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Talking about race: The role of Racial Identity Development models in antiracist pedagogy
ABSTRACT
This research explores the efficacy of using Racial Identity Development (RID) models as a curricular tool for antiracist pedagogy by examining the responses of high school students and university undergraduate students to a newspaper article that describes a racial incident. In a comparison of the responses of the two groups, the choice of language and the construction of arguments present a level of similarity unexplained by RID models. RID models are discussed in order to explore their role in curricular planning for antiracist pedagogy.

In the early 1990s, my colleagues and I designed a two-part study to understand the racial perspectives of undergraduate and high school students (Chávez Chávez, O'Donnell, & Gallegos, 1995a; Chávez Chávez, O'Donnell, & Gallegos, 1995b; O'Donnell, Chávez Chávez, Cross, Garcia, & Smith, 1996). For the initial study, undergraduate teacher education students were asked to read and respond to a newspaper article describing a racial incident. The article described how a group of Native Americans staged a protest at the start of the 1991 World Series between the Minnesota Twins and the Atlantic Braves. The protest was against the Atlantic Braves' fans use of the "tomahawk chop" and their accompanying chant complete with the beating of drums. The article—entitled "Tomahawk chop upset some American Indians" (an Associated Press wire report printed in the October 15, 1991, edition of the Las Cruces Sun-News)—was chosen because it presented the perspective of baseball fans and Native Americans. Fans argued that the tomahawk gesture was not "some kind of derogatory statement to Native Americans," but a gesture "which we view as very positive." Native American protesters, however, viewed the use of the "tomahawk chop," the beating of drums, and the wearing of ceremonial headdresses as an insult and an abuse of their traditions. The purpose of our study was to ascertain the relationship between students' everyday understanding of race and racism, and how these "commonsense" perspectives were informed and transformed through a multicultural education course. [1]

The second part of our work was a follow-up study examining how high school students would respond to the same newspaper article (O'Donnell, Chávez Chávez, Cross, Garcia, & Smith, 1996). Comparing the adolescent responses with the undergraduate responses, we found markedly similar responses - a circumstance that caused us to question the role of Racial Identity Development (RID) models in antiracist pedagogy. Although we had previously explored the use of RID models in multicultural education (O'Donnell, Chávez Chávez, & Gallegos, 1993; O'Donnell & Gallegos, 1993) as described and advocated by Gay (1985) and Tatum (1992; 1997), we now realized that they did not adequately explain or account for the similarity of the responses between the two groups of students who had read "Tomahawk chops upset some American Indians." After an overview of RID models, this article therefore presents a detailed comparison and analysis of the written responses of the undergraduate and high school students to the newspaper article, focusing on the ways that these responses cannot be explained by RID models. [2]

Racial identity development (RID) models
Racial identity development (RID) models developed within the African-American community (e.g., Cross, 1973, 1978; Jackson, 1976) during the civil rights movement. Various RID models for Asian-Americans (Kim, 1981), Latino- and Latina-Americans (Ruiz, 1990), and European-Americans (Hardiman, 1979; Helms, 1984; 1990) have been developed based on the models of Cross (1973; 1978) and Jackson (1976). RID models provide a description of the range of racial perspectives people traverse in their
development toward a healthy racial identity. RID models are conceived as a "stagewise process" (Helms, 1984, p. 154). Each stage reflects a person's worldview of race awareness, identity, and consciousness. In addition, Helms (1984) argues "that an individual's stage or world view [is] the result of his or her cognitive maturation level in interaction with societal forces..." (emphasis added) (cited in Helms, 1990, p. 19). [3]

Helms (1995), however, began to use the term "status" in place of the term "stage." She argues that many have interpreted her use of the term "stage" as indicating a strong-stage model: "To many researchers, stage seems to imply a static place or condition that the person 'reaches' rather than the dynamic interplay between cognitive and emotional processes that racial identity models purport to address" (p. 183). Although she still adheres to a developmental conceptualization of racial identity development, her construct of development reflects a Freudian principle, where "resolutions of the developmental issues of earlier or more primitive stages leave their imprint on subsequent stages" (pp. 183-184). Therefore, a person may exhibit evidence of racial understanding that may possibly straddle two of the proposed statuses. Nevertheless, one status is dominant, thus indicating the person's racial identity status. The term stage is used in my discussion of RID models, however, because it best reflects the RID model description of process of movement from one cognitive/affective understanding (stage) of race-related phenomena to a more advanced form of cognitive/affective understanding (stage). Further, the term "stage" continues to be used by many to describe this psychological process. [4]

No corresponding age is correlated with the various stages of the RID models, but Helms (1984; 1990; 1995) suggests that "cognitive maturation level" may operate in defining an individual's stage. Adolescence is usually described as the age where students can begin to achieve a formal operational cognitive stage perspective - a stage characterized by abstract thinking, hypothesis proposing, and manipulation of elements (Phillips, 1969). In most RID models, the first stage is described as a period of acceptance of racism and the norms associated with a race-conscious society (e.g., Cross, 1973, 1978; Jackson, 1976; Hardiman, 1979; Helms, 1984; Omi & Winant, 1986). Subsequent racial perspectives are encountered as students traverse through the stages culminating in a higher stage of racial identity and understanding. Thus, although racial awareness and racial identity develop along predictable lines, achieving the highest stage of racial identity and awareness is not a given (Tatum, 1997). [5]

**Methodology**

The following discussion is based on a comparative study of the responses of university undergraduate students (Chávez Chávez, O'Donnell, & Gallegos, 1995b) and of high school students (O'Donnell, Chávez Chávez, Cross, Garcia, & Smith, 1996) to the same racial incident as presented in the popular press. By asking students to respond to a text describing a racial incident, the racial perspectives of students-their ideas, beliefs, and attitudes about race-are revealed. The two cited studies explore (a) how university and secondary-school students make sense of a racial incident and a multicultural reality and (b) how the discourse on race is constructed in an educational site. [6]

In the undergraduate study, 107 students (age range 20-53) enrolled in a third-year education course at a major North American university in the southwestern United States read and responded to a newspaper article ("Tomahawk chop upset some American Indians") describing a racial incident. Of these, 75 were female, 31 were male, and one student did not specify his or her sex. The ethnicity of the participants was
as follows: 60 European-Americans; 39 Latino-or Latina-Americans; five Native Americans; one Asian-American; one Latino/Native American; and one African-American. Of the 107 students enrolled, 36 were third-year students and seventy were fourth-year students (one student declined to provide this information). [7]

In the adolescent study, 125 high school students (aged 14-19) in four separate classes in a high school in a mid-sized town in the southwestern United States were asked to read and respond to the same newspaper article ("Tomahawk chop upset some American Indians"). Two of the classes were taking a first-year social studies course, another was a second-year Developmental English class, while the last was a fourth-year World Literature class. Participants were equally divided between females (62) and males (62); one student declined to provide information about his/her sex. The ethnic distribution of the participants was as follows: 84 Latino Americans; 17 European-Americans; 11 Latino/European Americans; two American Indian/European American; one Latino/American Indian; one African-American; one Asian-American; one Native American Indian; and one Mexican. Six students declined to identify their ethnic affiliation, and an additional four responses were illegible. As a result, there were 115 usable responses from high school students for the purposes of Table 1, described below. [8]

The responses of the undergraduate and high school students were grouped into three categories: denial; ambivalence; and valuing the other. The criteria used to place a response in a particular category are described below.

- **Denial:** A response was judged to be in the denial category when the student affirmed the right of fans to cheer their team; or viewed the use of such American Indian symbols or names as ways to honor the American Indian; or negated how these stereotypical behaviors may harm and influence the way people view Native Americans.

- **Ambivalence:** A response was judged to be in the ambivalence category when the student could see both sides of the argument portrayed in the article or when the student expressed confusion about the complexity of the issue. The student offered no specific solution and often concluded her or his response by wondering whether, in fact, there was any way to resolve this "complicated issue."

- **Valuing the other:** A response was judged to be in the valuing the other category when the student implicitly or explicitly stated that, if a cultural group is being denigrated by certain behaviors, then these behaviors need to cease. For example, students within this category felt that the use of the "tomahawk chop" and other Native American symbols was inappropriate, observing that this practice should not be tolerated, even if only one Native American felt insulted by the "tomahawk chop." In other words, we should respect the thoughts and feelings of the "other." (Chávez Chávez, O'Donnell, & Gallegos, 1995, p. 7)

Extracts from both undergraduate and high school students are presented in the following sections to demonstrate the similarity of their responses to the same racial incident. The ethnic descriptors used to identify responses are those used by the respondent to self-identify himself or herself. [9]

**Results**

With respect to the total number of undergraduate students (n=107), 41 responses were in the denial
category (38.3%). Of the denial responses by undergraduates, 26 (43.3%) were written by students of European-American heritage (n=60) and 15 (31.9%) by students of color (n=47). Undergraduates as a whole gave an ambivalent response 30 times (28.1%). Of the ambivalent responses by undergraduates, 19 (31.7%) were written by students of European-American heritage (n=60) and 11 (23.4%) by students of color (n=47). Finally, undergraduates as a whole offered a response that was categorized as "valuing the other" 36 times (33.6%). Of the "valuing the other responses" by undergraduates, 15 (25%) were written by students of European-American heritage (n=60) and 21 (44.7%) by students of color (n=47). These results are summarized in Table 1. [10]

With respect to the total number of high school students (n=115), 55 responses were in the denial category (47.8%). Of the denial responses by high school students, 18 (60%) were written by students of European-American heritage (n=30) and 37 (43.5%) by students of color (n=85). High school students as a whole gave an ambivalent response 18 times (15.7%). Of the ambivalent responses by high school students, 6 (20%) were written by students of European-American heritage (n=30) and 12 (14.1%) by students of color (n=85). Finally, high school students as a whole offered a response that was categorized as "valuing the other" 42 times (36.5%). Of the "valuing the other responses" by high school students, 6 (20%) were written by students of European-American heritage (n=30) and 36 (42.4%) by students of color (n=85). These results are summarized in Table 1. [11]

As Table 1 indicates, the responses of these two groups are almost the same, especially in the "valuing the other" category where 36.5% high school students and 33.6% university students offered this response. Although undergraduate students offered denial responses at a rate of 38.3%, somewhat less than the 47.8% rate of high school students, this reduction in denial responses as students moved from high school to university is mitigated by a concomitant increase in ambivalent responses as students moved from high school (15.7%) to university (28.1%). The percentages of students who offered either denial or ambivalent responses therefore remained constant between high school and university. This was true for students of European-American heritage as well as for students of color. RID models—which state that ethnicity and other life experiences are factors leading to a higher stage of racial identity awareness—offer little explanatory power for this phenomenon. [12]

The Denial Category

The following representative examples are reflective of the types of responses given by undergraduates to deny that the use of the "tomahawk chop" by fans has racist undertones. Many of the responses voice the idea that the actions of the fans are not derogatory and, in fact, are being used to show their respect for Native Americans. While noting that the symbols are all in good fun, respondents repeatedly focus on the fact that Native Americans should be proud that their cultural symbols are being brought into various public settings. For example, a fourth-year undergraduate female, aged 24, majoring in elementary education and identifying herself as White (Indian, Irish, and German), wrote as follows: "In my opinion, I agree with Greg Smith [an Atlanta Braves fan quoted in the article] when he said, 'It's just a fun thing to do, nobody's thinking of it as some kind of a derogatory statement to Native Americans.' I have Native American ancestry in my bloodline and this does not offend me at all, if anything it keeps the image alive. Too many times ethnic groups scream, 'Foul' just to be screaming. It's outrageous! This is America, and individuals can exercise their Civil Rights as they wish. If others are offended they'll have to deal with their own personal instabilities themselves." [13]
A white male fourth-year student, aged 36, majoring in secondary education with an emphasis in social studies agreed, noting that sports mascots are "good, clean fun not intended to offend anyone. The American Indian was/is a proud race. No one denies that. No one is accusing them of being bloodthirsty savages, either today or yesterday. Mascots are chosen with pride. Fans are proud to be identified with them." Indeed, this respondent equates the survival of Native Americans with the "survival trip" that all sports teams embark upon in their quest for a championship. "That Indians are used as mascots by many teams represents the fact that Americans are proud of their original inhabitants and the way they fought to preserve their way of life 'against all odds.' It is amazing that so many tribes of American Indians still exist today. Like the American Indians, teams like to think that they can excel 'against all odds.' The chance of winning a championship is about the same as the survival of the Indian Nation who nearly passed into extinction." Another fourth-year student—a white male, aged 23, majoring in secondary education with an emphasis in physical education—drew a startling analogy between Native Americans and cowboys: "The United States is a fair country, so I believe that fans have every right to support their teams in the fashion that they have been. I believe [that] in today's society, too many people look for something to complain about. Cowboys don't get mad because somebody in Dallas is walking around shooting a cap gun and making Cowboys look [like] a violent breed. The Indians should not get mad either." [14]

The responses of high school students reveal similar sentiments. For example, a first-year female (aged 14) self-identifying herself as European-American (Anglo-American) responded that "The Indians of Minneapolis should not get so uptight about the situation. I agree with the fans. It is just a fun thing to do. They are not making racial statements. If anything they are learning a little bit about the Indian culture unconsciously. Even though they may be portraying them as savages, we know more about them now to know that they weren't. People just get too soft when it comes to your ethnic group. Sometimes you have to grin and bear it. Not everything people say is mean. If they know inside, what they are really like, it shouldn't bother them so much. It is just a game. It is just a mascot." Another first-year student—a male Mexican American (aged 14)—argued that "if the Indians are not wanting the Atlanta Braves fans not to use the drums, tomahawk chop or the paints and headdresses, then why do they sell some of their stuff in different cities, towns and other places?" [15]

Both undergraduate and high school students were unable to understand why "tomahawk" gestures, chants, and dress-up are viewed by Native Americans as offensive, racist, and stereotypical acts. For these students, the issue is trivial to the point that they view it as a rite of passage that all ethnic groups have to endure. The tomahawk chop therefore becomes a form of ethnic hazing, where "stereotyping and mockery are part of the price an ethnic group pays in order to be accepted into the American culture (Chávez Chávez, O'Donnell, & Gallegos, 1995b, p. 61). As one student put it, "sometimes you have to grin and bear it." [16]

The Ambivalence Category

Responses in the ambivalence category were characterized by an ability to see both sides of the issue and by an inability to decide how to resolve the issue. For instance, after stating that fans are merely cheering their team to victory and do not even realize that the team mascot may have some special significance to a particular group, a European-American male fourth-year education student (aged 29) nevertheless conceded that "[t]he Indians of today are proud of their heritage and I can see where they would feel that their heritage is being discredited. It might be like them sticking arrows into dolls that were supposed to
represent the Dallas Cowboys. I don't think that would go over too well either. So, where do we draw a line between what is acceptable and what is not? A female European-American (Anglo-American) third-year student (aged 20) concurred, noting that although she thinks that "the fact that the paint is worn and headdresses are used to symbolize how proud the fans are of their team is a positive use of these items," she can nonetheless understand that "these items (headdresses, warpaint) are sacred to the Indians and using them to cheer on a football team is sacrilegious and incredibly disrespectful. To the fans these things mean nothing more than a costume to urge on their team. To the Indians, they are used to honor their Gods (sic) and Spirits only on the sacred days in the most holy fashion...." [17]

High school students framed their ambivalent responses in a way that was almost identical to those of undergraduate students. For example, a fourth-year Italian-American male (aged 18) believed that, while "Indians have a very right to be offended," one should not, at the same time, "take it too far [because] many of the Atlanta fans probably had no idea that what they were doing was offending the Indians. But I do think that warpaint and the headpiece do take it a little too far." A fourth-year female Hispanic (aged 16) expressed the same confusion. On the one hand, she noted that "when I put myself in the Indians place, I would feel as if these people are making fun of my race because they do not know the meaning or tradition of the things they are doing." On the other hand, "it's not like they are doing any real harm to anyone because these fans are just trying to show their support to the team." [18]

A central theme in these responses is that, despite the fact respondents could discern racism in the "tomahawk" gesture and despite the recognition that this is a very serious issue for Native Americans, the idea of "harmless fun" allows such considerations to be swept aside. Regardless of how Native Americans may feel, the issue remains trivial. Fun outweighs cultural sensitivity. Indeed, the emphasis on the triviality of Native American concerns with regard to the appropriation of Native American symbols, gestures, and mascots is reminiscent of the responses in the denial category. [19]

In sum, these respondents are unable to make a decision and thus commit either to the fans or to the Indians. They are at a moral impasse. But in the end, "the students' indecision implies more a sense of not caring and just not wanting to be bothered by the dilemma posed" (Chávez Chávez, O'Donnell, & Gallegos, 1995b, p. 65). Accordingly, further study of the phenomenon of ambivalence needs to be undertaken. It may be that ambivalence-trying to see both sides of every story-is only a diplomatic cloak that hides a growing frustration with the insistence of Native demands. Conversely, it may be, following Macedo (1993), that some high school and university students really want to do something about gross injustices, if only someone would properly explain the real issues involved. [20]

The Category of "Valuing The Other"

In the category "valuing the other," participants dismiss any argument favoring the rights of fans or any rationalization that views the "tomahawk" gesture, chanting, and drumming as harmless. Respondents declare that the injustice perpetrated on Native Americans by the "tomahawk chop" and the mocking of ceremonial traditions is simply wrong and must stop. Many undergraduate students drew on their knowledge of Native American history and culture to support their perspective that the "tomahawk chop" was a racist act. Students explained that the "tomahawk chop" was stereotyping and degrading to Native Americans. In addition, students discussed how they would not like something precious to them displayed and mocked in a public forum. [21]
For example, a Hispanic male (aged 26) majoring in elementary education traces a gradual evolution of his thinking - an evolution that culminated in a recognition that defense of cultural symbols is a universal act.

Being a huge baseball fan I never really thought that a team's mascot's name would offend a group of people. As a former baseball player I looked at this activity as a type of fans' involvement.... I watched the series and the news reports beyond the game itself and began to see "the chop" was getting some Native Americans very angry. Why? I asked myself. Who gives a care what an organization calls themselves. Then it finally dawned on me. Why am I so proud of being Puerto Rican, why is a Black man so proud of being black, and a White man so proud of being white, the very threads of the Indian culture were being thoughtlessly abused just to show support of a ball team that probably doesn't have even one Native American on the team. Once I looked at the Native American's point of view instead of the ball players I was finally able to see the light. [ 22]

In addition, two female undergraduates-one Hispanic and one European-American-expressed concern over the "effects" and "negative images" such symbols have "on everyone" because "over the years and even today people stereotype Native Americans as being savages carrying weapons and wearing paint on their faces, for example, in the textbooks, the children read billboards and commercials. How is society ever going to stop this ignorance?" [ 23]

High school students whose responses were categorized as "valuing the other" often drew on the teaching embodied in the phrase "do unto others as you would like done unto yourself." For example, a European-American (Anglo-American) male (aged 14) observed that, because the "the tom-tom, drums, paint, and headdress are a major part of Indian culture and ceremonies," they should be respected insofar as "you don't see any Native American teams write names such as the Houston Rednecks or California Golddiggers." Another high school student-a second-year Hispanic female (aged 15)-was bothered by the harmless "just plain fun" argument, noting that Native Americans "do those things as rituals and the fans abuse this as some kind of joke to them. It doesn't seem like they're doing anything, but Indians don't do those things for fun and feel that fans are using the actions as insults. It's not a good idea to use those actions because of the way they insult Indians. Nobody likes to have their ways used as "fun" especially if they're rituals that are performed only on holidays and special occasions. The Indians' ways are meant for their cultures and not meant to be used as "fun" ways to cheer their teams on. Indians are very strict with their cultures and any violations of their cultures insults them." [ 24]

Responses such as these display genuine concern, empathy, and consideration for the perspective of Native Americans. Both undergraduate and high school students repeatedly explained that, in a situation where one party feels aggrieved, it is necessary to examine very closely the arguments of that aggrieved party. Whether sports fans did or did not intend to harm and mock Native Americans—or whether they are only having fun—is not the real issue. If Native Americans continually demonstrate their dislike for and express their concern about the "tomahawk chop," then their position must have validity for them, and the position must therefore be respected by others. No other argument has much weight. [ 25]

**Discussion**

The responses of these high school and university undergraduate students reveal a range of
understandings about the dynamics of race and racism within late 20th-century American society. Yet, as summarized in Table 1, students who identified themselves as "people of color" offered "denial" and "ambivalence" responses at rates that were only slightly lower than students who identified themselves as European-Americans. In addition, undergraduate responses were not substantially different from the responses of high school students, especially when "denial" and "ambivalent" responses are seen as a super-category. The RID models described above do not adequately account for the similarities in the different groups of student responses. RID models cannot adequately explain how a student aged 14 and a student aged 21-who, presumably, is operating at a higher cognitive maturation level-share a similar understanding of the social phenomenon of race. [26]

RID models grounded in a structural, stagewise perspective are being critiqued because of their imposed "worldview" and questionable conceptualization of stage progression (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994). Although Rowe, Bennett and Atkinson (1994) refer particularly to Helms' (1984; 1990) model of White racial identity development, their critique has equal applicability to the theories of Cross (1978), Jackson (1976), and Hardiman (1979).

Another major problem has to do with the conceptualization of White RID models as developmental stage models.... It is important to recognize that the directionality ... is imposed. That is to say, there is nothing in nature, similar to the Piagetian stages of mental operations, that orders the stages of White identity development and nothing other than our imposed ethics that imbues the stages with ordered levels of desirability. To speak of a progression ... is to speak metaphorically. This recognition of arbitrary directionality, then, places the burden for showing that the potential progression indeed takes place on the supporters of the model.... (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994, p. 132) [27]

Further, many of the RID models neglect the historical context and the contingencies of the sociocultural and sociopolitical to enhance our understanding of race dynamics (Rowe, Bennett, & Atkinson, 1994). Though the Black RID models emerged within the context of the civil rights movement as an explanation for understanding the changes occurring within the Black community (e.g., Cross, 1973; Jackson, 1976), White RID models (e.g., Hardiman, 1979; Helms, 1990) developed in the post-civil rights era. Hardiman (1979) views the civil rights movement as a catalyst to explain how many Whites moved from an acceptance (stage one) perspective to a resistance (stage two) perspective. Race dynamics, however, are constructed differently today (Gilroy, 2000; Holt, 2000; Omi & Winant, 1986). Viewing the beating of peaceful marchers probably was a catalyst to move many Whites from passively accepting the contradictions that that "type" of racism exposed. On the other hand, today's historical construction of race has groups of voters dismantling such civil rights gains as affirmative action. [28]

Further, the segregation that many Whites and "people of color" experienced during 1950-1970 does not necessarily reflect the social reality of how race was presented to their children in the 1990s, when children were often exposed to positive media representations of persons of color-Michael Jackson and Colin Powell, to name only two-and attended schools with diverse student populations unthinkable in the days of their parents (Gilroy, 2000; Giroux, 1997). Finally, RID models are unipositional and do not take into account how identities are informed and constructed from multiple positions (e.g., Rowe, Behrens, & Leach, 1995). Race is not a mathematical or scientific concept that requires a sequential learning of skills and knowledge in order to understand and to experience the pain of discrimination. [29]
Many RID models view the development of racial identity as an event that occurs during early adolescence (e.g., Cross, 1973; Jackson, 1976; Hardiman, 1979; Helms, 1984). The first stage of these models understands a particular person's experience of race as a blind acceptance to the racial status quo of Whiteness. And for many young persons of color, this first stage is characterized by an "obliviousness to socioracial concerns" (Helms, 1995, p. 186) or, as Cross (1995) puts it, by "attitudes toward race that range from low salience or race neutrality, to anti-Black" (p. 98). However, research indicates that young children between the ages of three and five are capable of distinguishing racial as well as gender characteristics (Derman-Sparks, Higa, & Sparks, 1980; King, Chipman, & Cruz-Janzen, 1994). Furthermore, children—especially children of color between the ages of eight and ten—are aware of the complex nature of racial preferences. For example, Rush (1998), a white woman, writes about her black daughter's struggle in early elementary school with issues of race and gender: "My daughter was not very old by the time she figured out that whites and boys are privileged in our society. She understood from a very early age that if only she were one or the other, she would be better off. Being white or male means having more power and privilege than being black or female" (p. 5). To assume that children accept the dominant race ideology is to ignore children's agency as individuals who may accept some but not all aspects of an ideology (e.g., Rizvi, 1993; Troyna & Hatcher, 1992). [30]

**Conclusion**

Although RID models are valuable tools for multicultural counseling, the above findings suggest that such models are less valuable as tools for guiding curricular planning for antiracist pedagogy. Curriculum planning based on RID models may limit teachers' and students' exploration and examination of racial topics. A teacher, for example, could explain his or her avoidance of a discussion about racial topics with young children based on the argument that young children could not understand such a discussion. However, according to the findings presented here, students exhibit a range of responses to the issue of race regardless of age or racial identification. Furthermore, the non-engagement of many students with issues of race is often the result of a lack of cognitive information, that is, knowledge about race dynamics (or more specifically an opportunity to talk about it) and an affective avoidance of the topic because of its contradictory nature in a country described as "free and just" (e.g., Chávez Chávez & O'Donnell, 1998; Tatum, 1992). Creating pedagogical structures that permit students to embark upon critical dialogue about their social realities may assist students in "encountering" issues of race. [31]

RID models tend to focus on the psychology of the individual. However, attempts to explain racism have typically focused on the individual and have not concentrated on the ideological, social, and cultural underpinnings of racist behavior. That is to say, structural explanations for racism have been downplayed. The "ideological" refers to the production and consumption of ideas as well as the processes employed to maintain and advance the ideology of racism. The "social" explores society's institutions and interrelationships and the way in which ideas are produced, reproduced, and, most importantly, resisted. Finally, the "cultural" examines the ontological, axiological, and epistemological constructs of the dominant culture. These three domains create a matrix from which students and teachers can explore, examine, and create an enriched dialogue about racism. Antiracist pedagogy cannot remain focused on the individual because such a unidimensional focus gives credence to what Henriques (1984) refers to as the "rotten-apple-theory," that is, rid society of the bad individuals and you rid society of racism. In sum, the responses of high school and undergraduate university students presented above call into question the educational role of RID models in antiracist pedagogy. More research about the application of RID models
in various educational settings is warranted. [32]
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**Table 1: Comparison of responses between undergraduates and high school students**

Legend for Chart:

A - Response category  
B - All undergraduate students (n = 107)  
C - European-American undergrad students (n = 60)  
D - Undergrad students of color (n = 47)  
E - All high school students (n = 115)  
F - European-American high school students (n = 30)  
G - High school students of color (n = 85)(**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>41 (38.3%)</td>
<td>26 (43.3%)</td>
<td>15 (31.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 (47.8%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>37 (43.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>30 (28.1%)</td>
<td>19 (31.7%)</td>
<td>11 (23.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.7%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing the other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33.6%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(44.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36.5%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(42.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) students who identified themselves as being part European-American were included in this category.

(**) six students did not provide an ethnic identity; the responses of four additional students were illegible.
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