/teachings in your life?</td>
<td>• What does it mean to you to work within the field of ES (whatever branch that might be)?</td>
<td>• If you were to try to predict the future of ES, what would that future look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal schooling in regards to ES experiences?</td>
<td>• Describe key elements of the ES curriculum (Where? In their university/school – other places? It’s important to be clear here so that you are able to elicit the kind of data needed to answer your</td>
<td>• What factors have been most important in the field’s success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memories of ES or ethnicity in your own educational background</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What have been the greatest challenges or barriers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What were you doing</td>
<td></td>
<td>• What would you want other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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occupationally before working within the field?

- How came to teach and research ES?
  - Which specific classes did you teach?
  - How many years teaching?
  - Are there any other experiences that you believe influenced your teaching and researching ES?

- Research questions.)
  - Are there ways that ES (whatever branch) has been deemed acceptable or unacceptable in terms of societal norms and school culture in the past?
  - What are some local, state, and federal policies you believe influence ES?
  - How do you think the field of Ethnic Studies has changed over the past 20 years?
  - Are there ways that ES (whatever branch) has been deemed acceptable or unacceptable in terms of societal norms and school culture in the past?
  - What are some local, state, and federal policies you believe influence ES?
  - How do you think the field of Ethnic Studies has changed over the past 20 years?
  - Are there ways that ES (whatever branch) has been deemed acceptable or unacceptable in terms of societal norms and school culture in the past?
  - What are some local, state, and federal policies you believe influence ES?
  - How do you think the field of Ethnic Studies has changed over the past 20 years?
  - Are there ways that ES (whatever branch) has been deemed acceptable or unacceptable in terms of societal norms and school culture in the past?
  - What are some local, state, and federal policies you believe influence ES?
  - How do you think the field of Ethnic Studies has changed over the past 20 years?

- Other comments/questions/ideas?
APPENDIX D

MY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AS RELATED TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS
Research Question: Sub-Research Questions 1 & 2 & Interview Questions

What are the experiences of academic leaders in the field of Ethnic Studies as this field developed in the U.S.?

How have they experienced the development of the field?

What are these scholars’ understandings of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?

Where born and grew up

Parents’ culture, education and professional background?

Was race/ethnicity a factor in where you grew up?

Important people/teachings in your life?

Personal schooling in regards to ES experiences?

Memories of ES or ethnicity in your own educational background?

What were you doing occupationally before working within the field?

How did they come to teach and research ES?

Are there any other experiences that you believe influenced your teaching and researching ES?

How many years teaching?
Research Question: Sub-Research Question 3 & Interview Questions

What are the experiences of academic leaders in the field of Ethnic Studies as this field developed in the U.S.?

What are their observations of how Ethnic Studies has been implemented in U.S. public schools?

What do you think is the relationship between ES and multicultural education?

What factors have been most important in the field’s success?

What have been the greatest challenges or barriers?

What would you want other educators to know about this field?

Is there a specific lesson within the curriculum that may be difficult to teach and difficult for the students to completely understand? Are there several?

Given what you have already told me, how do you make sense of your work within the field?
Research Question: Sub-Research Questions 4 & 5 & Interview Questions

What are the experiences of academic leaders in the field of Ethnic Studies as this field developed in the U.S.?

What is their vision for the future of Ethnic Studies as a field of study and practice?

What are their perspectives of the larger state and federal policy context of Ethnic Studies?

The graduation requirement of LAUSD and other California schools

Banning of Ethnic Studies

Your future aspirations as a researcher/scholar of ES and with the field of ES in general?

What do you believe are the goals of ES (whatever branch) are now? Why?

If you were to try to predict the future of ES, what would that future look like?
APPENDIX E

AN EXAMPLE STORY MAP OF THE LIFE STORY OF SCHOLARS OF ETHNIC STUDIES USING INTERVIEW DATA FROM MY PILOT STUDY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Background/Personal story &amp; Ethnic Studies</th>
<th>Present position within Ethnic Studies</th>
<th>Reflection on those experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past</strong></td>
<td>Taiwanese immigrants kicked out of their country by the Chinese government</td>
<td>There is a recognition of the privilege that was given to her as child and throughout her life</td>
<td>ES needs to repositioned through intersectionality with other issues such as colonialism, immigration, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
<td>It's what made her who she is—from being in a middle class immigrant family to growing up in a majority white San Diego community to going to Harvard as English Literature major</td>
<td>In the present, her role is to teach these concepts that students may not have ever thought about them. For some it's the first time they have been introduced to the idea and for others it is what they have been waiting for forever to hear</td>
<td>It is amazing how the value of ES changes depending on where one is in the US. In CA ES through school districts is being shown as valuable and curriculum necessity. In AZ it is being deemed illegal and dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Intent</strong></td>
<td>To keep teaching until she can't anymore</td>
<td>Get the community involved more with Ethnic Studies; go back to its origin of grassroots</td>
<td>Hopefully universities will recognize the value of Ethnic Studies and that the concepts will spread throughout the university not just in ES departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

CONTACT SHEET
Type of Contact:

Assistant Professor Her Office 12/9/14 ASU

JMA 5/13/15

Pick out the most salient points in the contact. Number in order on this sheet and note page number on which point appears. Number point in text of write-up. Attach theme or aspect to each point in CAPITALS. Invent themes where no existing one apply and asterisk those. Comment may also be included in double parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Salient Points</th>
<th>Themes/ Aspects</th>
<th>Memo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Confidentiality was important</td>
<td>RIGHTS/ PROTECTION/ SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2. Born in the Midwest Raised in California</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3. Middle Class Family-Dad- nuclear physicist and Mom physiologist started a biotech firm</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4. Taiwanese immigrants-some considered Chinese but they categorized themselves as Taiwanese</td>
<td>RACE/ ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5. Family BG was important b/c they begin the need for political activist-they were not allowed to go back to Taiwan</td>
<td>**POLITICS/ MOVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6. Universities recruited immigrants in the sciences (through giving scholarships) b/c of the Cold War (1970s)</td>
<td>CULTURE/ CLASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7. Both parents wanted to be professors, there were a lot of openings in the highly specialized field and many universities were hesitant to hire someone foreign</td>
<td>CLASS/ ETHNICITY/ CULTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9. Grew up in Southern California-in a majority middle class White area</td>
<td>ETHNICITY/ CLASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10. English major and an artist during college</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Didn’t have to think about race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11. Even though grew up in a majority White middle class area there was racial diversity</td>
<td>RACE/ ETHNICITY/ LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12. East coast-Old money and new money and Harvard’s diversity was different—lead to becoming a cultural geographer</td>
<td>RACE/ ETHNICITY/ LOCATION</td>
<td>West Coast/ East Coast difference and historical definitions of race and ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Studied American Studies at an university in Southern California</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>AS is considered ES within different university settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
