

---

The University of Georgia • College of Education  
Center for Latino Achievement and Success in Education  
(CLASE)

<http://www.coe.uga.edu/clase>

**CLASE WORKING PAPER:**  
**THE DREAM DEFERRED: WHY MULTICUL-**  
**TURAL EDUCATION FAILS TO CLOSE THE**  
**ACHIEVEMENT GAP—**  
**A CULTURAL HISTORICAL ANALYSIS**

**PEDRO PORTES, SPENCER SALAS**

**2007**



Running Head: MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

The Dream Deferred: Why Multicultural Education Fails to Close the Achievement  
Gap—A Cultural Historical Analysis

Pedro R. Portes, Ph.D.

College of Education, 318 Aderhold

The University of Georgia

Athens, GA 30602

[portes@uga.edu](mailto:portes@uga.edu)

Spencer Salas, Ph.D.

College of Education, MDSK

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

9201 University City Blvd

Charlotte, NC 28223-0001

[ssalas@uncc.edu](mailto:ssalas@uncc.edu)

18 October 2007

The Dream Deferred: Why Multicultural Education Fails to Close the Achievement  
Gap—A Cultural Historical Analysis

ABSTRACT

The authors critically examine multicultural education and its failure to address the stark differences that characterize student achievement in North America in terms of a praxis that would bring equity in learning or other developmental outcomes. Arguing that dismantling proportional group based inequality depends on the systematic reform of structures and policies currently perpetuating the correlation between children's ethno-cultural and economic history and their school achievement, we draw from a cultural historical theoretical framework to outline how the multiple and complex factors influencing underachievement might be better understood and, moreover, effectively counteracted in ways that begin to reverse the rates of school failure for U.S. ethnic minority students, in particular U.S. English learners.

INDEX WORDS: Multicultural Education, U.S. Latinos, Students Placed at Risk, Group Based Inequality, Cultural-historical theory

The Dream Deferred: Why Multicultural Education Fails to Close the Achievement  
Gap—A Cultural Historical Analysis

In the United States of America over 40 percent of Latino, Native, and African American children live in poverty compared to 14 percent of majority children. Such massive proportional disadvantage is reflected in standardized test scores of math and reading where 13-year-old students from the privileged majority academic performance approximates that of 17-year-old black students (The Condition of Education, 2004). Thus, a literacy gap ranging from three to four grade levels is constructed, resulting in massive group-based inequality that severely handicaps many of America's children from eventually accessing higher education and other so-called equal opportunity structures essential to today's post-industrial economies (P. Portes, 2005; P. R. Portes, 1996). This disturbing pattern has not changed in over four decades.

Multicultural education (MCE) is one of a number of multi-voiced, loosely organized fronts that have attempted to respond to the survival-of-the-fittest paradigms common to the first half of the last century and the group-based inequality we describe. However, we are unconvinced of the extent to which MCE has produced a conceptual cultural framework or pedagogy for actually narrowing the achievement gap around which its rhetoric is often centered. Specifically, this article examines through a cultural historical lens how MCE has (not) addressed the stark differences that characterize student achievement in North America in terms of a praxis that would bring equity in learning or other developmental outcomes. Instead it is a framework that explains but is not clear on how equity can be advanced in schools for groups of children who are not

only diverse but carry a specific type of cultural history. The latter interacts with schooling in the U.S. in ways that leaves different interrelated types of poverty intact. In relative terms, these children face obstacles in achieving a grade level education that essentially handicaps them from attaining quality of life for life.

We begin our discussion with a brief overview of the contexts in which MCE emerged and examine how its proponents have attempted to reframe the education of historically under-served children. Continuing, we draw from a cultural historical theoretical framework emphasizing the socially mediated nature of human development and learning (see, e.g., Cole, 1996; Cole, Engeström, Vasquez, & University of California San Diego. Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition, 1997; Cole & Scribner, 1974) to outline how the multiple and complex factors influencing underachievement might be better understood and, moreover, effectively counteracted in ways that begin to reverse the rates of school failure for U.S. ethnic minority students, in particular U.S. English learners.

#### From Cultural Deficit to Cultural Difference

Pre-MCE, the education and development of students outside of the male, European American, middle class was of marginal concern to a democratic society that practiced segregation or educational apartheid most apparent for Black and Native American students and women. Moreover, until relatively recently, educational research literature in the U.S. was characterized by implicit and explicit beliefs of predetermined ability and aptitudes—an individualism abetted by psychology and other social sciences emerging out of a Darwinian legacy. The tests and measurement tradition originating from Binet's work, and the subsequent organismic, stage- based genetic epistemology of

Piaget were exceedingly influential in education. Moreover, the role of the environment as articulated in behavioristic applications of learning theory suffered from the assumptions that male, middle-class, English monolinguals were the only learners that mattered. U.S. schools had, in fact, been constructed, implicitly, for them. Culture began to be considered more directly in education and science as the role of the environment, class, culture, and family impacted on individual and group development after Hunt (1961) laid part of the framework for the deficit-difference discourse that predates MCE.

With Piaget, the influence of behaviorism began to wane in the 1960s from its direct instruction approach based on logical positivism. Ironically, both behaviorism and direct instruction failed to take into account the role of language in cognitive mediation of learning and its cultural basis. Skinner's account of children's learning of language was debunked by a biological explanation by the psycholinguist Noam Chomsky in the 1950's. Piaget's model would soon begin to be challenged by Vygotskian inspired thinking about language and thought which began to appear with frequency in North American in 1980's. How language and culture influenced development both psychologically and sociologically became of central themes in those past decades.

#### *MCE and the Great Society*

National consciousness of social (in)justice emerged in the context of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society and its goals of removing the societal constraints placed on the development the disadvantaged. With the creation of the U.S. Census Bureau's category of "non-Hispanic whites", further discrepancies between population groups were subsequently uncovered. Alarmed by those discrepancies, a monocultural

educational system began shifting toward student centered pedagogies and away from a tests and measurement tradition.

Even before Johnson's reforms, Hunt's (1961) writings on the role of environmental factors in intellectual development, and Bloom's (1964) later finding that intellectual development seemed fixed by age 4 led to a series of early age interventions aimed at lessening the impact of poverty, and literacy (tools) on human development. But curiously it is not at this point that MCE emerged, which is telling from a socio-genetic standpoint. Rather, MCE appeared in the 1970's partly in response to the wash-out discourse concerning earlier group gains produced by experimental early childhood, federally funded intervention programs. The details of this controversial period pitting the cultural deficit against the cultural difference model are beyond our scope and can be found elsewhere (Cole, 1996; Lazar & Darlington, 1982; P. R. Portes, 1996). However, it was the backlash of federally funded research claiming genetic mental superiority that led to a new twist in cultural imperialism as central to educational policy. That is to say, deficit models that characterized federal evaluations of early-intervention programs suggested that children and their families were responsible for the problems encountered in schools, including poor academic performance (Coleman, 1966). Related perspectives described families and children from ethnic minority groups and poverty as pathological (see, e.g., Lewis, 1961; Myrdal, 1944; Rainwater & Yancy, 1965) and argued through a cultural deficit perspective that their failure to achieve in schools was due to inadequate cultural and linguistic characteristics (see, e.g., Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966).

In the U.S., a genetic inferiority movement drew from so-called scientific evidence to brand non-majority groups intellectually deficient (Herrnstein, 1971; Jensen,

1974) and their families pathological. Such families, in turn, produced damaged children who were framed as objects of pity to be granted a “special status as victims” (Scott, 1997, p. xiii). In reality, these children’s legal entitlement to quality public schooling was routinely violated. They attended under funded, substandard schools, staffed with teachers that were not adequately prepared with knowledge and skills to teach them (Kozol, 1992; Viadero, 2000).

Inspired by the 1960’s Civil Rights Movement and disillusioned by discriminatory schooling practices and racist research, scholarship responded with the two-factor conjecture that (1) the standardized tests used to categorize minority students as underachieving were biased; and (2), teachers routinely held lower expectations for minority students. In other words, Group Based Inequality was nothing more than a self-fulfilling prophecy. Such scholarship exposed the inherent racism in the ways minority children had been framed in the previous research and policy literature, demanded the elimination of pejorative treatment in schools, insisted on the inclusion of their history in the curricular content, and argued for examination of political, social, and historical events from multiple perspectives.

Culture-free tests were endorsed along with teaching styles specific or at least sensitive to non-majority children’s learning styles. This body of work began to engender a new educational reform movement, MCE, committed to improving access to schooling opportunities for ethnic minority children. Drawing from a cultural difference model that essentially acknowledged group differences in performance without discussion of the inherent superiority or inferiority of any one group, advocates of MCE aimed at promoting solutions to specific issues affecting the specific ethnic group for which they

advocated (see, e.g., Banks, 1969; Garcia, 1978; Gay, 1970) with the assumption that learning about diversity would lead to greater equity in a variety of outcomes. In the 1970s, MCE revised its content and purpose of multicultural to helping individuals and groups function more effectively in their own ethnic cultures, in other ethnic communities, and in the larger context of pluralistic U.S. society (see, e.g., Cortez, 1978; Gay, 1977; Grant, 1979). Unfortunately, the persisting problem of some groups of children remaining significantly behind in school academically and economically has not been a direct concern in terms of theory or practice.

#### MCE and a Nation at Risk

With the watershed of “A Nation at Risk” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), schools found themselves suddenly pressed for evidence of productivity and accountability in the context of global competition. Thus, the same national report fueled a standards movement, and the proliferation of specific instructional frameworks advocating performance-based student assessments.

Before the disintegration of the Soviet Union in the late 80’s and 90’s, many multiculturalists were engaged in a conceptual merger with proponents of Freirean-based critical pedagogy, process-oriented models of teaching and learning, and qualitative research paradigms as a means of resisting the quantitative models that, for them, had produced the cultural domination they were working to expose and resist. Such fusion resulted in rhetorically charged reform movement committed to social action, access to and equity in schooling, cultural pluralism, and culturally responsive pedagogies all aimed at reducing the achievement gap for students “of color” (Gay, 1994, 2000; Nieto, 1992; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). From our perspective the issue is not one of color but of

cultural history that can be indexed along some ethnic memberships. Furthermore, color along with race distracts us from a cultural analysis in the social sciences as a term that carries considerable political baggage. Unfortunately much of the discourse found in MCE writings is focused on such categories that become somewhat distracting and that fail to contribute toward establishing viable means for altering today's unfair structures.

With the consensus that MCE coursework for pre-service and in-service educators had the potential to improve the achievement of ethnic minority children, it was soon embraced by U.S. teacher education. To clarify, there is great ethical significance of including MCE in teacher education curricula; and we too are fervently committed to social justice, access and equity to education, and a pluralistic society. However, the persistence of large-scale proportional group based inequality reveals that MCE has had only limited impact on the achievement of students placed at risk (SPARs). The "hope-advocacy" or "empowerment/oppression" themes prevalent in multicultural and critical theoretical orientations, though potentially valuable, fall short of redressing the urgent social and academic needs of growing ethnic student groups left behind by unresponsive, often retarding educational structures

The ways proponents and followers position MCE in the field of education in an advocacy/hope orientation often uses the concepts of caring, same-race teacher role models, or teachers as 'change agents' as key mediators that are limited in altering group based inequality. But the latter has not remained unchanged simply due to *MCE missing the boat* but rather by societal conditions still preserved by privileged embedded structures and agency. Public schools is one such structure sustained both locally and federally. In the U.S. the federal structure attempts to guide local practices to the point

that MCE has become been absorbed, co-opted and managed through curricula, books and scholarship. It is ever present but unlikely to alter the status quo. This discourse may motivate novice teachers; but leaves them without the helping means (tools) to make a sustainable difference on a national scale. Furthermore, the rhetoric of MCE risks to assuage the consciousness of both sides of the political continuum who believe that MCE in and of itself—without a fundamental examination of the political and economic societal structures of schooling—is a solution for addressing inequality in schooling for large groups of disenfranchised children (P. Portes, 2005). We argue that MCE is not enough and although necessary perhaps, its framework is lacking with respect to giving analytic primacy to means required in understanding group variation in development.

#### The Mind in Society and Group Based Inequality

Cultural historical theoretical frameworks provide much insight as to why MCE has had little impact on group based inequality. Vygotskian cultural historical frameworks share the notion that higher mental functions in humans are mediated by meaningful social interaction (Cole, 1996; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1998) and activity. Consequently, from a methodological point of view, cultural historical theory rejects the notion that human psychological development or a cultural historical phenomenon such as the achievement gap in U.S. public education can be separate learning from the social, cultural, and historical contexts in which individuals participate either directly or peripherally (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Salomon, 1993).

Equally central to the Russian cultural-historical school and embedded in the hypothesis of the social nature of human cognitive development is Vygotsky's "uncharacteristic of human mental and emotional activity" (Holland & Cole, 1995, p. 475)—

the use of material tools and symbolic artifacts to mediate thinking. Holland and Valsiner (1988) explain,

He [Vygotsky] referred to these tools as “helping means” (in Russian *vspomogatel’nye sredstva*). These means (or activities, as Vygotsky with his emphasis on process might prefer) are psychological devices for mediating between one’s mental states and processes and one’s environment. (p. 248)

Thus, from a cultural historical perspective human thought is distributed across the material tools and social and cultural psychological devices that women and men have shaped over time and that have in turn shaped them (Salomon, 1993).

With its focus on mediational means, cultural historical theoretical frameworks identify mechanisms that affect individual as well as collective development in contrast to the above approaches. Those means, in turn, serve to formulate counter strategies to the problem of addressing developmental differentials.

Theorizing the many potential reasons why MCE has failed as a viable means to improve learning outcomes for today’s underserved students, we highlight the following:

- MCE lacks a genetic cultural-historical analysis to address the social, academic, and linguistic factors that deter particular groups of students in low-performing schools found in mostly high-poverty settings.
- MCE theorists and practitioners, along with many policy makers and academics, do not seem to be informed of what is required to master an additional language nor how to create optimal contextual and pedagogical language developmental conditions to enable second language learning.

- The effective preparation of large numbers of monolingual, monocultural English speaking principals, counselors and teachers for ethnically diverse multiple heritage language speakers remains both a liability and a challenge.
- The development of pedagogical strategies which include language and cultural accommodations to maximize, maintain, and advance children's native language development to proficient levels lies outside professional development for in-service and even pre-service teachers when it should not, and
- A strategy to dismantle the institutionalization of policies and practices, such as language segregation, tracking, disjointed pull out programs, high-stakes testing in a second language, age inappropriate curricular resources, and English-only instruction that unduly delay these students' learning and educational potential already crippled by poverty is not integrated in the MCE or radical pedagogy knowledge base.

In sum, proponents of multicultural and interrelated critical pedagogies are highly conscious of group based inequality. However, they have yet to suggest in very concrete terms how to dismantle the achievement gap that for decades has been produced and sustained in U.S. schools. Good teaching and effective pedagogy are indubitably welcome. However a more complex understanding of human development and of how interacting mediated actions and structures shape and perpetuate proportional disadvantage is perhaps even more essential to redressing the achievement gap.

#### *Understanding the Development of the Achievement Gap*

From a Vygotskian perspective, numerical comparisons of school performance among groups require that attention be given to the particular cultural history of each group. Cole (1996) maintained that school performance served as an index of cultural

achievement, and; as such had to be viewed historically in terms of access to certain cultural experiences and tools that strongly influence human development and cultural adaptation. Similarly, cultural differences in home environments factors were argued in U.S. educational research as the source of some of the inequality in scholastic and economic outcomes (Jencks & Phillips, 1999). That is to say, for example, group differences in income essentially reflect the extent to which school achievement differences are generated and repeatedly produced in and out of schools.

Obviously, schools located in high-poverty settings vary significantly from those found in middle and upper class neighborhoods; likewise, schools serving ethnic minority students differ from segregated schools with a majority of European American middle-class children. Along with obvious differences in student populations, physical structures, and the communities surrounding these campuses, there are also considerable variations in resources, mutuality of teacher-student acceptance, and treatment of children, including — teacher quality, appropriateness and accessibility of curricular materials, and the nature of pedagogical decisions based on the ways educators identify, evaluate, and respond to student cultural competencies. Thus, the cultural competencies and socialization patterns children acquire in their homes and communities may or may not be linked directly to what is required in school or to their potential to make successful adaptations to outside demands made by schools (see also, e.g., L. Delpit, 1995; L. D. Delpit & Dowdy, 2002; Heath, 1983).

Over time, differing behaviors, beliefs, expectations, values, practices, experiences are constructed and sustained by participants, as individuals and as members of groups. Under certain contexts, some groups are more likely to develop successful

patterns and display a willingness to comply with expected behavior. Others who are repeatedly treated in ways that are perceived as unfair, understandably, may choose to resist. Students who internalize a resistive pattern of self-control, in spite of consequences, generally make decisions that place themselves at risk (Ogbu, 1974, 1978, 2003; A. Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; A. Portes & Zhou, 1994; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Moreover, sustained unfairness erects oppositional habits of mind that are prone to resist short-term interventions. So, in a very real sense, it is not necessarily the socialization patterns associated and observed in certain cultures that are the causes of an achievement disparity. Rather, low achievement is the long-term product of forced adaptation to insensitive and inequitable socio-historical conditions. The latter are instrumental in producing cultural or group differences in a host of developmental variables. Thus color and race lose meaning when primacy is given to the analysis of mediated conditions associated with different forms of development and adaptation.

#### More Than Hope: Mediating Achievement

It may be precisely because of restrictions imposed on families and children's development that socialization practices produce dispositions that are incompatible with those required in schools (Tharp, 1989). Therefore, to achieve a significant and lasting effect on children's intellectual development to be sustained at the group level, both individual and contextual supports need to be weaved in the lives of those placed at risk for failure.

Equity in achieving at minimum grade level standards is a first, minimal step in dismantling educational iniquity. To that end, we argue that achieving comparable distributions and proportional achievement outcomes for SPARS involves systematic

overcompensation strategies for the first few generations of under-represented student groups.

Overcompensation can be defined as an early start that involves a high intensity and continuity of experience with respect to mediated cultural activity and is required to redress the detrimental influences resulting from the effects of socio-economic disadvantages which are cumulative and increase with age; and, limited school resources, norms, and damaging organizational features present in the inferior schooling experiences designed for SPARs. Thus, overcompensation needs to start at an early age and involve culturally mediated activities with high intensity and continuity of experience in and out of schools. It does not require sacrificing or destroying native culture but rather an additive approach defined as a cultural not chemical addition that in turn, can govern future interactions and development. Beyond celebrations of diversity lies the ethics of pursuing and effecting greater equity in quality of life for future generations of children across groups with different cultural history.

Moreover, supplementing and overcompensating efforts must show positive effects that truly narrow gaps in sustainable fashion. A socio-linguistic support system of inter-woven conditions for children reared in poverty needs to be in place to empower concept development in valued literacy or school content areas. Such a strategy would represent a departure from current “pull-out” or other remedial basic skill programs where ethnic groups are left to negotiate hostile school environments without sufficient support that often co-exist with MCE.

School cultures surrounding the category of Students Placed at Risk (SPARs) must involve “communities of learners” (Lave & Wenger, 1991) that activate continuous

enrichment in the very ways supportive, everyday classroom activities are mediated. Rigorous, challenging, academic environments, designed for continuity, need to be supplemented with human resources comparable to the other more “established or institutionalized” programs, such as Special Education, Drug Free programs; or even more expensive programs involving incarceration or alternative schools for minors. They need to reinforce the child’s development in valued areas with respect to school success in both formal and informal settings. Such communities can promote self-regulation, motivation, and orient SPARs cumulatively toward grade level academic learning.

The future of any nation depends on its effectiveness developing its young people; and, on its willingness to attend to the life challenges facing their most vulnerable citizens, children. What would it take for educational policy to reverse the current segmenting structures and to achieve parity for historically neglected populations who often complete high school with only a middle-school level of competency? A convincing strategy must attend to the academic, social, and economic conditions that simultaneously address individual and group development (P. R. Portes, 1996). Precisely, a cultural historical approach calls for a rectification and overhaul of policies and structures that still organize a caste-like educational system, - one that is as or better supported, as the wars on drugs, terrorism or NCLB (higher standards). A socio-cultural rather than multicultural praxis may eventually help restructure an unjust society steeped in group conflict, greed and violence. In this process, such learning societies can come to understand equity in schooling minimizes the achievement gap and a host of related national and international problems. This is an example of a collective, dialectic process

that is in line with cultural historical theory and semiotic analysis. One group can't change without the other changing as well.

Particular models such as MCE and interrelated critical and radical pedagogies or even so called "comprehensive reform"<sup>1</sup> (e.g., Borman, Springfield, & Slavin, 2001) give the impression that all that can be done is being done. Many children at risk are not being well served by Head Start and/or Even Start. Even when early age programs prove effective, an obvious problem concerns the fact that most children who have been placed at risk remain underserved due to family poverty outside their control. Current explanations of the achievement gap that include deficiencies in the educational system itself (Noddings, 1996), the pedagogical (under) preparation of educators (Clinchy, 2001), unfair school and social practices (McLaren, 1994; Varenne & McDermott, 1999), limited inherited capacities (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) —are beyond our present scope to describe in detail. Instead, a cultural and historical framework for dismantling the achievement gap outlined by Portes (1996) is the subject of the remainder of this paper.

#### Dismantling Group Based Inequality

A socio-cultural model emphasizing development considers the application of primary intervention measures as a strategy for cultivating a level playing field for children of poverty. Such a model necessarily employs an inter-generational historical lens to activate parent involvement, a most critical challenge. A plan for providing cultural continuity is needed to support any type of educational intervention. The concepts of "enrichment" and "intellectual stimulation" need, for example, to be re-

---

<sup>1</sup> Comprehensive reform is a term employed in educational research to refer to school and district new policies and practices to drill test relevant knowledge for poverty-level students such as "Success for All" (see Slavin)

examined insofar as they concern the development of intelligence or school aptitude. This reexamination of development needs in closing group based gaps in learning outcomes follows the following principles:

- The input from the environment needs to be designed for continuity, challenging and reinforcing the child's development in various valued areas with respect to measures of school success.
- These inputs need to be aligned with school curricula and help foster proximal zones for development that are culturally prized and consonant with those from which intellectual assessments are made in relation to adult career roles and activities. The activities found in the environment that mediate development require particular attention to symbolic tools centered on language-mediated literacy, intellectual skills as well as beliefs, and expectations.
- The culture around children placed at risk for success in school requires continuous enrichment in the very ways everyday activities are mediated. Pre and after-school activities need to be supplemented in ways comparable to the middle class' hidden curriculum.
- For comparable achievement distributions in the future, a strategy of overcompensation for the first few generations of adolescents needs to be embraced until parental support levels and practices are established intergenerationally. That is, a socio-cognitive support system needs to be in place long enough to influence future generations of families and produce a bi-cultural "kit" that promotes school success. A life-skills-in-adolescence-strategy is needed because it counters that imposed by and on generations living in poverty and

because activating parent involvement to support children's school success has been practically impossible.

Likewise, school-based activities need to be reorganized so that "basic skills" are not all that the child encounters: he or she also needs to learn higher order skills. Too often we find that schooling, low expectations, and remedial classes fail to work within children's zones of proximal development and actually impede the development of their higher intellectual skills. In this sense, schools frequently fail to provide optimal conditions for intellectual development, literally placing them at risk early and locking them there through tracking (Oakes, 1985).

In summary, reforms such as MCE and other well-intentioned programs have failed to bring about the conditions necessary to empower most children placed at risk with equal educational opportunity in the long term. Current policy only ensures that most children remain at risk in the lower range of scholastic achievement. Equal educational opportunity depends on the activation of specific conditions that favor intellectual development in and outside of schools and classrooms. These social and pedagogical conditions are the means to achieve the ultimate goal of closing the educational gap. They are the sine qua non for establishing equal educational opportunities. Ironically, these same social conditions may be considered, in and of themselves, the ultimate goal to be achieved by bringing about equal educational opportunity.

We close with a question:

“How can a strategic and comprehensive framework be formulated to integrate mediated actions in the lives of a sufficient number of under-represented students to eliminate bimodal distributions in learning outcomes?”

We argue that a lifespan-developmental model calls for a set of concerted actions in mediating the development of children from cultures placed at-risk. These include:

- Better preschool preparation for all SPARs, e.g., young, poor, competent children having access to effective Head Start and other preschool programs.
- Elementary school supports, e.g., once in elementary school, they would encounter a new set of supports in and out of school to stay at grade level each year. It also calls for college students and retired personnel to participate in the plan by serving as mentors in after-school programs.
- A life-skills adolescent curriculum. Specifically, as adolescents, they would continue to have extra academic support as they complete the first generation cycle. In secondary schools, they would complete the cycle and participate in human development workshops to be structured as an integral part of the educational system. In addition to providing SPARsfull coverage or support as they grow, direct academic supports in and out of school would be sustained to prevent the gap from emerging.
- Higher education transformation. This last component requires transformations in the professional preparation of educators and other college students in higher education. They need to be prepared with a more complete knowledge base and with new roles in primary prevention.

INSERT FIGURE (P. Portes, 2005)

Accordingly, dismantling group based inequality entails seamless intervention development at key transition points in the life cycle of students placed at risk. Only once a full or fuller system is in place might a more level playing field be established—a playing field that potentially liberates children in real ways from many of the constraints now imposed by poverty and GBI. The society in which we live might then become more ethical through a system of educational practices perhaps not powerful enough to eradicate inequality once and for all, but certainly powerful enough to reproduce less inequality in the not as distant future.

## References

- Banks, J. A. (1969). A content analysis of the Black American in textbooks. *Social Education*, 33, 954-957, 963.
- Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bloom, B. (1964). *Stability and change in human characteristics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Borman, G. D., Springfield, S. C., & Slavin, R. E. E. (2001). *Title I: Compensatory education at the crossroads*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Clinchy, E. (2001). Needed: A new educational civil rights movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(7), 492-498.
- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Cole, M., Engeström, Y., Vasquez, O. A., & University of California San Diego. Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition. (1997). *Mind, culture, and activity: Seminal papers from the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M., & Scribner, S. (1974). *Culture and thought: A psychological introduction*. New York: Wiley.
- Coleman, J. S. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cortez, C. (1978). New perspectives on multicultural education. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 7(3), 20-22.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Delpit, L. D., & Dowdy, J. K. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Garcia, R. (1978). The multiethnic dimension of bilingual-bicultural education. *Social Education*, 42(6), 492-494.
- Gay, G. (1970). Needed ethnic studies in the school. *Educational Leadership*, 28(3), 292-295.
- Gay, G. (1977). Curriculum design for multicultural education. In C. A. Grant (Ed.), *Multicultural education: Commitments, issues and applications* (pp. 34-56). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gay, G. (1994). *At the essence of learning: Multicultural education*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grant, C. A. (1979). Education that is multicultural as a change agent: Organizing for effectiveness. *Journal of Negro Education*, 48(3), 431-446.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Herrnstein, R. J. (1971). IQ. *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 43-64.
- Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). New York: Free Press.

- Holland, D. C., & Cole, M. (1995). Between discourse and schema: Reformulating a cultural-historical approach to culture and mind. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 26(4), 475-489.
- Holland, D. C., & Valsiner, J. (1988). Cognition, symbols, and Vygotsky's developmental psychology. *Ethos*, 16(3), 247-272.
- Hunt, J. M. (1961). *Intelligence and experience*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Jencks, C., & Phillips, M. (1999). *The Black-White achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Jensen, A. (1974). Ethnicity and scholastic achievement. *Psychological Reports*, 34, 659-668.
- Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage Inequalities*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lazar, I., & Darlington, R. (1982). Lasting effects of early education: A report from the consortium for longitudinal studies. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 47(2-3), 1-151.
- Lewis, O. (1961). *The children of Sanchez*. New York: Random House.
- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: an introduction to critical pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.
- Noddings, N. (1996). Noddings, N (1996) Rethinking the Benefits of the College-Bound. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(4), 271-276.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1974). *The next generation: An ethnography of education in an urban neighborhood*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb: A study of academic disengagement*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1994). Should immigrants assimilate? *Public Interest*(116), 18-33.
- Portes, P. (2005). *Dismantling educational inequality: A cultural-historical approach to closing the achievement gap*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Portes, P. (1996). Ethnicity and culture in educational psychology. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), *The handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 331-357). New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Rainwater, L., & Yancy, W. L. (1965). *The Moynihan report and the politics of controversy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Salomon, G. (1993). *Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, D. M. (1997). *Contempt and pity: Social policy and the image of the damaged Black psyche, 1880-1996*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tharp, R. G. (1989). Culturally compatible education: A formula for designing effective classrooms. In: Trueba, H. T., Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (Eds.). *What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts?* (Pps. 51-66). New York: The Falmer Press.
- The Condition of Education. (2004). Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- Varenne, H., & McDermott, R. (1999). *Successful failure: The schools America builds*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Viadero, D. (2000). *Lags in minority achievement defy traditional explanation*. Retrieved February 17, 2004, from <http://www.edweek.org/we/ewstory.cfm?slug=28causes.h19>.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans. Translation newly rev. and edited / ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Figure 1

A Developmental Lifecycle Model for Prevention and Overcompensation

