Race, Diversity Pedagogy: Mediated Learning Experience for Transforming Racist Habitus and Predispositions

Michael Cross and Devika Naidoo

INTRODUCTION

The fortress of white Afrikaner rugby, Loftus stadium has been perceived as a racist enclosure by many black South Africans. Very few dark-skinned rugby fans dared to watch rugby matches at this stadium. "At your own risk!" thought many. It was not until the soccer World Cup that this legacy came to be challenged. Loftus was booked for soccer World Cup matches and all rugby matches scheduled for Loftus were transferred to Orlando Stadium in Soweto. The decision was met with a great deal of concern and anxiety from both sides but mainly from the Loftus community: "It will be a disaster! No one will go to Soweto!"; "But Blacks do not watch rugby!"; "Who will stand the noise of the vuvuzelas?"; "Who is going to control the hijackers?"; and so forth! But one sign stood firm on the road to Soweto: "Soweto welcomes all rugby fans!" Surprisingly, the Tri-Nations rugby match at Orlando Stadium—the first in this stadium—turned out to be the most celebrated one in the whole history of South African rugby. It has changed notions of what it means to be a rugby fan. It has changed attitudes of white and black rugby fans towards each other. Today, increasing numbers of blacks and whites watch rugby together, wherever it is played. What lessons could be drawn from this "experience" that could be applied to the classroom?

White rugby fans who had made it a "habit" to read the experience of blacks in Soweto through the lens of apartheid stereotypes, symbols, and beliefs—the only knowledge that they could draw on (labeled *bitter knowledge* by Jansen 2009)—found it difficult if not impossible to attach new meaning to that experience, regardless of the criticism from the media or even the literature (scientific or non-scientific) they had read. For them there was no other interpretation beyond the "bitter knowledge" they carried with them. For Plato (1970), bitter knowledge would be "shadows cast on the wall" that prevent whites from knowing the truth about others. Applying Plato's allegory of the cave to bitter knowledge that whites carry: Whites could be perceived as immobilized prisoners (in the

chains of bitter knowledge) in a dark cave. In this constrained state, they take the bitter knowledge (shadows) as objective representations of reality. Just as the ideal teacher is one who frees the prisoners from their chains and turns them so that they can face the light, so too the need for confronting bitter knowledge so that the "truth" about others may be known.

With reference to meaning and experience, Jarvis (1987, 164) argues, "there is no meaning in a given situation until we relate our own experiences to it," regardless of what we might have been taught about it. In this particular instance, "experience" played a critical role in the process. The highly quoted Aristotle's (1908, 49) insight is revealing in this regard: "The virtues we get by first exercising them, as also happens in the case of the arts as well. *For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them*" (emphasis added). Or even better the famous dictum of Confucius (450 BC): "*Tell me, and I will forget. Show me, and I may remember. Involve me, and I will understand*" (emphasis added). It was through a lived experience of being with others that their own stereotypical perceptions of the other could be transformed.

This article foregrounds the salience of "lived experience" in the mediation of unlearning racialized habitus (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), and in learning and relearning the "truth about reality," or the truth about others. This article emphasizes the value of positive "lived experience" for anti-racist and reconciliation pedagogies, in addition to text-based experiences that facilitate the cognitive dimensions of learning (formal knowledge). Planning and providing positive lived experience and enabling systematic reflection and symbolic representation of informal experiences are essential for triggering the necessary disequilibrium for reviewing habitus, formed by apartheid structured realities, and for creating the conditions for the metanoia—"a mental revolution, a transformation of one's whole vision of the social world" (Maton 2009, 60). In this regard, this article represents an attempt to integrate this pedagogical dimension to current race- and diversity-related pedagogical discourses, which tend to overemphasize text-based experiences in isolation from lived experience. The term *pedagogy* is used in its broader sense in this article; not simply as synonym for teaching and learning styles, but also as the study of relations between teaching, learning, and school processes with wider social structures, cultural shifts, and intellectual conditions.

DIVERSITY, RACE, AND RACISM: WORKING WITH AMBIGUOUS AND ELUSIVE CONCEPTS

Generally, "diversity" remains an elusive and ambiguous concept not devoid of paradox. Throughout South African history the concept of diversity has been associated with race, gender, and class differences. Recent literature has widened its scope to embrace characteristics such as age, physical traits (e.g., disability), sexual orientation, language, ethnicity, nationality, socioeconomic status, place of origin, social and political affiliations, seniority and experience, education and training, or what makes us to be or be perceived as different. Diversity is about recognition of difference. As such, diversity represents a mix of

characteristics that makes a person or group unique, or assigns them an identity. But it must be emphasized that social markers of difference and privilege are neither innate nor innocent but the result of socially structured boundaries between individuals or social groups. The boundaries between different categories of social groups and knowledge are a function of power relations as "power relations create boundaries, legitimize boundaries, reproduce boundaries between different categories of groups, gender, class, race, different categories of discourse, different categories of agents" (Bernstein 2000, 5).

Attitudes towards diverse others have shifted in this third millennium. As elsewhere in the post-modern, post-industrial, and post-colonial world, in South Africa diversity is valued across the political spectrum. It is seen as a source of social and cultural enrichment that needs to be recognized, respected, acknowledged, enabled, celebrated, protected, and promoted through proactive diversity management and leadership strategies. It responds to what is perceived as a future trend, towards a multicultural, multiethnic, multi-lingual, multi-gender, and multi-sexual order (Rosada 2006). However, given the apartheid legacy, the pursuit of diversity in South Africa is only meaningful within the framework of human rights and social justice contrary to the postmodern apolitical celebration of diversity for diversity's sake. Commitment to diversity is manifested in the National Constitution, which is a compromise between individual liberties and freedoms protected by the Bill of Rights and the constitutional protection of group rights or community identity linked to cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity (Currie and De Vaal 2005, 634).

The term *racism* is used here to refer to the ideology of white supremacy, which legitimizes

Distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life. (United Nations 1966)

The ideology of racism permeates social structures, institutional practices and processes, individual attitudes and beliefs and becomes, according to Carmichael (1968), the basis for decisions and policies for the purpose of subordinating a racial group and maintaining control over that group. Racism can be personal, cultural, or institutional and these aspects often interrelate. The salience or arrogance of race has shaped the South African diversity debate in a somewhat unique manner only comparable to a limited extent to the American experience. Although the "class reductionism" that characterized the "charterists" and the "race reductionism" that dominated the Black Consciousness Movement in the 1970s and 1980s seem to have been superseded, "racism" and "race," by default, still occupy center stage. Soudien (2010) came close to argue that "race" represents today the generative mechanism through which other forms of difference are constituted/reconstituted, reinforced, or gain expression. This is a critical, analytical distinction, as racism is often intertwined with other forms of discrimination—based on social class, gender, ethnicity, religion, language, sexual orientation, and xenophobia—and uses these to justify and reproduce itself (Soudien

2009, 282). In this context, innovative pedagogies of race are required beyond the narrow world of formal education to suggest ways of understanding and talking about race in school contexts (Soudien 2009, 282). It points to the value of integrating lived experiences into the learning process. Linked to racism is also gender discrimination or *sexism*, which legitimizes unequal relations of power between men and women, and oppressive patriarchal relations that relegate women to subservient lower status and deny them access to societal rewards. This is not to play down the significance of the ideological manipulation of other forms of difference. However, it is necessary for analytical purposes to emphasize variation in degree, incidence, and prevalence.

CHALLENGES: WORKING WITH AND AGAINST RACIALIZED CATEGORIES

The contradiction for educationalists concerned with social justice is that in using racialized categories in research, teaching, and institutional development we are caught in a bind: working both with and against conceptual tools that have yet to be effectively replaced (Warmington 2009, 295). Categories can be defined as descriptors, concepts, theories, or indicators through which we make sense or attach meaning to the surrounding world. May (2010, 431) highlights the main aspects concerning the creation of categories as follows:

> Creating categories is what we humans do both consciously and unconsciously in order to understand the complex world around us... Through language (words, concepts, theories) we order, make sense of, and provide labels for things, people and experiences, and we tend to take these everyday understandings of the world for granted... These categories do not however correspond directly to a reality 'out there' but are rather the product of human embodied reason.

Two important meanings can be attached to these categories: categories of practice and categories of analysis. *Categories of practice* are "categories of everyday social experience, developed and deployed by ordinary social actors, as distinguished from the experience-distant categories used by social analysts" (Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 4). Within the South African experience categories of practice include, for example, *native, bantu, volk, coolie,* and *bushman.* Categories of analysis refer to terms such as *race, nation, ethnicity, citizenship, democracy, class, community,* and *tradition,* that are at the same time categories of social and political practice and categories of social and political analysis used by social scientists (Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 4). They have close reciprocal connection and mutual influence among their practical and analytical uses.

However the use of categories does not go uncontested. First, categories are never fixed but undergo constant boundary changes as a result of dialogue, dispute, and power struggles. Second, the act of categorization is never neutral or in May's (2010, 431) words, "acts of categorization matter because language is never 'just words but rather, the names and labels we give to things have real consequences in the lives of individuals.'" Categorization is part of the mechanics of constitution of the Other and or what Spivak refers to as domination or struggle "in and by words," in the sense that categories, images, and representations of

people, the intellectual construction of a group's Self and a group's Other, are not a neutral intellectual activity (Cross 1999, xiii).

Third, the act of categorization entails subtle forms of violence. Contemporary social hierarchies and inequalities are produced less by physical force than by symbolic domination or symbolic violence (Schubert 2009, 183). For Bourdieu (2009, 183), symbolic violence can be interpreted as a function of language including categories or indicators of social life. To him (Bourdieu 2009, 183), language itself is a form of domination and an instrument of power and action.

Categorizations make up and order the world and, hence, constitute and order people within it. Political struggle is found in efforts to legitimize those systems of classification and categorization, and violence results when we misrecognize, as natural, those systems of classification that are culturally arbitrary and historical.

Symbolic violence is thus an effective and efficient form of domination, although it is generally perceived as a "gentler" form of violence in comparison to physical violence. Symbolic violence leads to perceptions, action, and practice, with profound implications for the affirmation of desire, power, and interests within society. The apartheid history has shown how categorization can create and recreate social inequalities and oppressive political boundaries between groups of people.

Fourth, categorization tends to homogenize groups and create a discursive illusion that members of a category share more in common than they in fact do, which hides the variety of interests, social positions, and identities ascribed to the group by the category. The oppositional categories—victim/perpetrator, agency/oppression, moral/immoral, ethical/unethical—simplify the complexity of experiences determined by the intersections of difference across diversity: "it is not automatically given that a woman's voice comes from a person who is inhabiting the body of a woman" (Das 2010, 139). Similarly, it is not a given that anti-racist voices will come from Blacks. Essentialism makes it difficult if not impossible to account for the nature of the intersections of race, class, gender, and other forms of difference and how these could be addressed through suitable pedagogic practices. In this regard, the failure to grasp how racism—itself an evolving phenomenon—intersects differently with the different forms of identification or difference such as race, class, gender, and ethnicity in diverse contexts has yet to be explored and theorized. For example, although racism may be experienced as a primary conditioner of social life in most urban schools, this may not be true for a school in a remote rural area where students without a television may spend several months without a direct encounter with a white person. These intersections assume different character and nature depending on the context (in some cases, race takes precedence over class but in others gender or ethnicity may be dominant and so forth). The effectiveness of a particular pedagogical practice will depend on how this complexity is conceptualized and understood.

Post-conflict pedagogies in particular pose conceptual challenges of different kind. They tend to de-emphasize dimensions of conflict embedded in racial categories by privileging imagined post-racial categories, devoid of historical rootedness (e.g., reconciliation, compassion, etc.), leaning towards the imaginary,

idealist, or utopian worlds. This leaves post-conflict pedagogies with very little room for pedagogical negotiation of racism and diversity, leaving them with a somewhat un-situated transcendence of racial categories.

THE ARGUMENT

Although critical race pedagogies have made considerable strides in recognizing the centrality of race and racism and the need to address them in South African classrooms, they are still confronted with fundamental conceptual and practical difficulties. Conceptually, this is revealed by attempts at pedagogical recipes portrayed in universalizing or totalizing mode, which do not account for the contextual complexity and the diversity of classroom diversity in South African education (e.g., anti-racist pedagogies as the most suited to all circumstances in the country). In more informed cases, the problem has a lot to do with the unproblematic use of racial categories as suggested by critical race theories without paying attention to their homogenizing or essentializing character ("blacks as victims," "whites as perpetrators," "women or any other groups as undifferentiated," Blacks as homogenous, monolithic and experiencing racism the same way, "white students as carrying and reacting to the same forms of "bitter knowledge"). Certainly, there is no single way of being black, white, woman, or Zulu. The same way people are not integrated into class, gender, and other forms of difference in undifferentiated ways, there is no single way of experiencing such difference. As such, anti-racist pedagogies either have not yet embraced the value and significance of working with and through difference and diversity or have found it difficult to work with these as dynamic and changing concepts.

Practically, the difficulties in race and diversity pedagogies reside in the ways such pedagogies conceptualize the pathways for the transition from a racial to a democratic racial order in the classrooms and schools. Borrowing from the experiences of the United Kingdom and United States, initial attempts in South Africa included assimilationist and multicultural classroom strategies that soon proved inadequate as assimilation was premised on absorbing diversity into dominant ways of being and doing. And multiculturalism celebrated diverse cultures in isolated events, without attention to the curricular and pedagogical processes that would transform students' cognitive structures thus leading to a benign form of assimilationism. These dimensions have been at the center of the debate in recent pedagogical discourses generally referred to as anti-racist pedagogies. Generally, anti-racist theories agree on the complexity of the anti-racist and diversity project (i.e., no single pathway to the non-racial order is possible). This is partly due to the incompleteness of the post-racial order, often presented as an idea and not lived experience. These theories are divided on a number of fundamental issues.

On the one hand, there are theories that hold that the diversity of South African classrooms and the prevalence of racism in them should be negotiated with and through the very same categories that have shaped current racialization of classrooms, or more specifically via active anti-racist pedagogies (Carrim 1998;

Leanardo and Porter 2010; Soudien 2009, 2010; Warmington 2009). On the other hand, there are those who position themselves within an assumed (not experienced) post-racial order to negotiate backwards the elimination of racial categories through awareness of newly invented tools—reconciliation, compassion, etc.—and internalization of the values and principles underpinning them. They operate through categories of the imaginary or the imagined non-racial social order, which, it is assumed, will one day prevail over the racial world and racialized classrooms. Historically, they seem to follow the logic of how socialist societies and related pedagogies were being constructed before their emergence (e.g., pedagogy for socialism or pedagogy of liberation).

This article challenges both positions—anti-racist and reconciliation pedagogies—for emphasizing text-based cognitive dimensions of learning (formal knowledge) and de-emphasising the role of lived experience and thus constraining the required disequilibrium for unlearning, learning, and relearning. It does so by drawing on Feuerstein's theory of mediated learning experience, which operates both implicitly and explicitly to interpret and elaborate on the learner's direct experience of the world (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991).

Experience: A Pre-Condition for Modifying Racialized Habitus

Race and diversity pedagogies have gone a long way in proposing discourses suitable for developing pedagogical strategies for dealing with difference in the classroom. This article is concerned with the form and the content that these strategies should assume to create conditions for modifying, diversifying, and adapting cognitive structures for enhanced learning conducive to change of attitudes and behavior amongst learners. For this purpose, it makes use of two important theories: Bourdieu's habitus theory and Feuerstein's theory of mediated learning experience (MLE; Bourdieu 1993; Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991).

The change from a racist to a democratic social order in South Africa refers to changes in the field that individual and group habitus may be at odds with. The word *habitus* is similar to habit, but it goes further: "It is that which one has acquired but which has become durably incorporated in the body in the form of permanent dispositions" (Bourdieu 1993, 86). Another difference is that habitus refers to the principles underlying and generating regular practices or habits. Formally *habitus*, as a property of social agents, is a "structured and structuring structure" (Bourdieu 1994, 170)—it is structured by one's past and present circumstances such as family and educational experiences; it is structuring in that habitus shapes one's present and future practices; it is a structure—as it is made up of dispositions, perceptions and practices—that is systematically ordered. While habitus, carried by social agents, is durable and transposable to other settings; it is not immutable. It arises from one's history and the physical spaces one occupies or the field—and that in turn shapes the field. Put differently, when there is synchrony between habitus and field then the individual feels like a "fish in water." Mismatch between habitus and field results in feeling like a fish out of water. This mismatch is also the site for cognitive dissonance and potential change.

Habitus refers to the habitual ways of acting, thinking, feeling and being (Maton 2009) that are acquired from the social spaces (field) one lives in and the cultural capital one has access to in the field.

On the one side it is a relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus…On the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction. Habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world. (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127)

Habitus arises from social spaces or objective realities one lives in as well as from knowledge and cognitive construction one has access to. Should the social space (e.g., the family, school, church, cultural club, sports, including social networks) be dominated by exclusionary or racist practices (e.g., promotion of white supremacist ideals, stereotypes, symbols, rituals, etc.) the individual is more likely to acquire corresponding ways of acting, thinking, and being in the world. According to Jansen (2009), this mentality has been justified by the *laagering* (enclosed mentality) in the Afrikaner community in the face of perceived *gevaar* (threat) to their culture, home, church, sport, schools, cultural networks, and peers.

How to provide conditions in the classroom for modifying the racialized habitus arising from apartheid structures is a challenge for anti-racist and diversity pedagogy, given that both the field structures and the experience of ordinary life commonly unfold in racially segregated settings. Feuerstein's theory of MLE offers an analysis of the process in formal pedagogic settings.

The notion of learning "experience" is very often associated with experiential learning or MLE in Feuerstein's theory (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991). *Learning experience* refers to all formal and informal interactions irrespective of whether they involve human mediators (e.g., teachers) or objects or symbols acting as mediating substitutions of reality (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 4). It can be defined as the quality of interaction between the individual learners and their environment ensured "by the interposition of an initiated, intentional human being who mediates the stimuli impinging on the learners" (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 7).

Three key dimensions of learning experience theory are relevant here. The first is that "experience" is a precondition for enhanced "modifiability" of learners, which creates positive pre-dispositions for change. Second, all learning begins with experience; it is a human adaptation process "whereby knowledge is created [or reinforced] through transformation of experience" (Kolb 1984, 38). The third is the notion that extreme variations in the "modifiability" of individuals make the "single modality hypothesis" in human development highly questionable (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 11). Feuerstein and Feuerstein advocate direct exposure (learning) and mediated experience as responsible for two major intertwined phenomena unique to human beings: modifiability and diversity, that, is the propensity of the human being to modify and diversify their cognitive structures throughout the learning process, which affects their capacity "to learn to adapt to more complex and unfamiliar situations" (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 12). Mediation in this sense increases "the readiness to learn and derive from experiences those elements which can be transposed to experiences which

are similar or even identical to the experienced one" (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 13).

It is a powerful source of changes that may result in improved individual cognitive and emotional functioning (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 7) and enhanced modifiability. Feuerstein's theory of MLE operates both implicitly and explicitly to interpret and elaborate the learner's direct experience of the world. As Falik (2010) has warned, "it has been Feuerstein's expressed concern that those who have worked with the concept of mediated learning experience, either in its application or further conceptual development, have tended to de-emphasize the 'experience' aspect and consider mediated learning as primarily a cognitive phenomena" (see http://icelp.org/asp/Aspects_of_ Mediated_Learning_Experience.shtm).

Positive "experiences" in an environment in which learning is facilitated are key part of the process through which individuals create new meanings, reclaim their subjectivities and engage in self-discovery. They stimulate, animate, authenticate and reinforce learning (Hansen 2000, 29). We use here the qualifier *positive* to distinguish between meaningful and meaningless experiences (Jarvis 1987). *Positive experience* refers to when one experiences the surrounding world in ways that create the conditions for modifiability or change of pre-dispositions.

Feuerstein and Feuerstein (1991, 50) warn however that, as mediated experience is not the only influence in the development of the individual, "the teacher should never function only as a mediator but should also act as the source of information and skills." MLE is not "a fixed curriculum that can be applied automatically, mechanically and uniformly to all individuals" (Feuerstein and Feuerstein 1991, 50). In other words, celebrating experience without reflection and analysis of the experience would deny learners the opportunity to cognitively process it, thereby modifying and diversifying their knowledge and understanding, and being able to transpose such new forms of consciousness to similar or identical situations. "Experience on its own," Rosemary and Smith (1996) argue, "is however, no panacea because unless we are helped, and sometimes even directly shown, how to interpret what we see and to formulate the right response to it, we import ways of understanding and coping that are inappropriate to the new context." It becomes necessary to distance oneself from the experience and make it an object of analysis so as to glean systematized, more generalized knowledge applicable in other contexts.

PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES IN THE CONTEXT OF RACE AND RACISM

The different approaches to diversity have given rise to several competing pedagogical discourses: assimilationist, multiculturalist, anti-racist, and post-conflict or reconciliation pedagogies that allow for varying degrees of accommodation of dominated groups. These pedagogies are critically analyzed next to show that none of them gives sufficient attention to the role of positive experiences with the Other to create the conditions for improved individual cognitive and emotional functioning and enhanced modifiability.

Assimilationist Pedagogies: Legitimizing the Experience of Dominant Groups and De-Legitimizing the Experience of the Other

The most oppressive and least accommodative of the four approaches, assimilation concentrates on legitimizing the dominant groups' experiences and social practices thereby delegitimizing the experiences of dominated groups. Although this feature alone may negate a case for assimilationist pedagogies, a number of researchers have denounced its pervasiveness in former model C (historically white schools) and private schools. Assimilation approaches are not concerned with creating the necessary conditions for modifying, diversifying, and adapting students' cognitive structures. In fact, they tend to deny them the opportunity "to learn to adapt to more complex and unfamiliar situations." What counts as knowledge, pedagogy, assessment, and the examination questions and criteria advantage the dominant group (Bourdieu 1974). Mafumo (2010) considers assimilation as the socialization of minority or subordinate groups into the ways of the dominant group. The values, traditions, experiences, and customs of the dominant group frame the social and cultural context of the school (Soudien 2004); the experiences of the dominated groups are excluded and their voices silenced. The subordinate groups, whose standards are assumed as culturally inferior, are made to conform to or be absorbed into the culture of the dominant group; they are forced to give up their own identities and cultures through the adoption of the language, customs, and values of the dominant group (Soudien 2004). In this case, assimilation creates loyalty of the minority toward the dominant group (Commission for Racial Equality 2006, 1–6; Mafuno 2010). Mafuno argues that assimilation produces a mono-cultural policy that minimizes cultural differences and encourages social conformity and continuity.

Studies on school practices in former model C schools or private schools point to generalized assimilationist practices in curriculum, teaching, and learning strategies, resistance to racial desegregation and the infringement of individual and group rights of Islamic and other groups in the secondary schools (Kruss 2001; Vally and Dalamba 1999); as well as to the "absence of coordinated programmes to address issues of diversity and inequality such as racism and sexism" (McKinney 2010, 192). Analyzing integration in schools in the Western Cape, Soudien (2004) distinguishes three types of assimilationism: (1) aggressive assimilationism (deep resentment of the newcomers characterized by high degree of intolerance and often violence); (2) assimilation by stealth (evident in former colored and Indian schools where issues of race are seldom addressed and newcomers are recruited into new non-racial identities); and (3) benign assimilationism (evident in former white English-speaking schools). The latter contains dimensions of multiculturalism with attempts to acknowledge the cultural diversity of the learners through events such as cultural evenings to promote a sense of inclusion. Nonetheless, they leave the dominant relationships, culture, and ethos of the school unchallenged.

The consequences of assimilation can be dramatic. Black children are forced to give up their own aesthetic and cultural practices in favor of dominant middle-class white cultural practices (Soudien 2010). Classes are conducted in

a "shut up and listen" mode where individual experiences are interrogated in so far as they pose challenges to the dominant values and ethos. Learning experiences are modeled on the constructs drawn from the dominant culture. Black students tend to register the lowest self-esteem and also the lowest inclination to seek friends across the color line (Carter et al. 2009). The lack of cross-cultural understanding of students among teachers very often turns them into perpetrators of racism—by telling jokes that devalue ethnic groups, labeling, giving less help, making demeaning comments, subtly encouraging some to leave school, invoking stereotypes, and so forth (Partington 1998).

Multicultural Pedagogies: Superficial Celebration of Diverse Experiences

Multicultural education emerged in the late 1970s in reaction to the oppressiveness of assimilationism in the United States and the United Kingdom. It is a more accommodative policy. It has been conceptualized as "a system of beliefs and behaviors that recognizes and respects the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or society, acknowledges and values their socio-cultural differences, and encourages and enables their continued contribution within an inclusive cultural context which empowers all within the organization or society" (Rosada 2006, 2). Multicultural education recognizes and accepts the rightful existence of different cultural groups and views cultural diversity as an asset and a source of social enrichment rather than a handicap or social problem.

Central to multicultural education are the following features: (1) the notion that schools are expected to accommodate, value, and respect the different cultures of learners within the school context; (2) recognition of diversity—be it race, class, gender, sexual orientation; and (3) acknowledgement of the validity of cultural expressions of diverse groups without discrediting, belittling, displacing, or delegitimizing them (Soudien 2004, 96). However, many forms of multicultural education are in fact forms of assimilation, rooted in the view that the dominant culture is "unquestionably good" (Soudien 2004). Multicultural education has been under fire from the right and the left, nationally and internationally. For example, the right in the United States attacked multicultural education for undermining the inclusivist (read: assimilationist) nature of the great American culture—largely projected by "the great white man" ideology—and for infusing inferior standards. From the left, critics characterize multicultural education as weak and unable to challenge social structures, processes, and attitudes that perpetuate unjust power relations between groups.

Generally, multicultural education includes a school curriculum that integrates selected aspects of histories and cultural aspects of other groups (e.g., cultural evenings, joint religious functions, different music, dance or religion, and so forth) very often in an "add-on" manner. Besides strong criticisms about its failure to address power and social relations in society (Giroux 2003), it does not place cognitive modifiability and learner development at the centre of its agenda.

Anti-Racist Pedagogies: Learning and Knowledge Re-Creation Through Criticism

Anti-racist education is an educational approach that seeks to challenge inequalities. It includes individual, institutional, curricular change to assist the learner in developing an understanding of the historical and contemporary causes and effects of discrimination based on race, class, gender, nationality, culture, faith, language, and other differences (Carrim 1998). In addition to celebrating culture and difference, it includes issues of power, justice, and inequality within the formal and hidden curriculum to help pupils to understand and deal with racism, prejudice, and stereotyping. Its epistemological foundations are explicit: "Race is one of the media through which historical subjects live and experience; it is for this reason that attempts at reaching premature post-racial positions may undermine social action and analysis" (Warmington 2009, 285). The anti-racist education approach builds on the assumption that getting rid of racism requires adjusting power relationships in the economic, political, and cultural institutions of society, and creating new conditions for interpersonal interactions (Moodley 1986, 64–66). It requires not only confronting directly overt attitudes, practices, and customs but also working against subtle racism, stereotyping, and patronizing attitudes (Vally and Dalamba 1999, 35–36) and engaging with the "othering" implicit and embedded in dominant cultures (Soudien 2004, 96).

Pedagogical strategies rooted in the anti-racist discourses place emphasis on critical thinking as the foundation for new meaning construction, self-discovery, and self-creation against the legacies of prejudice and alienation. As race-conscious pedagogy, anti-racist pedagogy "must be predicated upon understanding race as central social practice," which requires "recognition of how and where race is played out through the deployment of raced boundaries, tools, and categories" (Warmington 2009, 287). Effective transitions to non-racist order are likely to be achieved more effectively through creative manipulation of race categories than by their artificial post-racial elimination. It is in this perspective that Ghorashi (2010, 1–2) argues:

One of the aspects of this self-creation or self-discovery is to take notice of any kind of rootedness we have. By this I mean, that we create our own meanings concerning any kind of bonding and roots rather than being subjected to pre-defined notions. Through exploration and reflection, students are challenged to question the taken for granted notion of their rootedness in a culture or a nation. For that, one needs to find a balance between involvement in and distance from the discourses surrounding us. One needs to be involved so that one can influence the discourse, yet remain distanced enough to reflect.

As such, anti-racist education attempts to empower teachers and learners with the necessary analytical instruments to examine critically the origins of racist ideas and practices as well as those actions that promote the struggle against racism (Mafumo 2010). School students should be helped to understand how negative attitudes and actions develop and to recognize some of the consequences of racism in their own and other communities. For this purpose, antiracist pedagogies incorporate the following self-defining characteristics: (1) dimensions of multicultural education to assist the learner in developing an understanding of

the historical and contemporary causes and effects of discrimination based on ethnicity, nationality, culture, faith, language, and color; (2) explicit focus on issues of prejudice, bigotry, discrimination, power, and racism in all its forms, personal, cultural, and institutional; (3) links to other forms of inequality and discrimination; and (4) attention to values and attitudes as well as knowledge and understanding of race-related facts embedded in the whole school agenda of school life. The main thrust of anti-racist pedagogy lies in its emphasis on individual, institutional, and curriculum change in line with a new political and moral philosophy that places issues of power and social justice at the center.

It is, however, at the level of classroom practice that some of its limitations become transparent. The first is the tendency to portray itself as the only pedagogical response suitable for dealing with the legacy of racism and diversity in South African classrooms without paying enough attention to the contextual complexity and diversity of these classrooms. The second is the essentialism that characterizes its dichotomized categorization ("Whites vis-à-vis Blacks," "perpetrators vis-à-vis victims," etc.). In this sense, it has been charged for being divisive in that it is mainly concerned with empowering the "victims" and pays little attention to the fate of the "perpetrators" (Leonardo and Porter 2010). The racist is "not a human other" but the enemy Jansen. The second is the knowledge reductionism in its proposed pedagogical project, which as already indicated reduces learning to a transition between two forms of knowledge: from racist knowledge ("bitter knowledge") to non-racist knowledge through severe criticism of the stereotypes, symbols, rituals, and ideology of the apartheid legacy. In such discourse, formal knowledge is seen as instrumental in dislodging the racist habitus and creating new understandings amongst the learners, but very little attention is paid to the role of learning experiences in creating new pre-dispositions for modifiability and adaptation.

Anti-racist pedagogies can also be split into two camps: a strong anti-racist pedagogy and a weaker version of it. The strong version advocates direct interrogation of the racist discourse thus embracing the psychosocial violence embedded in this discourse and interrogating it as a legitimate pedagogical strategy (e.g., pedagogy of fear). In this perspective, discursive violence is assumed as having a humanizing effect on the subjects. A weaker version advocates selective engagement with racist discourses, that is, in so far as classrooms are retained as "safe spaces" that can only absorb benign forms of racist discourse and its sensitivities. The weak version has been referred to as the pedagogy of compassion or reconciliation.

Pedagogy of Risk or Discomfort: Learning Through Disruption

Leonardo and Porter (2010) take issue with "safe spaces" pedagogy and advocate a pedagogy of risk or fear that, they argue, is more conducive to more transformative learning opportunities and higher standards of humanity in the school. Central to safe learning spaces is the assumption that learning which is threatening to the self (e.g., by warranting new attitudes or perspectives) is more easily assimilated when external threats are at a minimum; it proceeds faster when the threat to the self is low (Rogers 2010, 1). In contrast, the pedagogy of risk

or fear holds that the condition of "safety" in race education maintains white comfort zones, thus denying them understanding "the terrorizing force of white supremacy"' (hooks 1992) and becomes a symbolic form of violence experienced by people of color. This violence must be challenged through pedagogy of disruption—a form of humanizing violence that contests repression and raises the standards of humanity for all. Pedagogically it reframes the racial predicament by promoting a "risk" discourse about race, which does not assume safety but contradiction and tension because "violence is already there." This does not mean to create a hostile situation. According to Boler and Zembylas (2003, 111) a pedagogy of risk recognizes and problematizes "the deeply embedded emotional dimensions that frame and shape daily habits, routines, and unconscious complicity with hegemony." In this sense, critical race pedagogy is inherently risky, uncomfortable, and fundamentally unsafe, particularly for those who benefit from power.

In practice, a pedagogue may begin by having a meta-dialogue about the topic of race and then redefine the classroom space as a place of risk, which encourages students to experiment with their self-understanding, helps them to take responsibility for feelings of inadequacy and defensiveness. The task is to turn discomfort into liberating experience that leads to more transformative learning opportunities. It is also about creating classroom conditions that facilitate pupils' ability to speak, write, and listen in a "multi-perspectival language" (Weldon 2009b). Using the concept of border-crossing pedagogy, Giroux (1992) argues that pupils need to be provided with opportunities to engage with texts that both affirm and interrogate the complexity of their histories. Within this perspective, "pupils are engaged as border crossers who challenge, cross, remap and rewrite borders as they enter into counter-discourse with established boundaries of knowledge" (Weldon 2009a, 6). Border crossing pedagogy provides learners with opportunities to engage with texts that affirm and interrogate their historical discourses; it encourages them to produce multi-perspectival texts.

The pedagogy of risk is only limited by its narrow approach to experience as an act of exposing the learners to discomforting truths by asking questions which forces them to re-evaluate their worldviews, a process, which though developing the capacity for critical enquiry, can also incur feelings of anger, grief, disappointment, and resistance (Boler and Zembylas 2003, 110). Such pedagogy of discomfort can be divisive and counterproductive if not managed with adequate cognitive and emotional labor. This is where the notion of "positive experience" advocated in this article could play a role.

Post-Conflict Pedagogy: Learning Through Safe Spaces and Imaginary Experience

Jansen takes a more daring approach on how to mediate anti-racism between the "perpetrators" (whites) and the "victims" (blacks) of racism. The internalization of apartheid stereotypes, symbols, and beliefs has resulted in degrees of resistance, rigidity, lack of modifiability, or low level of adaptability of the individual or groups to the changing South African environment and its new value system.

These stereotypes, symbols, and beliefs, which he calls "bitter knowledge," represent "how students remember and enact the past" (Jansen 2008, 5):

The white students in this essay do not have a memory problem; they were not there, so to speak. They have a knowledge problem, and it remains a bitter knowledge that must be interrupted.

"Bitter knowledge" is a product of intergenerational transmission of spoken and unspoken messages from parents through five influential agencies: the family, the church, the school, cultural associations, and the peer group. Unfortunately, these messages have not been interrupted over the period of transition despite the major changes in the formal institutions of democracy. For Jansen (2008, 5), three kinds of messages are transmitted in this process: "The first message is about *racial exclusivity* (we belong by ourselves); the second is about *racial supremacy* (we are better than them); and the third is about *racial victimization* (we are being targeted by them)." Jansen (2008, 6) concludes that the persistence of racial incidents only indicates that "we have failed white youth by not interrupting their troubled knowledge—the consequences of which are now painfully visible throughout the country." Dealing with such a complexity, where the perpetrators and the victims share the experience of pain and suffer from different kinds of trauma that require healing, points to new pedagogical strategy: a post-conflict pedagogy or the pedagogy of compassion or reconciliation.

The same way that the bitter legacy of apartheid pointed to Mandela's ideal of "rainbow nation" as a framework for national reconciliation, the catastrophic events of Waterkloof, Skierlik, and the Reitz video at the University of Free State have placed greater emphasis on the possibilities offered by the discourses of reconciliation and the pedagogies emanating from them. A post-conflict pedagogy is "a pedagogy of compassion in a time of troubles" (Jansen 2008). Post-conflict pedagogy is more reconciliatory. Reciprocity and the blurring of the lines between victims and perpetrators are key features of such pedagogy. The same way that racism is a relational problem, so its resolution has to be relational, that is, it requires a pedagogical reciprocity in which both sides (white and black) are prepared to make the move towards each other. In other words, whereas anti-racist pedagogy and critical race theory demand whites to make the move towards blacks; a post-conflict pedagogy requires both to engage in this relationship. In the classroom, this means that a teacher can only begin to create the pedagogical atmosphere for learning once recognizing the humanity of the other:

It has to begin by insisting that both sides at least make the effort to listen empathetically and therefore patiently to what the other has to say.... What are you afraid of? Why do you feel so strongly about that? Where did you learn about this? This kind of tactical questioning does not take what is first said at...face value. It understands that often the outward expression masks a pain, an anxiety, and fearfulness. Even the most egotistical expression of racism conceals a vulnerability that can and should be laid bare. What are you so angry about? Do you really think it is this? How did this make you feel? Has this happened to you before? Tell me about it....But in a post-conflict pedagogy, the teacher's intervention has to go beyond acknowledgment and embrace of those hurt by such acts. A post-conflict pedagogy requires that the target of racism is empowered to confront such behavior and to do so from a position of strength. (Jansen 2008, 15)

It is the divided knowledge within the classroom that is the starting point for post-conflict pedagogy. The problem is a knowledge problem and the solution is essentially a knowledge solution. The pedagogical challenge is just about how gently "bitter knowledge" is interrupted and new understandings negotiated. It does not offer a strategy by a frame of principles and values: Classroom engagement must be dialogical, reconciliatory, reciprocal/relational, less divisive, and humanist. It is the pedagogical responsibility of the teacher to ensure that these principles are adhered to in the way questions are asked or answered and learners relate to each other.

CONCLUSION

The picture about the state of race- and diversity-related pedagogic debate is varied, dynamic, multi-dimensional, but not devoid of paradoxes. It provides an evolving and generative constellation of daring attempts which offer a multifaceted menu of pedagogical models or formulae rooted in varied types of discourses from quasi-colonial assimilation/segregationist discourses, critical race discourses, and anti-racism to reconciliation. On the balance, there is evidence of commitment and considerable insights on how race and diversity issues should be tackled as we create and consolidate a democratic racial order in schools and society at large.

There are however conceptual and practical tensions worth highlighting. Totalizing tendencies in approach do not do justice to the diversity, difference, and the complex intersections of these with racism in schools. Essentialism in race categorization also tends to blur social complexity and the dynamic nature of classroom practices. Positive experiences provide the context for experimenting, enabling, legitimizing, and reinforcing non-racist discursive practices and new understandings that offer opportunities for moral considerations vital to knowledge forms that oppose racist values and practices.

Anti-racist pedagogies are correct in placing knowledge at the center of the battle against racism in schools, which points to the need for un-learning (apartheid or bitter knowledge), re-learning (old positive knowledge), and learning new knowledge in the transition to non-racist order. They are also correct in emphasizing the significance of critical inquiry to enable learners to radically re-evaluate their worldviews and constructs about social life in a diverse society. It appears however that the missing link in the knowledge-learning relationship, through which the transition from racial to non-racist order is thought through in race- and diversity-related discourses, is the role of new positive experiences in creating pre-dispositions for modifiability, diversification and adaptation of their cognitive structures, the dislodging of a racist habitus and adaptation to the emerging spaces of social life. In this regard, the article has shown how anti-racist pedagogies tend to confine themselves to text-based cognitive dimensions of pedagogical exposure (promotion of awareness, changing perceptions, and improving understanding) and give short shrift to maximizing on learning from lived experience or from positive, informal interracial interactions. Learning and development only occurs under two conditions: exposure to stimuli (e.g.,

interrogation of racial categories) and positive experiences of the new as compared to the old. Unlearning and learning through critique or human imagination must be compounded with positive experiences of the changing social order. A general implication of the argument pursued in this article is that, like race- and diversity-related discourses, the choice, conceptualization, and the practice of race-related pedagogies in the diverging contexts remains essentially a contextual matter.

REFERENCES

Aristotle (1908). *The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. London: Macmillan.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Boler, M. and Zembylas, M. (2003). Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Difference. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of Difference—Rethinking Education for Social Change* (pp. 110–136). New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1974). The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities In J. Eggleston (Ed.), *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education* (pp. 32–46). New York: Metheuen.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in Question* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1994). *In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology* (M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (L. Wacquant, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity.

Brubaker, R., and Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond 'Identity.' *Theory and Society, 29*(1), 1–47.

Carmichael, S. (1968). *Black Power—the Politics of Liberation in America*. London: Cape.

Carter, P., Caruthers, J., and Foster, J. (2009). Knowing their Lines: How Social Boundaries Undermine Equity-Based Integration. *Perspectives in Education, 27*, 352–365.

Carrim, N. (1998) Anti-racism and the 'New' South African Educational. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 28*(3), 301–320.

Cross, M. (1999). *Imagery of Identity in South African Education, 1880–1990*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Currie, I. and de Vaal, J. (2005). *The Bill of Rights Handbook*. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta.

Falik, L. H. (2010). Chaging Children's Behavior: Focusing on Experience. Aspects of Mediated Learning Experience. Retrieved from http://icelp.org/asp/Aspects_of_Mediated_Learning_Experience.shtm

Feuerstein, R. and Feuerstein, S. (1991). Mediated Learning Experience: A Theoretical Review. In R. Feuerstein, P. S. Klien, & A. J. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *Mediated Learning Experience (MLE): Theoretical, Psychosocial, and Learning Implications* (pp. 3–51). London: Freund.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. London: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2003). Pedagogies of Difference, Race, and Representation Film as a Site of Translation and Politics. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of Difference—Rethinking Education for Social Change* (pp. 83–109). New York: Routledge.

Ghorashi, H. (2010). *Cultural Diversity the Greatest Challenge of Our Time. Keynote address at the Seminar on Diversity in Higher Education: South Africa, USA, The Netherlands. Summary of the Seminar*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: University of Amsterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences.

hooks, b. (1992). Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.

Jansen, J. D. (2008). *Bearing Whiteness: A Pedagogy of Compassion in a Time of Troubles*. The Fifth Annual Hans Brenninkmeijer Memorial Lecture, Catholic Institute of Education, 2008.

Jansen, J. (2009). *Knowledge in the Blood*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kruss, G. (2001). Towards Human Rights in South African Schools: An Agenda for Research and Practice. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 4(1), 44–61.

Leonardo, Z. and Porter, R. (2010). Pedagogy of Fear: Toward a Fanonian Theory of 'Safety' in Race Dialogue. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(2), 139–157.

May, V. (2010). Lone Motherhood as a Category of Practice. *The Sociological Review*, 58(3), 429–443.

Mafumo, N. (2010). *Managing Racial Integration in South African public Schools: In Defence of Democratic Action*. PhD thesis, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa.

Maton, K. (2009). Habitus. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. UK: Acumenpublishing.

McKinney, C. (2010). Schooling in Black and White: Assimilationist Discourses and Subversive Identity Performances in a Desegregated South African Girls' School. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 13(2), 191–207.

Partington, G. (1998). *Perspectives on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education*. Katoomba, Australia: Social Science Press.

Plato. (1970). *The Republic Book VII* (W. H. D. Rouse, Rev. and Trans.). New York: New American Library.

Rosada, C. (2006). What Do We Mean by "Managing Diversity"? In S. Reddy (Ed.), *Workforce Diversity, Vol. 3: Concepts and Cases*. Hyderabad, India: ICAFAJ University.

Rosemary, H. and Smith, R. (1996). Practical Judgement: Its Implications for Knowledge Development and Strategic Capability. In *Proc. European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management, 4th International Workshop on Managerial and Organisational Cognition: Management in the thought-full enterprise*. Stockholm School of Economics and Linköping University, Stockholm, August 29–30: Part 1.

Schubert, J. D. (2009). Suffering/Symbolic Violence. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. UK: Acumenpublishing.

Soudien, C. (2004). Constituting the Class: An Analysis of the Process of 'Integration' in South African Schools. In L. Chisholm (Ed.), *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Soudien, C. (2009). *Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation in Higher Education Institutions*. Pretoria: Department of Higher Education.

Soudien, C. (2010). The Reconstitution of Privilege: Integration in Former White Schools in SA. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(2), 352–366.

United Nations. (1966, March 7). *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*. New York: Author.

Vally, S. and Dalamba, Y. (1999). *Racism, Racial Integration and Racial Desegregation in SA Public Secondary Schools*. Report on a Study by the SAHRC. Johannesburg: South African Human Rights Commission.

Warmington, P. (2009). Taking Race Out of Scare Quotes: Race-Conscious Social Analysis in an Ostensibly Post-Racial World. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(3), 281–296.

Weldon, G. (2009a). *History Education and the Democratic Nation in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Unpublished paper. Western Cape Education Department, South Africa.

Weldon, G. (2009b). Memory, Identity and the Politics of Curriculum Construction in Transition Societies: Rwanda and South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 27(2), 117–189.