THE MULTICULTURAL DYNAMICS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Joel H. Brown

John Dewey said that the most mature person in any social setting is the one who's the most adaptable to other people's needs. In many classrooms, 30 students are adapting to the teacher rather than the teacher adapting to them. A mature person ought to be able to go with the flow of a classroom (Robert Sylwester in D'Archangelo, 1998, html).

The major components of the "Basic Skills" [Back-to-Basics] agenda are performance-based guidelines that require quantitative data on student and school achievement; performance-based "skill" kits, workbooks, drill sheets, and texts; criterion referenced pre- and posttests for use with specific curricular materials for specific subjects; and teacher evaluations measuring test effectiveness and appropriate "time on task" (Kanpol & McLaren, 1995, p. 203).

INTRODUCTION

And so it goes. In this volume, confluent education (CE) enters the new millennium with grateful acknowledgement to those researchers and practitioners who have facilitated the integration of cognition, affect and behavior within the diverse contexts of learning, instruction, leadership and evaluation.

Advances in Confluent Education, Volume 2, pages 169-189.

ISBN: 0-7623-0156-2

This chapter addresses confluent educators and others, thinking that in today's increasingly diverse communities, kids can learn the necessities of global participation via a retreat to "Back-to-Basics." In light of new information about learning, I will argue here that our continued use of "Back-to-Basics" is outmoded and outdated. It persists due to three reasons that will be addressed:

- Unawareness or misuse of ever-present affect in the educational process.
- The possible rearrangement of current power relations.
- The erroneous perceptions that "Back-to-Basics" prepares a society of learners to participate globally.

In this chapter the authors describe relationship(s) between affect, learning, power, race, ethnicity and education. They repudiate the values and practices of "Back-to-Basics." They note the vitality of local, if not global, diversity and interdependence as an intrinsically reasonable and productive educational objective. I will reinterpret some of their ideas to form a new understanding of the multicultural dynamics of educational change.

This chapter is organized along three dimensions that confluent educators typically address: interpersonal, intrapersonal and social contextual. In the first section on the interpersonal dimension, I specify principles of affect and learning and how the educator becomes situated as a facilitator with his/her students. The second section of this chapter focuses on the intrapersonal level, where I conduct a reflective exercise, noting my experiences of this chapter as it unfolds. By conducting this exercise, we may both better understand an important part of a facilitative CE educational process, "metacommunication." In the remaining sections of the paper, the interpersonal and intrapersonal discoveries are united, leading to a repudiation of "Back-to-Basics," and the recognition of our global interdependence, as fostered by an integrated multicultural education (ME) and CE paradigm. It is the examination of the three dimensions and their connection that lead to a new understanding of the multicultural dynamics of educational change.

THE INTERPERSONAL DIMENSION: AFFECT, LEARNING AND FACILITATIVE EDUCATION

In a facilitative educational system, confluent educators view cognition, affect, and behavior as linked with learning (Brown, 1996). I focus on affect for two reasons. First, in literature too voluminous to describe here, the relationship(s) between cognition, learning and behavior has been articulated (G.I. Brown, 1972/1990; G.I. Brown, 1975; J.H. Brown, 1996; J.R. Brown, 1996). Second, new evidence tells us that affect is essential to learning. This merits additional discussion and specification of its implications. I will focus on affect as a psychobiological part of learning, then as a social psychological part of learning. These constructs

will lead to some general principles about facilitative education and a discussion of exceptions to a facilitative affective educational process.

Affect is defined by Brown, "as the feeling or emotional aspect of experience and learning" (Brown, 1972/1990, p. 7). Learning will be viewed as information that becomes part of one's consciousness (Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1964).

A Psychobiological Imperative: Affect for Learning

Does the emergence and success of books like *Emotional Intelligence* and *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (Goleman, 1996, 1998) signify a readiness for educating in the affective domain? For some people it does. Sales of these books definitely show at least some public awareness that there exists multiple kinds of, as well as pathways to, "intelligence." Given some of the public's awareness on this topic and new research, the relationship between affect and learning deserves additional consideration.

Critical new psychobiological evidence indicates clear links between affect and learning. In an affirmation of work that confluent educators have been doing for over 30 years, the relationship between affect and learning is reported in a special issue of the journal, *Educational Leadership*:

> Thinking and feeling are connected because our patterning is emotional. That means that we need to help learners create a felt meaning, a sense of relationship with a subject, in addition to an intellectual understanding In that issue, a critical statement is made (Caine in D'Arcangelo, 1998, html).

In the first volume of this series, confluent educators DeMeulle and D'Emidio-Caston (1996, p. 48) specified the nature of the important relationship that Caine describes:

> Our brain, endocrine, and immune systems are an integrated biochemical system, and [Sylwester, 1995] urges us to think of our emotions as "the glue that integrate our body and brain" (p. 61). Emotional information is carried on chains of amino acids throughout our biochemical system, which explains why emotions experienced during the learning process are physically manifested and experienced in the body.

Like the brain research community, DeMeulle and D'Emidio-Caston concluded that as experience is valued, the more likely that the information accompanying said value becomes part of a learned experience. This conclusion, however, retains a caveat: Past or below a certain and as of yet imprecise point, researchers find that affect disrupts the learning process:

> An excess of emotions would be counterproductive. Anger, rage, sarcasm, hate, violence--all these are absolutely forbidden. The opposite is also true: If somebody has a complete absence of emotions and can hit another student without remorse, that's dangerous, too. What we're talking about is a healthy middle ground. Students are emotional beings, physical beings, cognitive beings. If we are not engaging emotions, then students feel a void, which they will fill elsewhere--and it may not be in school (Jensen in D'Arcangelo, 1998, html).

These researchers and practitioners conclude that those of us who have been focusing on utilizing affect in learning represent anomalistic leaders in their field:

> Question: How does tapping into students' interests help capture their attention?
>
> [Eric] Jensen: Anything that is emotionally laden will get our attention quickly. Teachers who know this have used it in the classroom for years.
>
> [Robert] Sylwester: That's true. Our profession has paid little attention to emotion. And yet, our emotional system drives our attentional system, which drives learning and memory and everything else that we do. It is biologically impossible to learn and remember anything that we don't pay attention to. The emotional system tells us whether a thing is important—whether we ought to put any energy into it. We've basically ignored emotion for years. We didn't know how to regulate it, to evaluate it, or to measure it. We've told kids that school is for learning and memorizing, and if they want to have emotion, have it at recess or after school. Or, if we're going to have emotion in school, we'll put it in art class. The biggest single problem of our profession is that we never learned how to deal with emotion in school (D'Archangelo, 1998, html).

From the preceding information, two issues become clear. First, for each person, affect is a psychobiological part of learning. Second, pedagogy translating this relationship into practice is rare.

The Social Psychology of Affect and Learning: Uncertainty

In this section, I take another perspective on the relationship between affect and learning. This perspective yields two conclusions. First, that the affective state of uncertainty is a normal part of learning (Kagan, 1992). And second, uncertainty serves as a stimulus to learning, not just for the learner but also for the educator. If engaged in the learning process, affect serves a psychobiological and a social psychological purpose.

In the traditional educational context of taking one path to achieve a learning goal, emoting is an initially uncertain, and to many, a useless part of the process. However, if we let go of the traditional educational context and the "useless" judgement and focus on the "uncertain" aspect, we may find that learning benefits accrue.

Uncertainty plays a key role in learning in both the scientific and therapeutic communities. In the latter many find that affective uncertainty accompanies the process of purging ourselves of disconcerting internal information (Brown, 1969; Perls, 1988). Affect paves the way for new information to emerge and become learned. In this volume some have identified the concept of uncertainty as cognitive dissonance. I identify uncertainty as a pre-dissonant state important unto itself (D'Emidio-Caston, this volume; Festinger, 1957).

Although he identifies uncertainty as "professional insecurity," Thomas Kuhn believes that working with affective uncertainty is an intrinsically important journey:

> [T]he emergence of new theories is generally proceeded by a period of pronounced professional insecurity. As one might expect that insecurity is generated by the persistent failure of the puzzles of normal science to come out as they should. Failure of existing rules is the prelude to a search for new ones (1962, p. 68).

From these two examples of the scientific and therapeutic communities, we see anecdotal evidence of uncertainty playing a role in learning. But is this only important within each individual, or does uncertainty play a learning role between people?

Mutuality

Until now in this chapter, affect or experiencing emotion, has been described as a psychobiological part of an individual's learning. In addition, in a properly facilitated educational process affect is a catalyst for mutual learning.

Uncertainty as our present example of affect, is a catalyst for learning because it situates participants as equals, both engaged in a discovery process. This engenders a trusting educational environment, one that stimulates learning. The educator and learner may not be on the same path for learning the same thing. But each learns something. As a confluent educator, Aaron Hillman recognized that his own learning emerged from interaction with his students:

> To my great surprise and delight, I discovered that working with students in this program led to accomplishments of my own—my own life and teaching ability were enhanced by the program. I was learning right along with the students (Brown, 1972/1990, p. 179).

As Hillman came to understand the relationship between affect and learning a mutual and significant learning experience unfolded. A particularly interesting example comes from D'Emidio-Caston (this volume). In working with her student educators, she notes the following:

> It is also important to note that we who design experiences to elicit new ways of understanding in students are not ourselves impervious to the same constructive process. For me, it is in the discomfort of the student teachers with whom I work, that I am confronted with my own inadequate understandings of diversity. I experience my students' awakening awareness as a reciprocal process in myself.

The affective statement of unclarity "I am confronted with my own inadequate understandings of diversity" is resolved with learning: "I experience my students' awakening awareness as a reciprocal process in myself." As people recognize that a mutual learning process exists, their language changes. For example, in her work with Santa Barbara's Latino children and families, instead of only describing how her students learned, at least four times, Heras (this volume) describes how "we learned."

Three different Brown's (two of three are related!) have discussed the relationship between affect and mutual learning, G.I. Brown (1972/1990), J.R. Brown (1996), and J.H. Brown (1996). Among us, there is agreement that facilitating affect situates the learner and educator together. It solidifies and sustains learning between people. If affect is the spark that stimulates learning within a person, it can serve the same function between people.

We recognize that the relationship between affect and learning seems to be psychobiological and also social psychological. In a pre-dissonant or dissonant state, uncertainty is worthy of notice.

AFFECTIVE PRINCIPLES AND FACILITATIVE INTERPERSONAL EDUCATION

In light of the psychobiological and social psychological relationship(s) between affect and learning, some self-explanatory principles guiding my work and seen throughout this book are derived:

- Affect accompanies learning and behavior, but it does not replace it.
- Affect is a necessary but insufficient part of learning (also necessary are the cognitive and behavioral domains).
- Through affective ties, knowledge is individually and socially constructed.
- Constructed knowledge is not absolutely relative; despite the individual and social construction of knowledge, certain extant realities exist, in other words, red is a color that exists.
- In the course of implementing the previous principles, participants risk a rearrangement of traditional social and/or power relations. This results in a higher potential for equity and equality.

When connecting these principles with what precedes them, I reach conclusions about the nature of educational interaction. Traditional models that view youths as mere objects or recipients are not only inefficient, but also ineffective. Consequently, throughout this volume, descriptions of didactic exercises are noticeably absent: "This is what we did to achieve this particular kind of learning, now to obtain the same outcome, you should go out and do this very exercise." Instead, CE/ME educators say "this is how I learned to operationalize these principles. Now you create your own experiential exercise to operationalize them." Imaginative experiential practice that recognizes multiple learning paths encourages affect, which is essential for learning.

A facilitative educational process incorporates the principles noted above. When educators interact with their students, learning occurs by way of making explicit ever-present affect in a mutual discovery process. The discovery process

often takes an "uncertain" route. By making affect explicit, educators position themselves with students as facilitators, not as pedagogues.

Reasonable Didactic Education

I have noted that confluent educators engage in a mutual learning process with their students. Yet, even in a mutual learning environment there is also a place for didactic education. In and of itself it is neither bad nor harmful for the teacher or the learner. However, we create a disingenuous learning environment when we give the appearance of facilitation, yet behave as pedagogues. I discuss this issue and what actions may lessen the likelihood of this occurrence.

Shapiro (1998) claims that CE "is permeated" by these issues, what he calls "coercive framing" (p. 95):

> The pattern (gestalt) of coercive framing consists of great promises if you make the required choice, even though allegedly, you have complete freedom of choice. But you are "coerced" into making the choice the gestalt authority requires you to make because the consequences are great rewards, if you submit, and disastrous negative consequences if you dare to reject this offer (e.g., G.I. Brown, 1971, pp. 3-18).

He concludes that:

> Double messages, the reflexive error, ambiguity, and hypocrisy are of course, common in other academic programs....But in CE, with its alleged high standards of confidentiality, personal confession, and emotional expression, authenticity and fairness, to be disingenuous is particularly disturbing (p. 96).

The issues Shapiro raises are of deep concern in any educational or social program. They merit consideration. It is unfortunate that neither he nor any one else has published any systematic evidence supporting his claims. It appears that he falls prey to painting a broad-stroke worst-case picture of this issue. Had he more carefully considered current CE praxis, a precise and useful understanding of this issue may have emerged. To avoid these kinds of negative interactions, I specify the circumstances under which even facilitative education is necessarily didactic. It need not be "disingenuous."

I find two classes of information where didactic methods are appropriate: (1) culturally designated, non-conceptual information and (2) participatory ground rules.

Culturally Designated, Non-Conceptual Information

During children's concrete operations phase (age 2-11), there are two kinds of knowledge they begin to acquire, conceptual and non-conceptual (Piaget, 1952). In conceptual learning information is individually constructed and cannot be didactically transmitted. In non-conceptual learning the culture agrees on the

meaning of some information and to be learned, it can be taught to students didactically. Verlee-Williams provides an interesting example of the difference between each kind of learning:

> [L]earning that 3+2=5 is very different from discovering that three of any kind of thing can be added to two of anything, and it will always make five things. The first is a set of symbols which can be memorized [non-conceptual]; the second is an understanding of a mathematical concept which can be used to develop further understanding of mathematical relations [conceptual] (1983, pp. 147-148).

For children to understand and learn concepts, they develop their own understanding. Otherwise, "It fills their heads with things they 'know' but do not understand" (Verlee-Williams, 1983, p. 148).

On the other hand, other categories of knowledge can be didactically transmitted. The color "red" is arbitrarily designated by the culture as "red." It does not involve conceptual manipulation, as does addition. People agree to designate the color red as "red." In this respect, certain culturally designated non-conceptual information can be imparted and learned.

Coercive framing may enter the picture when people didactically transmit conceptually based information that is not appropriate for didactic construction. For example, "just say no to drugs" or "you can make your own decisions about drug use," oversimplifies the issue when there are many complex concepts involved (Brown, 1997). One concept involves listening to "just say no" messages in school, and then experiencing the conflict of seeing a parent drinking wine. According to cognitive dissonance theory, the youth must then reconcile that conflict (Festinger, 1957). When youths resolve these conflicts they learn unintended lessons; some alcohol is OK; there really is no "choice" involved. Even young children sense the nature of this issue (Brown, D'Emidio-Caston, & Pollard, 1997; D'Emidio-Caston & Brown, 1998). When educators confuse conceptually based information and transmit non-conceptual information, there is high likelihood for coercive framing.

Transmitting Participatory Ground Rules

In addition to non-conceptual information, the second class of information where didactics are appropriate is learning the ground rules for facilitative education. Confluent/multicultural educators transmit ground rules for participating in an experiential and facilitative education. Ground rules include, but are not limited to:

- Participation is voluntary.
- Each individual speaks for him/herself.
- Any personal disclosures made during participation remain confidential.

Such ground rules for participation help an educator make explicit that this is a unique learning environment, one that might be unfamiliar to them. Explicit ground rules allow each person to be informed about the nature of their participation.

Despite our best efforts, either out of lack of awareness or dishonesty, nothing can prevent the rogue educator from creating the "disingenuous" and coercively framed circumstance. In fact, in a traditional learning environment, in which predetermined learning goals are maintained, feedback is absent and affect is ignored, we are especially concerned about coercive framing. However, because of the participatory nature of facilitative education, this is unlikely.

I find that two classes of information can effectively be transmitted from "educator" to "learner"; (1) culturally designated, non-conceptual information and (2) participatory ground rules. In the absence of any systematic evidence to the contrary, the likelihood of coercive framing may be diminished when we:

- Make explicit that there are necessarily didactic elements in these processes.
- Distinguish between what can and should be transmitted and what cannot or should not be transmitted.

In the context of an interaction between "educator" and "student(s)", I have discussed affect as psychobiological and social psychological parts of learning. Emerging from this discussion were some basic principles specifying the role of affect in the learning process. We situate the "educator" as "learner" and vice versa. I noted how a facilitative educational process has two classes of exceptions, in which information reasonably is transmitted. In these cases we can facilitate learning without creating a disingenuous learning environment. In our mutual learning affect is an inextricable part of the process.

THE INTRAPERSONAL DIMENSION: EXPERIENCING FACILITATION

The Dynamic Learning Process

We have made a digression from facilitative education to examples of where didactic methods are not only appropriate but necessary. Now I will come back to a main topic of this chapter, facilitative education. Facilitative education is dynamic. It is exploratory. It is participatory. I have discussed these issues.

In facilitative education feedback is also essential. I would like to discuss this. Feedback may result from the interaction of the mutual discovery process. It is the means by which the educational interaction evolves. In feedback, each person identifies what he or she is experiencing and thinking in the moment. It can take place on two different levels.

Feedback at the level of content (I'll refer to this as content processing). Here, we make explicit what we are learning from the material itself. This is similar to traditional educational models in which children talk about what they have or are learning.

On the second level, metacommunication is a different kind of feedback. Among other things, it is the means by which we communicate about how we learn:

> Simple cybernetic systems, like house thermostats are able to learn in the sense of being able to detect and correct deviations from predetermined norms. But they are unable to detect and correct deviations from predetermined norms....they are unable to question the appropriateness of what they are doing....More complex cybernetic systems such as the human brain or advanced computers have this capacity....It is this kind of self-questioning ability that underpins the activities of systems that are able to learn to learn and self-organize....Double loop-learning depends on being able to take a "double look" at the situation by questioning the relevance of operating norms (Morgan, 1986, pp. 87-88).

Morgan identifies double loop learning as evolving from the thinking of cyberneticians. We call it "metacommunicative feedback." Both are designed to allow us to learn how to learn. In content feedback we learn about what we learning in the moment. In metacommunicative feedback we learn how we are learning.

A Facilitative Exercise

Until now a description of the process of facilitation, and how I might operationalize some of these affective principles is obviously absent. In this section, I will conduct an experiential exercise designed to engage you, the learner. I will show you how I facilitate our learning. In this exercise as well as in an actual educational interaction, these are the steps I would take:

- Provide an informed consent for participating in this voluntary exercise.
- Begin the exercise by noting my current experience in the "here and now."
- Ask you to momentarily reflect on what you are thinking about, and what you may be feeling, in your mind and also kinesthetically in other parts of your body.
- At the end of the exercise, I will ask you to make explicit your discoveries in two ways:
- What you have learned *from* this exercise (content processing).
- What you have learned *about* your learning from this exercise (meta communication and processing).

My Experience and Checking in with Your Experience

I invite your participation in this experiential exercise that I am creating here. Your reading of, and/or participation in this exercise is completely voluntary. At any time you may stop. If you do not wish to participate please go to the next section of this chapter.

In stepping back from this writing my first step is to share with you what I am experiencing. What am I experiencing now? I am struggling with myself, to stay in the moment of my experience and jumping ahead to what I am actually going to write. At this moment I am full of emotion. Right now, I think that this chapter is taking a new form and shape. My concern shows in my lips. They tighten.

Now, please take a moment and check in with yourself. Do you have any response at this moment to what I am sharing? What are you feeling? What are you thinking? What is this guy's point? Where is he going with this? What does this have to do with confluent education?

Before you continue reading, take just a moment and reflect on some of these questions. In short, *try to identify what you are thinking and experiencing now.*

Although I cannot get feedback from you, which could possibly influence what I do next, I decide to continue to write about the images that are now emerging for me. Having paused and reflected I continue with my own process.

My first image is of Picasso and Braque's early phases of cubism. Around 1910, they began to present in one painting, different perspectives of objects by superimposing images on one another or placing them side by side. From each turn of perspective they brought a new immediacy to the guitars, bottles, or women they were depicting. Picasso and Braque understood that by being able to choose which perspective engaged each individual the most, that individual experienced what the artist was portraying. By means of the portrayal of the multiple perspectives themselves, the viewer experiences a stunning new understanding of the depiction.

Within only a few years of Picasso and Braque's perceptual shifts, the Jazz Age began. Jazz artists did what I am doing now: constantly reinterpreting well known songs that provide a new experience. Like Picasso and Braque, musicians examined multiple facets of the well known songs. Instead of Picasso's and Braque's guitars, bottles and/or women, it is Louis Armstrong's rare reinterpretation of Duke Ellington's "Azalea," that gives me a deeply emotional reaction to the song. Because of Armstrong's reinterpretation on Duke's original interpretation, I experience virtually a new song.

Before we move to a different stage of this experience, you may want to stop and again reflect. What are you experiencing? Also be aware of physical sensations. Do these images suggest an understanding of facilitation, or open you up to the possibility of discovering something entirely new for you? Is your mind trying to understand what my experiential description has to do with affect or learning?

I continue with imagery, seeing pictures and hearing songs in my mind's eyes and ears. And now, these images help me understand what I have been doing in

this chapter to this point: providing different perspectives of the role of affect in learning. I have developed affective principles and reflected on how to effectively facilitate learning.

I feel less concerned than when I started this exercise. I feel ready to try and explicate what I am learning.

Content Processing: What I Learned from This Exercise

In more traditional educational processes, most people would omit affective self-disclosure. Yet through this facilitative education and this experiential exercise, I am learning that it is this kind of affective material that is indispensable to learning. Staying with my experience has led me to learning in the moment. What I miss in this reflection is the feedback from those of you who are participating in this exercise. As a result of reflection, and the images that came forth, a final direction of this paper is unfolding.

Metacommunication and Metaprocessing: My Experience of This Experience

I work with a different kind of processing, and move to the metalevel. Here, we can each describe our experiences of this exercise. For example, rather than focusing on the content of the material itself, as in the last part, how do you react to the way I presented this material? By making your experiences explicit at both of these levels, you become aware to what you learn (content processing) and how you think and feel about the present experiences (meta processing).

To elicit your feedback, I abstract from my previous writing on this topic:

> [R]eflect on how you are receiving the chapter as it is being presented to you. Can you make your experience conscious by explicating not in terms of what is right or wrong with me, the author, but in a way that denotes your ownership of how you feel about this work. Instead of saying for example "his writing is horrible" or "his writing is great" maybe begin with "I think" or "I feel" a certain way about how the author is presenting this material—"I feel alienated" or "I feel engaged." Again, processing allows you to explicate your own awareness on these levels (what am I learning from the material?) and allows you to begin taking responsibility for your own awareness (how do I think or how do *I* feel about the process of learning the material?) (Brown, 1996, p. xx).

Processing for me means, "going from thinking to feeling and from feeling to thinking again, no longer thinking 'about' something, but rather a kind of reflection within a field of experience" (Von Schlippe, 1993, p. 210). Now, can you make explicit your physical responses? Are you processing aloud or to yourself? Is there a particular part of your body that you move or are aware of? Maybe it is that your eyes or arms feel heavy. What are your bodily responses now?

I believe that I presented my images in a positive way. I consider this is a low-level exercise that is appropriate in this context. Although my head hurts from

thinking so hard about what I am doing, about shuttling between several levels, I feel good.

I am hoping that in this section, by shuttling back and forth between being in the experience and talking about the experience, I can adequately share one aspect of my vision of facilitation. I am trained to operationalize double loop learning by becoming aware of my own experience and shuttling back and forth between interaction and what we call working at the "metalevel." Although authors like Morgan discuss double loop learning, and some have implemented a reflective work process, we have been refining these processes and applying them in education for many years. What I did here was an experiential exercise demonstrating what I mentioned before, metacommunication. I elaborate on this idea because metacommunication is what I am doing now. My colleague Judith Brown, so brilliantly describes this as "the level where the participants' experiences, their relationship, and the rules and patterns of the relationship are the matters of interest. Paradoxically, to do this one must—momentarily—step out of the relationship to bring about a fresh perspective on the interaction of the relationship" (1996, p.70). In this case the metacommunication is with myself, and I am sharing it with you. I emerge from self-conversation and step back to examine my feelings about this work. I clarify my ideas and allow myself the time for my experience to crystallize. In earlier paragraphs I stepped out of the traditional writing of this chapter to divulge my present experience. As I described my uncertainties, images emerged. The pieces came together and led me to a new understanding of what I was doing in this chapter, and where I was to take it next. To make this a facilitative exercise, in addition to sharing my experience, I asked you, the reader, to momentarily step out of this reading and see what you were experiencing in relation to what I wrote. Even though authors in this book may have had have different levels of sophistication in working with metacommunication, it is evident that they engaged in this process. In his chapter Mortola uses the metaphor of a bridge and discusses the utility of narrative as part of ME/CE. Near the end of his chapter, he steps out of his traditional writing to reflect about his writing process:

> Reflecting on why I chose to use that story in the first place, I realize that I wanted to get the reader emotionally involved in my writing. I didn't want the chapter to be just about ideas without those ideas being linked to actions and feelings in the real world. In this way, my use of a narrative in that case is a good example of the central point of this section regarding the link between narrative and CE.

Mortola reflected on "the rules and patterns of the relationship[s]" (Brown, 1996, p.70) governing his needs for his paper, explaining why he chose the bridge metaphor. His reflection contains affect: "I realize that I wanted to get the reader emotionally involved in my writing." He follows this affective statement with a statement about what he learned. The bridge metaphor represents "a good example of regarding the link between narrative and CE." Mortola's meta reflection on his own writing describes his own learning.

Metacommunication is a key example of facilitating affect in the learning process. Through double loop learning and metaprocessing we learn about how we are doing what we are doing. Confluent educators model by experiencing and experience by modeling. So often we find that through metacommunication or metaprocessing, new perspectives emerge.

In both the first and second sections of this paper, I have described different aspects of relationship(s) between affect and learning. In the first section I merely described this relationship and its influence in the interaction between learners, thus the interpersonal dimension. In the second section, I focused on the intrapersonal dimension, and noted my experiences in the moments of writing this section and the images related to them. Both sections may be valid routes to understanding the role of affect in learning. In cubism and jazz, the artist depicts different perspectives of the same object, and the viewer selects which perspective or perspectives are most salient. The artist, like the confluent educator, makes available multiple approaches for learning.

AFFECT AND LEARNING IN THE CONTEXT(S) OF "BACK-TO-BASICS" AND GLOBAL COMPETITION

Following, I examine two different social contexts that challenge us to implement a facilitative educational process: "Back-to-Basics" and global competition.

"Back-to-Basics" and Power Relations

You may have been wondering, "what do the principles guiding affect in learning have to do with "Back-to-Basics"? Quite simply stated, in light of the current knowledge, "Back-to-Basics" and their variations are outmoded and outdated. So too is the focus on the educator serving as knowledge functionary: simply a person who provides the information needed for youth to meet testing standards. This being so, it becomes clear that social or political contextual factors are driving the "Back-to-Basics" movement.

Dominant people want things to remain the same. Those who are for "Back-to-Basics" have an investment in maintaining current traditional power relations. Educators who imagine they can compartmentalize students and deal with only the cognitive function may imagine that dealing with the whole student means an out of control situation. Such a teacher does not invite participation that might evoke the affective domain. At the expense of addressing students' experiences, the emphasis is exclusively on teaching specific information and/or the maintenance of order. Professionals often refer to this educational process as "drill and kill."

The most direct way to alter power relations is to sit face to face with another and learn about that other, so that stereotypical images of the other, one by one, fall away. To proponents of "Back-to-Basics," education like this is abhorrent.

In ME, a field that necessitates the interaction of sitting with the other, I see a conspicuous absence of the kinds of facilitative education we have seen in this chapter and throughout this volume (Cameron Wedding; Cline & Necochea; Halcón): an examination of each of us as self as well as other, how we interact with the other, and how we are affected by our social environments. Notice how I say "with" because it is only in the recent past that education with those youth of multiple origins became a de facto legal reality. And many of us still question whether, even at this late date, real ME is a reality. Maybe it is understandable, then, why many people would want to maintain our comfort, and, thus, current power relations. Yet in our communities as well as the global community, the return on "Back-to-Basics" and the maintenance of current power relations may be veering downward.

The Social Cost of "Back-to-Basics" at Home

In our last volume, Gapasin (1996, p. 143), "a former retail clerk, hospital worker, mechanical assembler, autoworker, janitor, steelworker, mechanic, farmworker, paralegal union representative, and County Commissioner" showed how "the reintroduction of ethnocentric theories of racial inferiority, attacks on affirmative action, and increasing intercultural cleavages can be better understood by examining recent 'low road' business choices and affect in education" (pp. 143-144). Gapasin's context and explanatory detail is superior in comprehensiveness to mine. Indeed, from the atypical perspective of a man, who for most of his life worked as a laborer, he clearly describes what he not only read about, but also what he experienced. The price we pay for a "Back-to-Basics" movement Gapasin finds, is the "affective disempowerment and further disintegration of our society" (p. 148) resulting from degrading "non-dominant cultures and [supporting] the continuation of a hierarchical relationship between cultures" (p. 150). For him, these relationships have implications (p. 150):

> Among Black and Hispanic students in the five largest U.S. cities, the dropout rate exceeds 55%. For black males it approximates 75% nationwide (Comer & Haynes, 1990). African-American children are three times as likely to be placed in classes for the mentally retarded and to subsequently drop out of school; Latino students drop out at a rate higher than any other group—80 percent in some areas (Nieto, 1992).

In that same volume, although she does not mention "Back-to-Basics," Peters Behrens (p. 95) describes another price we pay for the maintenance of current power relations. She sees it in terms of the "persistence" of "aversive" or a more subtle form of racism:

> The persistence of racism and bias is of particular concern to educators, though, because it has been shown that racial biases are learned behaviors, adopted by children as early as five or six years of age (Clark, 1955; Allport; 1954; Kinjinfu, 1989).

Gapasin and Peters Behrens amply illustrate the cost of retrenchment in or intensification of traditional educational approaches; the persistence of racism, no matter how subtle, and the destruction of our social fabric. Both works represent outstanding examples of the relationship(s) they describe. They offer solutions by integrating affective, cognitive and behavioral domains on multiple levels.

The Social Cost of "Back-to-Basics" in a World Community

If we shift the focus beyond our own communities to the world community, the findings are equally disturbing. One key example suffices. Results from one of the largest international studies of our youth's science achievement, the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), tells us that compared with youth from other countries, our youth are disproportionately failing. In a recent speech to the National Science Teachers Association (April 16, 1998), the U.S. Commissioner on Educational Statistics (NCES) tells us:

> Looking at the different results of TIMSS that have been released over the past two years, what is the "story" regarding science achievement in the United States? I believe there are three major stories to tell:
>
> One is that despite generally positive signs at the fourth grade level, by the time our students are ready to leave high school—ready to enter higher education and the labor force—they are doing so with an understanding of science that is significantly weaker than their peers in other countries.
>
> The second story is that our idea of "advanced" is clearly below international standards.
>
> And the third story is that there appears to be a consistent weakness in our students' performance in physical sciences that becomes magnified over the years.

From evidence that has been presented in the last two sections, one is compelled to reach this conclusion: the influence of retrenchment and/or intensification of "Back-to-Basics" appears negative, both within our own society and globally.

The Persistence of "Back-to-Basics"

Despite "low-road" business choices, aversive racism and internationally failing students, each intimately connected with "Back-to-Basics," many people still perceive us as globally "competitive." "Back-to-Basics" still persists. But why? The desire to return to "Back-to-Basics" represents more than what I identified in the last two sections; that is, a regressive response to the perceived threat of change in power relations.

In the current "global competition" context, the primary motivation for education is the enabling of unrestrained competition with the other, for example, people of diverse cultures, races and/or ethnicities. Because of its focus on developing specific skills for specific needs, and being easily evaluated, competition appears best taught by "Back-to-Basics" curricula. When we compete in this way, we set the "superior" apart from the "inferior," the winners from the losers. This is not to say that the defined winners by virtue of their standardized testing excellence are sufficiently prepared for our sophisticated world. In a back to basics milieu, winners are defined by ascribing to narrowly defined standardized success, which may not be reflective of participation in today's real world, such as creativity or divergent thinking needed to solve complex problems. Despite this critical consideration, the "winners" go on to participate in the global competition and their benefits accrue. As has been shown by Gapasin (1996), many of the losers are simply cast off. Most often, the cast-offs were those who were at a disadvantage in the first place, witness "at-risk" youth (Brown & D'Emidio-Caston, 1995). Because they are now in dramatically different social and socioeconomic strata, winners and losers become increasingly separated from one another. Despite these costs, proponents still think that this is the best way to succeed in a globally competitive environment.

As the world gets smaller, the "other" gets both virtually (i.e., the World Wide Web, media), as well as actually closer (i.e., global transportation) to each of us (Georgi; Hackbarth; Janes, in this volume). By our very proximity, the nature of our well being becomes increasingly interdependent. A "Back-to-Basics" education that is primarily directed toward developing competition ignores the nature of our shrinking, changing world.

In this ever-smaller world, the relationship between winners and losers can be seen and experienced in our midst. When we, through "Back-to-Basics," create an increasing divide between winners and losers, we engender jealousy and hatred toward one another. This will increasingly inspire dominated peoples to scavenge for the opportunity to overcome their dominators. The concepts underlying "Back-to-Basics" and "Global Competition" produce and reinforce a hidden conflict: an intensification of separation between "winners" and "losers" despite our ever-smaller world. To summarize, in light of the increased separation precisely at the time when we are inextricably moving closer together, competition and the accompanying "Back-to-Basics" approaches cannot create effective learning.

If we change the goal of global competition to global participation, justifications for "Back-to-Basics" are arrested. By embracing the goal of reasonable global participation, new and healthier possibilities emerge. After a summary, I will close the chapter with a short discussion of these new possibilities.

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Speaking on the interpersonal level, affect is an inextricable part of learning for both for learner and educator. Affect is the vehicle through which mutual learning takes place. Speaking on the intrapersonal level, I provided a completely different perspective on affect and learning, showing how I experience it and asking you the reader to reflect on your experience. In this exercise we saw a glimpse of how confluent educators facilitate learning. This intrapersonal perspective yielded my own finding supported by other evidence that processing and metaprocessing allows me to solidify my learning and learn how to do better. On the social contextual level, I showed how both within our own community and in a shrinking world community, the goal of "Back-to-Basics" and accompanying unrestrained competition cannot work. If we shift the goal from unrestrained global competition to global participation, then we may realize that a CE/ME model is more appropriate for global participation.

When I write the words "global participation," I have the picture of large movements of people or migration across national boundaries, even across oceans. The authors of these chapters are right now facing the very challenges that are part of today's world. In their classrooms, through their own creative processes, combined with serious commitment, these authors are developing exactly what global participation means. Whether we have chosen it or not, we are participating in a global community. Interdependence is a fact of life. Organizations like the United Nations demonstrate that participation and collaboration is not easy, but it is becoming necessary, as well as mutually rewarding. Every day, the authors in this volume have been working with these kinds of formidable tasks, and now this book is an appeal to meet the challenges that interdependence brings.

Benefits of a CE/ME Learning Model

As Jordan Horowitz and I previously discussed (1996), we need to evaluate this model to determine the precise nature and scope of its impact. Because of the evidence presented in this volume that points toward effectiveness of a CE/ME model, I note its conceivable benefits. They represent exactly the kinds of learning that go to the heart of practicality:

- Increased acquisition of basic knowledge and skills
- Enhanced problem based learning capabilities
- Increased productivity

The educational principles that you have seen demonstrated in this chapter and throughout this volume can be facilitated in dyads, triads, small groups and large

groups. It is the skillful facilitation of shuttling and reconfiguring individual, group, and context in experiential, reflective and processing exercises that models and teaches us about our interdependence. Paradoxically, by continuing interaction, as we are affected we simultaneously affect one another. We create an ongoing learning process. By experiencing, reflecting and meta processing we also create a process that teaches how to learn. This is also learning itself.

The ability to compete may be considered a by-product of the larger goal of participation. But it is not the main goal driving our educational system. Only in beginning to shift our goal from competition to participation with others who are ethnically and racially diverse, will we and the coming generations be able to reasonably participate in a global community.

The multicultural dynamics of educational change are those that encourage affective collaboration through the exuberance of experiencing one another and learning about how all of us and each of us can participate in a global community.

Metaconclusion

The ending to this volume is one that I never anticipated. I did not think that a final point would be a reflection on destruction of the traditional construct of the learning processes defined inherently by global competition. My understanding emerged when I did three things. First, I stayed with my uncertainty of not knowing where this chapter was headed. Second, I allowed the artistic images that were in my foreground to become an explicit part of my process. And finally to these emotional states, I linked the interpersonal, intrapersonal, and social contextual findings. When processing at this metalevel then, I am satisfied with this ending.

A while back, I saw a movie about Muhammad Ali. George Plimpton, the writer, told this wonderful story about an appearance Ali made at Harvard University. As Plimpton told it, until that time the record for the shortest poem in the Barton's quotations was the physics poem "Atom Hatom". Don't ask me what it means! Nevertheless, when visiting Harvard, Ali, the self-proclaimed "Greatest" boxer and also a great poet, had just given a lecture about empowerment. When he concluded he received a standing ovation, and suddenly a student yelled out "give us a poem." Ali looked out on the nearly all white audience and waited a moment. He held up his fist up and said, "Me-We." While visiting what to many is considered the den of America's elite, Ali recognized the value of the relationship(s) between himself and others. He recognized the value of each individual, our interdependence, and our positive potential. And so it goes. "Me-We."

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author thanks George Brown, Zulmara Cline, Juan Necochea and Michelle Pair for their invaluable assistance. I also offer my heartfelt thanks to Judith Brown.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Brown, G.I. (1969). Awareness training and creativity based on gestalt therapy. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 2*(Summer), 25-32.

Brown, G.I. (1972/1990). *Human teaching for human learning: An introduction to confluent education.* Highland, NY: The Gestalt Journal.

Brown, G.I. (Ed.) (1975). *The live classroom: Innovation through confluent education and gestalt.* New York: The Viking Press.

Brown, J.H. (1997). Listen to the kids: When it comes to drug education, students confirm what research says. *The American School Board Journal (ASBJ)*(December), 38-40 & 47.

Brown, J.H. (Ed.). (1996). *Advances in Confluent Education, Vol. 1: Integrating Consciousness for Human Change.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Brown J.H., & D'Emidio-Caston, M. (1995). On becoming at-risk through drug education: How symbolic policies and their practices affect students. *Evaluation Review 19* (4), 451-492.

Brown, J.H., D'Emidio-Caston, M., & Pollard, J. (1997). Students and substances: Social power in drug education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis (EEPA), 19* (1), 65-82.

Brown, J.R. (1996). *The I in Science: Training to utilize subjectivity in research.* Boston, MA: Scandinavian University Press.

Clark, K. (1955). *Prejudice and your child.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Comer, J., & Haynes, N. (1990). Helping black children succeed: The significance of some social factors. In K. Lomotey (Ed.), *Going to school: The African American experience.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

D'Arcangelo, M. (1998). The brains behind the brain. *Educational Leadership, 56* (3)(November), html.

D'Emidio-Caston, M., & Brown, J.H. (1998). The other side of the story: Student narratives on the California Drug, Alcohol, Tobacco Education program. *Evaluation Review, 22* (1)(February), 95-117.

DeMeulle, L., & D'Emidio-Caston, M. (1996). Confluent education: A coherent vision of teacher education. In J. H. Brown (Ed.), *Advances in confluent education, Vol 1: Integrating consciousness for human change* (pp. 43-62). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Gapasin, F. (1996). School diversity, the economy, and affect in the curriculum. In J. H. Brown (Ed.), *Advances in confluent education, Vol 1: Integrating consciousness for human change* (pp. 143-163). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York: Basic Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working within emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Horowitz, J.E., & Brown, J.H. (1996). Confluent education and evaluation research. In J.H. Brown (ed.), *Advances in confluent education, Vol. 1: Integrating consciousness for human change.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Kagan, D.M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 129-169.

Kanpol, B., & McLaren, P. (Eds.) (1995). *Critical multiculturalism: Uncommon voices in a common struggle.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Kinjinfu, J. (1989). *Critical issues in educating African American youth (A talk with Jawanaza).* Chicago, IL: African American Images.

Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., and Masia, B.B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective domain.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization.* Newbury, CA: Sage Publications.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* New York: Longman.

Perls, F. (1988). *Gestalt therapy verbatim.* Highland, NY: The Gestalt Journal.

Peters Behrens, D. (1996). Beyond awareness: An action science approach to cross-cultural relations, a prolegomenon. In J. H. Brown (Ed.), *Advances in confluent education, Vol 1: Integrating consciousness for human change* (pp. 95-112). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children.* New York: International Universities Press.

Shapiro, S.B. (1998). *The place of confluent education in the human potential movement.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Verlee-Williams, L. (1983). *Teaching for the two-sided mind: A guide to right brain, left brain education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Von Schlippe, G. (1993). "Guilty!" Thoughts in relation to my own past: Letters to my son. In B. Heimannsberg & C.J. Schmidt (Eds.), *The collective silence: German identity and the legacy of shame.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.