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ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to examine racial bias and prejudice in current second grade textbooks. Second graders are generally 7-8 years old; an age during which morals and values are developed and racist ideations can be either challenged or solidified. Using the standards of multicultural education as an ideal, textbooks aimed at this population were examined to explore the extent to which racism continues to be reified.

The three most widely adopted second grade textbooks in America were assessed in the ways they depict African Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, and White Americans. Using a method of content analysis adapted from previous studies, five modes of analysis were used: picture analysis, people-to-study analysis, language analysis, storyline analysis, and miscellaneous analysis.

The major findings indicated persistent patterns and various types of racial bias present within all three textbooks. The American historical narrative consistently defaulted to a storyline focused on White America and taught through the lens of White Americans. When other racial groups were discussed, they were described as they were perceived by and/or related to White Americans; they were rarely integrated as a part of the larger narrative. This narrow view of history fostered frequent instances of racial bias and prejudice throughout the texts. By identifying the nature of racism in these textbooks, adjustments can be sought for future textbooks so that racist ideals might be confronted rather than maintained.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Racism is defined as White racial and cultural prejudice and discrimination, supported intentionally and unintentionally by institutional power and authority, and used to the advantage of Whites and the disadvantage of people of Color (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). Thus, racism is not the act of a few individuals, nor is it an isolated phenomenon. Delgado (1995) argues that racism is “normal, not aberrant, in American Society (p. xiv)” and Bell (1992) identifies it as “a permanent fixture of American life (Ladson-Billings, 2003, p. 9).” It is so enmeshed in the everyday functioning of America and American people that it is difficult to distinguish. Thus, the first step in battling racism in its current state is to “[unmask] and [expose] racism in its various permutations (Ladson-Billings, 2003, p. 9).” This study explores the ways racism is manifested in one area of American Society by focusing on educational curricula and racial depictions therein.

Sleeter and Grant (1991) recognize that “curricular materials project images of society, as well as of other aspects of culture such as what constitutes good literature, legitimate political activity, and so forth (p. 185).” The function and influence of textbooks extend far beyond the educational realm; by recording a particular perspective, they serve to create historical fact from “subjective interpretations of reality (Sleeter and Grant, 1991, p. 185).” In a recent examination of elementary curricula, Bolgatz (2005) discovered that Africans Americans are rarely discussed outside the historical eras of slavery, the Civil War, or the Civil Rights Movement. Moreover,
“even less attention is paid to Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans, and race relations among groups are rarely examined (p. 260).” This example seems like a clear omission of history, but one that continues to persist.

Banks (1996) discusses a model for more inclusive education which seeks to “unmask” and “expose” current racial assumptions. Banks defines such multicultural education as,

… a field of study … whose major aim is to create equal educational opportunities for students from diverse racial, ethnic, social-class, and cultural groups. One of its important goals is to help all students to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society and to interact, negotiate, and communicate with peoples from diverse groups in order to create a civic and moral community that works for the common good. Multicultural education … interrogates, challenges, and reinterprets content, concepts, and paradigms from the established disciplines (p. xi)

Operating under the assumption that racism continues to pervade all aspects of American society, the goal of this study is to determine ways in which current textbooks fail to meet the standards of multicultural education discussed above. What other forms does racism take than those discussed by Bolgatz? To what degree do racial stereotypes and biases persist? Using an anti-racist framework, a content analysis of current textbooks is performed to uncover specific ways racism continues to be reified.

This study focuses on the three most widely adopted second grade Social Studies textbooks. In the following literature review, I will discuss the development of racism in children and use both cognitive development theory and Vygostkian theory to iterate the particular importance of multicultural education for this age group. I will also identify the key aspects of
multicultural education and examine previous content analyses of Social Studies textbooks from across the United States and from various grade levels. During a time when children ascribe to stereotypes, yet are simultaneously challenging their meaning, I will analyze the extent to which textbooks reinforce racism and identify areas in need of improvement.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

There is research that shows that children develop racial attitudes as early as two years old (Vera & Feagin, 1995). What influences the development of racism in children and at what age can it be interrupted? What is multicultural education and how has it been utilized as a strategy to address racism? What obstacles stand in the way of effective multicultural education? This literature review uses theoretical approaches and previous research to address these questions and make an argument that further research is needed.

The first section of this literature review will focus on the development of racism in children. A study indicating the “universal development course (Raabe and Beelmann, 2011, p. 1732)” of racism is presented and investigated using both Piagetian and Vygotskian theories of child development. Application of the Piagetian theory ties the maturation of biological cognitive processes to the onset of racist attitudes and prejudices in children (Park, 2011). Vygotskian theory makes sense of racism by correlating it with social crises in the course of role development in the child’s environment (Vygotsky, 1978). Both theories identify age 7-8 as a critical time for challenging racial prejudices and engaging in discussions of racial bias.

The following section discusses multicultural education and the importance of its utilization throughout the entire educational system. Multicultural education is defined and its effectiveness is argued using empirical studies and classroom examples. Textbooks are identified as a key intervention point for multicultural implementation because they “define and determine
what is important in American history (Romanowski, 1996, p. 170)” and decide “what is historically important and what is not (Lintner, 2004, p. 30).” A specific focus is put on Social Studies because it is in this arena that the racial history of America is either ignored or acknowledged as “legitimacy and hegemony battle for historical supremacy (Lintner, 2004, p. 31).”

The third section examines the obstacles to multicultural education, both past and present. This includes a historical review of American history textbooks and the legacy they have carried into the texts of today. The current state of textbooks is investigated as well as specific hindrances to diversified education; among these are the ideology of colorblindness, the standardization of textbooks, and the politicization of education. This leads into the final section which reviews empirical studies of textbooks and the specific ways current texts fall short in multiculturalism. The importance of elucidating racism in textbooks is asserted and an argument is made for further research focused on texts published for the age group wherein prejudicial intervention is most critical.

**Development of Racism in Children**

As early as age 3, children are able to distinguish between racial groups. By age 7, most have developed “systematic racial prejudices” and “respond in a ‘prejudiced-like manner when confronted with people or images of people who look and act differently from themselves (Cristol & Gimbert, 2008, p. 202).” They understand how they themselves are classified racially and have assigned meaning to membership in various groups. Peer interactions and friendships are heavily influenced; there is a peak in racial prejudice (Davies, 2011). Around age 8, children begin to develop a more complex view of race. There is a decline in prejudice as they “begin to give personal belief responses that diverge from dominant stereotypes (Cristol & Gimbert, 2008,
Children start thinking for themselves and valuing individual human attributes rather than the social codes they have been abiding (Davies, 2011).

This development and decline of prejudice is illustrated in a meta-analytic study by Raabe and Beelmann; findings from 128 worldwide studies comparing prejudices at varying ages were synthesized. The increase in prejudice discussed above occurred mainly from the ages of 5 to 7 years, after which there was a sharp decrease in prejudicial thinking and acting. However, by late childhood (i.e. ages 9-10), bias increased sharply again. After age 10, there was no further generalizable “systematic prejudice development (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011, p. 1732).” This study is important because it is recently completed and incorporates many studies in order to provide “evidence of [a] universal development course (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011, p. 1732)” of racism.

The development of racism in children can be explained using both Piagetian and Vygotskian approaches. Both approaches discuss child development in stages; however, Piaget believes stage development is dictated by cognitive processes whereas Vygotsky believes development is guided by environmental adaptation. Both theorists examine crucial periods for racial bias intervention and provide insight into the importance of multicultural education during this time (Park, 2011).

Piagetian Approach: A deeper understanding of the U-shaped development of prejudice identified by Raabe and Beelman can be gained by examining Piaget’s cognitive development theory and its application. According to Piaget, both biology and environment are essential parts of development. As cognitive processes mature over time, the way children make sense of the world around them is re-organized. Every new thing learned builds on previous knowledge and assumptions continually shift based on new discoveries. Using Piagetian theory, Park (2011)
argues that there are certain “cognitive prerequisites for understanding ideas pertaining to race” and that the stage of development determines when “children becoming racially aware and/or biased (p. 390).” Piaget divides development into four stages, each of which builds on the progress of previous stages. These stages are termed the sensorimotor period, pre-operational period, concrete operational period, and formal operational period (Derman-Sparks, et al., 1980).

The first stage spans from birth to age 2 and is termed the sensorimotor period; emphasis is placed on sensory/motor responses and “development of object permanence (Derman-Sparks, et al., 1980, p. 14).” Children learn by imitating those around them and thus see their caretakers as models of appropriate behavior. Relationships become important and children become able to hold objects (both people and physical objects) in their mind even when they are not present. This enables self-soothing and allows them to begin developing a sense of themselves as separate from their caregivers (Davies, 2011).

The pre-operational stage incorporates ages 3-6 and is rooted in egocentrism; everything is experienced from the child’s point of view and they make sense of the world based mainly on personal past experiences. A sense of irreversibility is also developed, as children gain understanding of salience and constancy; this understanding of salience and constancy is the beginning processes needed for conceptualizing race (Cristol & Gimbert, 2008).

Using the lens of cognitive development theory, Derman-Sparks, et al. studied racial recognition in children and parents of children from the first part of this stage from 3-5 years old. They found these children easily distinguished people according to skin tone and recognized the permanence of race; however, their inability to understand groupness kept them from establishing racial groups or assigning meaning to skin tone. Their cognitive ability dictated how they made sense of differences and how they perceived the world. Skin tone is variant and
permanent, but groups are moot and children are too egocentric to take on meanings assigned by others. Thus, prejudice has not yet developed (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980).

Park (2011) concurs and asserts that “preschool children in the preoperational stage are egocentric and therefore ethnocentric and possess only a rudimentary understanding of race (p. 395).” Spencer (1982) argues that this egocentricity and inability to acknowledge the perspective of others during this stage renders discussions of race and prejudice fruitless. However, others believe the Piagetian paradigm is used as an excuse for the continuance of education curricula which ignores racial prejudice and silences discussion of racial differences. Ramsey (2004) believes multicultural education is stilted because “child developmentalists and early childhood educators…have traditionally focused on children’s cognitive limitations at each stage” when deciding what material to present and therefore have been “foregrounding children’s cognitive limitations” and providing “an excuse to avoid difficult and complex issues (p. 29).” Kelly and Brooks (2009) support this stance and argue the Piagetian approach “has unnecessarily helped to restrict the equity-related work that teachers envision by implying that it is developmentally inappropriate for younger children (p. 204).”

As children approach the concrete operational stage of development, an understanding of in-groups and out-groups develops; children become cognizant of distinct social groupings and where they belong in those groups. In a study of 89 children between 3 and 10, Pauker and Ambody (2010) investigated the development of group understanding and its relation to racial stereotyping. Children were read scenarios relating stereotypes of certain racial groups and asked to match them with pictures representing people from different racial groups. They found that children consistently displayed stereotyping by the time they were six years old, with stereotyping mainly aimed at out-groups. By age seven, children could identify both in-group
and out-group stereotypes with 70% accuracy (Pauker & Ambody, 2010). They determined that “children only oriented themselves toward out-group stereotypes once race became a functionally salient dimension and they developed a sense of the out-group as an essential category (p. 1803).”

Spanning from 7-11 years old, Piaget’s concrete development period marks the development of concrete thinking and utilization of hierarchical classification. Derman-Sparks, et al. (1980) report that by the beginning of this stage children have gained insight into grouping and understand where they fall within racial groups. Children are increasingly peer oriented, with growing pride in their identity and belonging in certain groups; in-group favoritism and out-group negative attitudes evolve. Piaget identified this period as “socio-centric” as opposed to egocentric. Children base their understanding of the world on judgments and input from those around them, rather than their own experiences. The beginning of this stage is when racial prejudice peaks (Reed, 2008; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011).

As children progress through this stage, they grow to understand the complexity of groupness and racial identity. They gain what Piaget termed “reciprocity” or the understanding that both group membership and individuality can be simultaneous (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980). They become aware of the intersectionality of identity groups and learn they can belong to more than one social group. Children also become capable of seeing things from perspectives other than their own, which fosters empathy and understanding. According to Reed (2008), this “shift from egocentric and self-interested personal agency to socio-centric and community interested cooperative agency” is crucial to moral development and represents the “[incorporation] and [transformation of] self-interest within a broader good (p. 359).”
During this critical shift is an opportune time to discuss racial prejudices and biases. As they challenge their previous assumptions, “children can be helped to recognize stereotyping and other expressions of racism in their immediate world (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980, p. 15).” The concept of fairness also becomes very important, making this an ideal time to interrupt racism. Though stereotyping has already occurred, “it is possible to utilize their emerging moral sense to help them perceive the ‘unfairness’ of racism and to teach them tools for dealing with expressions of ethnocentrism and prejudice in their immediate world (Derman-Sparks, 1980, p. 15).”

Derman-Sparks, et al. do not go so far as to examine the second spike in racial prejudice discussed by Raabe and Beelmann. However, it takes place as children move through Piaget’s concrete operational period and into the formal operational period (ages 12 and up). As children move into teenage years and young adulthood, thinking becomes increasingly logical and systematic. This is when values are solidified, including racial stereotypes and biases (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980). Thus, it is essential that children learn to recognize and challenge racial prejudices before this point.

Davey (1977) argued that “the development of prejudice in children is a product of the normal, necessary, and rational process of progressively ordering the environment into manageable categories and their need to comprehend their place within it (p. 1).” However, Derman-Sparks’ et al. application of Piaget’s cognitive development theory makes a different argument. Following the progression of cognitive functions, it is natural for children to develop the ability to categorize and self-identify in groups, however it is not “the crystallization of group identity per se that is responsible for the development of prejudice, but the fact that it develops in a racist and prejudiced society (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980, p. 14).” As children cease depending
solely on their past experiences and begin learning from the insights of others it is not “normal”, “necessary”, or “rational” that what they learn from their environment is racially biased. Children did not invent racism, they are simply re-constructing the patterns they see played out in society (Reed, 2008).

**Vygotskian Approach:** Whereas Piaget believed in a universal course of child development guided by the maturation of cognitive processes, Vygotsky theorized that child development is projected by social influences. Children go through stages marked by social crises throughout life and each time a critical period is passed the child enters a new developmental stage and role within their environment. Each “crisis formation is associated with the emergence of a new self-awareness (Kravtsova & Favorov, 2006, p. 11)” and gives way to a period of stability before the next crisis formation. Vygotsky asserted that these crises generally occur at age 1, 3, 7, 13 and 17 and are heavily influenced by the culture in which they occur (Vygotsky, 1978).

The first crisis occurs as the child realizes they are not an extension of their mother. Kravtsova and Favorov (2006) describe this as the development of “consciousness” or “the ‘greater we’ (p. 11).” The child interacts with other adults as an individual, separate from their mother, and develops a unique personality for the first time. The child’s transformation is a product of the child’s need for a new social role and is precipitated by interactions with their caretakers (Vygotsky, 1978).

In a longitudinal study of 200 children between the ages of 6 months and 6 years (half white, half African American), Katz (2003) investigated the ways children of varying ages relate to race. At 6 months, Katz found that White children responded primarily to gender cues whereas African American children responded more strongly to racial cues. Even before the first crisis of
Vygotsky’s theory, children with different social backgrounds showed differences in development. This evidence refutes Piaget’s assertion of a universal path of child development because as Park (2011) states “the ways in which Piagetian-developmental theories were applied to the study of children and race tended to overlook the social and cultural nature of learning and development (p. 395).”

In an investigation of children at 30 months, Katz (2003) found that both White and African American children tended to choose friends of the same race, with even more African American children choosing friends of the same race than White children. However, by 36 months there was a drastic reversal as 86% of White children chose White friends and only 32% of African American children chose same-raced friends. According to Vygotskian theory, children at this point are enduring the age three crisis referred to by Kravtsova and Favorov (2006) as “the intellectualization of perception (p. 12).” During this time, the child differentiates themselves even further from the mother, acknowledging that their behavior and actions are now under their own control. They have free will and are capable of assessing situations as they see fit in the moment. As they make their own friend preferences, the impact of the culture in which their development occurs is already evident (Vygotsky, 1978). Even during this critical stage of development, both White and Black parents in Katz’s study “said they did not discuss race with their child even though they [said] it [was] important (Katz, 2003, p. 901).”

The crisis at age 7 is termed the “intellectualization of affect” by Kravtsova and Favorov as the child now “endows emotions with a different meaning and gains the ability to manage them (p. 12).” The child is in total control of their interactions with others and is able to act strategically. They have fully developed both an internal and external world as they willfully engage in activity beyond their family of origin and begin to create their own morals. Vygotskian
theorists assert that this crisis is particularly influenced by the culture in which it manifests, making it an important time for racial discussions and intervention. As children begin to create their own identity, this process is inarguably different for minority children than it is for White children. As racial prejudice peaks in children of this age, children of color must develop “both resistance to oppression and accommodation to the realities of living in a racist society (Jones, 2006, p. 297).” The necessity of these developments is evidence, Jones argues, that “the individual cannot be analyzed as separate from a cultural community (Jones, 2006, p. 297).” Whereas the Piagetian theory of universal development acknowledges environment as a factor, it assumes that the moral development of a 7 year old slave would be more or less similar to that of a 7 year old colonist. In contrast, Vygotskian theory recognizes that moral development is first and foremost a response to society (Vygotsky, 1978).

The crisis at age 13 is marked by the onset of puberty. The child begins intentionally distancing themselves from their parents and moving into adulthood. By this time, morals and values are mostly solidified; racial prejudice and bias are instilled. The final crisis of age 17 occurs as the child becomes nearly completely individuated from their parents and family of origin.

One of the key concepts in Vygotskian theory is the “zone of proximal development (Kravtsova & Favorov, 2006).” This refers to the range of tasks a child is able to accomplish during each developmental stage; including those achieved both individually and with help from an “expert (Kravtsova & Favorov, 2006).” Vygotsky initially used the term “expert” to refer to a child’s caretaker, however more recent interpretations allow for the expert to be a teacher, a peer, or even educational materials (Kravtsova & Favorov, 2006; Park, 2011). As a child develops, they grow able to individually complete tasks they could previously achieve only with the help
of an expert. New tasks and concepts are then introduced by the “experts” in the child’s life and become part of the new zone of proximal development (ZPD). Thus, Park (2011) states, “ZPDs created among peers across racial and ethnic differences may play in helping students to stretch beyond the limits of their own understandings to co-construct new ways of thinking about identity and diversity (p. 395).” This means of skill and moral development is referred to as “scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978)”; the child sees the way others complete tasks and treat others, then develops these skills as their own.

Piagetian theory identifies cognitive development as the driving force of development, whereas Vygotsky identifies the child’s relationship with their environment as the motivation. However, both approaches provide insight into how racism develops in the U-shaped manner described above by Raabe and Beelmann (2011) and present a framework highlighting the importance of racial discussion and prejudice intervention during concurrent critical periods; the beginning of the concrete operational period in the case of Piaget and the 7 year crisis in the case of Vygotsky. As children grow to understand groupness and differentiate themselves from their parents, they begin forming their values and the importance of multicultural education is critical.

**Multicultural Education**

As discussed above, cognitive development and social influences around the ages of 7 to 8 cause children to naturally re-organize and re-orient themselves within their environment; this is a critical time for changing the projection of racism and establishing multicultural values. If children are socialized into racism and prejudice during this time, it will inevitably become woven into their values long-term. However, if they are taught to discuss implications of race and to challenge social presumptions, that too might become part of their value system. School is just one of the many arenas of learning in a child’s life, but it is an important one; it is broadly
regulated and has a large scale impact on children. Teachers, and the curriculum they use, can have a vast affect on whether children develop positive multicultural views or negative racial stereotypes (Cristol & Gimbert, 2008).

**Multicultural Education Defined:** The term “multicultural education” was coined following the Civil Rights Movement, during which the first real progress was made in addressing the lack of diversity in American curricula. Defined by Banks (1995), it refers to “an educational reform movement that tries to reform schools in ways that will give all students an equal opportunity to learn. It describes teaching strategies that empower all students and give them voice (p. 390)” and can be conceptualized using five dimensions; content integration, the knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, an equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture and school structure (Banks, 1995).

Content integration refers to the incorporation of teaching materials representing a variety of cultures and backgrounds. American history should not be composed exclusively, or even mostly, of White history; rather, it should entail a collective history of all racial and ethnic groups (Banks, 1995).

Using a knowledge construction process means helping students understand how their personal frame of reference and the frames formed by others dictate the way they understand knowledge. For example, if they are taught that the “American frontier” was ripe for exploration with only “savages” as obstacles, they will likely view White settlers as the “good guys” of the story. However, if they are taught that Native Americans inhabited the lands first and were driven from their homes by land-hungry Whites, their perception is quite different. Students should be taught to recognize the context and frames of historical information so that they can
gain a more “sophisticated, complex, and compassionate understanding of American history, society, and culture (Banks, 1995, p. 393).”

Prejudice reduction denotes working to reduce the racial bias that inevitably develops during early childhood. Banks (1995) describes this as the introduction of “democratic” thinking, wherein children are taught that people from all racial groups are equal. Banks goes on to acknowledge that “as children grow older, it becomes increasingly difficult to modify their racial attitudes and beliefs (p.394),” thus it is essential that this be implemented early.

Equity pedagogy refers to the identification and acknowledgement that children from different cultures have different educational needs. Teachers should be “culturally competent” enough to cater equally to both White children and students of color. Not all children learn the same way and children of color should not be expected to conform because they are in the minority (Banks, 1995).

Empowering school culture and social structure addresses the systematic oppression which permeates the entire educational system. In order to create real and permanent change, the entire educational paradigm must shift. It is not enough for teachers and curriculum to change in the ways discussed above, texts and assessments must change as well. “Reform may begin with any one of the parts of a system (such as with the curriculum or with staff development),” however, “the other parts of the system (such as textbooks and the assessment program) must also be restructured in order to effectively implement school reform related to diversity (Banks, 1995, p. 398).

Multicultural Education in Practice: Though not all school systems hail multicultural education equally, some argue implementation of such curricula has led to decreased prejudice in classrooms. According to Davies, “antibias curricula in schools that build on the more complex
cognitive abilities of school-age children have had some success (Davies, 2011, p. 346).” Key components of “antibias curricula” according to Davies include open discussions on racial differences/stereotypes and a focus on the internal vs. external qualities of all people. Davies also states that racially diverse environments are helpful in decreasing prejudice (Davies, 2011).

Bernstein et al. (2000) conducted an empirical study to assess the effect of combined multicultural education and exposure to diversity on racial attitudes. School-aged participants were given a survey of their ethnic awareness “based on cognitive-developmental theories using measures that include classification tasks (Bernstein, 2000, p. 181).” They were then assigned to either an intervention group or a control group and a similar ethnic awareness survey was conducted after several months. Children who took part in the “family diversity intervention” no longer sorted “solely because of race/ethnicity,” whereas those who took part in the control group showed no change. Researchers concluded that “exposure to race and ethnicities combined with an appropriate curriculum promote change in children’s attitude (Bernstein, 2000, p. 181).”

In examining elementary curriculum, Bolgatz (2005) asserts that in general teachers are ill-prepared to discuss the topic of race with children. However, he uses concrete examples from a multicultural educator from New York City to illustrate that improvements are possible. Mrs. Agosto is a fifth grade teacher who tackles the racial dimension of literature head on. When teaching the revolutionary war, Mrs. Agosto drew analogous parallels between the White colonists and their African American slaves. Colonists had an uprising against Britain because they were obligated to pay unjust taxes and work land they could not reap. However, those same colonists kept slaves who they treated even more unjustly. The difference between the organized slave uprisings and the Revolutionary War at that time was mainly a matter or resources. Agosto incorporates African Americans, Native Americans, Latinos, Asians, and other races into all eras.
of American history, not just the parts where they can be easily tacked on. Agosto also acknowledges the existence of White history and culture in America, but teaches that no race has a history separate from any other. It doesn’t make sense to teach White American history as separate from African American history, because the reality is that American history is composed of interaction between all racial groups (Bolgatz, 2005).

**Multicultural Education in Textbooks:** While teachers like Mr. Agosto are an essential and transformative part of education, they are guided by curriculum and textbooks. In a study conducted in the late 1970s, the National Science Foundation “concluded that not only did the 'conventional textbook' continue to dominate classroom instruction but that teachers tended to 'rely on' and 'believe in' a single textbook as the principal source of knowledge (Foster, 1999, p. 256).” It is essential that multicultural education be incorporated within textbooks, the most utilized tool of teaching.

Textbooks hold great importance both in the classroom and as contributions to societal culture. Apple hails the importance of the textbook specifically because “it is the textbook which establishes so much of the material conditions for teaching and learning in classrooms…and it is the textbook that often defines what is elite and legitimate culture to pass on (Apple, 1988, p. 81).” Societal norms are reflected in textbooks and textbooks reify what the “societal curriculum suggests (Ladson-Billings, 2003, p. 4).” American society and history can be interpreted in many different ways through many different lenses, but what is written in textbooks becomes accepted as fact. That which is subjective is falsely presented as objective in textbooks (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p. 185) and whatever is left out is essentially censored from education. Textbooks dictate which ideas and information reach students and serve as a clear example of how “curriculum usually serves as a means of social control (p. 186).”
Racial prejudice and bias can show up in all subjects and in all textbooks; thus multicultural education must target all curriculums. However, this literature review and project will focus on Social Studies in order to narrow the scope and because as Nelson and Pang (2006) state “of all the school subjects, Social Studies is the one that should be most directed to the matters of racism and prejudice (p. 125).” Social Studies is tasked with relating the history of racial development and controversial interactions in the United States. Though it may fall short, when utilized to its fullest potential Social Studies “uses ideas and information from a variety of disciplines to understand and evaluate conceptions of race and ethnicity (Nelson and Pang, 2006, p. 125).”

Obstacles to Multicultural Application

Given the evidence showing that multicultural teaching decreases racial prejudice, why isn’t it reflected in all current curriculum and texts? Nelson and Pang (2006) focus on the Social Studies curriculum to explain some of the various reasons:

- Special interest group pressures on schools and publishers;
- Relative recency of Social Studies as a subject of instruction;
- An early linkage to traditionalist historians and history associations;
- Lack of professional Social Studies association leadership;
- Isolation of more critically oriented social educators;
- State regulations that mandate certain values or viewpoints on social issues;
- Lack of intellectual depth in teacher education programs;
- Lack of disciplinary depth in undergraduate liberal studies programs;
- Role of teachers as subservient employees; and
The broad chilling effect of censorious actions by boards and administrators to restrict
teachers practice and regulate curriculum content (p. 128)

Each of these assertions could be examined in depth, but Brown and Brown (2010) capture the
heart of the reason multicultural education is often not implemented. “School knowledge is
political (Apple, 1993; Banks, 1993; Buras, 2008; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995) (Brown & Brown,
2010, p. 57).” Large scale debates on school curriculum are bogged down by “several political
entities and ideological perspectives that disagree on how school texts should render U.S. history
(Brown, 2010, p. 57).” In an effort to allay criticism and take the path of least resistance, “these
‘cultural wars’ have led official texts (Giroux, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 2003) to present historical
narratives in line with a traditional, uncontroversial form of consensus history (Hoffer, 2004)
(Brown, 2010, p. 57).” However, because Whites make up a majority in the population and hold
a majority of the political seats making these arguments, the consensus most often ends up being
a White consensus (Sleeter & Grant, 1991). People of Color become an “add on” to the history
created by the majority and are systematically erased from curriculums (Ladson-Billings, 2003).
This “non-recognition of race as a form of political power tacitly enables the colorblind ideal to
steer education policy toward the reinforcement of the dominant culture as the norm and the
maintenance of hegemonic social arrangements (Freeman, 2005, p. 1).” Put simply, it is easier to
pretend race does not exist than to grapple with its influence throughout U.S. history. The
consequences of this fall most heavily upon children. At an age when children are developing
their understanding of differences and creating identity classifications, their teachers and
curriculum fall silent on race.

**History of American Textbooks:** The shortcomings of current textbooks are deeply
rooted in their history and can be traced back to the beginning of American education. From the
time America began through the nineteenth century, textbooks were the most widely read texts in the nation besides the Bible. Since their inception, these widespread texts “written by an assortment of amateurs” have “[created] and [solidified] an idealized image of the American type (Foster, 1999, p. 256).” Nearly all textbook authors from the time were from New England and published theories developed by “Joseph Gobineau, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, John Calhoun and George Fitzhugh” who considered whites to be “the paragon of all races: intellectually, morally and physically superior to all others (Foster, 1999, p. 257).” Children were required to ascribe to and memorize these theories along with “the Puritanical virtues of honesty, truth, temperance, obedience, industry and thrift (Foster, 1999, p. 257).” This narrow perspective of race and morality was determined by a few White men and officially declared the “American” perspective through the distribution of textbooks (Foster, 1999). In the late 1800s, the most lucrative publishers merged to create the American Textbook Company, a corporation which “held 80% of the American textbook market (Foster, 1999, p. 256).” This conglomerate approach to textbook production still persists today, with just four major companies owning 90% of the market (Keep Productions Inc., 2011).

With the 1900’s came a wave of immigration that challenged the homogeneity of the United States and its classrooms. Stanford professor Ellwood P. Cubberly responded to this with a solution that came to be known as “Americanization,” wherein teachers were “to assimilate and amalgamate these people as part of our American race, and to impart in their children...the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order, and popular government (Foster, 1999, p. 259).” Other ideas were also presented during this time, including the “melting pot” model and “cultural pluralism;” however, “Americanization” of immigrants was most widely adopted by educators and textbook publishers (Foster, 1999).
Teachers were not required to be educated past grammar school during this time and thus the role of the textbook gained even more status. Administrators called for thorough and guiding textbooks that teachers could abide by when teaching. Racist and anti-immigrant attitudes dominated these texts in the decades to come; children learned that “Indians were a barbaric people who stood in the way of progress and “Negroes were racially inferior to whites (Foster, 1999, p. 263).” Neither diversity nor critical analysis were valued, texts were created with the sole purpose of instilling “a sense of unity and patriotism and veneration for the nation's glorious heritage (Foster, 1999, p. 267).”

The first movement for intercultural inclusion in the Social Studies curriculum began in the mid 1930’s with the New York Teachers Union. In the decades that followed, numerous studies and publications criticized Social Studies textbooks for two primary reasons: (1) minorities were mostly absent from the stories that made up American history and (2) when texts included minorities, it was done in a way that reinforced stereotypes (Black 1967; Moreau 2003) (Hughes, 2007, p. 202). However, it was not until the Civil Rights Movement and protests of the 1960’s that any progress was made; more racial minorities were included in texts and outright stereotyping was targeted for removal (Hughes, 2007).

**Racism in Current Textbooks:** Since the Civil Rights Era, studies of racism in textbooks have died down; some believe that racial prejudice in textbooks is no longer a problem (Berenson, 1992). Others believe reform has gone too far. Glazer and Ueda (1983) asserted that racism evidenced in previous texts has been “replaced with new myths proclaiming the superior moral qualities of minorities” and “a Manichaean inversion in which whites are malevolent and blacks, Indians, Asians, and Hispanics are tragic victims (p. 60).” They preferred a history rooted in White morality and racial harmony. They believed textbooks should contain “details of how
ethnic minorities contributed to the development of American history” while leaving the “main Eurocentric story line (Foster, 1999, p. 268)” unchanged.

While it is true that pictures and stories of racial minorities can now be found in Social Studies textbooks, many argue that a different sort of racism pervades (Sleeter & Grant, 1991). Rather than being integrated into the narrative of American history, racial groups are added on “without forging a new multicultural narrative or addressing the role of white racism in shaping American history (Fitzgerald; Foster 1999; Garcia 1993; Groff 1982; Loewen 1995; Moreau 2003) (Hughes, 2007, p. 203).” Described by Foster as “mentioning,” entire groups of people are added into textbooks without being integrated into the fabric of American history (Foster, 1995). These groups are appreciated only “in so far as they contribute to the larger story of an American history dominated by White society (Foster, 1999, p. 270).” For example, Native Americans are acknowledged as having given “us” corn and African Americans are appreciated for giving “us” blues and jazz (Foster, 1999). American history is composed of the interactions between many different racial groups, but it is told as if each group lived on an island. Though racial groups now exist in the periphery of history textbooks, Foster (1999) asserts that the “central story line has changed little for more than two centuries (p. 270).”

Another way racism persists in current textbooks is through a continued focus on nationalism. History texts portray an American society rooted in liberty and opportunity for all people. The U.S. is a safe haven for immigrants and refugees who come to its shores in search of a better life and the American dream. “The ideology of unceasing progress and nationalistic pride is enshrined in every textbook written today (Foster, 1999, p. 271),” however there is little discussion of “why individuals from minority populations are disproportionately poor, and/or the role the capitalist system plays in perpetuating poverty (Foster, 1999, p. 271).” It is not explained
that the American dream only applies to some Americans and that White Americans are the standard against which all minorities are compared.

Not only is the inherent unfairness of American society absent from texts, but also the history of minority groups struggling for equality. By reading a current Social Studies textbook, one might assume that the Civil Rights Era eradicated all forms of racism and that advancements in came about peacefully as Whites became aware of their moral wrongdoings. In actuality, Whites did not choose to curtail lynchings, stop slavery, or allow Black suffrage. Whites “generally have benefited from structural racism” because “perpetuating the existing social order has often been in their best interest (Foster, 1999, p. 274).” Minority rights were achieved because they fought for them, at the expense of many lives and hardships, and despite these fights an immense racial inequality persists. However, because White racism is buried within the "larger narrative of American progress, students perceive race relations as a linear trajectory of improvement rather than a messy and continual struggle over power (Hughes, 2007, p. 203).”

Hindrances to Diversification: The desire to paint America as a historically moral nation, free of tumultuous race relations and currently based in equality, has given way to “colorblindness” within education. This refers to the systematic erasure of cultural differences in curricula and the assumption that “we are all the same.” These policies are “championed as fair and just, congruent with the egalitarian aspirations of the Civil Rights Movement.” However, their implementation results in cultural silencing and continued White privilege made to “appear as a logical consequence of the natural order of things (Freeman, 2005, p. 1).” We are not all the same and we are not treated the same in today’s America. Colorblindness is an excuse for White teachers, who make up a vast majority of educators, to fall silent on the issue of race. A recent study found that when teaching about race, teachers most often take one of the following
approaches: (1) avoid it all together, (2) present a racial past free of conflict, or (3) teach within a framework that reifies white privilege (Epstein, 2009). Teachers do not touch race because it is uncomfortable and because they aren’t required to do so. Throughout the “ten thematic strands for teaching K-12 Social Studies (Ladson-Billings, 2003)” as outlined by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), not one incorporates the study of race or racism (Howard, 2003). Teaching about the very concept of racism is an “add-on,” a “mention,” an afterthought.

With no incentive to do otherwise, textbooks follow suit. Textbook production is a $2.5 billion market which accounts for 16% of current printed materials sold (Foster, 1999). The primary goal is to make money and the easiest way to do so is through standardization (Vinson & Ross, 2001). Publishers cater to the largest states and smaller states must fall in line (Foster, 1999). “Textbooks adopted in Texas play a particularly important role in this process because it (along with California) sets the standard for textbook adoption across the United States (Cornbleth and Waugh, 1995 page).” These two giants represent 20% of the current textbook market and thus dictate what is represented in books distributed across the nation (Foster, 1999).

Local districts do not dictate what this standardization entails. An “expert panel” appointed by each state reviews several texts and chooses a few from each subject to place on an “approved adoption list from which local school districts can select (Foster, 1999, p. 273).” Foster (1999) asserts that “without question, adoption committees are influenced by pressure groups that lobby aggressively for their attention (p. 273)” and publishers are aware of the political power held by special-interest groups. Of these groups, the religious right is particularly organized and effective in textbook lobbying. “Those from the political right seek vehemently to protect the cultural traditions of Western civilization (Foster, 1999, p. 273)” including the historical framing of “manifest destiny” and the fundamental morality of America. Textbooks are
quickly “condemned by influential conservative forces if they challenge right-wing political orthodoxy (Foster, 1999, p. 273)” and politicians who support “pluralistic” curricula are tagged as anti-American. Despite the continued diversification of United States society, the systems controlling textbooks and curriculum remain rooted in colorblindness and White privilege, and “American history textbooks cling to an idealized image of society based on common traditions established more than two centuries ago (Foster, 1999, p. 274).”

A Measure of Multiculturalism

Tangible effects of educational politics and colorblind legislation are illustrated in several empirical studies of textbooks. In 1991, Sleeter and Grant published a study of 47 textbooks copyrighted between 1980 and 1988. Six modes of analysis were used to study bias according to race, gender, disability, and social class in math, science, reading, and Social Studies books distributed across the United States. This review will only discuss findings of racial bias in Social Studies books, which incorporated five modes of analysis of 14 textbooks. A “picture analysis” included tallying the number of people from each racial group and identifying stereotypes of picture settings. A “people-to-study” analysis was done by tallying the racial group of each person mentioned in the text. A “language analysis” identified words portraying racial stereotypes and phrases that overlooked or misconstrued racial conflict. A “story-line analysis” assessed which racial group received the most attention in storylines, who caused/resolved problems in the story, and which characters solicited sympathy from the reader. The fifth analysis was termed “miscellaneous” and incorporated other themes which became apparent in the textbooks (Sleeter and Grant, 1991, p. 188).

In their analysis, they found that pictures from textbooks most often contained 11% Black Americans, 10% Native Americans, 4% Asian Americans, 3% Hispanic Americans and 70%
White Americans. Native Americans were discussed only in the early colonial period, with no mention of being part of American history before or afterward. Hispanic Americans were also discussed in early American history, mostly Mexican Americans, with little mention before or afterward. Most Asians depicted were Chinese and heavily stereotyped, with no discussion of Asian diversity or how/why Asians immigrated to America. The role of Black Americans was highlighted mainly during the Civil Rights Movement and White Americans’ role in oppression was widely omitted. In fact, the majority of language surrounding White Americans highlighted positive attributes and silenced negative contributions to history. Overall, White historical characters evoked empathy even when Whites were acting unjust, there was little intermingling between racial groups, and a great deal of stories were not based in historical context (Sleeter and Grant, 1991).

In a more recent literary content analysis of Social Studies, Brown and Brown (2010) investigated the representation of violence against African Americans throughout 19 textbooks adopted across Texas. They chose textbooks from fifth, eighth and eleventh grade because these are the grades when United States history is covered most thoroughly. Each narrative from each text depicting violence against African Americans was collected and coded with attention to three aspects; individual vs. group act of violence, strategic vs. haphazard, and resistance or no resistance to act.

As researchers collected narratives, they found very little was written of violence against African Americans after the Civil Rights time period. The omission of acts such as the Atlanta child murders and the lynching of James Byrd might have left readers to assume that such violence against the African American community no longer existed in the Post Civil Rights era. When coding for resistance to violence, they found it was only made evident during the period of
Slavery and the Civil Rights/Black Power era. By not mentioning resistance, it gave the impression that African Americans sat back and accepted this violence “as a condition of their existence (Brown & Brown, 2010, p. 55).” When coding for strategic vs. haphazard, there was an overwhelming finding that strategic acts were presented as being carried out by individuals or by particular groups; rarely were they discussed as products of systemic racism. Slavery was portrayed as having been enacted by individual players in society, rather than the product of a society that allowed it to happen. There was no discussion of:

…the long-term effects of such violence on maintaining a system that provided the socioeconomic and political infrastructure of the United States (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) and the financial wealth and stability of some families and corporations (e.g., Fleet Bank, Aetna Insurance Company) that continue to reap social and economic benefits of these past events (Biondi, 2003; Martin & Yaquinto, 2004). (Brown, 2010, p. 56)

Slavery was seen as an exception to an otherwise moral American history.

Need for Further Study

In 2009, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that 43% of Americans under 20 years of age were minorities (U.S. Bureau…, 2009). By 2020, that number is expected to reach greater than 50% (Banks, 1995). Schools are diversifying at a much faster rate than textbooks. Colorblindness can no longer be an option for politicians and teachers; multicultural education must be instituted. The studies of Sleeter and Grant (1991) along with Brown and Brown (2010) provided a framework for the investigation of multicultural deficiencies in textbooks. However, a more focused study is needed to highlight racial bias in textbooks published during one of the most critical ages in childhood. Understanding the way these textbooks fall short of meeting
multicultural ideals is essential for creating a path forward and confronting racism before it takes hold in the values of American youth.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

As discussed above, the cognitive development level of 7-8 year olds makes it particularly important that they are introduced to anti-racist and multicultural values in their school environment. Because textbooks inform curriculum and teachers, the purpose of this study was to investigate what racial biases persist in current second grade Social Studies textbooks. Second grade was chosen because children typically enter second grade as 7 year olds and leave as 8 year olds, and this is the age group I am interested. Social Studies was chosen because it is the subject area that addresses American racial history. Though there are several previous content analyses critiquing racial bias in textbooks, I did not find any which focused specifically on this critical age of cognitive development and personal value formulation.

Research Design

In order to assess racial biases in Social Studies textbooks, I conducted a literary content analysis. Historian Richard Beringer Alridge asserts that literary analysis is composed of four steps: “(1) reading the literature, (2) noting the themes, (3) discussing the themes, and (4) supporting conclusions with examples (Brown & Brown, 2010, p. 40).” He maintains that the nature of content analyses is qualitative, though King and Domin (2007) hold a differing opinion. “A content analysis consists of dividing a text into units of meaning and quantifying these units according to a set of agreed upon rules (King & Domin, 2007, p. 343).” Thus, I drew from a range of methods to construct an approach that integrated both qualitative and quantitative
aspects. In order to allow for an in-depth study, only the three most widely adopted second grade textbooks in the United States were analyzed.

I used the framework of Sleeter and Grant (1991), with a few variances. After reading through each book and identifying over-arching themes, I tallied the race of each person mentioned in the text as per the people-to-study analysis and the number of time each racial group was mentioned (i.e. African American, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, and White). I then conducted a language analysis wherein I identified words indicating conflict, frequently used words, and themes/phrases that misconstrued racial conflict. I also did a story-line analysis by tallying the race of each historical figure mentioned and recording which received the most attention, solicited reader empathy, and were presented as causing or resolving conflict. Drawing on the work of Brown and Brown (2010), I paid close attention to historical periods of racial violence and the context that surrounded the narration of these periods. Miscellaneous themes and forms of racial bias were noted throughout analysis (Sleeter & Grant, 1991). A picture analysis was performed that was similar to that of Sleeter and Grant, but which was adopted from King and Domin (2007).

In a content analysis of 11 undergraduate chemistry texts published after 2000, King and Domin (2007) did an in-depth picture analysis of racial bias. Four frequent forms of bias were assessed; invisibility, cosmetic bias, stereotyping, and fragmentation/isolation. I used their method of assessment to determine existence of these types of biases in second grade Social Studies textbooks. Invisibility was determined to be present if the representation of people of color in the photos was less than their representation in society. This required tallying the number of people in each racial group represented through pictures and comparing it to their percentage in the American population. Cosmetic bias analysis required the same tallying and
representation comparison, but was restricted to the textbook cover and pictures taking up a full page. Stereotyping was considered present if the people of color in pictures were reinforcing a racial stereotype or were in a stereotypical setting. Fragmentation was determined if more than one person of color from the same minority racial group was present in a photo void of White people and/or if a photo containing only people of color was part of a separate boxed-in section (King and Domin, 2007). Fragmentation evaluation was adapted to include Whites as well; defined as present when more than one White person was present in a photo void of people of color. Cosmetic bias was not assessed because there were very few applicable pictures within the textbooks analyzed. However, because pictures play such an important role in relaying information to second graders, another form was assessed which was referred to as “professional bias.” This was evaluated by noting the professions represented throughout the book by each racial group.

Though I used previous studies to guide my analysis, there were a few other important differences. Whereas Sleeter and Grant focused on multiple academic subjects from multiple grades, I focused solely on Social Studies textbooks that cater only to the second grade. Because children are in the cognitive development stage of forming personal racial opinions during this time (Park, 2011; Derman-Sparks, et al., 1980), I believed focusing on the information relayed to this age was of primary importance. Students this age are both susceptible to racism and malleable for change. I narrowed my study to three books to allow for a broader analysis. All races were included in the analysis, as opposed to Brown and Brown’s study which focused on African Americans and King and Domin’s study, which excluded Whites from analysis.
Sample

The sample of books I studied consisted of the following:

- Harcourt – Social Studies: People We Know
- Pearson – My World Social Studies: We Do Our Part

They were chosen because they are the most current versions of the central textbooks for the three most widely adopted second grade Social Studies programs in the United States. Social Studies “programs” consist of a main textbook which is paired with supplemental materials (such as readers, CD-Rom activities, and workbooks) and marketed collectively so that teachers are outfitted with various types of instruction. The above list of textbooks was created with the assistance of Gilbert T. Sewall, Director of the American Textbook Council (ATC). Their “databases, developed since 1986, survey publishers’ websites, key states and large school districts to determine what are the nation's most widely adopted textbooks in History and Social Studies (Keep Productions Inc., 2011).” According to the ATC, four “revenue-driven multinational corporations (Keep Productions Inc., 2011)” hold 90% of the textbook market and as such have been able to “offer fewer and fewer standard textbooks for states and teachers to choose from (Keep Productions Inc., 2011).” These companies are Harcourt, Pearson, Macmillan/McGraw-Hill, and Houghton Mifflin. Three of these companies are represented in the list above. Houghton Mifflin creates a separate Social Studies program for each state, with no specific title that is distributed across the nation. Because the history relayed in a book that focused on any specific state would not compare directly to a book that covers a broader history of the United States, a Houghton Mifflin book will not be included.
It should be noted that Harcourt, Macmillan/McGraw-Hill, and Pearson each also create specialized programs for states and for particular elements of Social Studies. However, the above titles are able to be used as stand-alone Social Studies textbooks and thus appeal to the broadest population. This is likely why their programs were the most widely adopted. It should also be mentioned that only the student versions of books were analyzed; though teacher editions are important, the focus of this study was the information relayed directly to second grade students. Supplemental materials were not examined either; the variance in supplemental materials made them difficult to compare and focusing on textbooks allowed for a more in depth study.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

By registering with the Harcourt and Macmillan/McGraw-Hill online distributors, I was able to secure online versions of each of these textbooks. However, the Pearson text was unavailable online; thus, I ordered and studied a hard copy of this textbook. Once acquired, I began by reading through each text thoroughly, noting over-arching themes and frequently used words I wanted to document for language analysis. I then conducted the people-to-study analysis and parts of the picture and language analyses. The people-to-study analysis was quantitative; the number of characters from each racial group was recorded into an Excel spreadsheet, as well as the number of times each race was mentioned. The invisibility bias, fragmentation bias, and professional bias of the picture analysis were also quantitative; these numbers were also recorded into an Excel spreadsheet. The percent representation of each racial group in the general population was collected from the United States Census Bureau for comparison in the people-to-study analysis and invisibility bias of the picture analysis. Next, the words chosen for language analysis were tallied; these included freedom, liberty, loyal(ty), justice, fair(ness), honest(y),
rights, independence, slave/slavery, and race/racism. These statistics were also entered into the Excel spreadsheet.

The stereotyping bias from the picture analysis was conducted next and marked the beginning of more explicitly subjective analysis. Instances of perceived stereotyping in pictures were recorded into an Excel spreadsheet and followed by three subsequent columns of data: the race of involved people of color, the textbook/page it came from, and the period in history during which it occurred. Language analysis and storyline analysis were done in a similar way. During this part of the language analysis, racially stereotyped language and language that obscured or misconstrued racial conflict was recorded in Excel with relevant information in subsequent columns. For the story-line analysis I noted the race of each historical figure and how they were portrayed. I also focused on historical events where there was interracial conflict or interaction and tracked how each race was portrayed in such situations (including when racial groups were involved but not mentioned). Any other themes or biases I noted throughout the books I entered into a miscellaneous category in the spreadsheet to investigate at the end of analysis.

The second group of analyses was qualitative. Instances of stereotyping, obscure language, portrayal of historical characters, and interracial conflict was based on my own interpretations of the text. As a White American, my own bias must be acknowledged. I was likely unaware of some racial stereotypes, either of my own race or others. I may not have noticed underlying themes or obscurity because I have been socialized to understand historical stories from one perspective my entire life. I may have perceived historical characters and conflicts in a certain way because of my own racism. I was not part of a multi-racial team combing through these texts; I was one White person. Because I believe it is impossible for me (or any researcher) to conduct fully subjective research on this topic, my methods were rooted in
the social constructivism paradigm “which emphasizes multiple subjective realities and the impossibility of objectivity (Rubin & Babbie, 2013, p. 17).” I aimed to induce meaning from observations and exploration, without coming to any discreet conclusions.
CHAPTER IV

Findings

The purpose of this content analysis was to identify the various ways racial bias persists in current second grade textbooks. The three most widely adopted texts were analyzed and a sample was created based on textbooks by three different distributors: McGraw-Hill, Pearson, and Harcourt. Five categories of analysis were used: picture analysis, people-to-study analysis, storyline analysis, language analysis, and miscellaneous analysis. Picture analysis confirmed the presence of visibility bias, fragmentation, professional bias, and stereotyping. People-to-study analysis revealed the emphasis of race during discussion of minority groups and the invisibility of race as it pertained to White Americans. Storyline analysis demonstrated an emphasis on white historical figures and a narrow representation of racial conflict throughout the American narrative. Language analysis exhibited the emphasis on cultural harmony and the prominence of independence, equal rights, and freedom as American ideals.

Picture Analysis

Initial picture analysis involved assessing for visibility, fragmentation, and professional bias. Visibility bias was determined to be present if the percent of people pictured from each racial group was less than that present in the general U.S. population as stated by the United States Census Bureau. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2012), 63.4% of people in America identify as “White” and non-Hispanic, 16.7% identify as “Hispanic or Latino origin,” 13.1%
identify as “Black,” 5.0% identify as “Asian,” and 1.2% identify as “American Indian and Alaska Native (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012).

Pearson, McGraw-Hill, and Harcourt all showed visibility bias toward Hispanics, with respective inclusion percentages of 12.4%, 10.0%, and 8.3% as compared to the current 13.1% Hispanic presence in U.S. society. McGraw-Hill and Harcourt also showed visibility bias toward Native Americans with inclusion percentages of 0.3% and 1.0% as compared to their 1.2% actual presence. African Americans were depicted at percentages of 16.6%, 13.6%, and 19.4% and Asians were shown in 12.9%, 11.0% and 9.8% of pictures; all of which exceeded racial representation in the U.S. population.

All books showed multiple instances of fragmentation, determined to exist when pictures had two or more persons of color and were absent of White persons. Picture fragmentation indicates isolation of racial groups from the main story line and reinforces a separate historical narrative for people of color (King & Domin, 2007). Throughout the three texts, African Americans were fragmented 21 times, Hispanics 15 times, Asians 13 times, Native Americans 5 times, and Whites 67 times; a total of 121 fragmentations throughout. To put this in perspective, there were a total of 69 pictures throughout the books that had more than one person and did not show fragmentation according to race; this is only 36.3% of the total 190 pictures.

Professional bias was determined by noting the professions depicted by each racial group in present day context. In the Pearson text, African Americans were shown only in roles as a bus driver and a seamstress. McGraw-Hill also depicted an African American bus driver, but included pictures of an African American scientist, governor, and singer. Harcourt had the widest range of African American professionals; 7 total, featuring a preacher, police officer, judge, construction worker, politician, sales attendant, and member of the armed forces. Hispanics were
featured in a wider range of professions, but the majority were in the service or entertainment industry. Throughout the three books, there were 7 Mariachi Band members, 3 Hispanics servicing fruit/vegetable stands, 2 on the production line, 2 farmhands, 2 dancers, 2 working a register, a dog groomer, a singer, a construction worker, and a mail carrier. These were complimented with one Hispanic doctor, one police officer and one politician. Asians and Native Americans had very little professional representation. In the Pearson text Asians had no representation as professionals; when they were depicted in the McGraw-Hill and Harcourt texts, Asians were shown as a florist, a farmer, a writer, and an architect. Native Americans were shown professionally only twice throughout all three books, both times as a weaver of native crafts.

Whites were shown a total of 64 times in professional situations, far more than the 25 Hispanics, 13 African Americans, 4 Asians, or 2 Native Americans. However, more significant than the number of professionals was the vast array of occupations portrayed; Whites were shown in a total of 32 different professions. Whites were shown in service and entertainment professions as construction workers, musicians, gardeners, barbers, farmers, bakers, sales attendants, postal workers, and janitors. They were depicted as a piano teacher, a violin maker, a police officer, a business owner, a park ranger, a member of the Red Cross, military personnel, United Nations workers, baseball coaches, mayors, judges, nurses, firefighter, a fisherman, an oil rig attendant, doctors, a dentist, governor, and a voting attendant, among many other professionals.

Professional bias gives some insight into the stereotyping found in pictures, but there were other forms as well. A two page pictorial spread in the Pearson text epitomizes stereotyping as it introduces the topic of “culture;” African Americans chase children while wearing tribal
masks, Native Americans are in a tipi holding a dream-catcher while standing next to a totem pole, Asians wear dragon costumes and kimonos, and Hispanics sell tacos while wearing sombreros. No White people are pictured. A picture in the Harcourt text with a similar intention to “celebrate diversity (p. 240)” shows only African Americans, Asians, and Whites; rendering Native Americans and Hispanics invisible in American racial diversity.

Throughout the texts, African Americans are shown repeatedly in tribal masks and traditional African clothing. When they are not featured in this “cultural” way, they are depicted as street performers, construction workers, and playing sports. Hispanics are similarly romanticized for their “cultural” singing and dancing, featured as flamenco dancers in flashy outfits and wearing grass skirts while dancing in Brazil. Otherwise, they are shown working on farms or tending vegetable stands. Asians are also stereotyped; each of the three texts shows at least one picture of an Asian using chopsticks and another of an Asian in a kimono. Native Americans are reduced to perhaps the most succinct stereotype; they are always in Native dress, in one instance entailing leather clothes, a feather headdress, and a drum. In the historical context they are shown harvesting corn and in the modern context they weave or make artifacts, hardly ever participating in mainstream America.

Photos featuring immigrants were also stereotypical. Each text had a section about immigrants with accompanying pictures; of the 23 people pictured as immigrants, only one was White. At least one of the pictures from each book showed people raising their hand to do the pledge of allegiance, an implied rite of passage for entrance to America.

People-to-Study Analysis

The first part of the people-to-study analysis is a similar study to the invisibility bias assessed above, but was done by noting the race of people mentioned throughout the text rather
than those portrayed in pictures. In all three texts, Hispanics characters were mentioned at a rate less than their 16.7% presence in society; only 3.8% of the people studied were Hispanic in Pearson, 8.6% in McGraw-Hill, and 13.3% in Harcourt. African Americans and Asians were also under-represented in the Pearson text. White characters were present at a rate of 75.5% in the Pearson text, 55.2% in McGraw-Hill, and 61.3% in Harcourt; a combined average of 64.0%, slightly higher than their 63.4% presence in society.

When they were mentioned, Native Americans were the most likely to be described using their racial identity. The term “Native American” was used 35 times throughout the texts, including when it was associated with actual people and when it was used in the historical narrative. African American was used 10 times (including the use of Black), Hispanic descriptors were used 7 times (including Mexican-American, Cuban, and Puerto Rican), Asian descriptors were used 5 times (including Chinese and Chinese-American), and White was used three times. Though Whites made up a distinct majority of the people studied in textbooks, their racial identity was rendered nearly invisible.

**Storyline Analysis**

**Asian Americans:** The storyline analysis focused on the portrayal of historical figures within the texts and the amount/type of attention each racial group received throughout history; a particular focus was placed on identifying instances of misconstrued racial conflict. None of the textbooks portrayed Asian historical figures. One of the few references to the history of Asians in America was presented in the lesson titled “Cultures in our Country” from the Pearson text: “Many Chinese Americans in San Francisco live in Chinatown. In this neighborhood children speak both English and Chinese. Shop and street signs are written in both languages, too (p. 136).” Chinatown is romanticized for its bilingual children and cultural competency.
Hispanic Americans: Hispanics have only slightly more historical visibility. Elfido Lopez is mentioned on half a page of the Harcourt text and Cesar Chavez is discussed on one page of the Pearson text. Lopez is appreciated for his rural lifestyle and farming abilities in the late 1800s and Chavez is praised as an advocate for the rights of farmworkers. Both display the stereotype of Hispanics working in fields and on farms. On multiple occasions, similarities are drawn between Mexican history and United States history. “Just like the Unites States, Mexico was once ruled by a far away country and fought to become free (Pearson, 2013, p. 149).” By citing an analogous historical event, students are encouraged to identify with the Mexican historical narrative. The Pearson text also discusses how Texas used to be a part of Mexico and that on May 5, 1862 the Mexican Army had to fight off the French who were trying to invade the land that is now Texas. The Battle of Puebla was such a victory for Mexico that it has become a holiday that is celebrated every year called Cinco de Mayo. Students are meant to empathize with the Mexicans; they were good guys fighting against the bad guys, just like Americans when they fought off Britain and gained their independence.

The Spanish are also depicted as part of American history, for their early invasion of lands that belonged to Native Americans. “The Spanish settlers wanted the land for themselves. They forced the Timucuan to leave. They built a town called St. Augustine (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p.27).” They are later praised for building the oldest and one of the most beautiful cities in the U.S. and their conquest of Native Americans is quickly minimized. However, they are briefly depicted as bullies whereas the Pilgrims from England are shown a page later getting along amicably with Squanto on the first Thanksgiving.

Native Americans: The example above is not the only time that violence toward Native Americans and the Native American role in American history was minimized. The Pearson text
presented the most Native American historical figures with inclusion of Sacagawea, Sequoyah, and John Herrington (an astronaut). Squanto was the only Native American historical figure represented in the McGraw-Hill text and Anyokah (the daughter of Sequoyah) was the only one in the Harcourt text. Sacagawea was commended for helping Lewis and Clark, Sequoyah and Anyokah were praised for developing a Native American Alphabet similar to that of the English, and Squanto was appreciated for helping the Pilgrims survive. They were discussed primarily as they related to White settlers, rather than as part of the original history of America. In the Harcourt text, there is no mention of conflict between European settlers and Native Americans; it is noted that Natives helped the European settlers on one page and the next page moves into American independence from Britain. When conflict is acknowledged in the other texts, it is downplayed. “Native Americans often lost land when colonies were built” states Pearson (p. 176) and when the Trail of Tears was instituted “they were sad to leave their homes (p. 174). However, “Native Americans were forced to move to make room for the pioneers. President Andrew Jackson made them give up their land and leave their homes (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 42).” Jackson alone is assigned the blame for establishing the Trail of Tears and the McGraw-Hill text shifts to a narrative that sympathizes with other early settlers. “Driving covered wagons over rivers and mountains was hard for the pioneers. Sometimes Native Americans attacked them (p. 23).” This implies that it was the Native Americans who created conflict, rather than the pioneers who invaded and stole their land.

**African Americans:** African Americans have more historical figures represented than any other minority racial group. The Pearson text discussed four African American historical figures over five pages, McGraw-Hill discussed three figures over three pages, and Harcourt discussed six over eight pages. Eight different historical figures were represented overall, with
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Harriet Tubman present in all three texts and Sojourner Truth present in two texts. African American historical figures and accomplishments center around two periods of history; the Civil War period and the Civil Rights Era. African Americans show up in these parts of the American historical narrative to fight for equality, but play a minimal role in the broader historical context. Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth are featured during the Civil War period. “After the war ended, slavery in the United States ended. At long last, African Americans were free (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 41).” With the help of all those who fought for equality, McGraw-Hill gives a sense that many of the struggles for African-Americans were finally over.

African Americans are rarely mentioned again until the presence of Rosa Parks and MLK during the Civil Rights era. At this point it is acknowledged that African Americans were “not allowed to eat at certain restaurants. [They] also had to sit at the back of the bus. This was because of the color of [their] skin (Harcourt, 2012, p. 208).” “African Americans were not treated fairly in the United States because of the color of their skin (Pearson, 2013, p. 142);” however, “Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. believed that all Americans, no matter the color of their skin, should be treated equally (Pearson, 2013, p. 142).” Multiple times, the texts site “the color of their skin” as the reason African Americans were not treated equally. This language implies that there is something inherent about African American skin that would make them less worthy of equal treatment. Nearly all the African American historical figures mentioned were championed as fighting for equal rights, but their opponent is not mentioned. During a chapter in Harcourt on women’s rights, Susan B. Anthony is discussed over a two-page spread as an advocate of women’s rights. During this, she is quoted as saying “it was…not we, the white male citizens…but we, the whole people, who formed the Union (Harcourt, 2012, p. 31).” She is
citing white males as the oppressors of white women; however, the oppressors of African Americans remain unstated for the entirety of all three texts.

**White Americans:** White Americans make up the majority of historical figures in all three texts. A total of 50 figures are discussed using 58 pages throughout the texts. Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, and Paul Revere are repeated in all three texts and Susan B. Anthony, Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Edison appear in two texts. The rest come from a range of historical periods and reflect an array of achievements in various contexts. The importance of White figures is further emphasized by the numerous times and places they are referenced. George Washington is mentioned in two different sections of the Pearson and McGraw-Hill text and in four sections of the Harcourt text; there are at least two review questions about him in every book. Paul Revere is deemed a “hero of the American Revolution (Pearson, 2013, p.188)” and “because of his courage, the Americans were ready when the soldiers arrived (Harcourt, 2012, p. 190);” he is mentioned three times in the McGraw-Hill text and there is a review question about him in every book as well. Thomas Jefferson is depicted as another true American hero of the time, mentioned multiple times for helping write the Declaration of Independence, which finally gave Americans freedom from Britain. Colonists “wanted to be free to choose their own way of life (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 18).”

Abraham Lincoln, another American hero, is praised in the Harcourt text because “he kept our country together during the Civil War (p. 199).” However, the Civil War is described as simply “a time Americans fought one another (p. 199),” with no mention of slavery or conflict between African Americans and Whites. The other two texts acknowledge racial conflict and identify him as a hero because he “worked hard to end slavery (Pearson, 2013, p. 182)” and “he said that all people were free (Harcourt, 2012, p. 31).” He is depicted as the true hero of the Civil
War and the primary reason slavery ended; “a monument called the Lincoln Memorial helps us remember how he cared about freedom for all (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 23).” Harriet Beecher Stowe was also acknowledged as being against slavery and writing Uncle Tom’s Cabin which “helped people understand why slavery was wrong (Pearson, 2013, p. 173).” This indicates that White Americans did not mean to be oppressive, but that they simply did not understand what was wrong with slavery.

Many other White Americans are also depicted fighting for justice. Elizabeth Cady Stanton advocated for women’s rights during the early 1900s. During a time when women were denied suffrage, she and Susan B. Anthony “worked hard for a new law that allowed women to vote. Today all citizens over age 18 can vote. Our country became more fair because of these women (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 41).” The text goes on to state that “the law changed in 1920. Women could vote (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 41)!” They are presented as heroes of equality.

White contributions to America are continually highlighted over those of other racial groups and language reifies them as the key players of American history. Lewis and Clark were “courageous! (Pearson, 2013, p. 180),” Amelia Earhart was both brave and “believed in women’s rights (Pearson, 2013, p. 148),” and Annie Oakley supported her entire family after her father died. Both Thomas Edison (a White scientist) and George Washington Carver (an African American scientist) were praised for their inventions in the McGraw-Hill text, but Edison was mentioned two other times in the text and had four review questions about him whereas Carver had only one review question.

The roles of White Americans take the form of either a victim or a hero throughout nearly every conflict and every era of history; their role as oppressors is repeatedly ignored or diverted. “Life was hard for the early settlers. They did not have much food, and winters were very cold
settlers are painted as victims of their environment and courageous for surviving the harsh winters. “The United States government listened when Parks and King stood up for justice (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 10);” the government is portrayed as temporarily misguided, but ready to change inequalities when provided the understanding to do so. The Harcourt text uses two pages to discuss a book drive that White fifth grader Brandon Keefe has begun in his hometown. He “believed that everyone should have books to read (p. 38)” and is shown distributing books to a room full of kids. Twenty-five students are shown, eleven of which are children of color; he is portrayed as a modern day American hero, taking care of the needs of others.

The Role and Depiction of Conflict

Though the concept of racial conflict is rarely addressed outright, the broader subjects of conflict and cooperation are part of the curriculum and presented in each of the three texts. In the Harcourt text, the vocabulary word “conflict” is introduced directly after a segment on diversity and described as occurring when “people have different points of view on what to do or how to do it (p. 242).” Difference is identified as the source of conflict and students are informed that cooperation is the best way to resolve this problem. On the next page, students are asked to form groups and practice cooperation with the following prompt: “suppose your group wants to make a bulletin board showing different cultures in your school. Work together to list the steps. Write what to do in each step (p. 243).” A picture shows an African American girl, a Hispanic girl, and a White boy working together on a bulletin board entitled “Our Garden of Diversity.” The children must cooperate in order to work through their differences and in this case the difference is displayed as racial diversity.
The McGraw-Hill text also discusses conflict and cooperation. “Citizens in communities work together to solve problems. A problem is something that makes things difficult (p. 14).” The next page shows a picture of two African American children and two Hispanic children on a soccer field; two of them are holding lacrosse sticks and the others a soccer ball. Students are asked to “Look at the picture. Name the problem that needs to be solved. Make a list of possible solutions (p. 15).” Children of color are again portrayed in a scenario of conflict. A few pages later, a White child named Clay and an African American named Juan are used to demonstrate cooperation in an interaction entitled “Clay helped Juan by cooperating (p. 21).”

Clay: Hey Juan! Can you go with me to play ball?
Juan: No, I have to finish raking these leaves.
Clay: We can cooperate. You rake and I will bag. Then, we can play ball. (p. 21)
The White child introduces the concept of cooperation and presents a resolution; he is the vehicle for compromise.

The Pearson text is less thorough on its discussion of conflict and cooperation, but also depicts cooperation as a White quality. In a segment entitled “How do people best cooperate? (p. 138),” students are asked to “draw a picture of how you and your classmates cooperate to get a job done.” A picture shows three White children as a model, working together and doing various chores to help clean the classroom. It insinuates that when White Americans are left to themselves they can easily cooperate. The various ways conflict and cooperation are presented in each text subtly depict diversity is the root of conflict and White Americans as conflict resolvers.

Language Analysis

The language analysis consisted of tracking prevalent words throughout the texts and identifying themes that were present throughout all periods of history. The most frequent
recurring concepts were those representing American ideals and were so interwoven into the story of American history that they guided the entire narrative. “Loyal” and “honesty” were used six times throughout the texts and “justice” and “liberty” were used 14 times. “Fairness” was used 33 times, “independence” used 40 times, “rights” used 42 times, and “freedom” used 75 times.

Native Americans are discussed for a few pages in each text, but the emphasized beginning of the American narrative begins with the story of independence. Great Britain was an unfair ruler of the colonies; the settlers deserved freedom and liberty. The Pearson text recalls that “England made laws for the colonies and forced colonists to pay taxes. Many colonists grew unhappy. They wanted to be independent (p. 178)” and Harcourt states that colonists “thought that some of the king’s laws were unfair. The people of the colonies wanted the freedom to make their own laws. Freedom is the right of people to make their own choices (p. 186).” Eventually, the unfairness could not be tolerated any longer and Americans “fought a war against England and won their freedom (Pearson, 2013, p. 140).” The language guides students to empathize with early settlers and imagine the injustice of being ruled by another country. America’s fight for independence is used to identify with other countries as well, including Mexico as mentioned above and Egypt who also gained independence from Britain. “[Egyptians] wanted freedom from England, just like people in the 13 colonies did (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 62).”

The story of independence sets the stage for a further emphasis on freedom and rights. Following a triumph over Great Britain, the Constitution was created as a sign of American independence, it “lists the rights of all citizens. It is a symbol that reminds us of our freedoms (p. 197)” states Harcourt; the implication being that the “freedoms” established by the original Constitution applied to all Americans. “Freedom is important to United States citizens. Many
people think this is what makes our country a great place to live (p. 23)” asserts McGraw-Hill; further indicating that “freedom” is universally recognized as an attribute of America. “All citizens in the United States have rights, or things we are free to do. The government cannot take away these rights. Citizens have the right to be treated as equals. This means we should each be treated the same way. The rules and laws in our country are the same for everyone (Pearson, 2013, p. 21).” The implication is that the American government is unbiased and just to all citizens, regardless of race, class, etc., but that even if they wanted to they would be unable to take away the “freedoms” ascribed to all people by law. The textbook story of independence indicates that “America has a tradition of working for freedom and fairness (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 40),” and that this has been the case for the entirety of its history.

The idea of America as a place where all cultures are accepted and everyone co-exists happily is another ideal that is woven through the texts. The Harcourt text has a chapter entitled “A World of Many People” and is introduced with the lyrics of “What a Wonderful World” by Louis Armstrong. The song is illustrated with pictures of children from several races embracing, walking in fields of flowers, and smiling together (p. 222-225). “Because cultures have different ideas and beliefs, people in our country have many different points of view. We learn from each other’s ideas and share different ways of living (p. 240)” states Pearson, “We come from different cultures, but we are all Americans (p. 241).” This depiction of harmony between cultural groups paints a universal picture of tolerance and renders racial conflict invisible.

The narrative of American immigrants reiterates American unity. “People from many parts of the world come to the United States to live. They bring their cultures with them. All of these cultures make up American culture (Pearson, 2013, p. 134).” American culture is described as equally representative of each distinct culture; an amalgamation of the ideas, traditions, and
lifestyle of every Americans and a sanctuary for all. “Millions of immigrants from around the world have come to live in America. Today people still come to make America their home. Some come to live in freedom. Others come to make a better life (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 4).” An abundance of opportunity and an ease of immigration are implied. “In the past, immigrants from Ireland came because they did not have enough food. Today immigrants from some African countries come to escape war. Many immigrants come to the United States for a better life (Harcourt, 2012, p. 237).” While this references early White immigrants, it leads the student to believe that modern immigrants and those bringing “culture” with them are mainly people of color; this is reified by the weighted depiction of people of color in pictures featuring immigrants, as discussed in the “Picture Analysis” section. “As immigrants learn about the culture of their new country, they also keep their own culture (Harcourt, 2012, p. 238).” The texts assert that the culture of immigrants is respected and that they are received openly into American culture.

Though the narrative insinuates that American culture accepts and encapsulates many cultures, White American culture is the standard to which others in the historical narrative repeatedly assimilate. The Harcourt text discusses the contributions of Anyokah, the Native American daughter of Sequoyah, “In 1817, six-year-old Anyokah began working with her father, Sequoyah, to help the people of the community get along. By 1821, they had created an alphabet for the Cherokee people (p. 16).” The people they are trying to “get along” with are the White colonists who felt it was important for Native Americans to have a writing system, though they had never relied on one before. Also in the Harcourt text, African American Benjamin Banneker is commended for mapping out the District of Columbia in the late 1700s. A discussion question asks students: “How did Benjamin Banneker show patriotism (p. 132)?” It is not his personal
value or achievements that are emphasized, but rather what he contributed to the greater White America. When asked why slavery was bad, a student’s reply is commended in the McGraw-Hill text, “people should be free because all people are the same except for on the outside (p. 48).” He states that it is this “sameness” that makes people deserving of freedom and implies that inequalities are caused by difference. The historical narrative of harmony seemingly allows for diversity while simultaneously requiring assimilation.

The continual depiction of America as a land of freedom and independence, created as a utopia for people of all cultures and racial groups, is present throughout the entire historical narrative. Concepts conflicting with this narrative are systematically minimized. Neither the words “race” nor “racism” exist in any of the texts. “Slave” or “slavery” are used six times in Pearson, nine times in McGraw-Hill, and zero times in Harcourt. Even when mentioned, the narrative of slavery is accompanied by stories of White heroes fighting against injustice and advocating for the rights of African Americans.

**Miscellaneous Analysis**

One of the ways that textbook publishers avoid mentioning “race” and “racism” is to mask them by the tidier concept of “culture” in the ways discussed above. However, “culture” is more broadly used to describe lifestyles in other countries. In the Harcourt text, the word “culture” is not introduced until learning about “world cultures (p. 226);” this is after Native Americans and other cultural groups present within the United States have already been introduced. Students learn about Ghana, Spain, and Japan in the “world culture” chapter. The McGraw-Hill text illustrates “culture” with Juan from Mexico playing Mariachi music and Lisa from China using chopsticks (p. 30-31). This reifies the narrative that there is one cohesive
American “culture” and implies that cultural diversity is a product brought to America from other countries.

This dynamic allows for repeated tokenization of racial groups. In all three texts, chopsticks are cited as an element of Asian culture and an Asian child is shown using chopsticks. Hispanics are portrayed continually as immigrants striving for citizenship. African Americans are confined to tribal outfits or the role of advocates for racial equality. Native Americans, the founders of original American culture, are ignored as Lewis and Clark are deemed pioneers; “a pioneer is a person who is the first to settle in a new place (Harcourt, 2012, p. 180).” This implies they were the first to inhabit lands that had belonged to Native Americans for centuries. Other discussions of Native Americans are vague or annotated to make space for the history of White America. However, regardless of their role in American history, all Americans are expected to be patriotic. “Our flag stands for freedom and justice. Justice means fairness. We make a promise to be loyal to our country when we say the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag (McGraw-Hill, 2009, p. 38).” Saluting the ideals of America is a daily ritual in every classroom and is presented as an important act of being an American.

Conclusion

Multiple forms of racial bias were exhibited throughout the texts. Photo analysis revealed visibility bias shown toward Native Americans and Hispanics and fragmentation in 63.7% of pictures containing more than one person. Professional bias was also demonstrated. White Americans were depicted as professionals 64 times in a total of 32 professions, whereas Hispanics were shown in 22 professions, African Americans in 13, Asians in four, and Native Americans in one profession. Stereotyping was also present. African Americans were shown most often as construction workers, athletes, street performers, or in tribal outfits. Hispanics
were portrayed primarily as entertainers or farmers, Asians were shown in kimonos or using chopsticks, and Native Americans were almost exclusively depicted in stereotypical tribal regalia.

Storyline analysis revealed an under-representation of Hispanics, African Americans, and Asian characters throughout the books and an over-representation of White Americans. However, all racial groups were discussed using a racial descriptor more often than Whites; “Native American” was used 35 times, African American descriptors were used 10 times, Hispanic descriptors were used seven times, Asian descriptors were used 5 times, and “White” was used only three times.

People-to-study analysis focused on historical figures and found zero Asian figures discussed throughout the texts, two Hispanic figures, five Native American, 13 African American, and 50 White American historical figures. Hispanic figures were praised for farming, Native American figures were discussed as they related to White Americans, and African American figures were only discussed during the Civil War and Civil Rights Era. White American historical figures came from a broad range of history and were depicted as American heroes throughout. Relationships between racial groups were rendered invisible and conflict was minimized.

Language analysis identified words that were prevalent throughout the historical narrative; “fair(ness)” was used a combined 33 times, “independence” was used 40 times, “rights” was used 42 times, and “freedom” was used 75 times. These ideals, paired with the story of independence from Great Britain, bolster an American narrative of unity and harmony. Immigrants are always welcome and all cultures are accepted. Texts portray American culture as
representative of many different cultures while simultaneously emphasizing the values of sameness and assimilation.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

One of the primary goals of multicultural education is to “…create within schools and society the democratic ideals …such as justice, equality, and freedom. These ideals [which] are stated in the nation’s founding documents—in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights (Banks, 1995, p. 391)” as they apply to Americans of every racial group. The value of multicultural education is widely accepted (Banks, 2005; Brown & Brown, 2010; Davies, 2011, Sleeter & Grant, 1991) and its value is substantiated through research (Bernstein, 2000; Bolgatz, 2005).

A key time for implementation of racial intervention is at the ages of 7-8; developmental theory identifies this as a time when children begin to form their own values and perspectives of the world (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980; Vygotsky, 1978). This content analysis explored the application of multicultural concepts in texts used to educate children in this age group and sought to identify areas in need of improvement moving forward. The shortcomings revealed through this investigation can be best discussed as they relate to the five concepts of multicultural implementation as outlined by Banks (1995): content integration, the knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, an equity pedagogy, and empowering school culture and school structure. The first three of these concepts relate directly to issues concerning textbooks and will therefore be the focus of this discussion. The latter two address teacher implementation of materials and broader areas for systemic intervention, but will also be
discussed briefly. Generalizability of this research, limitations, and implications moving forward will also be discussed.

**Content Integration**

Content integration refers to the incorporation of materials representing diverse cultures and the presentation of these materials as an integrated history. Rather than revolving around a narrative focused on White Americans, an integrated historical narrative should reflect multiple dimensions of every racial group and relationships between groups (Banks, 1995). In an effort to incorporate diversity within textbooks, two methods are often utilized which fall short of content integration: “recognition of contribution” and an “additive approach (Banks, 1994, p. 5).”

“Recognition of contribution” is exhibited when textbooks contain “various isolated facts about heroes from diverse groups” (Banks, 1994, p. 5). The overall curriculum remains unchanged and people of color are discussed as their contributions relate to the primary White narrative. Recognition of contribution was evidenced repeatedly throughout the texts, supporting the previous findings of Sleeter and Grant (1991). For example, Sacagawea contributed to the success of Lewis and Clark and Squanto to the survival of the Pilgrims. Sequoyah and Anyokah modeled a Cherokee alphabet after that of the early settlers. African Americans were isolated to their roles in the Civil War and the Civil Rights Era; historical periods when their involvement directly and drastically impacted White Americans. Chinese-Americans were recognized for establishing Chinatowns within larger cities; a place where White Americans can go to appreciate and enjoy Chinese culture for the day. Repeatedly, the texts failed to integrate the histories of racial groups.

The “additive approach” entails the use of “special units on topics like the Women’s Rights Movement, African Americans in the West, and Famous Americans with Disabilities”
The primary curriculum remains unchanged, but stories about people of color are added on through a sub-unit or side-bar. Similarly to the lack of content integration, the additive approach was present throughout the texts. Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth were celebrated in their own section for their contribution to the Civil War however, Abraham Lincoln’s role as a liberator of slaves continued as the main story. Native Americans were discussed for their survival skills and proficiency in farming difficult land, yet, the bravery of settlers and perseverance through difficult times was the highlight. Banks (1994) asserts that the additive approach, while an improvement over the passing mention of contributions, still relegates groups such as women, African Americans, and people with disabilities to the periphery of the curriculum.

However, while limited, the recognition of contribution and the additive approach have likely improved the visibility of people of color in textbooks. This study showed an increase in photographs portraying people of color as compared to the findings of Sleeter and Grant (1991). African Americans made up 17.1% of those depicted as compared to 11%, Hispanics Americans made up 9.8% as compared to 3% (which still indicates visibility bias), Asian Americans made up 11.0% as compared to 4%, and White Americans were shown less at 62.1% as compared to 70%. However, visibility bias was far worse toward Native Americans in this current study; they were depicted at 0.9% as compared to 10%. It is important to note that even if visibility bias was eradicated in textbooks, authentic inclusion entails more than inserting the right percentage of pictures featuring people of color or from each racial group.

Both the recognition of contribution and additive approach reify segregation throughout the historical narrative. There is no relationship drawn between groups; its evident that races co-existed at the same time, but connections are not made, nor are the complexities of that co-
existence raised. Colonists were ruled by Great Britain at the same time that slaves were owned by White Americans; both had the same goal – freedom. However, this opportunity for linking between racial groups was passed over as the storyline compared colonists to Mexicans and Egyptians who also fought for freedom. The relationship between White Americans and slavery is never explicitly made; slavery happened to “them” and “they” were shaped by it, but not “us.” As DiAngelo (2012) states:

The first African slaves arrived in Hispaniola (Haiti and the Dominican Republic) in 1501, and slavery was legal in all 13 colonies by 1750. This means that every foundational aspect of our country was developed in the context of slavery. Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence while holding over 200 slaves. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights were all written by slave-holders, and slavery did not end in the United States until 1865. If it is important for us to study in depth the founding of our country in schools, why do we minimize the impact that over 300 years of slavery had on the hearts and minds of the founders and the populace? If political and economic systems such as democracy and capitalism are understood to be fundamental in shaping our consciousness and thus worthy of in-depth study, how can we deny that slavery and the white supremacy that developed from it have also been fundamental in shaping us as a society, and where we are today in terms of national identity and race relations (Mills, 1997)? How can we ignore the monumental role that slavery played in the building of U.S. wealth (p. 224)?

In addition to truncating history, the textbook storyline conveys to students that racial groups have always functioned separately and the prevalence of fragmentation normalizes the
continuance of segregation. With segregation demonstrated in nearly 2/3 of group pictures, the message is hardly subtle.

Cognitive development theory affirms that children in the age group studied are learning about the complexities of group membership. Intergroup relationships are important as they begin to understand intersectionality and develop a sense of where they belong in society (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980). As children are trying to figure out what groups they belong to, the messages surrounding them are critical. What patterns indicate how groups are aligned? How will they align themselves? By gender? By class? By age? By race? Unfortunately, most white children in the U.S. are learning at this time—through the practice of their daily lives in neighborhoods and schools—that racial segregation is the accepted norm (Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2012). However, if this is countered through a historical narrative that does not center on White Americans and that teaches an integrated history of all racial groups, they may find more commonalities than differences with those who belong to different racial groups.

**Knowledge Construction**

Knowledge construction refers to the concept that knowledge that is legitimized in schools reflects the values and interests of those who produce it; school knowledge is reflective of the interests of those in the institutional position to promote and circulate their perspective. School knowledge as presented through textbooks has been approved or officially sanctioned by the State and thus serves the interests of the State. A critical component of school knowledge is not only what is taught, both explicitly and implicitly, but also what is not taught. Yet in order to achieve the goals of multicultural education, students should be presented with multiple historical perspectives and be able to recognize that each understanding of history is influenced by the lens through which it is presented. “Insiders and outsiders often have different
perspectives on the same events, and both perspectives are needed to give the total picture of social and historical reality (Robert Merton, 1972) (Banks, 1994, p. 8).” For this reason, students should be encouraged to think critically in order to identify biased information and form their own opinions (Banks, 1995). Understanding that how people construct knowledge depends on their positions within society helps students learn to think critically and with more complexity about a given historical dynamic and its impact in our current lives.

**The White Role as Oppressor:** Throughout the texts studied, the historical perspective rarely shifted from the experience of White Americans; the triumphs were those of White Americans and the struggles were those of White Americans. The perspective of people of color and the struggles they faced were ignored. Acknowledging the relationship between the struggles of peoples of color and whites would force White Americans to recognize their role as oppressors and admit that their heroes were not always just and fair. Throughout the texts, the struggles of people of color and the simultaneous role of White Americans as oppressors was repeatedly rendered invisible, minimized, or obscured by a simultaneous story of White heroics.

When Chinatown was romanticized as a place of sustained culture—as it was in the Pearson text—the long history of discrimination and repressive legislation that led to the establishment of Chinatowns across America in the first place was denied. There was no indicator that an entire race of people was refused basic rights to attend school, own property, and marry outside their race. Chinatowns were not developed to be a cultural experience; they were the only place Chinese-Americans could find sanctuary in the oppressive America of the 1850s. The one-sided narrative of Chinatowns erases the reality of oppression and creates a false history of Asians in America (Low, 1982).
When Mexico’s battle with France is discussed and Mexicans are compared to colonists fighting for independence against Great Britain, Americans and Mexicans are identified as the “good guys.” However, the story fails to mention that the United States also played the part of the “bad guys” when they invaded Texas and other Mexican land during the Mexican-American War (Fehrenbach, 2000). The U.S. played nearly the exact same role as the “bad guy” French, the only difference being that they were successful in their land-grab. However, their role is only discussed when it reinforces a positive portrayal of White America. Less palatable parts of the historical narrative which emphasize the struggles of others are omitted and children again learn only one side of the story.

Though slavery is acknowledged as terrible, there is no mention of who owned slaves or the benefit of slavery to White society. Many times, the texts state that MLK and other African Americans were discriminated against because of the “color of their skin.” However, it was not because of their skin that they were not allowed to eat at certain restaurants or sit at the front of the bus; it was due to the internalized belief in racial superiority on the part of White Americans who held the institutional power to systematically discriminate against them.

The perspective of immigrants overall was also ignored. The difficulties of White immigrants in the past are discussed; however, as the narrative shifts to discuss current immigrants, it identifies them as nearly all people of color and silences their struggles. America is painted as the land of opportunity and a place where anyone would be lucky to live. The difficulties of obtaining citizenship, adjusting to a foreign culture, and accessing services are all ignored.

When the White role as oppressor is not rendered completely invisible, it is heavily minimized. During sections featuring early America, Pioneers gain sympathy for their
difficulties and their violent relationship with Native Americans is downplayed. The Pearson text states that Native Americans “often lost their land (Pearson, 2013, p. 176)” and paints the Trail of Tears as the action of one man, describing Native Americans as “sad to leave their homes (Pearson, 2013, p. 174).” In actuality, Native Americans lost nearly all their land to colonists and were far more than “sad” to leave on the Trail of Tears. They were decimated by war, disease and starvation as a result of European settlers and they were forced to move west, but not just because of President Andrew Jackson. Americans wanted the land occupied by Native Americans, so they took it and forced Native Americans to relocate. It was not the work of one man, but the product of a society that allowed and condoned the mistreatment of an entire race of people (Carter, 1976).

The oppression of African Americans is also minimized through invisibility outside of the Civil War and the Civil Rights Era. Once the Civil War ended and slavery was illegalized, the narrative implies that the problems of African Americans dissolved. In fact, the Civil War was only the beginning; African Americans still did not have many of the rights afforded to White Americans and they would continue to battle oppression and racism. The period following Emancipation—Reconstruction—was perhaps the most brutal period of all for African Americans (Cardyn, 2012). When discussing the Civil Rights Era, Mc-Graw-Hill (p. 10) praises “the United States government” who “listened when Parks and King stood up for justice.” In actuality, it was well-established that the government did not listen to Parks and King until years of unrest and activism forced them to (Hughes, 2007). Minority rights were only achieved after decades of struggle. Whites did not give up power because it was the “fair” thing to do, they gave it up when social pressure became too great (Foster, 1999). Still, racism did not end with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Whites benefited and continue to benefit from systemic racism. Yet
the narrative falls silent on African Americans after mentioning them during the Civil Rights Era, implying that equal rights were achieved and it was the end of oppression for African Americans.

Simultaneous stories of White heroics are another way that the White role as oppressors is obscured. Rather than focus on violence toward Native Americans, Pioneers are praised for their braveness in venturing westward. During the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln is cited as the hero of justice and Harriet Beecher Stowe helps Whites understand why slavery is wrong. Sympathizing with the oppressor and eluding issues of racial conflict allow White Americans to continue being the heroes of the historical narrative. The very terms “race” and “racism” go without mention for the entirety of all three texts because racism is not a struggle that applies to White Americans and to address it would be admitting that White Americans are the culprits of racism. Rather than confront it, White America holds the power required to dominate the historical narrative and render the entire concept invisible. It is not one or two individuals who make this happen; it is an entire system of oppression. Repeatedly, a White lens is used to examine the historical narrative and the perspective of minority racial groups is silenced.

**The White Perspective:** Rather than acknowledging the perspectives and struggles of people of color, the texts give way to a pervasive narrative of nationalism. Ideals such as independence, freedom, rights, fairness, justice, and liberty are widely celebrated in textbooks, although they have been narrowly applied throughout history. American pride is celebrated and patriotism is expected; there is no mention that these “American” ideals have been historically reserved for White Americans at the expense of Americans of color. As Banks (1995) asserts, “when we approach the realization of these ideals for particular groups, other groups become victimized by racism, sexism, and discrimination (p. 394).” Washington and Jefferson are lauded
as heroes of freedom without revealing that they were both slave owners (Hirschfeld, 1997). The Constitution is celebrated for establishing independence without mentioning the continued prevalence of slavery. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony get credit for women’s suffrage, without mention that this only applied to White women. The only reality discussed is the reality of White Americans and this country has always been “fair” and “just” to White Americans. Recognizing the inequality of people of color would challenge this popular narrative of nationalism. The problem is not that the story is untrue, the problem is that it only represents a partial truth for one group of people.

As further means to avoid the concept of oppression and the white role as oppressor, the White historical narrative highlights the unity of Americans. There is a false notion that all are accepted and that many diverse cultures make up “American culture.” With titles like “People we Know (Harcourt)” and “We do our Part (Pearson),” a sense of camaraderie and togetherness is implied, which may represent the perspective of White Americans but which is ironic given the prevalence of segregation discussed above. “American culture” is actually White culture and has been since the pressure to assimilate began in the early 1900s (Foster, 1999). “This coerced assimilation does not work very well (p. 4),” asserts Banks (1994); however, the implications of assimilation for people of color are easily ignored and those who resist assimilation are seen as trouble makers.

Prevalence of such concepts as unity and sameness create a narrative that identifies difference as the cause of conflict. This is exemplified as conflict and cooperation are addressed in each of the texts. “Different points of view (p. 242)” are the cause of conflict in Harcourt, illustrated by children of different racial groups working out a problem. In this case, “difference” is easily interpreted as “racial diversity,” indicating to students that the existence of racial
diversity causes conflict. In McGraw-Hill, the concept of conflict is introduced with a picture of four children of color and the concept of cooperation is presented by a White child. The White child is a vehicle for compromise and conflict resolution; it is only when difference and children of color are integrated that problems and conflict arise. This one-sided White perspective allows for the continuing misrepresentation of conflict.

Cognitive development theory states that 7-8 year old children become capable of seeing things from perspectives other than their own (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980). This is an optimal time for presenting children with more than one side of the historical narrative and fostering empathy; they can develop a broader understanding of history and insight into the importance of perspective. By only allowing children to interpret history through the White lens, children of color do not see their own history reflected and White children are left to believe a false narrative of unity. Using a more well-rounded approach to knowledge construction can “teach about our differences as well as our similarities. Teachers can help students understand that, while Americans have a variety of viewpoints, we share many cultural traditions, values, and political ideals that cement us together as a nation (Banks, 1995, p. 6).”

**Prejudice Reduction**

Prejudice reduction entails fighting bias in children which has already developed and teaching students that all racial groups are equal. According to Banks (1994), “researchers have shown that while children enter school with many negative attitudes and misconceptions about different racial and ethnic groups (Phinney and Rotheram 1987), education can help students develop more positive intergroup attitudes, provided that certain conditions exist (p. 5).” The conditions referred to are the use of “instructional materials with positive images of diverse groups…in consistent and sustained ways (Banks, 1991, p. 5).”
The “instructional materials” in this study exhibited many forms of prejudice. Supporting the research of Sleeter and Grant (1991), racial groups were repeatedly tokenized and stereotyped. Native Americans were depicted exclusively in leather outfits, often with drums, feathers, and headdresses. African Americans were shown in tribal outfits, as athletes, and as street performers. Hispanics were either entertainers or farm workers and Asians were shown repeatedly with chopsticks. The continual reduction of racial groups to diminutive stereotypes reinforces biases in children which have already begun learning rather than challenging them.

Professional bias throughout the texts also exemplifies prejudicial messaging. White adults were depicted far more often as professionals in a much wider range of occupations. At an age when children are looking around them for information on their own future potential (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980), the message of professional bias comes through clearly throughout the textbooks; people of color are limited professionally, White people can be anything. White children visualize their future as doctors and politicians, whereas children of color see their future more often as farmers, construction workers, or not at all.

The prevalence of White professionals, the over representation of Whites in general, and the emphasis on White culture leads to the acceptance of Whiteness as the norm. Anything different is put in the category of “other.” When Native Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, or Asians are discussed a racial descriptor is most often used. John Herrington is a Native American astronaut, Benjamin Banneker was an African American city planner, and Elfido Lopez was a Hispanic farmer. None of the White historical figures are described using their race and the word “White” is used only three times, as compared to other racial descriptors used a total of 57 times. “White” is not used because it is the standard and needs no qualifier; it is only when people fall outside the standard that their race must be acknowledged. This
“othering” of minority racial groups perpetuates a bias that identifies them as abnormal or less than.

Race is relevant and should be recognized, but it should be done equally across all racial groups. White Americans have a racial identity as much as every other racial group. Rather than recognizing this, a popular tactic aimed at reducing prejudice is the institution of colorblindness. Similar to the concept of unity described above, the colorblindness ideal asserts that all people are inherently the same and race doesn’t matter. “Culture” is used to discuss differences in lifestyle and the concept of “race” remains silent. Culture is important, but it masks the inequalities and history of race in America. Colorblindness further reifies the false narrative that all Americans live by the same rules. White privilege is obscured and teachers are excused from addressing the difficult topic of race. One of America’s ideals is and always has been “*e pluribus unum,*” out of many, one. The pressure to assimilate and an emphasis on colorblindness are seen as means to this end. However, “an imposed *unum* is not authentic, is not perceived as legitimate by nonmainstream populations, does not have moral authority, and is inconsistent with democratic ideals (Banks, 1994, p. 4).” *Unum* will not be achieved by silencing differences, but by accepting and celebrating them in a way that recognizes that all people make up an equal part of this inclusive “one.”

Children reading the texts studied are beginning to develop their own morals and are heavily influenced by the culture of their environment (Vygotsky, 1978). They have already received information from their parents about the meaning of race, but they are challenging their assumptions and open to new information. Fairness is an important focus (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980), making this a key time for reducing racial prejudice. If racial bias is affirmed at school it
will likely solidify into an accepted frame of thinking; if it is challenged, children might shift
toward more democratic thinking and beliefs in racial equality.

**Equity pedagogy**

The concept of equity pedagogy emphasizes cultural competency in teachers; children
from different cultures and backgrounds learn differently and should be taught according to their
strengths. “Research indicates, for example, that the academic achievement of African-American
and Mexican-American students improves when teachers use cooperative (rather than
competitive) teaching activities and strategies (Aronson and Gonzalez, 1988) (Banks, 1994, p. 4).” This is ironic given the above observances associating children of color with conflict and
White children with cooperation.

A range of activities should be used to reach all children, rather than focusing on the
teaching methods that are most effective for the majority. Catering only to White students further
reifies Whiteness as the norm and applies increased pressure to assimilate. Due to the limited
number of activities relayed through textbooks, this aspect of multiculturalism was not
investigated through this study; however, it is an important piece of the larger goal of inclusive
education.

**Empowering school culture**

Striving for textbook reform is not enough. The entire educational paradigm creates a
form of systematic oppression and requires change in order to achieve multicultural education.
Empowering school culture refers to creating change in all aspects of the system: curriculum,
staff development, assessments, school boards, etc. There is no “quick fix” to racial bias in
education and past attempts to do so have been ineffective. The “recognition of contributions”
and “additive approach” still resulted in visibility bias toward people of color and promoted a
culture of segregation. The idealization of “sameness” and institution of colorblindness also sought to reduce prejudice but proved to be a disservice to people of color; unity was not created, but a false sense of “American culture” and added pressure to assimilate.

Inclusivity cannot happen overnight and certainly cannot be gained by silencing diversity. The cultural and racial differences must be recognized and integrated into all aspects of the system. “To create an authentic, democratic unum with moral authority and perceived legitimacy, the pluribus (diverse peoples) must negotiate and share power (Banks, 1994, p. 4).”

The value of diversity must be understood and Whites must room for people of color in educational decision making.

**Generalizability**

While the type and level of racial bias varied between texts, all texts exhibited multiple forms of racial bias and failed to meet the standards of multicultural education. Though this study was confined to only three books and specific types of bias discussed are not all generalizable, it can be inferred that racial bias continues to permeate second grade Social Studies textbooks.

Content was presented in a way that reinforced segregation and rendered people of color invisible. The historical narrative was presented through a white lens; silencing the struggles of people of color and allowing the white role as oppressor to be obscured and minimized. The concepts of nationalism and sameness were exalted, creating a false narrative of universal freedom and equality. Prejudice continued to permeate both pictures and storyline; sometimes outright and other times masked in the concept of colorblindness. Over and over, Whiteness was emphasized as the norm of American culture and diversity was hidden or portrayed as the culprit of conflict.
**Limitations of study**

Though generalizable in many ways, the scope of this study was restricted to a single grade level, a single subject, and just one of the many aspects of education. This study focuses on the texts of 7-8 year old children, an age that is critical in teaching about race and racism (Derman-Sparks, et al., 1980).” However, content integration, knowledge construction, and prejudice reduction should be further assessed in texts affecting all ages to identify the varying ways they fall short of inclusivity. Photographs are particularly prevalent and important for younger age groups, whereas the language and storyline may have increased importance in later grades.

This study also focuses solely on Social Studies. While this is the most applicable subject for studying racism, as it is tasked with telling the story of race in America (Nelson & Pang, 2006), other subjects show racial bias as well. Mathematics and Language Arts books may not have historical figures or people-to-study, but they can still have photos and language which reinforce segregation and invisibility. All subjects should be investigated for the unique ways they show propagate racism.

Even if textbooks from all age groups and in all subjects were studied, the concept of empowering school culture identifies textbooks as just one area in need of multicultural reform. This study omits the extremely influential teachers who help deliver textbook knowledge, the standardized tests which cater to the strengths of the majority, the State school board who decides the goals for each grade level, etc. All other areas of education should be assessed as well, so that their shortcomings can be targeted for change.
Implications of Study

Implications of this study for future practice are widespread because racism affects all people. By the time children are 3 they become aware of race and by the time they are 7 they know the stereotypes (Cristol & Gimbert, 2008). Most children have not been given truthful information about race and racism in America. Because, as first grade parent Geraldine Wilson stated, “One thing adults do – white, brown, Black, red and yellow – is to lie to children about racism (Derman-Sparks et al., 1980).”

Children must learn at school what they are not learning at home; they must learn the truth about race and racism in America. White children must learn that their history is and always has been intertwined with the history of people of color. They must be taught history through multiple lenses in order to fully understand racial conflict in America and the privilege that comes with being White. They should gain appreciation for diversity and learn that all people are equal; not because all people are the same, but because all have inherent human value. Children of color must see their history reflected in educational materials and teaching; they should recognize themselves as part of the main historical narrative, not as an add-on or contribution. They need to be taught history through the lens of their ancestors and see American heroes that reflect their racial identity. Rather than be pressured to assimilate, they should be encouraged to celebrate diversity and recognize that their contributions to society are just as important as those of their White classmates.

By the time children of color are seven years old, the age the textbooks in this study target, they have already begun adapting to racism (Jones, 2006). It is not their job to adapt, but the job of the education system to implement a method of education that represents and serves the diversity of American students. Multicultural education emphasizes the same ideals that are
outlined so prolifically in the textbooks studied: “justice, equality, and freedom (Banks, 1995, p. 391)”.
However, its strategies are aimed at assuring that all students have equal access to these ideals and that all students “have equal opportunities to learn, regardless of the racial, ethnic, social-class, or gender group to which they belong (Banks, 1995, p. 391).”

The use of multicultural education enhances students on both an individual and a societal level. “When content, concepts, and events are studied from many points of view, all of our students will be ready to play their roles in the life of the nation (p. 8),” states Banks (1994). “They can help to transform the United States from what it is to what it could and should be—many groups working together to build a strong nation that celebrates its diversity (p. 8).” Society will benefit from the restructuring of “institutions in ways that incorporate all citizens. People who now feel disenfranchised will become more effective and productive citizens, and new perspectives will be added to the nation’s mainstream institutions. The institutions themselves will then be transformed and enriched (Banks, 1994, p. 4).”

Exploring the areas of textbooks that lack the premises of multicultural education is a small but necessary step in shifting the institution of current education. While textbooks are just one piece of the picture, they are essential. By bringing their shortcomings to light, changes can be targeted for the next generation of texts affecting a critical age in fighting racial bias. “For it is certain, if we choose to stop working or seeking out ways to improve how we meet the challenge of teaching about racism, we will never break the cycle of ignorance and resistance (Brown, 2011)."
References


