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**A Note from the Authors**

The *Bridging Cultures* Project has used a framework for understanding cultural differences based on the constructs of individualism and collectivism. These constructs represent clusters of values that tend to favor either individual or group needs—“independence” versus “interdependence.” The reader is cautioned to remember that these two cultural values orientations can be used to describe relative tendencies of groups, but no group is absolutely individualistic or collectivistic. Nor is any single human being. Moreover, variation within any given culture is as great as variations among cultures. Nevertheless, certain cultures are overall clearly more individualistic or collectivistic than others.

The United States has been judged to be considerably more individualistic than the majority of cultures in the world, while cultures in Asia, Africa, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the whole tend to be quite collectivistic. Many of the kinds of conflicts immigrant students and families from these parts of the world (and others) encounter with U.S. schools can be understood with reference to these two constructs. However, the framework is best thought of as a starting point for getting below the surface of culture to what some have called “deep culture.” It can be used to help teachers think about what might be going on and prompt questions for further investigation, as they get to know students and families personally.

Of course, other factors influence values: level of formal education, economic status, exposure to other cultures, and the like. People may become bicultural through necessity or choice. In general, culture is explored very little in schools as a source of conflict between home and school, though sometimes it is invoked as a reason for students’ failure to achieve. It is the hope of the members of the Bridging Cultures Project that what readers of any of our materials take away is the notion that learning about students’ cultures while becoming aware of the cultural values underlying usual school practices is not only worthwhile but extremely important. Schools operate on the basis of an implicit value system that reflects the values of the dominant culture, which are undeniably quite individualistic; and large numbers of students (immigrants as well as native-born students) have very different implicit value systems. Usual practices in U.S. schools may not only be uncomfortable and unfamiliar, they may set students at odds with the values they have been taught at home. We believe this kind of negative outcome can be minimized when teachers learn to recognize and tap students’ culture-based strengths as a result of conscious learning about school culture and home culture.
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What is *Bridging Cultures*?

The *Bridging Cultures* Project is a collaborative action research and development project involving WestEd; the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA); California State University, Northridge (CSUN); and a group of seven experienced bilingual teachers (four Latino and three European-American) from the greater Los Angeles area (Table 1). The purpose of the Project has been to improve professional development for teachers in order to make education for diverse populations more successful—and for immigrant Latino students, in particular. The Project responds to an increasing need for teachers to understand culture beyond the surface level and to develop meaningful practices and materials that are harmonious with students’ home cultures rather than in conflict with them. In the following pages we show how the Project has addressed this need through pre-service and in-service education, classroom-based research, and a range of publications for teachers, teacher-educators, and researchers.

TABLE 1. *Bridging Cultures* partners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WestEd</td>
<td>Elise Trumbull, Patricia Greenfield, Blanca Quiroz, Carrie Rothstein-Fisch, Marie Altchech, Catherine Daley, Kathryn Eyler, Pearl Saltzky, Giancarlo Mercado, Elvia Hernandez, Ada S. Nelson Elementary School, Amada Pérez, Mar Vista Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View School District (Oxnard, CA)</td>
<td>Ocean View School District (Oxnard, CA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*some affiliations have changed

---

1 *Bridging Cultures* was part of the Language and Cultural Diversity Program (now Culture and Language in Education) at WestEd. It was funded primarily by the Office for Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the federal Department of Education between 12/95 and 12/00.
PROJECT RATIONALE

The need to improve teachers' education about culture is widely acknowledged (e.g., Banks, 1995; Hollins, 1996; Irvine, 1992; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990), particularly in light of the increased diversity of the student population and lack of diversity within the teacher population. While 34.4% of students are “non-White,”2 only 13.5% of teachers in U.S. schools are “non-White” (U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999). With current trends, the imbalance of representation of “minorities” in the teaching population will not be addressed in the foreseeable future. But even when teachers from “minority” communities do join the teaching profession, they are often denied the opportunity to use their intuitive, culture-based knowledge in teaching because of pressures to conform to dominant culture norms (Nelson-Barber & Mitchell, 1992). The following quotation from a new teacher who participated in a Bridging Cultures session as part of a course for intern teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District illustrates this fact poignantly. This exploration must address the value systems of teachers and schools as well as those of students’ communities.

As a first-year educator a major cause of frustration has been parents’ lack of involvement in their students’ education. I attributed this phenomenon to the school’s poor effort in reaching out to the community and the parents’ lack of education. Reviewing this pamphlet 3 has helped me recognize my own culturally biased attitude. This is particularly important because I am Latina and a first generation American. The university system’s impact on my expectations and perspective is amazing to me because I identify so much with my home culture.

In this case, a teacher who is working in a district that is heavily Latino—who was perhaps hired partly on the basis of her cultural and linguistic knowledge—has been influenced by her education in ways that prevent her from actually using her own cultural knowledge effectively with her students and their families. It is clear that professional development that supports conscious exploration of cultural values that influence child-rearing and education is a much-needed resource for all teachers.

Latino4 students (called “Hispanic” in the census literature) constitute 14.3% of the total student population nationally—and vastly greater percentages in several states (U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1999). “Hispanic” students (immigrant and non-immigrant) are not well-served in schools. This fact is reflected by their level of achievement as a group and the numbers in which they drop out of school. In 1998,

---

2 This term is used by the Bureau of the Census. We might quarrel with it since it defines all groups with reference to the dominant group (White).
3 Bridging Cultures in Our Schools: New Approaches that Work (Knowledge Brief). San Francisco: WestEd.
4 We use “Latino” instead of “Hispanic” because it is a broader term for peoples from Latin America (some of whose first language is not Spanish, as “Hispanic” denotes) and because it appears to be preferred by Bridging Cultures participants, other colleagues, and families with whom we have worked.
90.2% of “White non-Hispanic” youth aged 18-24 had graduated from high school, but the rate for “Hispanic” students was only 62.8% (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1998).

In California, where the Bridging Cultures Project has been concentrated, “Hispanic” students constitute nearly 40% of students in the public schools (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1998), and many of those students are from immigrant families. As a group, they perform well below average on statewide achievement tests (Gándara & Merino, 1993) and drop out of high school at higher rates than their European-American and African-American peers (California Department of Education Web site, www.ca.gov, 2001). It is clear that something needs to be done, and research points to teacher education as the most important source of potential change (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999; Ferguson, 1991; Shulman & Sykes, 1983)—hence the focus of the Bridging Cultures Project.

STRANDS OF THE BRIDGING CULTURES PROJECT

There are several strands to the Bridging Cultures Project:

- Developing workshops for a core group of teachers on the cultural value dimensions of individualism and collectivism and their implications for child-rearing and schooling
- Documenting changes in thinking and instructional practice of these teachers
- Supporting core teachers in developing their own skills as researchers, including teaching them how to use ethnography to learn about cultures
- Collaborating with core teachers to design and provide professional development for other educators at conferences and meetings
- Teaching pre-service teachers, new teachers, and school counselors about the Bridging Cultures framework
- Publishing materials on the theory and teacher-developed practice of Bridging Cultures and disseminating them through workshops and other means

Of course, a substantial number of these students are still mastering English and probably should not be compared to their English-speaking peers.
Table 2 shows these strands and activities within them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2. Major activities of the Bridging Cultures Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshops 7 Core Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meetings 7 Core Teachers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Documenting Teacher Change and Innovations** | • Teachers document their own changes in practice  
• Staff researchers document teachers’ changes in thinking and practice  
• Two UCLA seniors conduct ethnographic studies for their psychology theses |
| **Pre-Service Teacher Preparation** | • **Bridging Cultures** 3-hour instructional Module incorporated in courses at CSUN  
• Module presented at other CSU campuses  
• Module used nationally at other colleges and universities |
| **Development of Materials and Publications (listed in Appendix C)** | • Knowledge Brief  
• **Bridging Cultures: A Guide for Teachers** (book)  
• 2 *Educational Leadership* articles  
• **Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module** (book)  
• 4 papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association  
• *Connections* article  
• 2 books in preparation |
| **Presentations/Networking/Dissemination** | • Presentations at national conferences  
• Presentations at California conferences  
• Workshops for Head Start staff  
• Presentations to networks of professional developers  
• Dissemination Round Table (for college faculty and professional developers) |

THE COURSE OF THE PROJECT IN BRIEF

Staff researchers designed and carried out three intensive workshops with the seven participating teachers during the fall of 1996. Teachers were introduced to a theoretical framework that describes cultures in terms of the degree to which they are *individualistic* or *collectivistic* (Hofstede, 1980, 1983; Triandis, 1989) and to classroom research based on this framework. In brief, individualism represents a value system in which greater emphasis is placed on the well-being and rights of the individual versus the group (family, community, society). Collectivism places relatively more emphasis on the well-being and rights or needs of the group. The majority of cultures in the world, including most of the cultures of recent immigrants to the U.S., could be described as collectivistic. In contrast, the U.S., Western European countries, and Australia, among others, could be described as individualistic. Of course, no culture is completely individualistic or collec-
tivistic, but differences in strong tendencies of groups toward one orientation or the other prevail and cause conflicts when members of these different groups come together in common endeavors such as the schooling of children.

The staff researchers were hopeful that the framework would help teachers understand the immigrant Latino students in their classrooms and their students’ families’ ways of interacting with their children and with the school. Ideally, these teachers would make shifts in their understanding that would lead to innovative classroom practices that could be shared with other teachers in similar situations. The teachers would, in effect, become researchers themselves (“teacher researchers”), as they explored applicability of the theory and past research to their own teaching. Staff researchers, teacher researchers, and others who became involved with the Project met five to six times per year for the next four and a half years to continue the professional development process and share what was being learned. In the process, teachers expanded their roles not only as researchers but as professional developers and writers. We present a much fuller description of the Project’s participants and teachers as researchers, its theoretical perspective on professional development, and its processes in Appendix A.

**Purpose and Scope of the Report**

The primary purposes of this five-year report are to:

- *Provide accountability.* This report documents all of the major activities of the Bridging Cultures Project and reports the outcomes of the research, development, and dissemination efforts. In addition, we evaluate the quality and impact of these efforts on the basis of available data.

- *Target further research, development, and dissemination.* We point to new applications and future directions for the Bridging Cultures Project, using all data available to identify important research questions, new development activities, and promising dissemination strategies related to teacher professional development. In the process, we reflect on how what has been learned could improve future work.

The report addresses the two purposes stated above, which could be reframed as two broad questions:

- What are the outcomes of the Bridging Cultures Project?

- What have we learned that points to and could inform future efforts?

---

6 As the project has grown, not only the core teachers but graduate students have contributed to professional development.
These top-level questions can be divided into several sub-questions related to the different strands of the Project:

1. What was effective/ineffective about a) the initial professional development workshops and b) the ongoing group meetings for core teachers?

2. What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on teachers and other in-service workshop participants? Specifically, a) What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on core teachers’ thinking and practice? b) How have core teachers’ professional lives and roles changed during the course of the Project? and c) What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on participants at presentations and workshops (other than the core group of teachers)?

3. What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on students of the core teachers? 7

4. How has *Bridging Cultures* affected pre-service educators, new teachers, and counselors enrolled in graduate programs?

5. What is the nature and extent of the dissemination of the *Bridging Cultures* Project? Specifically, a) Who has been served/reached by the *Bridging Cultures* Project? and b) What resources has the Project developed, and what is the status of their dissemination?

After a review of our sources of data and data collection procedures, we take each question in turn and answer it on the basis of the data we have collected. Following that, we discuss what has been learned from the Project, challenges faced, and reflections on what could be done differently “next time.” Finally, we list possible future research and development efforts that seem to build on what has been accomplished.

**Sources of Data and Methods of Collection**

Throughout the Project, both formal and informal methods have been used to document all aspects of the Project and its impact. Table 3 shows the tools used.

The team also relied on telephone calls, faxed messages, e-mails, and letters/notices between meetings to keep threads of connection going and to plan meetings, classroom visits, and the like. Table 4 maps each source of data to the appropriate strands.

---

7 While the project did not set out to study effects on students, because teachers report such effects, we have documented and reported on them.
* The first classroom observations and interviews were coordinated, i.e., interview followed observation. Observations were guided by teachers’ discourse at meetings and in other conversations about changes in their classrooms. For example, because the teacher had spoken at length about parent volunteers, staff researchers focused on learning about volunteers during a half-day visit and follow-up interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. Tools used to document the Project and its impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• teachers’ journals (for their own use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher questionnaire (to obtain background information on each teacher, e.g., country of origin, languages used, length of time teaching, etc.) given to teachers at the first workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pre- and post-assessments of awareness of individualism and collectivism given to all seven teachers (before and after the first three workshops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• videotapes of the three workshops and first follow-up meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• exit survey (completed by teachers after the three workshops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• classroom observations of all seven teachers (minimum of two hours two to four times, depending on teacher, beginning Winter 1998 and continuing through Spring 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• written reflections by all seven teachers on a question posed by staff researchers (periodically gathered at meetings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• two sets of extended, semi-structured interviews with all seven teachers (ranging from 1½-4 hours; one set completed in association with classroom visits, one via telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• field notes taken at each of the 24 meetings between Fall 1996 and Fall 2000 (notes were reviewed and edited by all participants for accuracy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• periodic interest surveys completed by the core teachers (for planning meetings, readings, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• videotapes of a Bridging Cultures classroom and a non-Bridging Cultures classroom (documenting peer relations and teacher-student relations in the two classrooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• evaluation forms distributed at most external presentations (to ascertain perceptions of quality and utility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• questionnaires for reviewers of the Bridging Cultures Guide and Knowledge Brief (including teachers and research colleagues: professional developers’ questionnaires completed by pre-service educators during and after courses that included the Bridging Cultures Module)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• e-mail questionnaires completed by graduate students after courses that included the Bridging Cultures Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• e-mail questionnaires to selected core teachers to clarify their professional development experience during their careers before they were involved with the Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The first classroom observations and interviews were coordinated, i.e., interview followed observation. Observations were guided by teachers’ discourse at meetings and in other conversations about changes in their classrooms. For example, because the teacher had spoken at length about parent volunteers, staff researchers focused on learning about volunteers during a half-day visit and follow-up interview."
TABLE 4. *Bridging Cultures* strands and sources of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>WORKSHOPS</th>
<th>MEETINGS</th>
<th>CHANGES IN TEACHER PRACTICE</th>
<th>PRE-SERVICE PREPARATION</th>
<th>MATERIALS, PUBLICATIONS*</th>
<th>PRESENTATIONS/ NETWORKING/ DISSEMINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teacher questionnaire</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-, post- assessments</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videotapes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exit survey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluations, surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All publications went through an editorial process that involved outside reviewers (e.g., the Knowledge Brief and Guide were reviewed by teachers, professional developers, and professional editors; the Module by teacher educators and teachers).*
QUESTION 1
What was effective/ineffective about the initial professional development workshops and ongoing group meetings for core teachers?

Here we discuss the professional development processes of Bridging Cultures and their impact on the core teachers. The most intensive professional development took place in the three initial workshops, but the ongoing meetings served the purpose of professional development (through teacher-teacher and teacher-researcher interactions as well as informal presentations and participation by colleagues from beyond the core group). Of course, the meetings were also an opportunity for the staff researchers to learn about changes in teachers’ thinking and practice. What came up at one meeting led to new topics and questions for the next.

Question 1a
What was effective/ineffective about the initial three workshops?

The ongoing participation of teachers was judged to depend on the success of the three professional development workshops. If these workshops did not have the impact of drawing them into a long-term collaborative research venture, there would be no Bridging Cultures Project. Here we address the immediate impact of the workshops, as documented by videotapes, teachers’ pre- and post-assessment performance, the exit survey, and teachers’ oral reflections at the end of the third workshop (documented in the field notes). This analysis is distinct from analysis of the long-term impact on teachers’ involvement in the Project throughout the four years of their participation.

In order to establish a baseline regarding teachers’ awareness of the individualism/collectivism framework, teachers were given a set of four scenarios: two posed a home-based dilemma and two a school-based dilemma that could be solved in different ways (the pre-assessment). These scenarios had been used in past research (reported in Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000) and were shown to be useful in distinguishing individualistic and collectivistic value orientations in fifth-graders, parents, and teachers. A similar set of four scenarios was used as a post-assessment. Responses were scored by Ms. Quiroz according to a protocol developed for the original research.

The results of the post-assessment revealed a fairly dramatic shift from teachers’ generally individualistic orientation toward the pre-assessment scenarios to an orientation that reflected an understanding of both individualism and collectivism in the post-assessment scenarios. For example, five of the teachers responded to the pre-test scenarios with a consistently individualistic perspective. All three changed their responses to reflect a more collectivistic perspective, indicating that they better understood ways to solve problems from the perspective of another set of cultural values. Another interesting finding was that three teachers moved from considering a single, individualistic perspective in the pre-test to including both an
individualistic and collectivistic solution to scenarios in the post-test. Table 5 shows the number of teacher responses that were from either a collectivistic or individualistic point of view, reflected both perspectives, or reflected neither perspective (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Quiroz, & Greenfield, 1997). The total of 14 in each column represents responses to two scenarios from seven teachers for the pre-assessment and for the post-assessment. Although teachers answered questions about four scenarios on each assessment, only two of each (a total of four) scenarios had inter-rater reliability already established from the original research, so we chose to formally analyze responses to those four scenarios only.

Early on, several members of the group (specifically, the Latino teachers) had strong personal reactions to what they were learning about the conflicts between individualism and collectivism. In Workshop Three, they talked about the degree to which they had forsaken their own early value orientation as they unconsciously strove to fit into American society and American schools in particular. One teacher said,

_As an immigrant from Mexico myself I can see how I have had to fight my own collectivistic upbringing to be successful in U.S. schools. Those of us who jumped from one orientation to another made the leap without even knowing it! Now we need to tap our own cultural knowledge for the sake of our students._

Other teachers echoed her comment in various ways. Some teachers spoke of personal struggles between loyalty to family and their family’s needs and dedication to their own efforts to get through college and graduate school, which required neglecting family needs at times. So, it was not only in terms of potential classroom practice that teachers interpreted the framework. More than half of the teachers could reach back into personal experience to confirm its meaning. It is striking that even though many of the teachers had collectivistic roots (and were effectively bicultural), without an explicit framework for understanding the differences between collectivism and individualism, they were unable to fully resolve certain conflicts—both personal and professional. One teacher said in discussion,
For me it’s just being aware of the differences, of what we’re doing. It gives a name to what we’re doing. I don’t think I would have known how to talk about this before.

As they completed the three-part workshop series, the core teachers had set goals as to how they would implement the individualism and collectivism framework in their practice. On the exit survey administered at the end of the third workshop, teachers were asked, “Will you use your knowledge of individualism and collectivism?” Table 6 summarizes their responses. The responses not only describe how teachers anticipated using the framework, but are also indicative of how useful the teachers perceived it to be.

### TABLE 6. Applying the principles of individualism and collectivism to the classroom

| I will use [knowledge of collectivism] in classroom management decisions and in my view and understanding of the parents’ actions and views...not to view parents as ignorant because they do not look at things my way. |
| I will modify certain things such as: conferences, helpers, collaborative work, relationships between teachers, parents, aides and administrators...examining individualistic classroom policies or reexamining them. |
| Everyday I will be much more understanding and tolerant of my students’ need to help each other and their families. |
| I plan on reforming my class so that it can be more collectively friendly with the freedom of expressing individuality. My reading and math journal groups are going to be much more group oriented. |
| I want to use this knowledge in my classroom. I need further training in how. I do try to meet situations with openness and heart, but putting that desire into practice in the school setting is a challenge that needs support. |
| I will think before I act or speak when dealing with conflict that may occur between students and also participate more from this perspective on a professional level at faculty meetings or just at lunch. |

During discussion at the end of the third workshop, teachers talked about what had affected them most. One specific element they agreed had brought home the effects of different cultural orientations on students was a set of bar graphs taken from the research of Greenfield, Quiroz, and Raeff (2000). These graphs (Figures 2 and 3) show great discrepancies in how European-American teachers, immigrant Latino students, and immigrant Latino mothers would solve a common dilemma (the “Jobs Scenario,” Figure 1).

What is shocking is that one can see how even elementary-age students have moved away from their parents’ values toward the values of their teachers/school. The graphs symbolically show how the acculturation of children is alienating them from their parents.
It is the end of the school day, and the class is cleaning up. Salvador isn’t feeling well, and he asks Emanuel to help him with his job for the day, which is cleaning the blackboard. Emanuel isn’t sure that he will have time to do both jobs. What do you think the teacher should do?

**An Individualistic Response**
Find a third person to do the job.

**A Collectivistic Response**
Emanuel should help Salvador.

**FIGURE 2. School 1 (European-American)**

**FIGURE 3. School 2 (Latino)**
Teachers rated the value of the workshops highly. The exit survey shows that all of the teachers rated their overall experience as “great.” One teacher stated,

*The awareness I have experienced in three meetings is amazing! How is it possible that one chapter, one article, and fourteen hours can make so much impact?! Dialogue was a key component. A “comfort zone” was established early on...and barriers were taken down allowing for meaningful conversations to take place.*

Some aspects of the workshops that the teachers perceived to be particularly useful included the readings and presentations by Patricia Greenfield and Blanca Quiroz, sharing personally and in small groups, scenarios from Workshop One, and planning future steps after Workshop Three.

The teachers also provided valuable feedback regarding the design of the professional development workshops, suggesting which elements ought to be kept in future presentations to teachers and which might be changed. For example, one of the teachers suggested that involving administrators and teachers of different cultures might improve the format. A universal suggestion of the teachers was to allow more time for sharing and discussing so as to further their knowledge about the model and its applicability in their classrooms and schools. They knew they would need more interaction and reflection in order to deepen their understanding and put what they were learning to use. As the workshop series came to an end, the teachers asked to continue meeting on a monthly or semi-monthly basis. One said,

*Meeting three times sets the fire, but nothing’s been cooked yet. The risks are that people will go back and close the door on their classrooms. We should keep this core group alive.*

Thus, the staff researchers and the core group of teachers began meeting regularly.

Teachers’ responses to the initial three workshops via the pre- and post-assessments and the exit survey show that they were effective as a professional development model. In addition, through discussion and written reflections, the teachers described the manner in which the framework touched not only their professional but their personal lives. Perhaps the strongest indicator of the effectiveness of the workshops was the teachers’ willingness and desire to “take action.” The three workshops led to the development of a collaborative effort of researchers and teacher researchers who continued to meet and develop strategies for disseminating the *Bridging Cultures* Project for four-and-a-half years.

**Question 1b**

**How successful were the ongoing meetings from the teachers’ perspectives?**

As mentioned in the introduction, the teacher researchers and staff researchers have met regularly over the course of the last four-and-a-half years. Teachers’ perceptions regarding the usefulness or value of the meet-
ings have been documented primarily through the use of field notes, interviews, and written evaluations. These sources provide rich information concerning what the teacher-researchers consider that they have gained from the meetings, as well as how they have contributed to them.

The majority of the core teachers attended the professional development meetings regularly. The attendance of two teachers was diminished by family needs related to the care of children and elderly parents. When asked about his attendance at the meetings in an interview, one teacher stated,

\[
I \text{ have been to every single meeting. I don't want to let it go. I feel strongly about continuing, because it was so mind-awakening and thought-provoking. It really distances itself from common professional development because it wasn't a one-shot deal.}
\]

The consistency of the meetings over an extended period of time has enabled communication within the group to grow increasingly open and fluid. Indeed, an essential component of the Project’s methodology for achieving understanding across role types of teacher-researcher and outside researcher (and, more recently, graduate student) has been dialogue. Conversations at the semi-monthly meetings have allowed the group to learn about each other’s thinking, ways of working, and requirements for professional growth and success. It has not been simply through the direct work of gathering and analyzing observational data and planning publications and presentations that members of the group have related to each other. Informal time at the meetings (often over lunch or breakfast) that was not scheduled for discussion of particular topics has also allowed for dialogue between individuals or within small groups. Teachers found the meetings invaluable for sharing classroom innovations, as did the staff researchers for learning about teachers’ growing understanding and application of the framework. Teachers had considerable input into shaping the content and format of meetings, particularly after the first two or three, and this ensured the meaningfulness of topics.

The Project is not only collaborative across institutional lines but also collegial. That is, participants have strong interpersonal relationships and many opportunities to talk and reflect on professional concerns and support each other. Teachers and researchers critique each other’s ideas, a process that often leads to the crafting of modified activities on the spot. For example, when one teacher decided on student-led conferences as a solution to communication problems with parents, a researcher questioned whether that practice would be harmonious with the collectivistic parents’ view of parents, not children, as the leaders of the family. It wasn’t long before that teacher was turning to small-group conferences, which made sense culturally and were tremendously successful (see Quiroz, Greenfield, & Altchech, 1999).
Beginning in January 2000, all seven teachers were interviewed in depth by Carrie Rothstein-Fisch. They were asked several questions about the ongoing meetings. Table 7 shows a sample of teachers’ responses to these questions.

**TABLE 7. Comments from core teachers about meetings**

**What are the best aspects of meetings?**

It is always nice to have your professional work and opinion valued and deemed important by other colleagues. This is one of the changes of [going] from subject to collaborator. Others listen and hear what you are doing, and that is a good thing.

The connections and the dialogue and the opportunity to share successes...I've gone to lots and lots of meetings in my professional life—often going off on tangents of negativity. But in our meetings, we share successes—lots of excitement and only a little negativity, in spite of the difficult times for the state and big changes over testing...all the anti-immigrant laws and hysteria in the media. We have touched on those things, but it is in the spirit of sharing and moving on with our business. It is different from what I have seen in other places...the meetings over a meal, friendly and community, less formal.

The sense of gaining new territory. Covering new ground with people’s new stories. I had never thought about it in that way. And moving forward...[Once] I have learned it in the meeting, and I see [it] in my practice, then it is easier for me to tell other people about it.

**What are your three most potent memories that have come from the meetings? Why do these things remain in your mind?**

Unbelievable passion of those people involved. Passion of people with regards to understand and to have the framework make a positive effect in their classes. It was very altruistic and like a haven. Power of the message itself because it gave me images and definitions; words that define how I’ve felt in my life going to school that didn’t back up my home culture and how to assimilate...Now I have a new goal: I can help them bridge their sense of adequacy in wherever they happen to be.

…the exhilaration and motivation that came across at every meeting from everyone. This is an overarching memory that continues to be very powerful...[E]veryone seems to be truly motivated. Nice to know that you as a teacher are working with other teachers who have the same mind-set about teaching and their children.

I recall the professionalism of group leaders and the comradeship of the group and the willingness to work to continue the project and the relevance the model has had on our teaching. I like being part of a group that takes this work seriously. I am proud to contribute to the group because we respect each other and have done the best that we could for the project considering we all have other important commitments. I, like other teachers in the group, continue to consider many things and have reflected on the model before saying or doing many things on my job as I relate to the staff, my students, and their parents.

There are so many. People's honesty and willingness to continue to share stories, and to actually admit changes. I remember [teacher’s name] said, “Whoa!” She made a discovery that she had been so patronizing to the parents of her children. She hadn’t known that and thought that was how she was supposed to be treating them. She didn’t realize so many things about the culture that were so different.
**What have you learned from the meetings that you have used with your own teaching or professional life at school?**

It has made me acutely conscious of my communication skills with students and families and of my teaching. How I set up the classroom—the rules, the routines and how I let the children express themselves. And through that consciousness, lots of good stuff has come out of it...Why is the student looking uncomfortable and what can I do? My first thinking is “culturally, what did I do?” Did I learn from the meetings? It gave me the allowance to do it. I am a lot stricter in the classroom than I used to be.

[I] introduced the framework to people at school who want to listen. They have to be ready to listen. The framework’s been very helpful. [Second], I continued to use it because it validated learning as a group and in circles, partner groups. [In] projects where they [students] could be independent, I allow them to choose either a partner or alone, the requirements are a little different, but they can choose. [Third,] a good lesson I’ve learned is ethnography. Taking time in learning about parents’ cultures and that it is hard to get an education in Mexico, the informal cultural chitchat, in passing and on the phone. They will feel more comfortable working with you. [Fourth,] I kinda knew, but solidified why parents bring all their children to school during conferences. Telling them to leave children at home during conferences is not very cool. I create a play area in my room with older children watching them and then the parents feel comfortable to talk. When I have my group conferences, I definitely do it. If I have a planned individual conference, I will ask some of my older children to plan to stay late. It doesn’t always work out. [Fifth,] the importance of children’s stories. [It is] Important to teaching them about what they already know.

I have learned how to better conduct my parent-teacher conferences and have implemented a parent-volunteer program where I feel parents of any educational level can feel welcomed and encouraged to participate.

...Understanding the whole lunch area...parent involvement...and how to deal with it successfully was helpful. It was especially true when I was teaching kindergarten and I had to be in the lunch area with the children and parents. There were benches outside the area for parents...they had to sit on the sides and it was very hard for the parents to sit on the sidelines while their children were struggling with their little milk containers. I was able to explain it to them in a way that they didn’t feel offended. Then they were pretty good about sitting there.

One way the *Bridging Cultures* teachers have contributed to the development of the Project is by providing feedback as to how to improve it. One of the most common suggestions voiced by the teachers has been to extend the application of the framework to more cultural groups. At the onset of the Project, the model was specifically focused on immigrant Latino families. One teacher stated:

*I will continue to say this—to continue to extend it to other cultures. Not just through discussion—to do the surveys, African American and Asian—we have helped so many Latino American students and families, but we have alienated some people (the minute they know it is Latin American).*

*I don’t want to pay attention to just one culture since I have many cultures. I don’t think our studies are complete until we look at all American cultures.*
Another teacher said that she not only wanted to understand how the framework applied to other cultural groups, but also suggested,

...recruiting other teachers with different experiences and cultural backgrounds [who] work with children that are not in bilingual classrooms.

As a result of the teachers’ feedback, educators and speakers of various backgrounds were invited to participate in the meetings so as to diversify perspectives on the framework.

Another issue that has been raised by teachers has to do with the diversity of communication styles employed by the various members of the Bridging Cultures Project. While the teachers predominantly describe the meetings as promoting openness and freedom of expression, some also acknowledge that some of the dialogue and feedback may be unconstructive. Table 8 presents some comments bearing on this issue.

**TABLE 8. Teachers’ comments about communication at meetings**

Many times when people will come in with ideas or have experiences that they would like to share, collectivism, and I am one of those people, I am reticent to share. Others are much more ready to share ... we are not as conscious about hearing from everyone. I think we should [hear] from everyone ... almost all the things that I have done have come from Marie. Some people do have ... ideas [but] not everyone is systematically heard from. They have to be given the floor [or] they won’t take it....

We must reemphasize our comfort zone rules so that everyone feels free to express him- or herself without any non-constructive feedback.

[Finding ways to ]express positive feedback and be more open to listen to each other’s experiences.

I stopped coming because either it “had to be what had to be done or get off the project.” [This]... made me uncomfortable....I wasn’t at a point where I could get into it like the other people. I felt bad about it. I knew that I didn’t have it to give at that point and it was uncomfortable for me. I couldn’t do what everyone else was going to do.

The dynamics of communication in a group where members come from such a range of institutions are almost inevitably influenced by status differences despite all best intentions. Like it or not, there is an implicit status hierarchy in education that places “pure,” university-based research at the pinnacle, applied research somewhat lower, and practice at the bottom (Pagano, 1991). Even though the premise of a collaborative action research project is that this hierarchy doesn’t make sense and that everyone’s contributions are critically important, participants may still feel the effects of such commonly accepted implicit values. A constant risk is that those with higher status will feel more comfortable asserting their knowledge and those...
with traditionally lower status (the teachers) will draw back and fail to assert their own. Even in this confident and capable group of teachers, that phenomenon occurred at times—and it is something that such collaborations, including our own, need to address consciously if all participants are to contribute as much as they might. The teacher whose comment comes last in Table 8 exhibited some trepidation at taking on the role of researcher in the group, as staff researchers were encouraging teachers to do after the first few months of the Project. This was in spite of the fact that she had already engaged in serious, insightful thought about how the framework applied to her and her practice and had begun to experiment with innovations that proved to be quite beneficial to her students.

On the whole, meetings were judged to be valuable and successful by the core teachers. As one said,

_We all have a common purpose. We all wanted it to go on, to continue._

And we have continued. It is fabulous that everyone is willing to come together to improve teaching and learning through a common understanding of that framework. Every time we come together to share our stories and progress, it strengthens the “high” or solidifies the common purpose.

As described in Appendix A, several of the meetings have been devoted to specific topics. The March 11, 2000, meeting addressed the “Implications of the Bridging Cultures Framework for African-American Students” alluded to above. It was attended by eleven people; including three of the core teachers; an African-American professor (a colleague of Carrie Rothstein-Fisch) from California State University, Northridge; an African-American educator (who formerly taught with two of the Bridging Cultures teachers); two of the staff researchers; three Northridge graduate students; and a visiting professor at Northridge from the University of New Mexico, a Latino-American. Participants prepared for the meeting by reading several articles on African-American culture by authors such as Lisa Delpit, Gloria Ladson-Billings, and Joyce King. The group explored parallels and differences between Latino- and African-American cultures. At the end of the meeting, eight participants (some had to leave early) completed an evaluation that asked how useful the meeting was, what questions remained, and what personal experience each person had had that might be elucidated by the individualism/collectivism framework.

Respondents were uniformly positive about the value of exploring the topic. All eight marked the session as 5 on a scale where 1 was “not informative” and 5 was “very informative.” Several said how important it would be to continue learning about African-American culture and applications of the framework to understanding it; some suggested expanding our professional development to include African-Americans more.

A Latina teacher wrote:

_There are so many commonalities between Senta’s [an African-American professor] experience and mine! African-Americans and Latinos have to learn very early in life that in order to be successful in this soci-
ety, we had to learn to BE individualistic...Fortunately, because of strong family support we learned to keep our cultural integrity and go back and forth between cultures. I loved learning more from Senta and Emily! They're a great addition! We need to continue with anti-racist, anti-bias education. More, more, more! Thank you so very, very, much!!!

Three other participants specifically mentioned the need to merge Bridging Cultures efforts with anti-racist education efforts or to embed racial identity development as a topic for our professional development. Two Korean-American graduate students mentioned parallels between African-American and Asian cultures or Asian and Latino cultures. One said,

*I went to the Title VII conference on 3/4/00....I brought the book on individualism and collectivism I borrowed from Carrie [draft Guide]. The Vietnamese teacher who works at our office saw the book and immediately said “day and night.” She said that she is individualism during the day and collectivism at night. I did not explain to her anything, but she automatically knew what this means just by looking at the title of the book.*

Participants agreed in discussion that Project members could benefit greatly from deepening their knowledge about African-American/Black culture. One said,

*Our guests, “new members”...gave me such a great, but only a beginning, insight into Black culture....[We need to] continue expanding our dialogue about the framework and African-American children. How do I keep up learning about all my children’s cultures so I can best teach them?*

**QUESTION 2**

**What impact has Bridging Cultures had on teachers and other in-service workshop participants?**

To address the various dimensions of the Bridging Cultures Project and its impact on the seven core teachers, who have been involved since the fall of 1996, we pose the following questions:

2a. What impact has Bridging Cultures had on core teachers’ thinking and practice?

2b. What impact has Bridging Cultures had on core teachers’ practice?

2c. How have the teachers’ professional lives and roles changed during the course of the Project?

2d. What impact has Bridging Cultures had on participants at presentations and workshops (other than the core group of teachers)?

---

\(^{8}\)Senta Green is an African American instructor of special education at California State University, Northridge, who attended a Bridging Cultures meeting with Emily Williams, also an African-American teacher, who taught with two of the Bridging Cultures teachers for several years.
Question 2a
What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on core teachers’ thinking?

Here we explore how, as a result of participation in the *Bridging Cultures* Project, teachers’ thinking about the meaning of culture for them personally and in terms of their teaching changed. We also discuss the process and outcomes of teachers’ making changes in their classrooms and in their overall practice. Several of the sources of data mentioned above were examined.

Teachers’ ways of thinking about culture and their teaching changed even during the first few months of the Project, apparently as a result of the initial workshops and meetings. These changes were evident in the ways they talked about culture, which were captured on the videotapes of the workshops and first post-workshop meeting, and in their written reflections. Here we present a few examples, but a fuller account is documented in a paper presented at the 1999 meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Maynard, 1999).

At the first workshop, a European-American kindergarten teacher commented on her frustration with trying to be culturally appropriate in her classroom:

*I wanted to understand my students better, so I started studying Mexican culture. Then I realized that the children in my class came from so many distinct regions of Mexico, Central and South America, each with differing histories and traditions, I just knew that I would never know enough. I had to give up trying.*

Later in the same session, she said:

*I do nothing cultural now because I don’t know how. I finally realized I don’t know how. So I don’t do holidays because I’ve messed them up. I mean—I used to talk about Indigenous people, and I felt that I didn’t do it right. So now I just don’t know what to do. I don’t know what to do…*

The change in her discourse by Workshop Three was pronounced:

*I know I’ve probably read things that had that title [multicultural education], and I had a really superficial understanding of what they meant. But it did not alter my way of being in the classroom—and this did. Everything I’ve ever done to about culture was about their culture, and this is exactly [the] point: I have a culture, too, and it dictates what I do. It’s not just, “Oh, well, the Latino parents do this and that because that is their culture.” I do what I do because of my culture. And this is the first time that I really had an understanding of that. And not, you know, just thinking.” Well, yes, you read to your children, and that’s a universal right idea.” No, that’s from my culture.*

Perhaps the most powerful point here is that this teacher came to recognize that her own actions and beliefs were rooted in a cultural perspective. It is not only her students who “have culture.” Her altered perspective has
translated into a different stance toward parents and an openness to different instructional strategies.

Another teacher, a Latino fourth-fifth grade teacher, spoke of how the Bridging Cultures workshops helped him think more analytically about his teaching:

> For me I think it was just being aware of the differences. You know so many times where we’re doing things in the classroom already, and suddenly it’s been given a name. And you’re like “Oh, well, I was doing that, but now it has a name.”

At another time, he said,

> What is different [since Bridging Cultures]? In some ways, it’s a matter of degree of commitment to certain ways of teaching. I have a stronger rationale for what I do, a new way of thinking about things. I do these things [like cooperative groups] more purposefully, and I am better at assessing what is working. I feel I analyze outcomes better as a result of these new ways of thinking about how the students relate and behave.

A third teacher, a European-American who teaches first grade, said of her own shifts in understanding:

> Although I had a basic connection with the culture of my students in that I majored in Spanish, and I too come from a family of immigrants, it was the Bridging Cultures focus that made me aware of where and how I was holding back and holding on to my views, even without wanting to. It was this awareness and willingness to open to another view that made last year my most successful school year academically and interpersonally (parent involvement-wise).

The four Latino teachers became conscious of the sources of conflicts they had experienced as children in the U.S. school system and reflected on the consequences of these conflicts. A third-grade teacher noted:

> ...I remember going through it [the conflict] as a child—as an immigrant child—and trying to become... to understand this system. And in my family it ended up where the school was right and the teachers were right, and their value became more important... and because of that many of my brothers just stopped communicating completely with my father, because he represented the bad, the wrong way, and that was hard.

One teacher thought that the Project had helped teachers focus on a common purpose. She described the intent of her teaching and the environment she tries to create in her classroom as one of equity:

> One common purpose is equity. If you understand the culture of the children you are working with, your practices will give them more equal access to what you are teaching. You take into account where they are coming from, because if I use [one strategy] it will be more productive than if I use [another strategy].

In short, all of the teachers acquired new ways of conceptualizing culture and how its influences are felt in the classroom. They began to use explicit language related to cultural values to describe their observations and use cultural constructs to understand their students and themselves.
Question 2b
What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on core teachers’ practice?

Changes in teachers’ practice fall into the following categories: 1) *interpersonal relationships in the classroom and classroom management*, 2) *instructional strategies*, and 3) *home-school relations*. It is important to note that these categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive. In fact, many of the practices could be assigned to more than one category with equal justification. For example, classroom management strategies may intersect with instructional strategies when they have to do with organizing students. Changes in these three areas have been documented largely through classroom observations, teacher interviews, teacher reflections, and field notes taken from discussions at regular bi-monthly meetings.

**Relationships in the Classroom and Classroom Management**

*Focus on Helping and Sharing within the Group*

The ways *Bridging Cultures* classrooms are organized tend to reflect an emphasis on group orientation. Students’ seats are typically arranged in clusters, making it easy for them to learn and work collaboratively. Materials such as writing utensils, paper, and books—often located in central areas—are considered the joint property of all students. In the following example about Lego blocks, one teacher recalls her previous approach to student use of community property in the classroom and how she has since modified it.

*There is one propeller in the Legos. I used to say, “He had it first,” and then tell them to take turns. Now I say, “You need to find a way to share it.”*

Parents, family members, and students from neighboring classes are often visible and active participants in the classroom, and it is not unusual to see students literally cheering one another’s academic achievements. Students in *Bridging Cultures* classrooms also share roles, responsibilities, and recognition. Teachers have revised many classroom management practices to be more group-oriented. For example, rather than having a single room monitor in charge of attendance, they will have a pair of monitors. One teacher has no monitors at all. All children simply take care of what needs to be done—without assignments for individual responsibilities. Another teacher says that he is now using the word “village” a lot more in the classroom. He describes how the monitors in his class actively participate in keeping the classroom organized. He goes on to say that other students are welcome to help out as well: “That’s okay, ’cause in the village you’re allowed to help.”

Another teacher now selects two or three “students of the week,” rather than isolating only one student for special recognition. Since children from collectivistic cultures may not like to be singled out for praise or attention,
sharing this type of privilege with a friend seems to make the children feel much more comfortable with the special attention they are given.

In another variation on this theme, a first-grade teacher began having "co-presidents" of the class, one male and one female, instead of one president (a rotating leadership position). Perhaps because of culture-based notions of female and male roles, boys always seemed to be chosen by the group; nevertheless, the selection process was time-consuming and frequently resulted in hurt feelings. This practice of selecting co-presidents created a more balanced distribution of power in her classroom and more harmony among students. In general, teachers report that they are letting children help more in the classroom. This helping takes the form not only of more shared jobs but of more shared learning activities (see below).

One teacher saw her classroom become an environment of “better relationships with each other, more caring, more willingness to help anybody.” She notes that as a group they were “gravitating to activities that were based on cooperative and collaborative work much more than the individual competition thing.” Teachers report that there is more of a “family” feeling in the classroom. One kindergarten teacher said, “In my classroom, I started being really conscious of the helpers—not just allowing them to help, but encouraging it. It is a much different atmosphere...I can tell by the looks on their faces.”

Isaac (1999), in a study using observations, interviews, and videotaping, compared the relations between Latino children in a “typical” U.S. second-grade classroom and the relations between Latino children in a Bridging Cultures second-grade classroom. Her videotapes illustrate how the Bridging Cultures classroom reflected more harmonious relations among students and between students and teacher than the non-Bridging Cultures classroom. It is not surprising that she found important differences in the ways teachers orchestrated relationships in the classroom and in students’ behaviors. The teacher in the non-Bridging Cultures classroom more often discouraged children from helping one another and utilized individualistic ideologies of learning which were dissonant with the children’s home culture. Moreover, the unwillingness to allow children to help each other in the non-Bridging Cultures classroom was correlated with an increased frequency of competitive behaviors between the children.

In contrast, the Bridging Cultures teacher encouraged helping and social responsibility, collectivistic values consistent with those of the students’ home culture. Bridging Cultures teachers also provided children the opportunity to work as a cohesive group by allowing five or more children at a desk. Behaviors also observed in the Bridging Cultures classroom were a less formal teacher/student and student/student communication style. The Bridging Cultures teacher allowed the children to speak out when they needed to talk to her and spoke to the children using informal language styles, thus fostering a sense of closeness among the children and between the children and her.
The examples cited above illustrate the flexibility that teachers demonstrate in terms of interpersonal and classroom management strategies. The classroom observations document that harmony permeates these “villages.” Teachers, students, and volunteers spend more time on teaching and learning and less time on resolving conflicts and managing the classroom (Isaac, 1999). Observation notes of a Bridging Cultures classroom state, “Not one disciplinary action in nearly four hours of group time!”

**Instructional Strategies**

It is difficult to draw the line between classroom management and instructional strategies.\(^9\) The same cultural values of helping and sharing—a group orientation—shape how teachers organize instruction. They encourage students to take part in collaborative problem-solving and decision-making. Many of the classroom assignments involve students working in teams where helping one another has become the norm. Observation notes of Bridging Cultures students in a computer lab session show that even when the teacher may not overtly tell students to help each other, there seems to be a natural inclination for them to do so. The observer stated that although the teacher offered her assistance by letting the students know to raise their hand if they needed help, many of the children opted to first turn to their classmates sitting next to them. One teacher explains that she encourages students to assist one another and finds that it is perhaps more effective than having a teacher help with the problem-solving initially:

> Helping is prevalent. I really encourage it now...[I]Instead of me getting up to help Fabiola, I get the students to do it... “Maybe you can explain it better.” Then they help step by step. Instead of my doing it or another teacher, they can help someone else.

**Drawing upon Students’ Lives and Ways of Knowing**

*Bridging Cultures* teachers have modified their instruction in an attempt to make it more socially meaningful for their students. They have always used techniques such as speaking Spanish to communicate or clarify aspects of the lessons as well as multi- and cross-cultural resources and materials. A dominant theme now found throughout their classrooms is the notion of family and of relating students’ learning to their lives within their families. An underlying premise of the instructional strategies highlighted here is that they build upon many of the interpersonal and classroom management practices described in the previous section. These approaches have enabled teachers to relate to their students and, in turn, enabled students to relate to schooling. By tapping into the collectivistic value orientation of many of their Latino students, teachers say they have found an improvement in academic performance.

*Bridging Cultures* teachers say that they are using experiences from students’ lives more in their teaching. During a discussion of potential con-

\(^9\)Many strategies discussed here are explained in Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, & Hasan, 2000.
licts between students’ discourse styles and the expected discourse styles of the classroom, one teacher talked about how she uses children’s personal stories to bridge to curriculum content and classroom discourse. Another teacher chimed in, “That’s my life [in the classroom].” The second teacher went on to explain how if the students are learning about the ecology of the desert, she starts with their own experiences in the desert (a realistic starting point for children in Southern California). She wouldn’t think of beginning with a text or formal lesson and waiting to get to their stories as an afterthought.

In another example, a fourth-fifth grade teacher explained how she applies the individualism-collectivism framework by describing the experience of her class as they prepared to take a field trip to the Ballona Wetlands near Los Angeles. A docent came to her classroom and asked a series of factual questions about plants and animals, but the students responded with stories based on family experiences rather than “scientific discourse.” The docent asked the children to “stop telling stories.” The children immediately stopped responding. As a naturalist, he was making a familiar assumption about what counts as relevant scientific knowledge. However, the Bridging Cultures teacher did not make this assumption because she understood that children from collectivistic value systems relate objects and living things to their social meaning. This does not mean that the children could not learn to talk about plants and animals in “accepted” scientific ways. They naturally put their knowledge of plants and animals into a (socially) meaningful context (Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Trumbull, 1999; Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, & Hasan, 2000).

The teacher recognized that these stories would be the source of the implicit “scientific” information that her students, children of Latino immigrants, brought to school. When she followed up on the docent’s presentation, she encouraged the children to write and tell their stories about flora and fauna. From the stories, she helped students extract the “scientific” knowledge and frame it in “scientific” language. Table 9 shows a T-chart with examples from the children’s stories on the left. On the right are state-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Experience</th>
<th>Scientific Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carolina’s Story</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hummingbird</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I was playing in the garden with my grandmother. I saw a hummingbird near the cherry tree. It was really pretty.</em></td>
<td><em>Brownish with bright iridescent green and red coloring around head and neck</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The bird stood in the air. I tried to go close to the little bird, but it kept darting away.</em></td>
<td><em>Wings beat rapidly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bird can hover and fly in any direction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Has to eat frequently because of using so much energy in its movements (high metabolism).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ments in “scientific” language created in a process of questioning, elaboration, and modeling by the teacher. The children had much of the knowledge; what they needed to learn was how to frame it in a way demanded by the classroom. Of course, this entailed learning some new vocabulary and concepts, but because she elicited what children already knew, the teacher was able to target the instruction appropriately—and keep her class engaged.

“Family” as a Focus

One teacher recalls,

*I tried to listen to everybody and not discourage them from relating family experiences as they relate to the concepts being taught. I started to teach time this week and one of the kindergarteners raised her hand and said, “We bought a clock for my grandmother’s room and her name is Magdalena,” and then she became much more interested in the clock and everything since she could say her grandmother’s name with pride.*

It is easy to see how accepting students’ cultural values/ways of thinking leads to a better classroom climate, something that leads to greater student participation.

Teachers also acknowledge the validity of using family as a topic in reading and writing activities. They have found that students will write more when given a topic that connects with family experience than when assigned one that does not. One teacher gets students to focus on family and personal experience and encourages them to think about their roles in their family, how holidays are spent, and other family-oriented topics. A third-grade teacher observed that on a districtwide writing assessment students wrote little in response to the prompt, “What is it like to be a good friend?” In contrast, they tended to write lengthy responses to the prompt, “Write about a family vacation or unforgettable experience you have had with your family” (Trumbull, Diaz-Meza, & Hasan, 2000).

Another innovative strategy has been to create classroom and homework assignments in which students are able to involve family and community members directly. One teacher has students write letters home to parents and family to announce upcoming events. She explains,

*Instead of me writing the parents a note about a celebration of songs and poetry, we work on it together. And the children write the letters to the parents, and they sign it. So it works because it is meaningful. Now the children know that writing is an important medium for inviting people together…there is power in their words when they write the invitation… They use it to bring the families in, and then the families come in and see the results of this work.*

In another example, students wrote a book about the dangers of drugs and then drew up a list with the names of people to whom they would read their books. The teacher recalls,
They came back with so many signatures. They read it to father, sister, cousins, neighbors, anyone. They kept reading and more people signed … The more signatures they got, the more practice they got reading.

Another teacher summarizes the significance of getting students to do academically related tasks with their families as part of the curriculum:

I feel when I send home family homework, when my children’s task is to read to younger siblings, measure ingredients as their parents cook or some other family involvement, I am valuing the role the child has as part of the family.

**Capitalizing on Students’ Peer Orientation and Sense of Group**

As mentioned previously, many of the instructional practices described by the teachers contain a collaborative element. Using a variety of approaches, students work with their peers as they participate in classroom activities and assignments. Some of the activities involve the entire class gathering for a class circle, participating in a bilingual show-and-tell, or creating and reading class books. In some instances, students gather in small groups or pairs to help each other with vocabulary and homework assignments, as well as oral English proficiency. Whether the students are working collaboratively in large or small groups, the underlying objective is that they gain confidence in their ability to help each other and to recognize the power in co-tutoring.

A third-grade teacher had students at three levels of reading proficiency at the beginning of one school year (first-, second-, and third-grade levels). She used classroom plays as a way to capitalize on her students’ group orientation and boost their reading and oral language skills. Students chose to work together across reading levels to put on plays. The teacher prepared scripts for all of the children. Then they were cast in roles and learned their parts. When they were ready to perform for other classrooms, no one knew who was at first-grade or third-grade reading level. According to the teacher,

The experience empowered the second-grade group to move forward. They moved to third-grade level. Now students are sharing the third-grade books because we don’t have enough to go around. But they don’t mind!

All *Bridging Cultures* teachers use some form of “process writing” instruction, according to which students go through steps of brainstorming, drafting pieces of writing, and engaging in peer review and editing. Says a fifth-grade teacher,

I go one step further. Many students aren’t “there” for writing in English, so teams are writing stories together (Godzilla stories are popular now). Students can choose to write individually and illustrate and type together. For assessment, I have them alternate so I can see individual performance...They do not always write in a group. I have done scripted poetry, journal writing, and other individual writing.
Supporting Bicultural Competence

It is important to acknowledge at this point that although the Bridging Cultures classrooms represent a strong collectivistic orientation, teachers are acutely aware that they need to prepare their students to survive and thrive in more individualistic settings or succeed on particular individualistic tasks such as tests. Teachers teach much more collectivistically than individualistically, but they do not see collectivism as “all good” and individualism as “all bad.” One teacher commented in one of the meetings,

I think it’s…fair to…respect the collectivism, if that’s the background of the child but also to expose them…without negating..without saying to them, “No, you can’t work on this within a group. You have to do it alone. Work on it by yourself.” I think you should allow them to experiment and still expose them to independence. “If you wanna do it by yourself, go ahead.” We have a right to not negate their culture but also not to negate the American culture that their parents want them exposed to as well. So neither should be negated. Both should be accepted and explored.

In California, where bilingual services to students who are still learning English have been reduced, these culturally appropriate ways to involve students are all the more important. One teacher says,

The issue of how to engage students now that we can’t use their first language is even more pressing. The writing prompts, the literature selections, the core books we select show families and cultural experiences familiar to the children. Amelia Bedelia10 just doesn’t cut it!

Home-School Relations

One of the first areas of change for Bridging Cultures teachers—simultaneous with or shortly after classroom organization—was that of home-school relations. Because of their new perceptions of parents and their cultures, relationships started to change almost immediately. Exposure to the individualism/collectivism framework has enhanced the teachers’ understanding of Latino families and how their value system may differ in regard to their orientation towards schooling. At least as important, it has made them more aware of their own cultural values and of the values implicit in schooling. For some teachers, this increased awareness has meant moving away from regarding parents as ignorant and in need of education by the school. In others, it has meant an openness to more involvement with families and more social and personal interactions. Several teachers report that they have consciously begun to talk with parents in explicit terms about home values versus school values and how potential conflicts can be addressed.

Communication with Parents

At the most basic level, the core teachers have made changes in their communication efforts with parents. The teachers report that they now

---

initiate more frequent communication with parents, with the object of strengthening the bond between home and school. Some teachers cultivate every possible opportunity for informal conversation with parents during “bus time,” when parents are picking up and dropping off children. It may be that only a few words are exchanged, but over time it gradually leads to getting to know all of the students’ parents who come to the school. One of the teachers discussed making more phone calls and sending notes home simply to stay connected to parents and family. In the following quotation, this teacher describes her new tactic of also calling to communicate the positive aspects of a child’s academic progress:

> Before I only made phone calls when it was a problem … Now I call to congratulate them when their student gets student of the month; that the child is really improving; when they do something wonderful; as well as when there is a problem. But I make a lot more positive phone calls now…It is all that importance of family.

It is evident from the quotation above that this teacher has changed her objective from simply transmitting information and reporting problems to seeking ways to build trusting relationships with parents.

In addition to impromptu and informal strategies for increasing communication with parents, one teacher instituted a practice called “First Wednesdays” with the support of a team-teaching partner. They held meetings on the first Wednesday of every month right after school and then again at 5:30 for the purpose of sharing with parents. They dealt with information ranging from routine announcements to review of upcoming curricular units. At first, only a few parents showed up, but over the course of several months, the teachers had seen most of the parents at at least one meeting. Says the teacher,

> My Open House and parent-teacher conferences are attended by all of the parents. I think this has a great deal to do with the monthly meetings. While I’ve always wanted to hold these meetings, I don’t think I’d have seen the full value in them had it not been for the Bridging Cultures Project.

Creating Personal Bonds

In cases where parents were unable to visit the school due to transportation, childcare, and/or work schedule barriers, Bridging Cultures teachers have made home visits. One teacher’s willingness to visit a student’s home and community is based on his belief that schools should make more accommodations to bring the two together. In his case, he had many students bused in from another section of the city. To accommodate their parents, he arranged to spend a day in a school in their area and meet with them.

Some parents eagerly accept a teacher’s suggestion for a home visit, while others may thank the teacher for offering and state their preference for a phone conversation. One of the teachers, who is a Latina immigrant herself, explains the potentially sensitive nature of requesting or suggesting a home visit due perhaps to a student’s or family’s discomfort with a “school
official’s” becoming aware of household or economic conditions. The teacher reflects upon her own experience as a child as she says,

I know that, because I would have died to have a teacher come to my home.

The strides that teachers have taken in efforts to establish bonds with students and their families have also included becoming participants in social events and activities in the home and community. A first-grade teacher, who in the past tended to refuse invitations to social events—children’s birthday parties or other family occasions—has taken a new tack with parents. Now she finds herself accepting such invitations and reports a marked change in her relationships with families. During the 1997-98 school year, she began a reading program with her students that required parental participation, and her increased understanding of the meaning of interacting with families (and not just focusing on students as individuals) allowed her to engage the parents in the program.

It was the Bridging Cultures focus that made me aware of where and how I was holding back and holding on to my views, even without wanting to. It was this awareness and willingness to open to another view that made last year my most successful school year academically and interpersonally (parent involvement-wise).

This teacher’s Spanish-language students scored far above average on overall reading (in Spanish) at the end of that year, much higher than the English-speaking children in the other first grades. She attributes this success to the home-school collaboration she forged.

Group Parent-Teacher Conferences

One practice used by several of the core teachers that has proven to be particularly successful is conducting parent-teacher conferences in groups. The group setting provides parents and family members the opportunity to get to know other families. Some of the parents had perhaps seen each other for years in their children’s school and yet had never progressed beyond a wave or “hello.” The following account is one teacher’s written description of her experimentation with group parent conferences:

I scheduled three group conferences on the “Pupil Free Day,” two Spanish-speaking groups and one English-speaking group. I arranged the Spanish language groups when my paraprofessional aide could attend and assist in translation... The parents sat in a circle with me and the children (including many siblings of the children in the class). The children presented their parents (mostly mothers) with a folder that contained test scores, report card, a parent tips list, and a booklet designed to help parents interpret test scores. I explained a simple way of understanding how the children’s test results showed which academic areas were strong and which needed improvement...Parents seemed very pleased with the new approach to conferencing. A friendly, comfortable, and warm feeling came across during the conferencing. Many parents had questions that benefited the other parents. Parents’ conferencing together lent a source of mutual support, like family members all supporting each other. This familial atmosphere aligns with a collectivistic model. I found the group
conferencing to be relaxing for the parents. It was a less threatening environment than the individual conferencing style, with support and company lent by the other parents. This format elicited a group voice from the parents rather than an individual voice. It also represented a shift in the balance of power.

(See Quiroz, Greenfield, & Altchech, 1998, for an extended explanation of this process.)

Individual conferences were still conducted if either the parents or teacher wished to communicate about specific questions or concerns. However, when these individual meetings took place, they tended to be more productive from the teacher’s perspective than they had been in the past because the necessary background information had already been provided in an atmosphere of shared power. In fact, only three such conferences had to be scheduled. The teacher is able to analyze why this conference format was so successful by referring to the individualism/collectivism framework.

(Note: Not all teachers have found that group conferences work for them and the parents of their students. It is evident that more than one option needs to be available to parents.)

Student-Led Conferences

One approach to parent-teacher conferences that the core teachers vehemently oppose is the notion of student-led conferences. In the context of building rapport with Latino and other immigrant families, teachers must take into consideration the cultural connotations of imposing this role upon students. Through their exposure to the concepts of individualism and collectivism, the core teachers reached a consensus that such an approach has the potential to add stress to the parent-teacher conference because it runs counter to collectivistic values by putting the child in a higher status category than the parents or teacher. As one teacher stated,

*I don’t have student-led conferences and now I know why they don’t work. It makes the parent AND the student very uncomfortable. I feel strongly [about] establish[ing] a comfort zone especially in conferences.*

Parents as Volunteers

The *Bridging Cultures* teachers have also fostered parent involvement in the form of encouraging and organizing parents and family members to volunteer in their classrooms as well as within the school community. Parents and other family members such as grandparents visit the classroom to participate in celebrations by sharing stories, poems, and songs. One teacher discussed how an invitation to a student’s father to do a presentation about his work experience turned out to be surprisingly engaging and interactive. She describes his presentation as follows:

*I had one father come and do a presentation about his work. He owns a used car lot. He brought prizes and asked questions. It was amazing! I just asked him to tell his story—how he came, and how he progressed. He had never done it before and he loved it!*
It is evident from the teacher’s account that the experience was satisfying not only for her and her students but for the parent as well.

In one teacher’s K–1-2 class, volunteers of two generations (parents and grandparents) come and go fluidly throughout any given day. They take many different roles, whether it be helping students move from one activity to another seamlessly, supporting an individual child who has an emotional problem, or helping students with story writing. Some parents are taking the role of “student.” They sit in on literacy lessons and learn reading and writing skills right along with their children. They are also learning how their children are taught and what the performance expectations are. In this way, they increase their own literacy and can help their children with homework more effectively if they choose. It is likely that their comfort with trying out a teaching role is enhanced by the encouragement and support the teacher offers them and the fact that it is not demanded of them (see Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2001).

The data show that parents are fulfilling a mentoring role not only for the students in the class, but also for each another. In one teacher’s class the parent volunteers supported one another’s development. The teacher observed that,

*The parents of the first graders bonded with each other...the older parents now help the newer parents.*

This example illustrates the collectivistic value of helping as it occurs among students and among their parents and family members as they carry out leadership roles in the classroom. By helping one another, the adults are simultaneously modeling behaviors familiar to the students. Through their presence in their children’s classrooms, parents and family members are playing an instrumental role in the academic and social development of the students.

A key to parent involvement is flexibility—in the ways parents may participate, in who may come to the classroom (including small children), in scheduling, and in how the teacher communicates with the parents.
Question 2c
How have the core teachers’ professional lives and roles changed during the course of the Project?

Teachers have expanded their roles as professional developers, presenters, and writers over the course of the Project. As the meetings progressed, the teachers began to shift their role as subjects to those of collaborating school-based researchers and professional developers. In these new roles, they have contributed to the *Bridging Cultures* Project in several ways. First, they have continued to test the validity and usefulness of the theoretical framework, as they attempt to apply it to daily life in their schools and classrooms (acting as applied researchers). In the process, they have developed and documented numerous innovations that bridge cultures for their students—innovations that have gone directly into user-friendly publications as examples for the field. All teachers have directly or indirectly contributed to these publications (acting as writers). Finally, teachers have actively participated in planning and carrying out dissemination of the project. They have co-designed workshops and conference presentations and have developed presentation materials and hand-outs (acting as professional developers). As professional developers, teachers have been pivotal to the process of deciding on the most productive routes of dissemination within the Los Angeles Unified School District, a particularly important “market” because of its size, numbers of new and inexperienced teachers, and large immigrant Latino student population.

Teachers as Researchers

By the spring of 1997, the *Bridging Cultures* teachers began to move from being students and subjects in a research project to being researchers themselves on what has truly been a collaborative action research project. We have characterized the two components of teacher research as *inquiry* and *reflection* (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2001). Staff researchers have supported teachers in their research both through scaffolding discussions to frame questions and examine evidence and through introducing research tools. One tool of inquiry introduced to teachers is “ethnography,” which entails consciously talking with parents (and sometimes students and other community members) about their cultural background and family history. For some teachers, this meant extending the efforts they were already engaged in; for others, it gave permission to develop closer relationships with families than they had felt comfortable with previously. A first-grade teacher observed,

> As a result of Bridging Cultures, I’ve found myself making a conscious effort to be more friendly with parents by writing more letters and thank-you notes home, letting them know I wanted to learn more from them.

Another teacher, speaking of how she used ethnography as a step in the process of increasing parent involvement in her classroom, said:

> Both the parents and I had difficulty approaching each other for help. Most parents had little formal education and probably did not know how
they could actually assist in the classroom; only a few had attended junior high or high school. I had to conduct my own informal ethnographic research about my families and began to build relationships with parents in the process. Through simple conversations I had with some of them after school, I became aware of how much formal schooling they had. This gave me a good idea as to who could help my students to practice reading skills and who would rather assist putting materials together in the classroom or at home. As I became more familiar with my parents, I built a bridge between school culture, their culture, as well as my own. I started getting a better response regarding my call for volunteers.

Teachers also documented their observations about their own cultures and school culture and how all of these cultures intersected in the classroom. They jotted down notes in personal journals that were used to jog memory for discussions later in the group meetings. At times inquiry took the form of reading articles or book chapters and learning from “cultural informants” from other cultural backgrounds, as when the group explored implications of the framework for Korean-American and African-American students and families.

Reflection was most often oral, but sometimes teachers engaged in “quick writes” at meetings, responding to a question posed by someone in the group. Reflecting in a group or with another teacher seems to bring insights to consciousness that may otherwise lie below the surface for some time. Prior to a meeting in early 1999, the staff researchers asked the teachers to think about whether Bridging Cultures had affected their language arts instruction and, if so, how. In the course of group reflection at a Bridging Cultures meeting, the third-grade teacher realized that she could conduct a short experiment in her classroom that might demonstrate the importance of “topic” to students’ motivation to write. She had already observed that her students produced much more writing when asked to write about “a family experience” than about “friendship.” The latter had been one of the topics for the districtwide writing assessment and hadn’t elicited much extended writing. She knew that anything about family—as the content of rug discussions, the topic of library books, or the subject of research projects—drew great interest from her students. But she realized that a more controlled experiment, with the wording of prompts parallel except for the actual topic, would be more persuasive in the district than her own less formal observations. “I don’t know why I didn’t think of doing this before!” she exclaimed.

What this teacher did was a portion of the experiment. She simulated the conditions of the districtwide assessment by designing a writing prompt that paralleled the structure of the original prompt and administering it in the same time block, without opportunities for editing or discussion. The original prompt said, “Write about a friend you have and what friendship means to you. Be sure to include who, what, where, when, why, and how.” The new prompt said, “Write about an experience you had with your family. Be sure to include who, what, where, when, why, and how.” She then shared the essays at a faculty meeting, where everyone agreed that the
length and quality of the essays on family were much greater than those on “friendship.” Now the district is using the “family” prompt instead. Here, reflection led to further inquiry, which in turn led to a positive change in school policy. Dinkelman (1997) has described collaborative action research as including a “spiraling, recursive series of at least these four steps—plan, act, observe, and reflect” (p. 251). In this case, the order seems to have been observe, reflect, plan, and act.

The innovation of group conferences, described earlier, was also a result of the inquiry and reflection process. In fact, frustrated with individual teacher-led conferences, the fourth-grade teacher had begun to experiment with student-led conferences. It was through discussion and reflection in the Bridging Cultures group that she came to realize that such conferences might not be culturally harmonious for parents who would expect the teacher as an authority in the classroom to take leadership. Subsequently, the teacher began experimenting with small-group conferences, which were noticeably more successful.

**Teachers as Writers**

Before the Bridging Cultures Project, only one teacher had previously been published. In addition to disseminating the Bridging Cultures Project at conferences and in schools, all of the teachers have either contributed to publications or collaborated as co-authors. In the development of Bridging Cultures Between Home and School: A Guide for Teachers (Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2001), the teachers contributed extended examples of how they used the framework of individualism-collectivism to inform their work with parents. One of the teachers has collaborated with two core researchers to write two articles on the group conference concept and her experiences with it. One article appeared in the UCLA publication, Connections, in the Winter 1998 issue and the other in the April 1999 issue of Educational Leadership. Two other teachers co-authored a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in Seattle in April 2001 (Rothstein-Fisch, Trumbull, Isaac, Pérez, & Daley, 2001).

A number of the Bridging Cultures teachers have expressed an interest in writing. One teacher, who had to write extensively in the process of getting certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards notes,

*Bridging Cultures added a lot to the writing of the National Board’s process. The National Board is a very good assessment point—it is what makes an accomplished teacher. Not only is it about subject matter such as math...it is writing, community building, it’s professional development. It is community involvement. In this area you have to demonstrate how you have made an impact in the community. I really think Bridging Cultures plays a role in that because I am aware of what is needed in order to bridge school and community.*
This teacher is now interested in writing about the same topics for other publications.

One of the coauthors of the 2001 AERA paper has also experienced considerable professional growth as a writer. Prior to her involvement in the Bridging Cultures Project, she had written a chapter for a book on critical pedagogy (Pérez, 1995). Then early in 2000, she published a children’s book titled My Very Own Room (Mi propio cuartito) about her experiences growing up in a Mexican-American family in California. The book, which was published by Children’s Book Press in San Francisco, received an award from Parent’s Guide to Children’s Media on October 25, 2000, for its outstanding achievement in children’s literature. Recently, this teacher has begun working on a second book with the same publisher that will also be based on family-oriented situations. She notes that the publisher is especially interested in her underlying theme of collectivism and that “that is the idea that really sold them on my first book. That’s what really interested them.”

Teachers as Professional Developers

Dissemination of the Bridging Cultures Project was a priority for the teacher-researchers as well as the staff researchers. As the teachers continued to find more applications of the framework, they were eager to help others understand how cultural value systems can influence approaches to learning. The meetings have provided continuing support to the teachers’ growth as a professional development cadre. In fact, meetings have been used as an opportunity to practice presentations, something that all members (including staff researchers) have found helpful.

Since 1997, six of the seven teachers have participated in at least 40 of the more than 100 Bridging Cultures presentations (see Appendix C). The range of participation is great: four have presented many times; one has made two formal presentations outside her school and several within it; one has presented once; one has not presented. When core teachers have not been presenters, they have often contributed to planning presentations. All of the teachers have shared information about the Bridging Cultures framework formally or informally with fellow staff at their elementary schools. For example, several have described the spread and popularity of parent group-conferencing at their schools as a result of their having introduced the notion to other teachers. The two teachers who are least comfortable presenting have, nonetheless, contributed to the design of workshops and materials: one has been an active audience member at certain presentations, and the other has done a small-group presentation in her school.

In addition to presentations at local schools, the teachers have also been guest lecturers and presenters at surrounding colleges and universities, such as Oxnard Community College, California State University at Channel Islands, California State University at Long Beach, California State
University at Dominguez Hills, University of California, Los Angeles, and the University of Southern California. They have been invited to lecture in courses ranging in discipline from Education to Chicano Studies and Religious Studies. Outside of the southern California region, the teachers have been involved in a number of statewide conferences sponsored by organizations such as the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), the California Elementary Education Association, the California Association for the Education of Young Children, and the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative (BASRC). In addition, four of the teachers participated in a panel presentation at the *Bridging Cultures* Dissemination Round Table, a statewide event sponsored by WestEd that brought together professional developers and teacher education professionals.

Outside California, the teachers have presented at national conferences sponsored by organizations such as the National Institute for Dispute Resolution, the National Association for Multicultural Education, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. One teacher recently presented at an international conference sponsored by the National Council for Teachers of English at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands. Audience comments from presentations have supported and extended the teachers’ high-level enthusiasm for the capacity of the framework to inform educational decision-making.

It is important to note that four of the seven core teachers had experience conducting professional development prior to the *Bridging Cultures* Project. These particular teachers have played a role in teacher education efforts within their districts and in collaboration with local universities. For example, in her position as Language Specialist, one of the teachers did staff development and training with educators in school districts throughout her county early on in her teaching career. Two of the teachers have had long-term relationships with institutions such as the University of California, Los Angeles, and California State University at Dominguez Hills, where they have been called on as facilitators in projects such as the California History and Social Science Project. Another taught English as a Second Language Methods at California Lutheran University for five years.

Despite their “seasoned” backgrounds, all four teachers who were already experienced presenters insist that the *Bridging Cultures* Project has enhanced their abilities as professional developers. One of the teachers says that the framework has enabled him to understand his feelings of discomfort when in front of large groups of people as being due to his collectivistic orientation. The teachers also attribute their personal and professional growth to the sense of belonging to a team and the consistent opportunities to dialogue with others in the Project. The following quote summarizes this sentiment:

> While I was a teacher educator before, I’d never been what I’d call a “presenter” of any kind prior to Bridging Cultures...Bridging Cultures has definitely had a positive effect on me as a presenter. I feel honored that I’ve been given these opportunities and am always excited about being
Currently, two of these four teachers teach in the District Intern program of the Los Angeles Unified School District, one in Social Science and the other in Language Arts. This program is sponsored by the District and prepares intern teachers for certification. In addition, four teachers are mentor teachers in their schools.\textsuperscript{11} This means that they have strong leadership roles and opportunities to bring new ideas into existing professional development and norms of practice. Today they are finding ways to integrate key \textit{Bridging Cultures} concepts and resources into their professional development with new teachers.

The teacher whose account of group parent conferences was quoted earlier developed a workshop on the topic for the entire staff at her school. The K–1-2 teacher designed her own parent conference workshop that draws upon \textit{Bridging Cultures} principles and \textit{Bridging Cultures} teachers’ practices. She has also developed a parent workshop on participating in parent-teacher conferences and training for parents on how to volunteer in the school. The first-grade teacher, who describes herself as very shy about presenting, gave a workshop on how to use \textit{Bridging Cultures} perspectives to improve reading performance through the Reading Recovery program she and her colleagues are using.

The teacher who has been most overtly influenced by critical pedagogy continues to explore the links between \textit{Bridging Cultures} and that philosophical approach. In workshops using poetry to promote student empowerment, she has brought to bear \textit{Bridging Cultures} concepts related to cultural differences in ways of expressing oneself and interacting with others. In August 2000, she presented at an international conference in the Netherlands (mentioned previously), where she integrated critical theory with \textit{Bridging Cultures} concepts. She says,

\begin{quote}
The work with Bridging Cultures has enabled me to “put it all together.” Now my presentations are much more powerful, focused, and reflect a much deeper understanding of inherent cultural differences. The “aha” that I experienced when I learned the framework is like none ever before. I am at my synergy stage of my professional development (my “praxis”) where the theory informs my practice and my daily work with children and adults clarifies the theory… I have presented more and in many more different settings within this state and in other states since Bridging Cultures.
\end{quote}

In short, six of the seven teachers have found endless ways to incorporate what they have learned in the \textit{Bridging Cultures} Project into the professional development opportunities with which they are involved, a fact that supports our belief in the generativity of the individualism/collectivism framework.

\textsuperscript{11} See Trumbull, E., Greenfield, P.M., Rothstein-Fisch, C., & Maynard, A. (under review). \textit{Forging new discourses in schools.}
Question 2d
What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on participants at presentations and workshops (other than the core group of teachers)?

As mentioned, the *Bridging Cultures* team (core teachers and staff researchers) have made at least 100 presentations to groups of educators at conferences, in school districts, through college courses, and in their own schools since the summer of 1997 (see the section on dissemination for a full account of these presentations and Appendix C for a full listing). Evaluation data have been collected from participants at the majority of these events. While this question addresses the impact of dissemination, we chose to put it here because it has to do with effects on teachers.

Evaluation of Presentations and Workshops

The majority of the *Bridging Cultures* workshops and presentations have been evaluated by their participants. In Table 10, we show the average scores (based on a scale of 1-5, with 1 representing poor and 5 representing excellent) awarded by participants in response to the prompt, “Please give an overall rating of the workshop/presentation.” The presentations were selected for the table on the basis that they represent a range in terms of a) geographic scope (national, state, county, local), b) target audience (early childhood teachers, teacher educators, bilingual teachers, multicultural educators, school counselors, and undergraduate and graduate students), and c) size of audience. In addition, nearly all *Bridging Cultures* team members are represented here, i.e., five of the teachers participated in one or more of these ten presentations and all four staff researchers presented at one or more of them. The mean score for this “overall” category is 4.52, in line with the general trend of all evaluation data of this type we have. We do not have as much evaluation data as we would like for another audience: researchers. We have reached them largely through presentations at the American Educational Research Association, the Society for Research on Child Development, and the Jean Piaget Society. We do have personal observations about the responses of these audiences during discussions or question periods that show a strong interest in both the theoretical framework and the applied, longitudinal action research.

Evaluations for the *Bridging Cultures* workshops have also included open-ended questions. Participants have been asked to state 1) The most useful ideas/insights for them that have been presented, 2) How the Project may be applied to their own work, and 3) Suggestions for the Project and/or for future presentations of the Project. What follows is a sample of participants’ thoughts on the three areas mentioned above. Data was summarized from the above-mentioned presentations and workshops, as well as a number of other presentations.

For many of the participants, the presentations brought new ideas and perspectives. For some participants, the ideas presented merely reinforced the importance of what they had already known. Many participants claimed
## TABLE 10. Sample of Bridging Cultures presentations and their overall ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshops/Presentations</th>
<th>Number Attendees</th>
<th>Evaluations Returned</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Conference Bal Harbour, FL, 1998</td>
<td>150 70</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Early childhood educators, teacher educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Annual CREnet Conference, National Institute for Dispute Resolution Irving, TX, 1997</td>
<td>44 35</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Counselors, multicultural educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) Conference St. Louis, 1998</td>
<td>24 17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Teachers, directors of multicultural education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Association of Bilingual Education (CABE) Los Angeles, CA 1999</td>
<td>25 15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Students, pre-service educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County Head Start Ventura, CA, 2000</td>
<td>73 56 22</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Pre-school teachers, administrators (3 sessions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern CA Kindergarten Conference Burbank, CA, 1998</td>
<td>27 26</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Primary grade teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area School Reform(BASRC) Collaborative Conference Oakland, CA, 1999</td>
<td>27 7 23 4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Educational researchers, teachers, administrators (2 sessions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard College Oxnard, CA, 1999</td>
<td>15 13</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge, at Channel Islands 1999</td>
<td>68 68</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Students seeking credential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California School of Education Los Angeles, CA, 1999</td>
<td>17 17</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Graduate students in Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the presentation would cause them to have a “heightened awareness” of cultural issues in their everyday work. A large number of participants expressed an interest in trying new techniques such as group parent conferences and in finding ways to apply the individualism/collectivism framework to their daily work with students. Table 11 presents some typical comments taken from several presentations.

**TABLE 11. Responses of presentation participants to “What stands out from the presentation?”**

Knowing the characteristics of the individualistic and collective approaches of the white-American and minority cultures.

The value of the ethnographic approach—looking carefully at critical incidents, describing as many details as possible, probing beneath the surface to find solutions.

How family and community tie together to form a whole individual.

I liked your idea of group conferences, this can help a shy parent to voice his/her concern.

I never thought of a group conference and I think it’s a great idea and am eager to try it.

Reinforcing the idea that cultural differences are just as important as learning style differences in developing classroom activities.

That collectivism and individualism would naturally result in conflicts which could be used to build stronger understandings.

First time I have heard a clear explanation for things and incidents that didn’t feel right.

I like the idea of preventing conflict by increasing awareness and understanding of deep, core cultural values...I want to find out more.

This is one of the only (if not the only) presentation I’ve attended that *directly* addresses helping the student transition back and forth from home to school...considering collectivistic group-oriented values, etc. Very helpful framework.

Most presentations were made in the mainland United States or Canada, but one took place in Kauai, Hawaii, at the annual Pacific Education Conference (PEC), which is attended by more than a thousand educators from U.S. entities in the Pacific. Teachers and administrators from such places as Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and American Samoa come together to share ideas about culturally appropriate pedagogy in their settings. The societies represented are much more collectivistic historically than the U.S. education system that has been implanted since U.S. involvement beginning during World War II. Here are a few comments from
PEC participants at the 1998 conference about the most important thing they got from the workshop (Table 12).

**TABLE 12. Comments of PEC participants at 1998 conference**

This workshop is very important in a sense that we might apply some of the things we learn from the workshop. The Western culture really denunciates[s] the culture of the islands Pacific. [In] most schools in the Pacific the parents don’t know what’s going on in school. They said that school takes care of their own problem. I do believe that this workshop and the handouts and the book will really help us in our communication regarding this topic.

The discussion on individualism and collectivism go[es] beyond the classroom and into society as society wrestles with these same issues. For students it’s shaded by the biases of the teacher.

Involvement [of] all persons (parents, teachers, students and community) helps. Interaction is important to understand one another.

I’ll continue to reflect on the dichotomy that exists in the school[:] western and family values.

First of all thank you for sharing your experience. We are all faced w/similar situations. It is very important to have open communication.

---

**How Presentation Participants Expect to Use Bridging Cultures in Their Work**

A number of the participants expressed the intention of informing their peers and co-workers about the project and framework. Teachers wanted to tell other teachers; and administrators wanted to apply the information to their work with other administrators, teachers, students, and parents. Table 13 (next page) shows a typical set of comments in response to a question like “How do you expect to use what you have learned in your work?”

These comments are representative of those participants at presentations made across a large range of settings. They show varying degrees of awareness but considerable openness to these new ideas and a desire to explore how they might be applied. The general impression of all of the team members who have presented (now including some graduate students) is that most teachers and those involved in providing services to families from non-dominant communities are eager to learn about strategies for reaching those families more successfully. Of course, most audiences have attended

---

12 In a separate project involving WestEd staff (Sharon Nelson-Barber, Elise Trumbull, Richard Wenn), the Bridging Cultures framework and teacher examples provided context for a collaborative project with teachers on aligning local values with instructional practice, documented in Nelson-Barber, S., Trumbull, E., & Wenn, R. (2000), *The coconut wireless project: Sharing culturally responsive pedagogy through the World Wide Web*. Honolulu: Pacific Resources for Education and Learning.
the presentations voluntarily and are not necessarily representative of our educators.

### TABLE 13. Responses of participants regarding applicability of *Bridging Cultures* to their work

| Response                                                                                                                                  |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Love the group conferences and the children’s stories with their families. I’ll probably try both of them.                               |
| I will try to engage parents more and bridge the difference between school and family cultures.                                          |
| We are working to build an in-service training workshop through safe and drug-free schools for teachers and administrators. With our huge population growth and great diversity, this learning and training is crucial. This will deepen work already in our school. As a reform coordinator, I would like to repeat some of what you did today with the staff. |
| Will share with other staff...Include in proposal for school ELL plan.                                                                       |
| I will meet with the high school ESL teacher to discuss your findings. I will apply the findings to any work I do with parents and students. |
| In working with teachers/school leaders to define best practices and to develop useful assessments to guide teaching and program development, I will ask questions that might draw colleagues’ attentions to the way that culture affects student performance. |

### Suggestions for Improving Presentations

Many of the evaluations included comments about wanting more examples and tools to use in their classrooms. A great majority of the evaluations indicated the need for more handouts and more visuals, with a video being the most requested. Some participants wanted information on how to apply *Bridging Cultures* to other populations—older children and/or other racial or ethnic populations. Table 14 (next page) offers a sampling of such comments.

According to the reports of *Bridging Cultures* team members, all audiences, from teachers to administrators and researchers, express the need for time to reflect and bring personal experience to bear, to discuss, to exchange ideas, and to explore implications for groups beyond the one studied (immigrant Latinos). Criticisms of workshops center around getting more: more examples of how to apply the theory; more opportunities to discuss and interact; applications to more ethnic groups; examples that move beyond elementary school to high school. Of course, with regard to time, presentations are constrained by the schedules of conferences. By their nature, these kinds of presentations are introductions to a set of ideas and practices that can at best be expected to stimulate further exploration by participants. We can support this exploration somewhat now that we have developed several publications.
QUESTION 3
What impact has *Bridging Cultures* had on students of the core teachers?

While the *Bridging Cultures* Project has focused on teacher professional development and teachers as researchers, the desired impact of the Project is ultimately on students. After all, the framework is intended to help the teacher understand the culture of the student and his or her family as well as the culture of the school and the teacher. Because of the design of the Project, we have not been able to look at longitudinal effects on student achievement—usually operationalized as “test performance” or “pass rate.” The teachers come from different schools, and, with one exception, they do not keep their students for more than a year. It is probably unreasonable to expect major effects on student achievement in a single year. Nevertheless, teachers and others involved with the Project have documented changes in non-cognitive indicators that are associated with student achievement (attendance, homework completion, parent involvement, time on academic task). Here we report on these and other effects that teachers attribute to the Project. Our sources of data are classroom observations, teacher interviews, some test scores, and field notes from meetings.

**Attendance**

Since being involved in the *Bridging Cultures* Project, a number of teachers have noticed improvements in students’ attendance in their classrooms. After a chronic problem with keeping attendance rates up, a *Bridging Cultures* kindergarten teacher decided she needed to do something about

---

**TABLE 14. Suggestions for improving presentations**

Add a greater focus on specific, practical things that teachers can do to further implement this fascinating model. Perhaps a video of teacher and student interactions using some strategies... I know that this is a little greedy, but a video would be nice—more colors (I guess I’m a visual learner!). I was hoping for more ideas to get more parent involvement in the school. More concrete suggestions about not only Parent-Teacher conferences but of other situations. High school examples? That would be helpful, things are often applicable to both, but some specific high school/older teen examples would help. More ideas on activities that can incorporate each child’s cultural background. More information on the cultural differences in the schools, groups and other everyday situations. Organize around foundations, interventions, findings and applications.
it. Realizing that many students were probably missing days at school because their parents simply didn’t have the time or assistance to bring their children to school, she thought it would be a good idea to have parents buddy up and help each other get their children to school when there was an emergency. She approached parents and found that they were very responsive. They themselves suggested that they could find parents near them for assistance in getting their children to school. The teacher found that when she went to parents with a problem and the question, “What do you think we should do?” they were very responsive, and it seemed to make a huge difference to them to be treated this way.

**Homework Return Rate**

By accepting the children’s needs to work in groups or with partners, and through encouraging group participation in reviewing homework assignments, reading the entire assignment, and deciding on the best answer as a group, one *Bridging Cultures* teacher has noticed that homework return has grown significantly, to nearly 100%. The group strategy was especially beneficial to children who did not have an English-speaking adult in the home to help, according to the teacher. Although students work together in sharing ideas, their work is still completed independently.

Another teacher has noticed some changes in her students related to helping absentees keep up in the classroom. While she has always worked at having high attendance in her classroom, she has noticed that since she began the *Bridging Cultures* Project, her students are more helpful to other students who are absent. She noticed that there are always many students who volunteer to deliver homework to a family member (the brother or sister) of the student or to the absent child’s home.

**Time on Task**

Since beginning their involvement with the *Bridging Cultures* Project, many teachers have noticed that the new practices they have implemented have translated to more time on task in their classroom. A number of the teachers report that they are able to spend less time on classroom management and create more time for students to work on tasks. One teacher found that making learning a personal experience has increased time on task in her classroom. By finding ways to help students relate to what is being taught, she can engage the students’ interest in learning for longer periods. She says,

*It doesn’t matter if it is a book or personal stories, just as long as they can relate it to their personal experiences. They don’t even want to go out to recess, they just want to keep it going.*

Another *Bridging Cultures* teacher observes in her classroom,

*Children know there is a time and place for everything. There are times and reasons why we work together and help each other and other times*
everybody needs to work on their own. We get a lot done in one day and before lunch.

A fourth-fifth grade teacher saw more time on task in his classroom as well. He notes,

Students are more involved and more on task because I know and am aware of what buttons, motivating factors, to push—such as a writing prompt that would be geared to something they are knowledgeable about versus some isolated incident that they are not too interested in or familiar with. If a child is more interested, there are naturally less problems. That leads to good classroom management and good cooperation.

In a study comparing the relations between Latino children in a “typical” U.S. second-grade classroom and the relations between Latino children in a Bridging Cultures second-grade classroom, there was evidence that Bridging Cultures classrooms had more time on task (Isaac, 1999). According to the study, transitions (change of task) in the non-Bridging Cultures classroom are announced by the teacher, but the children in the Bridging Cultures classroom maintain an implicit understanding of the day’s schedule. According to the researcher,

This understanding is evidenced in the way the children flow in and out of the classroom without the necessity of announcements by the teacher, as well as the way that the children work after the activity period is over (Isaac, p. 34).

Student Achievement/Performance

The changes that Bridging Cultures teachers have made in their classrooms have often resulted in an increased level of performance in students’ work. The changes have sometimes come about as a result of teachers’ recognition of the importance of family in students’ lives, as mentioned. Some of our teachers have noticed a change in students’ performance as a result of parent involvement in the classroom. As one teacher observed,

Parents that have volunteered have seen the value of reading, and their practice is the key to gaining fluency and comprehension. As a result, many students have become better readers.

In the case of the districtwide writing assessment mentioned earlier, the Bridging Cultures teacher involved noticed that her students tended to write much more when questions were related to students’ families than when they related to such things as what is it like to be a good friend. (This example will also be discussed as an instance of a teacher’s taking on the research role.) At a faculty meeting, she suggested an alternative question to be used in the assessment:

Write about an experience that you had with your family. Be sure to include who, what, where, when and how.
The result was that students’ scores jumped—from four to 17 points on a 100-point scale. Students not only wrote longer and better narratives, they did better on language usage, punctuation, capitals, vocabulary, and quotation marks. She noted,

_We were tapping into collectivism, honoring lived experiences._

The first-grade teacher also noted a change in students’ performances in her classroom as a result of her improved relationships with parents. From her participation in the *Bridging Cultures* Project, she learned that she needed to build better relationships with her students parents. Before being involved in the project, she hesitated to accept personal invitations from parents. However, when she began to develop better relationships with her students’ parents, she noticed some very positive changes. She says,

_Last year [1996-1997] I feel the parents, students and I were a real team. The reading program required that the parent read with the child each night and return a slip noting how much time they read. There was 100% participation._

However, even more significant is the change in her students’ test scores. She says,

.onStart...our May testing was excellent. My students, tested in Spanish, as a class scored way above average on overall reading. Their mathematics scores were equally high.

This teacher noted that her two English-speaking first grade classes’ group scores on comparable subtests were “significantly below average, markedly lower than those of my Spanish readers.”

Another teacher saw changes in her students’ performance as a result of the importance she placed on her parent-teacher meetings. She says,

_I expect the children to come if possible. The children see a perfect example of camaraderie and open discussion of parents and teachers and they see all the parents involved. It lets them feel more comfortable expressing themselves in the classroom and it lowers the filter on getting a concept or skill—like lowering the wall between the home and school._

By using choral reading in her classroom, one teacher has noticed improved English reading skills in her classroom. With her ESL students, she realized a “tremendous power in choral reading, chanting, reciting poetry, singing songs, anything that includes the whole group.” She observed that the students loved doing it, their English had significantly improved and that practicing this way had ensured success for her students.

One *Bridging Cultures* teacher found improved writing in her classroom as a result of permitting students to share ideas. She noted that by allowing the children to help each other, each one of her second-grade students was able to write a three-paragraph essay complete with an outline for the end-of-the-year assessment, a feat that the majority of the teachers at this same school thought would be too difficult to accomplish. The children benefited from building off each others’ ideas while writing.
QUESTION 4
How has Bridging Cultures affected students at institutions of higher learning?

*Bridging Cultures* (i.e., its core concepts and examples from teachers) has been presented to an estimated 750 students at several California State University campuses. It has also been the topic of presentations in a course for educational therapists at Holy Names College (Oakland, CA) and twice in an anthropology course at Stanford University. More than 400 teachers-in-training (some teaching via emergency credentials, some returning for advanced study) and students in the school counseling program at California State University, Northridge have learned about *Bridging Cultures* since the fall of 1997, largely through the auspices of Dr. Carrie Rothstein-Fisch. She began incorporating a three-hour *Bridging Cultures* module in the following courses: Advanced Psychological Foundations of Education, Lifespan Human Development, Advanced Theories of Child Development, Applied Child Development for Parent and Child Educators, and Theories and Issues in Early Childhood Education. Graduate students in programs in School Counseling, Early Childhood Education, Learning, Development, and Instruction, Career Counseling, and Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling have been involved, as well as a relatively smaller number of undergraduates. She has routinely had students evaluate the three-hour *Bridging Cultures* module she teaches. Some evaluation data will be discussed below.

Dr. Rothstein-Fisch has collaborated with one of her graduate students and a *Bridging Cultures* teacher to make presentations to students at the Channel Islands campus of California State University, Northridge, at Oxnard College, and at California State University, Long Beach. As mentioned later in “Teachers as Professional Developers,” one of these has taught pre-service educators at the University of Southern California, and another incorporated *Bridging Cultures* into his twice-yearly coursework for teachers (some credentialed, some not) on history, social science, and culture at UCLA. Table 15 (next page) presents comments from his course in July 1998. All 11 evaluations were positive. Every such presentation has been evaluated by students.

The *Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module* (in press) contains evaluation commentary from 54 students in two sections of the course, Psychological Foundations of Learning K-12, taught by Dr. Rothstein-Fisch at two different campuses of California State University, Northridge, in the spring of 1998. About one-third of the students were working as emergency credential or substitute teachers. Students completed written evaluations of the *Bridging Cultures* course content (presented as a three-hour session) immediately following the presentation. On their mid-term exam, students were asked to “Describe the five most salient parts of the *Bridging Cultures* model.” The final exam gave an indirect opportunity for evaluating the impact of the Module through an open-ended statement (“De-
scribe the five most valuable things you learned in the course and cite an example of how this might be applied in your own classroom”).

On the evaluation immediately following the Module, 46 of 47 students answering the questions gave very positive comments about the value of the Module. For many, the Module raised awareness about the role of culture in education. Sample comments are listed in Table 16 (next page).

Three weeks later, students typically reported that they continued to recall differences between individualism and collectivism and the kinds of school conflicts that could ensue from misunderstandings based on those orientations. One student mapped out his/her understanding:

The BC model is based on the concept of individualism and collectivism. Individualism involves mainly the viewpoint of white-European thinkers. Collectivism refers to the viewpoint of immigrants. The key points of these views can be stated as follows:

On the final exam for the course, three months after the Bridging Cultures Module was presented, students were asked to indicate the most valuable things they had learned in the course and cite an example of how this might be applied in their own classroom. Bridging Cultures was the most frequently cited topic (23 students out of 54), with Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences and the role of classroom organization as the next most popular responses, garnering 14 votes each.
TABLE 16. Comments of students in Psychological Foundations of Education K-12, Spring 1998

It [individualism-collectivism] is a new concept for me in relation to contact with other cultures. It helped me to take one more step beneath the surface of relating to others. It will help me understand or at least be open to bridging rather than judging.

It makes me aware of how students come to school with different attitudes and expectations. I can appreciate the differences among people.

Students who were (apparently) working in the classroom were able to speak more concretely about the relevance of the framework. One example:

Information is relevant only when I can take it back to the classroom—which I could do with this information. In talking with Hispanic parents I can be more aware of why they may react the way they do.

They had personal responses to the Module, based on their own experiences:

I could really relate [to the model] because I’ve been the student having conflict between school and home.

I am able to understand why my Mexican-American boyfriend and I thought so differently about everything, including education.

Three weeks later, students typically reported that they continued to recall differences between individualism and collectivism and the kinds of school conflicts that could ensue from misunderstandings based on those orientations. One student mapped out his/her understanding:

The BC model is based on the concept of individualism and collectivism. Individualism involves mainly the viewpoint of white-European thinkers. Collectivism refers to the viewpoint of immigrants. The key points of these views can be stated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Collectivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child as individual</td>
<td>Child as part of family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects belonging to person/school</td>
<td>Objects for everyone to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work independently</td>
<td>Work to help group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as public servant</td>
<td>Teacher as authority figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise—good self-esteem</td>
<td>Criticism—make sure child doesn’t stick out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One student was not persuaded of the usefulness of the framework. His comment actually reflects Project members’ concerns about the danger of generalization based on categories:

I don’t believe individuals, regardless of their background, neatly fit into each category. I feel I have traits from both individualism and collectivism. I’m sure most people feel this way.
Sixteen students (some pre-service and some in-service educators) taking Advanced Psychological Foundations of Education K-12 in the spring of 1999 were asked to write immediately after the Bridging Cultures Module presentation about the most valuable things they had learned, questions or concerns they had, and how they might use what they had learned. A sample of comments about what was most valuable shows the range of depth of understanding and both personal and professional perspectives on the material (Table 17).

**TABLE 17. Survey responses of students in Advanced Psychological Foundations of Education K-12, 1999, to “Most valuable things learned.”**

...how cultural background and upbringing has an indirect, but very important, impact on school performance.

Our society cannot “tolerate” differences. We must embrace and celebrate them. We cannot educate students based on “sameness”—an over-used construct.

The most valuable to me was the concept of family and how American culture has devalued the family while collectivist cultures respect, honor, promote and value family more than the individual. American focus really is on the individual. Sad, but true.

The most valuable thing I learned today was that everyone got a chance to explore how the individualism is different than collectivism... I felt that my culture, which is collectivism has been more understood than before the class, and I feel more proud of having collectivism culture and individualism culture together in myself.

Most valuable thing I learned tonight—how important helping is and how I have quashed helping behavior in the past.

**Students cited a range of questions and concerns:**

[How do you explain this idea to rigid teachers who aren’t open to... differences in relating?]

I am concerned that many of our schools lack the philosophy inherent within the Bridging Cultures concept. Many teachers are unable to accept learning styles or disabilities, let alone cultures and schemas.

My questions would be in reference to the African-American culture. Although I am American, I identify very much with the culture that is collectivistic—in every aspect. We talked about teachers/school and family/home conflict but I would like to know about the student in the classroom conflict—meaning when one immigrant child with a very different culture is in a classroom, or and school, where they are the only one. What can I do to help and understand the one child?

I want you to share more and more specific examples of teachers using these ideas in their classes.

Where is the balance between the positive and negative elements of independent and interdependent cultures?

I want to reach out to my ESL students and learn from them. I want to grow and broaden my understanding—When I do that I’m sure I’m going to have many, many questions.
How to balance privacy issues with a collectivist environment
How to keep students accountable for individual learning while allowing for collaborative work
How can we educate others in this? expanding to outside the school domain. It seems a lot of misunderstandings between people (friends, colleagues, etc.) can be avoided. This is true for me (others understanding me) because I am from a collective culture raised here.

Regarding applications of what they had learned, here are some examples of student comments:

(How can you use this?) Oh my God! How can I not use it? I can use it to allow “collective” students to assist each other with homework and increase group knowledge. I can implement more cooperative learning techniques. I can grade the group as a whole on some tasks. I can use choral reading. …I think that everything we talked about today can be used in everyday life, because we live in a multi-cultural society. It makes me want to learn more about each and every culture.

I can use this:
@ my internship
@ my job
w/ my friends/family
w/strangers in the street

I will use what I learned tonight in the way I interact with not only parents and students in the schools, but also in understanding friends from different backgrounds than my own.

I can use this as a school counselor. When I counsel kids, I will pay attention to their health and seeing how they’re feeling before discussing psychological issues. I want them to trust me and feel comfortable with me first. I will learn in this class how to invite Latino parents to become involved so that they will feel more comfortable. I will also be dispelling myths and negative assumptions that other teachers and counselors may believe…. I can start to recognize elements of my own culture and how this [sic] value elements have shaped my own development.

The responses, even in this single class, give a sense of how varied students are in the ways they make sense of the Bridging Cultures framework. Students’ concerns and questions reflect their personal experience, their sense of the school settings they are or will be working in, and their thoughts on broader social issues. Overall, the evaluation data we have from such students suggests that the impact of exposure to Bridging Cultures concepts is extremely variable. Those who have personal and professional experience germane to the framework (such as Latino teachers, who often intuitively understand the conflicts and solutions, or educators who have already tried to explore the role of culture in schooling) seem to be able to grasp the concepts in a sophisticated way and immediately infer possible meanings for their practice. An experienced teacher in a graduate course at CSUN said,
...[The framework] brought forth and clarified how our American society focused more on the individual. The competition, pushing to succeed beyond others, individual achievement regardless of others. I view the idea of collectivism now as something not so strange and that greater success can be achieved as a group without sacrificing the individual. Together we’re better...I can see the success and pride that parents have when they collaborate.

Others apparently experience some cognitive dissonance, showing through their course evaluation comments that exposure to Bridging Cultures has raised questions and made them think. But they also demonstrate confusion about the implications of what they have learned. They may say in one breath that culture must be understood and in another breath that they will treat all parents and students the same (see Jun, 2000). Some students seem to get alerted to the fact that they need to pay attention to possible culture-based conflicts and their implications for altering schooling—but their sense of how to act on this awareness is very general.

Twelve Stanford University undergraduate and graduate students in a two-hour anthropology seminar on Bridging Cultures (January 1998) responded to the question, “What will stick with you from the presentation today?” Their reflections had to do with both personal experiences and education in general (Table 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 18. Reflections of Stanford students in Language, Culture, and Education in Native North America, 1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I thought the need for cultural understanding was what stuck with me the most. Going through school with a grandma who only spoke Navajo, it was hard to mediate (as a kid between the teacher and the parent/guardian). I think the most encouraging act then, would be for the teacher to demonstrate that she cared—at some level. The most interesting aspect of this discussion for me is discovering what the underlying intention of the school is. Is the intention to bring these families from other cultures into “American” culture, or is it to alter American values in order to include everyone? Obviously the goal is the latter in this project but is that true for educators in general? …I think a lot of classroom problems could be avoided if parents (their opinions and household operations…) were understood and respected as valuable [for] teachers to learn from. The main thing that grabs me is the subtlety of what teachers do and how harshly it can effect a child. It really reached me that these poor kids see two very distinct cultures—home and school! Teachers really need to reach across the line and help kids bridge over. Also, it seems—what really is the point of school? Are all the aspects of the school culture necessary or could home culture be easily integrated?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-four graduate students (mostly European-American) in an educational therapy program at Holy Names College in Oakland, California in March 1998 participated in a three-hour class on Bridging Cultures. They were asked the same question. The comments of these students represent some fairly deep reflections on the meaning of culture’s personal implications for U.S. schools (Table 19).

**TABLE 19. Evaluation responses of Holy Names graduate students in Educational Therapy course, 1998**

The roles of Individualism and Collectivism are not roles that I am unfamiliar with, but defining, discussing and exemplifying them I found to be invaluable. This was more of an awakening of things that I see around myself every day, yet don’t stop to think a lot about them. It was great to hear examples (stories) of real-life situations and then apply them to my own situations.

The readings caused me to have a clearer understanding of the differences between the individualistic and collectivistic cultures and how Euro-centric most classrooms continue to be. As a former K teacher, I realized how many youngsters come into a new culture upon entering school—one that requires far more than the academic and social orientations of the majority culture many are already a part of by virtue of their Euro-American ethnicity.

…I truly experienced a shift in awareness and understanding. The readings generated conversations between my husband and my 3rd grade daughter regarding cultural influences not only at school but in my husband’s business. I also see implications for this information that extend even to purely Euro-American settings.

It is important to be culturally sensitive to others, especially immigrants. My grandfather was an immigrant from Bolivia and my grandmother was from Nicaragua. They met each other in Los Angeles where my mother, Yolanda, and I are from. I like the idea that the schools and teachers are more immigrant friendly in California today. I know the schools were not as friendly a generation ago.

The most important points that will stick with me through my professional career are the inherent differences between Individualism and Collectivism. I am an Anglo-American that has failed to identify any cultural basis of my own. After reading both articles: Cross-Cultural Value Conflict and Bridging Cultures I have come to realize that indeed I am part of something (Individualism) that has shaped my environment from an early age. A more practical application of my newly acquired knowledge is my communication skills used with Latino parents and students. I feel more capable of my abilities to empathize and facilitate bridges between teacher, parents, and students.
Graduate and Undergraduate Student Researchers

CSUN Researchers

A total of 15 pre-service educators enrolled in graduate programs at California State University, Northridge are now involved in research related to Bridging Cultures (Appendix C gives a complete list of the projects). Most of these students are completing master's theses, in preparation to be more advanced teachers, specialists in early childhood education, or school counselors. Many of the studies concern the usefulness of Bridging Cultures professional development with Latino parents; others investigate the impact of Bridging Cultures professional development on in-service teachers or counselors. Six of these students (chosen because of availability) were asked to complete a short survey posing two open-ended questions:

1. What is it about Bridging Cultures that motivated you to do your master’s thesis (or other research) on it?

2. Has Bridging Cultures had an impact on your thinking or on the ways you interact with others (in personal or professional situations)? If so, please describe this impact.

A common denominator among responses to Question 1 was a recognition of how schooling was failing to meet the needs of immigrant students and capitalize on their cultural strengths along with the hope that the Bridging Cultures framework could help teachers to turn around that situation. Said one, herself a Korean-American immigrant,

...When I entered the program two years ago, I wanted to pursue my career to help immigrant students to find their pathway to success in this country. I found that Bridging Cultures would help the immigrants to see their values that could lead them to towards success in their future careers...Bridging Cultures motivated me to see my culture as well as other cultures, to recognize the differences and to try to find a right way to direct my future in a helping profession.

Another, a European-American student who has worked in schools throughout his two years of graduate school, said,

As I was working in two different schools...I immediately noticed more disengagement from Latino students...It was impossible for me to believe that 70% of the population of the district was less intelligent or had less family support than the other 30%...When I first heard the Bridging Cultures framework described in a class of mine, I was taken aback by the concept. How could there be any other value system in the world than the one I was raised learning? As I observed these elementary aged school children interacting in the classroom and on the playground, I quickly saw proof of collective concepts. From the moment I attended my first BC meeting and listened to the ideas that the teachers were using in the classroom, I knew that this was a better way to teach students with these value systems...Bridging Cultures is one way in which I can help improve the educational process for these students.

A third said,

Intuitively, I always felt there was conflict between the home and school
culture but no one had ever put a name to it. Bridging Cultures was the first time my feelings were validated. I’m motivated by Bridging Cultures because I want others to feel validated like I did.

In response to the second question, the first student cited above said,

... I feel that Bridging Cultures impacted greatly my own thinking as well as how I act with others. I know I am more aware of my own culture as well as other cultures. I remember myself as very closed with my own culture, but now I am more open to other cultures, to their values and characteristics. I know that now I try to understand other people’s point of view in a very different way...

Another student said,

...I think the Bridging Cultures framework fits so appropriately into my life as a Korean-American. I was able to relate with the issues of biculturality and the conflicts it can bring. Bridging Cultures has allowed me to articulate issues more clearly and be able to recognize situations of conflict coming from culture. In personal situations, I am constantly in a mental struggle of decision-making for my life and family as well. I must always consider others because I was taught to, however it brings conflict to my individualistic education. Bridging Cultures has helped me to pinpoint what the conflict is about and then I am able to make decisions with a lighter heart. In professional situations, I am now careful to be sensitive to how I present my ideas so as to include all viewpoints as equally valid and important, especially if they are viewpoints I don’t fully understand because of culture.

A Latina student responded,

Bridging Cultures has had a tremendous impact on how I think and in the ways that I interact with others both personally and professionally. Personally because it allowed me to understand that some of my values and actions come from my cultural background and that they are okay. I have questioned in the past why I was so different from “whites” and thought maybe something was wrong with the way my family does things or thinks. I know now that the difference is okay and should be shared with other teachers so that there is a better understanding of the Latino student population. I am not saying all Latinos are the same, but my experiences could relate to the students...Professionally, in the classroom I have become more sensitive to how students respond. [Also] I have welcomed people to ask me questions or bring up a concern with Latinos without taking offense.

One can see how the personal becomes intertwined with the professional in terms of what motivates students to explore the meaning and usefulness of the framework.

Two of these students recently received special awards at California State University, Northridge. Patrick Geary was selected for the Don Dorsey Excellence in Mentoring award on the basis of his mentoring of elementary and secondary students in the Los Angeles Unified School District and work with immigrant Latino families as well as for his advocacy of underrepresented applicants to the School Counseling Program at CSUN. Deborah Park was honored as first-place winner in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling for a paper presented at the Cali-
fornia State University, Northridge, Creative Works and Research Symposium in Fall 2000. Her paper was titled, “Bridging Cultures in the Korean American Classroom.” Winning this award entitles Park to present at a statewide (California) symposium in Spring 2001.

One of the most recent pieces of research associated with Bridging Cultures was conducted by Catalina Jun (2000), a master’s student of Dr. Rothstein-Fisch’s in the School Counseling Program at CSUN, who is one of the interviewees above. We discuss this piece of research at some length because it represents a) the first extensive piece of Bridging Cultures research with counseling students; b) it follows university students into the workplace; and c) it illustrates how variable the learning can be among university students exposed to the same instruction.

For her thesis, Jun interviewed 11 students about to graduate from the CSUN School Counseling Program who had taken a course with Dr. Rothstein-Fisch in which the Bridging Cultures Module was presented. Working as intern counselors in schools in the Los Angeles area, they were interviewed about how they were or were not applying what they had learned about individualism and collectivism. Seven areas of potential classroom conflict between individualistic and collectivistic values that had been identified in research (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000) were used as a basis for questions. Examples of sources of conflict are differences in emphasis on: helpfulness versus independence; social versus cognitive skills in the developing child; respect for authority versus oral self-expression; and criticism to ensure normative behavior versus praise to support self-esteem. There are also cultural differences in the role expectations for parents and teachers. For instance, collectivistic cultures tend to expect teachers to be in charge of academics. Thus, parents are not expected to teach their children reading, for example. Parents are seen as in charge of inculcating moral values and norms for socially appropriate behavior (though the expectation is that the teacher will also support such development in the classroom).

Jun found that these intern counselors were all over the map in terms of the degree to which they remembered or understood the Bridging Cultures framework, their levels of ability to apply the framework, and the degree to which they had resolved apparent conflicts in their thinking with regard to how important culture is as a factor in schooling. From Jun’s data, it appears that six students have a grasp of implications of the framework for their roles as counselors. Six intern counselors responded with examples of what they have observed about the values of helpfulness and independence. (Others did not respond directly to the question.) Some examples of responses:

Many students baby-sit and do chores at home.

At my internship at Smith Middle School [not its real name] I asked a group of Latino students what was the difference between helping and cheating. Joyce, a first generation student whose family is from El Salvador, told me that helping is when you show somebody HOW to do
something, and cheating is when you just give them the answer.

Kids can help each other in areas not directly related to individual learning.

The first two responses seem to show some grasp of the meaning of such values for students. The third is focused on what counts as appropriate helping in school from the individualistic perspective. One of these new counselors has an extremely well-developed understanding and has made numerous innovations in his practice in accordance with what he has learned. When asked, “What have you learned from the Bridging Cultures framework presentation that you have used with your own counseling profession at school?” this intern replied,

**The most powerful examples I have drawn from are the praise vs. criticism value conflict. In situations with two different students I have taken my knowledge of this and employed it in my individual counseling.**

*In the first case, with a fifth-grade Latina named Jackie, I was counseling her under the guise of math tutoring after her teacher referred her to me. Initially, I was praising the student when she began to correctly solve problems. Then, in one session immediately after I said, “good job,” I heard Jackie mock me and also say “good job.” From that moment on I used criticism to motivate her in her understanding of math. The beauty was that, not only did she begin to work harder at learning the problems, but also it was at that very point in our counseling that we made a breakthrough in our therapeutic relationships and Jackie began to disclose more personal issues.*

Another two interns show some grasp of the framework and can cite at least one way in which it has influenced the ways they work with parents or students (or other staff) or interpret parents’ thinking/behavior. Examples:

*I see that Asian and Armenian families see the teacher’s role as to teach academics and the parent’s role as to teach moral values, disciplines, and social skills.*

*Understanding that parents are apt to defer to the teacher’s authority, we can ask the parent as an expert on the child about what they think about a problem.*

Sometimes these interns seem to be confused about the role of culture in schooling in general and only slightly aware of the framework and its potential relevance for them. The following respondent shows some confusion over whether cultural values related to the role of parents should or should not be considered:

**The parent role at my intern site is low. When open house happens less than 50% of the parents show up. Parent participation is a role that all parents should have, no matter what ethnicity. Unfortunately some Latino parents hustle in their jobs and do not have time to talk to teachers or go during open house. I also have to understand that the parent role for everyone is not the same. I know a Latino family who expects the teachers to teach their child everything the child needs to know. I think parents play different roles according to their culture and subcultures within that culture...**
In response to the question, “What changes have you made with regard to how you engage parents?” another respondent said,

_ I don’t treat parents any differently than I treat students although I may defer to parents more than I would to a student. My counseling style works well in my interactions with parents because it is tailored to them. I also stress to them that I am not an expert on their child, they are to an extent, but we together must follow the child’s lead._

Jun notes that this response moves back and forth between individualistic and collectivistic values. First, the intern expresses an egalitarian view of roles (individualistic), then leans a bit in the direction of collectivism by saying he/she would defer to parents; then says his/her counseling style is tailored to parents (as individuals or as members of a cultural group?); he/she is not an expert (back to egalitarian roles), that the parent is an expert on his/her child (acknowledging the parent’s role in the collectivistic hierarchy); then suggesting that parent and teacher must follow the child’s lead (very individualistic).

Two respondents make very general statements about the value of understanding students’ cultures but show no awareness of the *Bridging Cultures* framework. Asked what they had learned from the *Bridging Cultures* presentation, two interns said,

_Taking account what culture they are from and how to interact with them..._

_...I... feel that I have been opened to empathize more and to be sensitive to other cultures that I was a bit closed to._

Jun concludes that understanding cultural values is a developmental process that varies depending on personal experience (often by virtue of group membership). Some students hold beliefs that contradict each other, perhaps a natural step in the developmental process but suggesting that more learning or experience is needed.

_UCLA Researchers_

Dr. Ashley Maynard, a former student of Dr. Patricia Greenfield, has also contributed to the project, both as a participant at several meetings and as a discourse analyst and co-author of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in 1999 (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Maynard). For this paper, Maynard reviewed approximately 16 hours of digitized videotape to track changes in teachers’ ways of talking about culture and document how teachers said their new conceptualizations of culture were affecting their teaching.

Two of Dr. Greenfield’s undergraduate students did their senior honors theses on the project. Maricela Correa-Chavez did an ethnographic study (1999) in which she compared peer relationships in a *Bridging Cultures* second grade and a non-*Bridging Cultures* second grade with a similar student population (immigrant Latino). Adrienne Isaac’s thesis (1999) was also an ethnographic study carried out in the same classrooms but focused
on teacher-student relationships. Both studies entailed extended classroom observation and videotaping and have contributed significantly to the understanding of how the inclination of collectivistic students to help can either be drawn upon as a strength for group learning or suppressed by the teacher.

**QUESTION 5**

**What is the nature and extent of the dissemination of the Bridging Cultures Project?**

In this report, the topics of *Bridging Cultures*’ impact on participants at presentations and “dissemination” are somewhat artificially separated. We decided, however, that teacher impact should be treated as one topic (whether having to do with *Bridging Cultures* teachers or other teachers). Refer to Question 2c for evaluation data on the impact of dissemination on participants at workshops and in courses.

This section of the report addresses dissemination of the *Bridging Cultures* Project through workshops, presentations, and publications. We address the following sub-questions:

5a. Who has been served/reached by the *Bridging Cultures* Project?

5b. What resources has the Project developed, and what is the status of their dissemination?

5c. How have others used our materials, and how do they evaluate them?

5d. What other resources and dissemination strategies has the Project developed?

The *Bridging Cultures* team began making presentations and developing materials before the end of the first project year. Research, development, and dissemination proceeded as three activities from that point on. As soon as innovations and insights were identified, we incorporated them into presentations and materials.

**Question 5a**

**Who has been served/reached by the *Bridging Cultures* Project?**

**Number of Workshops/Presentations and Attendees**

Since the summer of 1997, *Bridging Cultures* teacher-researchers and staff researchers have made more than 100 presentations (documented in Appendix C). The presentations have been directed to a wide range of educators from national, state, and local audiences. Evaluation data have been collected and analyzed for over half the workshops (see Question 2a). Some situations have not allowed time for outside evaluations. The number of attendees per workshop has ranged from seven to more than 150. Because the network of staff professionals continues to grow, the number of workshops and individuals reached continues to increase. In
fact, not only the core teachers and staff researchers are able to make presentations but so are at least eight graduate students who have served as teaching assistants in courses where Bridging Cultures content is taught.

Type and Number of Clients Reached

Many presentations have involved a collaboration between staff and teacher researchers. The Bridging Cultures Project has been presented in a variety of settings and locations and has reached a range of professionals. Locations of workshops include: California, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Missouri, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, Washington DC, Hawaii, Montreal and Toronto (Canada), Micronesia, and the Netherlands, with the largest concentration in California. Bridging Cultures staff researchers and teachers have presented the framework at a number of educational institutions throughout California, including core teachers’ own school districts, as well as to pre-service teachers at universities such as the University of California, Los Angeles, and California State University, Northridge. Workshops have been presented at professional conferences, institutes, associations and organizations, and at schools, colleges, and universities. The types of clients have included teachers, administrators, district-level professional developers, faculty from institutions of higher education (IHEs), pre-service teachers, graduate students, and researchers. Altogether, approximately 2,750 participants have attended these presentations. Teachers’ presentations at faculty meetings at their schools and to groups of mentors add at least 350 to this number.

Question 5b
What resources has the project developed, and what is the status of their dissemination?

The Bridging Cultures Project has produced seven publications since 1998 and has two in preparation (Appendix B). The publication with the widest distribution is the Knowledge Brief, Bridging Cultures in Our Schools: New Approaches That Work (2000), of which over 23,000 copies have been distributed. This does not include thousands of reprints or photocopies used by professional developers. The March 2001 issue of the Journal of Staff Development (circulation >10,500, with 16,000 Web site hits per month) includes a five-page article based on the Knowledge Brief.

The Knowledge Brief has been distributed largely to professional developers, teacher educators, and teachers mainly in the western region of the United States. Bridging Cultures between Home and School: A Guide for Teachers has been distributed to more than 1,000 educators in draft form and was published by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates in April, 2001. Carrie Rothstein-Fisch has documented her three-hour course module on Bridging Cultures in The Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module (in press). The Module has been shared with an estimated 350 teacher
educators and professional developers in draft form, and feedback from users has been used to revise it.

The *Bridging Cultures* team wrote two articles that appeared in the April 1999 issue of *Educational Leadership* (circulation 56,000). An article about group parent conferences was published in the UCLA newsletter, *Connections*, in the fall of 1998. In addition, the *Bridging Cultures* Project has been featured in an article in *The Washington Post*, which reaches an audience of over 700,000 readers for the daily edition. Finally, *Bridging Cultures* has been profiled as an exemplary project for educators working with Latino students in an Ideabook soon to be released by the U.S. Department of Education. Many requests for *Bridging Cultures* publications have occurred as a result of these articles and references, as well as presentations. In addition, respected magazines such as *Teaching Tolerance* have recently requested a copy of the Knowledge Brief “for possible review in [the] magazine.”

**Question 5c**  
How have others used our materials and how do they evaluate them?

As is evident, *Bridging Cultures* materials and publications have been distributed widely over the past five years to numerous organizations throughout the United States. Our materials have been used by a variety of professionals ranging from teachers, to district-level professional developers, to state-level administrators, to college and university professors. Widespread audiences of educators, students, and community members have been exposed to our framework through *Bridging Cultures* materials that have been used in trainings, workshops, and courses. In addition, *Bridging Cultures* materials and publications have been made available in registration packets at both state and national conferences.

*Bridging Cultures Publications*

Users report that they employ our materials to facilitate professional development efforts focused on understanding diverse students and families. Some examples of the contexts in which our materials have been used include the following: a workshop titled “Working with Families of Many Cultures” coordinated by a family-school involvement center in California; a training unit for Multicultural Education, Student Diversity, Children from Poverty, and Special Populations within an Alternative Teacher Certification Program in Texas; and college and university courses titled “Cultural Foundations of Education” and “Families and Schools in a Pluralistic Society” at Beaver College in Pennsylvania and at Kennesaw State University in Georgia, respectively. Information to address Question 5c was gathered from the following sources:

- interviews
- letters of appreciation
critical written reviews solicited by WestEd
written evaluations from educators and professional developers

This section focuses on commentaries about the following publications: a) The two articles published in *Educational Leadership* (the journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), “Bridging Cultures with a Parent-teacher Conference” and “Bridging Cultures with Classroom Strategies;” b) The book *Bridging Cultures between home and school: A guide for teachers*; and c) The 16-page Knowledge Brief, *Bridging Cultures in Our Schools: New Approaches That Work*. This section summarizes suggestions and recommendations from educators and professional developers regarding the future use of the materials as well as ideas for dissemination of the framework.

*Bridging Cultures with a Parent-Teacher Conference* and *Bridging Cultures with Classroom Strategies*

These two articles—published in the journal, *Educational Leadership*—were regarded as a “must read” by educators participating in a global studies program run by the North Carolina Center for International Understanding (NCCIU) earlier this year. The Educational Exchange Coordinator of the NCCIU explained in a phone interview that the articles were incorporated into the orientation packets of approximately 25 educators before a 10-day trip to Mexico. The coordinator noted that she included *Bridging Cultures* materials—and especially the *Educational Leadership* articles—as background reading for the participants because their program is “always looking for models of how other states address the needs of Hispanic/Latino students.”

The *Educational Leadership* articles were also used in teacher education classes in the Region IV Education Service Center in Houston, Texas. A consultant working with the Alternative Certification Program calculated distribution at approximately 90 copies given to the interns (potential elementary teachers) participating in the training, which includes units on Multicultural Education, Student Diversity, Children from Poverty; and Special Populations. The consultant highlighted the “condensed” length of the articles as being an attractive feature for effective time management in teacher training. She summarized her letter by sharing some feedback she had received from her students about the articles:

> Recently I completed my three-day class in which your articles were used. Feedback was very positive. Interns discussed how useful the information was in helping them understand their students’ actions better as well as parent attitude and responses.

*Bridging Cultures between Home and School: A Guide for Teachers*

This publication was first introduced in draft form in Fall 1998, as *Bridging Cultures between home and school: A handbook*. One source of evalu-
vation data on the book is a set of student responses in a 1998 course for the CLAD program, History/Social Studies and Culture, taught by a Bridging Cultures core teacher. Approximately 20 in-service teachers participate in this ongoing course that is offered every semester. Our file contains written evaluations from nine students, who refer to the text as “useful,” “helpful,” and “enlightening.” In addition to feedback about the text’s enhancing their instructional methods, a couple of the students indicate that the book enabled them to achieve a greater understanding of their own educational experiences growing up biculturally in the United States. One student wrote,

\[
I \text{ appreciated the directness and simplicity of the text. Though I myself am Latina, it brought to my attention many issues to reflect upon as an educator. As a child of immigrants from Mexico, I find myself torn between two cultures and socializations. This text allowed me to understand my experiences and become empathetic to the diverse populations I teach.}
\]

The lessons surrounding this text were useful for the way in which I focus my instruction, but also were good in helping me to analyze my own experiences and identity. Being caught between both individualistic and collectivistic cultures, I understand that it is imperative to be conscious of that situation. It is at that point that we become aware of our decisions and their effects.

Several of the students stated that the book increased their awareness of working with and involving parents and community. For example, students wrote,

\[
I \text{ have all Latino children in my third grade classroom, and they span the spectrum from individualistic to collectivistic. But nearly all the parents fall more toward the collectivistic side. I have learned many more sympathetic methods to communicate with parents and also include them in my class activities.}
\]

This book was very good to understand some of the behavior that I have seen in reference to parents. I am aware now that parents need to be understood in their own terms to begin a constructive communication. I have learned that parents do want to participate, contrary to some of my colleagues’ ideas. Thence, I will try to be more sensitive to parents’ diverse cultures. Thanks for this inclusive book!

Additional feedback on this book during the course of its writing has been offered by at least six other teachers outside the Bridging Cultures team: three specialists on the education of Latino students, two editorial staff members at WestEd, and our editor at Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (the book’s publisher). In addition, the seven Bridging Cultures teachers have critiqued the book for accuracy in the representation of their thinking and practice. All of this input has resulted in many changes: expansion of examples from numerous cultures and settings; clarifications about how to avoid the pitfalls of dichotomous frameworks; a full description of the teachers’ roles and how they evolved over the course of the Project; a clearer explanation of the role of ethnography in schooling; and many more detail-oriented clarifications.
Bridging Cultures in Our Schools: New Approaches That Work

This publication, usually referred to as the “Knowledge Brief,” has been the most widely circulated after the Educational Leadership articles. Data on distribution of the Knowledge Brief come from three sources: records of the WestEd Information Resource Center, which handles publication orders; a log of requests and distribution at presentations kept by Bridging Cultures staff; and selected interviews with known consumers. Qualitative information comes from four written reviews of an earlier draft of the brief; interviews with professional developers and a university professor; e-mail correspondence from users; and a file that we refer to as “Letters of Appreciation.”

WestEd distributed 15,000 free copies of the brief to bilingual and ESL (English as a Second Language) educators throughout the four-state region (AZ, CA, NV, UT) in the spring of 2000. The Bridging Cultures team has distributed an estimated 2,500 additional briefs, and the Information Resource Center has filled another 4,000-plus orders. But it is very difficult to document the full extent of distribution because WestEd gives permission to duplicate such publications, as long as appropriate credit is given. When a single brief is sent to a professional developer, for example, he or she may make hundreds of copies; and unless we call her/him directly, we won’t know about that. For instance, an administrator for the California State Department of Education initially requested permission to make 900 copies of the brief, but then when interviewed by telephone, informed us that she had distributed approximately 2000 copies of the Knowledge Brief at two state conferences. Participants at these conferences were parents, paraprofessionals, teachers, and district and county office staff developers. Sometimes (when they can afford to do so), agencies order large numbers of originals. A WestEd director from the North East Regional Resource Center ordered 350 copies to distribute at a presentation focusing on increasing diversity in public schools at a national conference in Washington, DC.

A doctoral candidate preparing to teach a course titled “Cultural Foundations of Education” at Beaver College in Pennsylvania requested extra copies of the Knowledge Brief and commented,

*I think you have done an excellent job putting together something that is meaningful, readable, theoretical, and practical.*

The Knowledge Brief was also used for a workshop titled “Working with Families of Many Cultures” coordinated by the Sacramento County Family-School Involvement Center, which served approximately 50 district parent coordinators, school site parent advisors, teachers, counselors, and a couple of administrators. The Project Specialist who organized this workshop said,

*Some teachers were reading it at lunch time and did say that this is something that teachers need to read.*
An administrator from the California State Department of Education (cited earlier) described the Knowledge Brief in a phone interview as talking explicitly about cultural differences [and]...[providing] understandable and concrete suggestions.

She also mentioned that she was unable to find even one copy of the brief in her office after the conference—indicative of its perceived usefulness.

Some of the comments contained in our files suggest that exposure to the individualism/collectivism framework is an eye-opener even for teachers with long years of experience. We believe a publication like the Knowledge Brief is a useful tool to reach these teachers. One teacher who identified herself as having worked with ESOL (English speakers of other languages) student populations for 22 years remarked,

*It is a wonderfully enlightening article. And even after all these years of working with many cultures, I realized many things. I also recalled many events in my life that dealt with parents, and your article clarified to me why the events occurred as they did.*

Another teacher’s account—in which he reflects upon his own experience as an immigrant—also speaks to the impact that *Bridging Cultures* had on his thinking:

*I believe many of us are not fully aware—let alone prepared—when we enter the field of teaching that there are major cultural differences that greatly influence the way our students learn. We impose our own values with the belief that it will make our students better thinkers and better people. In my experience, I became very cynical of my family’s customs and traditions, especially the views and beliefs of my parents. I am not aware when it happened but at one point I despised their unwillingness to learn English or even live in an area which was [predominantly] Latino. I now understand that even though they could afford to live in a better area, they enjoyed the security of having a market that sold Mexican spices and above all, being close to their friends and family.*

It is evident in the quotation above that applying the individualism/collectivism framework to his personal experience positively changed his perspective regarding his relationship with his parents—something that speaks to the impact of this short publication.

We realize that these comments on *Bridging Cultures* publications are all positive—perhaps because all of them benefited from critical commentary during the writing process. We have not received any negative comments about the published versions. We have received recommendations for expanding on them, however (see below).

*Recommendations for Expanding Bridging Cultures Publications*

Suggestions regarding use and improvement of *Bridging Cultures* materials (which inevitably moved into discussion of the direction of the project in general) tended to fall into three categories. First, some of the educators and professional developers had ideas as to how to further develop the
model. One teacher who reviewed the Knowledge Brief in its early stages stated,

I would have liked some more concrete suggestions on working with parents from collectivist backgrounds. I don’t want to offend my parents when I push their children to excel. I also don’t want to insult anyone with a note about possible classroom contributions that parents can help with.

Another teacher who reviewed the Knowledge Brief stated that it sparked a number of other questions such as,

How are children educated in Mexico? Is it exclusively done with group learning? How do they give tests? So far, I’m beginning to wonder about assessment in the classroom. How much assessment is group? How much is individual? What happens to the students that are individualistic? What happens to the students who don’t do well in groups?

The same teacher also suggested moving away from a focus on Latinos and including other ethnic and immigrant populations as well (something that has come up in nearly every setting in which the Project has been presented).

Second, educators and professional developers suggested how to further the dissemination of the materials as well as the visibility of the Project. One teacher who reviewed the brief suggested presenting it to college professors to use it as a tool in teacher training. Another teacher who reviewed the brief suggested the production of a video that teachers could use:

I would love to see videos of real classroom interaction of students and teachers where these examples could be experimented first hand.

And finally, two of the phone interviewees—the Educational Exchange Coordinator for the North Carolina Center for International Understanding (NCCIU) and the Project Specialist at the Sacramento County Family-School Involvement Center—requested facilitation and presentations by the Bridging Cultures staff. They would like to see professional development paired with the publications.

The Bridging Cultures Project anticipates that the number of educators and community people exposed to its materials will continue to increase. Feedback from professional developers indicates their desire to expand the use of the materials in additional workshops and/or courses. For example, a letter from the consultant for an alternative teacher certification program in Texas said in regard to the Educational Leadership articles,

There is interest in adding this unit to the training program for ESL, Bilingual and Secondary Content classes.

This step would more than triple the current circulation of materials from 90 to 300 interns per year. The Coordinator from the NCCIU expressed interest in obtaining more copies of the Guide to disseminate to educators in the Global Studies Program in their future meetings.
Other Resources

As a result of the numerous presentations made by members of the Bridging Cultures team, we have a compendium of workshop formats with accompanying overheads and handouts. These have been developed for several types of audiences and for time slots ranging from 45 minutes (not advisable!) to a series of three four-hour sessions. Although each presentation is tailored to a particular audience, existing materials obviate the need for starting from scratch. In preparation for the Bridging Cultures Dissemination Round Table (described below), Patrick Geary of CSUN and Patricia Greenfield prepared a PowerPoint presentation (approximately one hour) that includes photographs from several Bridging Cultures classrooms as well as charts, text, and tables reviewing the empirical research underlying the Project and visual representations of many of the concepts. This was developed in lieu of a videotape, for which we did not have adequate funding. It can be used with any group interested in learning about the project and its applications, because the oral text can be adapted as needed. At this time, we are reserving it for use by the Bridging Cultures team, but it could be shared with others for a small fee on a case-by-case basis. Our concern is that users have adequate background knowledge to interpret it and present it appropriately.

The Bridging Cultures Dissemination Round Table

On the basis of recommendations from the field and on the Bridging Cultures team’s own perceptions of likely ways to “scale up” the dissemination of the project’s learning and materials, we organized a Bridging Cultures Dissemination Round Table. This was held at WestEd’s San Francisco headquarters on October 19, 2000. The objective of the Round Table was to bring together professional developers with some background knowledge of the Bridging Cultures framework. Ten Bridging Cultures Project team members and 36 professionals, representing a variety of institutions throughout California, attended the Round Table.

The majority of the attendees had incorporated or had expressed an interest in incorporating the Bridging Cultures framework in their teacher education courses and workshops. The event began with presentations by the Bridging Cultures team in the morning and early afternoon. Elise Trumbull introduced the Project and the day. Patricia Greenfield gave the keynote address; four of the core teachers spoke as a panel, explaining the influence of the framework on their teaching; Carrie Rothstein-Fisch and two of her graduate students talked about impact of Bridging Cultures on higher education and research. Presentations and a whole-group discussion were followed by small group break-out sessions and ended with all of the participants re-grouping to share recommendations for expanding the impact of the project into pre-service and in-service education throughout California. Participants were given packets of publications that included the Knowledge Brief, the draft of Bridging Cultures between Home and School: A Guide for Teachers, the two Educational Leadership ar-
articles, the Module, and two articles describing the original research on which the project is heavily based (Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000 and Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000).

Evaluation of the Round Table

Approximately half of the non-Bridging Cultures participants completed the evaluation forms. They rated the Round Table highly. Of the 17 evaluations collected, 16 rated the day as “highly worthwhile” or “worthwhile.” All of the participants indicated that the Round Table succeeded in meeting its three objectives, which were “increased awareness and understanding of the framework,” “opportunities to network with others,” and “promotion of your interest in incorporating project content in your own work.” Participants were also asked to rate the main presentation events on a five-point scale. The keynote received an average rating of 4.1, the teachers’ panel 4.8 and the presentation on the Teacher Education Module 4.3. One aspect of the Round Table that the participants enjoyed in particular was the small group meetings in the afternoon.

Some of the participants provided feedback regarding the Bridging Cultures framework and how they might incorporate it into their work.

I like the conceptual framework provided and the ways in which it provides an “umbrella” for integrating issues of race, class, language and reflective practice for teachers and teacher education.

In some of the evaluations, participants referred to the framework as a tool for understanding minority students and families. One of the attendees commented about the usefulness of the framework in its applicability to Latino and Asian communities:

This approach merits widespread dissemination. We talk about the importance of cultural competency but we really have limited tools. This approach provides a concrete tool...to develop strategies that make sense for Latino and Asian children and families.

Another participant will attempt

...to make connections with racism and institutionalized racism and using [the] Bridging Cultures framework as a tool to begin to have teachers change their practice to better meet the needs of their African-American and Latino students.

Twelve of the attendees at the Round Table volunteered to serve on the Bridging Cultures Advisory Committee to assist in planning for the future.

Round Table Participants’ Suggested Dissemination Strategies

Not a single participant suggested that the Bridging Cultures concepts shouldn’t be incorporated into pre-service and in-service education, and the small groups convened in the afternoon synthesized an extremely useful set of strategies for expanding the dissemination of the Project into their
own domains. Some of the dissemination suggestions were as follows:

- Work through networks of principals and assistant county superintendents and offer presentations at their meetings
- Develop an interactive website where users of *Bridging Cultures* materials can communicate
- Hold a California State University summer institute
- Make videotapes showing applications of the *Bridging Cultures* framework
- Incorporate *Bridging Cultures* into the community college system

The difficulty of getting a new course approved within any university program is well-known, but the IHE participants at the Round Table seemed very receptive to the inclusion of the three-hour Module in their courses and optimistic about getting others to do so. One serious concern about dissemination of this nature is quality control. On the one hand, if professors who heard the presentations and who have a background in language, culture, and education thoroughly read the publications given them, they are likely to be able to engage students/teachers successfully with the material. On the other hand, if they are not so conscientious, the set of concepts could be misinterpreted or watered down, and its ability to engage students at a high level could be compromised.

A second issue has to do with the actual effectiveness of a single three-hour “module” for stimulating deep understanding about culture in schooling among students in university courses (whether pre-service or in-service teachers seeking additional credits or credentials). One need only review the section in this report on outcomes with students in university courses to realize the problems of limited exposure. So, somehow university users need to figure out how to extend discussion, reflection, and observations related to the framework at least over the length of a course.
What Have We Learned?

Here we offer a short synthesis of what has been learned during the course of the Project. Table 19 gives an overview of outcomes and impact of each of the five strands presented in Table 2.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT?

The Core Teacher Workshops

The changes manifested by the core teachers are evidence that moderately experienced teachers of immigrant Latino students who are motivated to learn about culture and its role in schooling in order to improve their practice are able to grasp and apply the research and theory on individualism and collectivism on the basis of three four-hour workshops. In fact, teachers began applying what they were learning immediately after the first workshop. They were able to shift their perspective from largely individualistic to one that incorporated understanding of both individualism and collectivism from Workshop 1 to Workshop 3. We believe our inquiry-based approach was appropriate for these motivated teachers, who did indeed become researchers themselves. Teachers’ evaluations of the workshops show that the processes used were effective—a mix of presentation, whole-group discussion, small-group and pair interaction, individual reflection, and unstructured/informal time. We would continue to offer stipends, although teachers said they weren’t necessary. Payment for weekend time seems only fair.

The Ongoing Meetings

The ongoing meetings responded to several needs the teachers expressed when they were asked to critique the three workshops. They allowed teachers opportunities to extend the application of the framework and more time to reflect and discuss the meaning of the framework to their practice. Teachers valued hearing about each other’s practices and being respected/validated by the non-teacher researchers. The long-term nature of the collaboration through these meetings increased the likelihood that professional development would be effective (cf., Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1999; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Sparks, 1995). In addition, the meetings served an important research purpose: learning from teachers in detail about what they were doing in the classroom (and schoolwide). This information then guided observations and interviews. These meetings were also a key to preparing for professional development that would be offered to other educators.

We believe some provision for continuing professional development where peers support each other and interact with outside researchers is a key to developing other cadres of teachers such as this one. The informal setting
### TABLE 20. Outcomes and impacts of the six strands of Bridging Cultures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRAND</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>• Workshop process validated</td>
<td>• Core teachers change from individualistic to mixed individualistic/collectivistic orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group becomes team</td>
<td>• All decide to stay with Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Changes in teachers’ roles (from subjects to researchers; participants in professional development to professional developers)</td>
<td>• Teachers (5/7) become cadre of professional developers, make presentations locally, regionally, nationally, internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All conduct research in their own classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting Core Teacher Change</td>
<td>Changes in:</td>
<td>• Increased parent participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Home-school relations</td>
<td>• Greater classroom harmony and time on task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classroom organization and management</td>
<td>• Better student attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content-area instruction</td>
<td>• Improved student writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers’ roles</td>
<td>• Expansion of Bridging Cultures ideas throughout teachers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Important contributions to publications, presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>• Over 400 pre-service educators participated in Bridging Cultures education</td>
<td>• Pre-service teachers’ perceptions of need to address cultural classroom strongly affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher educators from at least 125 IHEs use Bridging Cultures publications</td>
<td>• Pre-service, in-service teachers, counselors in training can specific ways their work is/will be affected by Bridging Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Materials and Publications (see List)</td>
<td>• Knowledge Brief</td>
<td>• Approximately 25,000 Knowledge Briefs disseminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bridging Cultures Guide</td>
<td>• 56,000 people reached by Educational Leadership articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 Educational Leadership articles</td>
<td>• 10,000 staff development professionals to be reached by Journal of Staff Development article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bridging Cultures Module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 AERA papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connections article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 books in preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations/Networking/Dissemination</td>
<td>• 100+ presentations, reaching more than 3,000 people in U.S., Canada, Micronesia</td>
<td>• Reported increased awareness by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15 teacher educators from CSU System attended Dissemination Round Table</td>
<td>• Commitments to incorporate Bridging Cultures into existing courses and workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of a deli or restaurant that can provide a private room for several hours at low cost is preferable to a more formal university site. We don’t have formal evaluation data on this point, but conversations with teachers over more than four years lead us to this conclusion. If videotaping is part of a research design, then meeting at a site that can accommodate the technical demands of doing so is necessary (e.g., a university or school).

**Other Presentations/Workshops**

A sizeable number of participants in even a short (e.g., one-hour) *Bridging Cultures* presentation appeared to grasp the basics of the framework, and many were able to begin to discuss how it might be applied in their settings. Respondents to evaluation questionnaires cited the appeal of concrete examples of common practices such as parent-teacher conferences and their own plans to modify them to be more appropriate for their families. However, many of their responses to a question about how they might apply what they have learned are extremely general—indicating a willingness to look at practices in a new light but perhaps a lack of ability to anticipate exactly how they might do so. More time to discuss, to hear examples, to share personal experiences, and to explore applications to other groups all seem to be important to a full understanding of the framework and its implications. In addition, respondents often encouraged the *Bridging Cultures* team to develop a video showing classroom applications or to produce more handouts and visuals. (Note: More recently, the Knowledge Brief and the *Educational Leadership* articles have filled a need for short, teacher-friendly publications that summarize the theory and practice associated with *Bridging Cultures*.)

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT TEACHER CHANGE?**

This question can be answered only with reference to the specifics of the Project, but there are several conclusions we draw from our experience with this group of teachers (Trumbull, Greenfield, Rothstein-Fisch, & Maynard, 1999):

1. It is possible to support important changes in perceptions of culture (and who has it) along with changes in instructional practice and home-school relationships through an ongoing professional development process entailing 12 hours of workshops and five or six meetings per school year.

2. The cultural framework we used was a productive vehicle for teacher change.

3. Changes in perceptions and attitudes may be simultaneous with changes in practice; the relationship may be reciprocal.

4. Opportunities for teachers to share their innovations and pose questions to each other may be key elements in sustaining changes in practice and supporting them in trying innovations they had not considered.
5. Having a framework/rationale for one’s practice supports perseverance beyond the stage where something may lose its novelty (and be set aside without a reason to continue it).

6. Teachers’ changes are supported by interaction not only with peers but with educators in different roles (university, educational agency staff).

7. Teachers’ changes will to some degree reflect their local contexts (including effects of local and state mandates), perceived student needs, and personalities.

7. Not all teachers, no matter how much support is provided, will feel comfortable with moving into the roles of researchers, writers, and professional developers, at least if those roles are made explicit. That is to say, in our experience, one or two of the core teachers were comfortable doing ethnographic and classroom research and contributing to professional development but did not seem to feel comfortable with the labels “researcher” or “professional developer.”

What Changes Can Be Attributed to Bridging Cultures?

It must be acknowledged that the Bridging Cultures core teachers entered the Project already committed to improving their practices, specifically with their immigrant and otherwise “minority” students in mind. They were all successful teachers by many measures, and they were selected for the Project because of that and their interest in culturally responsive teaching. All of them were engaged in practices that they believed were effective with their students, but they felt the need for more. In addition, by their own accounts, none had a cultural framework that they could use to guide their thinking about how to choose strategies or interact with students and their families. In fact, the teachers’ willingness and motivation to make the changes they have made is based (by their own accounts) on their exposure to the individualism/collectivism framework and its applicability to their lived experiences in working with Latino and other immigrant students. We do not have baseline observational data on the teachers, but we do have the pre- and post-assessment data, which show a lack of awareness of the individualism/collectivism framework prior to the initial workshops and a distinct shift in ability to use the framework to interpret cross-cultural conflicts after these workshops. We also have written and oral reflections throughout the course of the Project in which teachers are very explicit about changes in their understanding of why old practices should be continued or discontinued and new ones implemented on the basis of their understanding of individualism and collectivism. Observations corroborate their claims of current practice.

Teachers are, of course, continually exposed to new ideas through professional development opportunities that may influence their thinking and practice. Likewise, Bridging Cultures is not the only influence on the seven core teachers. Nevertheless, data collected over a period of more than four years show a deepening understanding of the framework and its applica-
tions quite specifically. Teachers’ individual accounts of how they use what they have collectively constructed as “Bridging Cultures knowledge” are convincing testimony to the effects of the Project. Their ways of talking about cultural issues in the classroom have changed, and they respond to educational policies on the basis of their new perspective. For instance, as teachers have grappled with the onslaught of mandated statewide norm-referenced testing, they have brought Bridging Cultures thinking to bear by drawing on students’ values of helping and sharing to encourage group studying and group completion of practice tests.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT REACHING UNIVERSITY STUDENTS?

Virtually all students who have directly evaluated a Bridging Cultures presentation have claimed that it is of great interest to them and will influence their practice. Students’ comments are almost uniformly positive, suggesting that they have not been “turned off” but rather alerted to potentially important new ways of thinking about culture. Of course, there is no way of knowing whether or how exposure to Bridging Cultures influences their teaching or counseling without follow-up research (we have some data bearing on this issue but not a great deal). University students seem to make most sense of the Bridging Cultures framework when they have personal and professional experiences that can scaffold understanding.

The intensely personal response of some students (particularly students who reveal that they are from collectivistic backgrounds) suggests that those students may, indeed, have been affected in a lasting way by the course Module. Because the framework reaches them at an emotional level and connects with personal experience (prior knowledge), it is hard to imagine that they will not begin to observe classroom and home-school interactions in a new way, as did the Bridging Cultures teachers. Whether they can go ahead and act on their new perceptions constructively is a question to be examined. However, when students have given explicit plans or expressed explicit insights regarding practice (such as commenting that they will use children’s natural inclination to help as a resource or that they are chagrined at having prevented children from helping each other in the past), one can fairly infer that they will be more accepting of children’s helping behaviors.

Jun’s thesis (2000) and the interview data collected by staff researchers shed some light on longer-term effects. She concludes that 80% of her counseling interviewees found the framework helpful and were able to apply it to their work. It seems likely from the data we have that some percentage of students (perhaps 30 or 40%) are able to apply what they have learned in a more than superficial way and continue to develop their understanding through observation and interaction with others.

Students who already have some in-service experience (e.g., as intern teachers or emergency credential teachers) have much clearer ideas of possible
applications of *Bridging Cultures* concepts. Nevertheless, even they would quite surely benefit from a community of peers with whom to continue to explore the individualism/collectivism framework’s applications as well as questions of the role of culture in their schools in general.

The fact that quite a number of students have chosen to do thesis research on various applications of *Bridging Cultures* concepts is an indicator of the value that many students assign to this content.

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT IMPACT ON STUDENTS IN *BRIDGING CULTURES* CLASSROOMS?**

Teachers attribute specific effects on students to *Bridging Cultures* innovations, and they are able to give cogent rationales for believing it is these innovations that have brought about the effects. For example, one teacher’s group homework preparation strategy is predicated on the understanding of her students’ group orientation; the increase in homework completion is a concrete outcome. In another teacher’s classroom, increased support of students’ helping each other has contributed to a higher rate of homework return among students who have been absent.

The most justifiable claim of student impact is based on the lengthy ethnographic study conducted by Isaac (1999), who showed differences in teacher-student relations in a *Bridging Cultures* classroom compared to a non-*Bridging Cultures* classroom. These differences resulted in more time on academic task and easier transitions from one activity to another in the *Bridging Cultures* classroom as opposed to the non-*Bridging Cultures* classroom.

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED ABOUT RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND DISSEMINATION?**

Developing print resources is important and demands time and other resources. We believe it has been very worthwhile to develop the compendium of resources enumerated earlier. As is evident, they fill different niches, and when the two books in preparation are complete, we will have expanded our reach to even more potentially interested educators. Our existing publications have been well-received and considered useful by many professional developers and university educators, as well as teachers. If there were one improvement to be made to satisfy readers it would be to include even more concrete examples related to cultural differences.

The feedback we have gotten suggests that those who have some background in teaching about culture or have personal experience that helps them understand cross-cultural issues are able to make use of the publications. Nevertheless, to have a deep and lasting impact, the publications are probably best read in conjunction with long-term professional development (see professional development section above). Presentations at re-
search-oriented conferences (e.g., SRCD, AERA, Jean Piaget Society) have been useful in helping us criticize our own evidence for the conclusions drawn on the basis of the research.

One notable gap in our resources is a set of videotapes that could be used in professional development and courses. These would complement presentations and the publications we have. The publication of *Bridging Cultures between Home and School* can be expected to spawn additional requests for videotapes and professional development.

With regard to dissemination, we believe we have reached a significant number of educators in the western region (AZ, CA, NV, UT) through the strategies of WestEd (particularly with the Knowledge Brief) and nationally through our two articles in *Educational Leadership*. Of course, the professional development workshops and conference presentations are a major aspect of dissemination.

**Challenges Confronted by the Bridging Cultures Project**

Many of the issues identified for this section have been alluded to earlier or could be inferred from what has been written, but we want to make them explicit for the benefit of our own future work and efforts that may be undertaken by others. Inherent to the process of carrying out a research project is recognizing limitations and using that knowledge to make modifications or adjustments.

**TEACHERS’ STRUGGLES TO UNDERSTAND IMPLICATIONS OF THE FRAMEWORK**

Implications of the framework were not automatically evident with regard to every situation. For example, one of the strategies called into question by the team was the use of student-led conferences. In this particular situation, one of the teachers discussed her notion of inviting parents to confer with her about a student’s academic and social progress in a meeting led by the student. The teachers and researchers responded to the teacher by suggesting the inappropriateness of the strategy, given that the majority of her students were Latino. In Latino families children tend to defer to adults, and therefore a student-led conference could provoke uneasiness between the child and parent. Instead of facilitating and enhancing communication, this strategy could potentially inhibit trust and openness by directly opposing a fundamental value in Latino culture. Upon becoming aware of the possible detrimental “side effects” or negative implications of student-led conferences, the teacher re-thought her approach and soon discontinued this practice. Shortly thereafter, she came up with the idea of group conferences.
Another example of individual interpretation and application of the framework can be seen in one teacher’s account of how she has modified her communication style with Latino students. Again, the scenario that she describes involves the notion that in collectivist cultures, promoting respect for authority and/or elders is of utmost importance. This Latino teacher describes re-visiting her own childhood upbringing and utilizing the disciplinary examples set by elder family members to inform her relationships with Latino students. While the idea sounds empowering, it also runs the risk of generalizing one’s personal family socialization to that of other members of one’s ethnic or cultural group. The following quotation illustrates the teacher’s approach and her own acknowledgement of its potential to verge on the inappropriate:

> When I do my castigating, I hear my mom, grandparents...I have said, “you look down when I speak with you.” I do what their families expect them to do...Before Bridging Cultures I would have NEVER imagined myself doing that. I do get into screaming fits when they don’t do their work...The screaming is all part of the game—then I am doing my dad... It is my culture and how I was brought up...I am still learning how to do that without “being home” with the dysfunctionality of my own family.

It is apparent from her interview that this teacher respects her students and their families. In her attempt to draw them closer to her and move into their circle of trust, she has modified her communication style so as to match what she assumes is familiar to them. But as with any cultural group, there is variability among families even when there are similarities in values. So for example, while it is true that in Latino culture, children and youth tend not to look their elders in the eyes, failing to observe this may not necessarily be grounds for punishment; in some families it is simply understood. The way in which an adult teaches values may not necessarily involve raising his/her voice or using harsh words.

Discussions at the bi-monthly meetings offered opportunities to explore how teachers were applying the framework and to critique some applications, but there is no foolproof method for ensuring that teachers “do the right thing” at all times. It is to be expected that teachers will make their own sense of the meaning of any theoretical framework and may not always generate practices that others would find appropriate. These are the risks associated with a non-prescriptive approach to professional development, yet we do not believe they justify a prescriptive approach. Rather, they underline the need for ongoing, informed reflection and interaction with other professionals.

**COMMUNICATION ACROSS ROLE TYPES**

Some of the teachers acknowledge that the discussions during the bi-monthly meetings have tended to be skewed in terms of who is willing to speak up. The researchers tended to take the floor more frequently, while some of the teachers seemed to feel inhibited given the implied status differential. This is a classic problem of collaborative action research projects.
involving different institutions that needs to be anticipated, and strategies for preventing the problem should be identified in advance.

SEPARATION BY GEOGRAPHY

Blanca Quiroz, one of the four core researchers, left her master’s program at UCLA and moved to Harvard University’s Department of Education in the fall of 1998 to begin working on a doctorate. Although she continues to be an official member of the Project and has contributed to publications, she cannot participate to the degree she did previously. The loss of her more continuous input is felt strongly by her colleagues and the teachers. It is a detriment to the Project that the researcher who has inside knowledge of Mexican culture is not as involved as she was.

Maintaining close communication and a collaborative working relationship even between Northern and Southern California presents a challenge: Elise Trumbull is at WestEd in the San Francisco Bay Area; Patricia Greenfield and Carrie Rothstein-Fisch are in Southern California (and 60 miles from each other, at that). In the 1999-2000 academic year, Patricia’s research took her to New Mexico for nine months. The core teachers reside and work in Southern California, but even they are spread out over a considerable distance. Despite this challenge, the group continues to be close and productive (see lists of publications, presentations), attesting to the strength of commitment and relationships among its members. Staff researchers, core teachers, and UCLA and CSUN students have managed to stay connected through meetings and telephone, e-mail, fax, and often FEDEX.

STATE, DISTRICT, AND LOCAL CHANGES AND MANDATES

During the Project period, two new statewide mandates had particular effects on teachers and their students. First was passage of Proposition 227, which essentially dismantled bilingual education in the state of California. All but one teacher have significantly reduced the amount of Spanish they use in instruction, a situation that makes culturally harmonious teaching even more important. One teacher explained that rejecting a child’s language was like rejecting his or her culture. Another teacher lamented that the Proposition had dismantled not only bilingual education programs but also his relationship with his students. The comfort zone that he had created over the years by speaking Spanish with his Latino students was no longer a possibility. Idioms and expressions translated from Spanish into English do not have the same meaning.

Proposition 227 also had an impact on the participation in school activities of Latino parents who were Spanish-dominant. The teacher who was successful in increasing the number of parent volunteers in her classroom was no longer able to allow parents to read to the children using materials in Spanish. This teacher was confronted with the task of finding alterna-
tive ways for many of the Latino parent volunteers to participate without being involved in reading activities. Furthermore, the prohibition of Spanish in the school setting may also translate into students’ not wanting to speak Spanish in any setting. One teacher says that her primary concern is how the rejection of Spanish might affect relationships between children and their parents. In the following quotation, this teacher discusses how a student’s embarrassment and refusal to learn to read in Spanish may also serve to diminish her parents’ roles in her schooling:

It alienates the parents’ social and academic involvement with the child … I told the parents to read in Spanish if they don’t know English. One girl told her mother to stop reading in Spanish. “I don’t like Spanish. Only read to me in English.” And mind you, her English skills are nil. So the parent is completely alienated from the child’s education. That has an enormous impact on social relationships.

The second mandate is adoption of a standardized, norm-referenced achievement test, the Stanford 9, which all students grades 2-11 must take yearly. While several of the Bridging Cultures teachers state that they refuse to teach to the test, they acknowledge the dilemmas it has caused. Some of the teachers at their schools do feel the pressure to focus their class time on preparing their students for the test. First-year and emergency-credentialed teachers are working longer to meet the demands of the test. The Bridging Cultures teachers discussed growing tension and dissatisfaction among teachers in their school environments. Perhaps the worst problem is the collision of the two mandates: now students who are not yet proficient in English must take the test (with very few exceptions). Before Proposition 227, Spanish-speaking students participating in bilingual education took a test in Spanish called “Aprenda,” which is no longer available. Since these students typically score low, districts are creating new “categories” of students. One Bridging Cultures teacher describes her frustration with the new mandates in the following quotation:

Learning hasn’t changed, but as a result we now have the after school intervention for the “at risk” kids. They did poorly on last year’s Stanford 9—in the bottom quarter. And they did so poorly because they had to take it in English. Our Spanish test, Aprenda, was no longer available. So you have all these kids—who would have done great in Aprenda—doing terrible on the Stanford 9.

These policies have added stress to teachers’ lives, as they do not believe they can use the most appropriate strategies to teach, nor do they believe the tests are appropriate for their students.

LIMITATIONS ON TEACHERS AS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPERS

Teachers have a limited number of days (and/or hours) in which they can participate in or offer professional development during the academic calendar year. The professional development offered to teachers through Bridging Cultures took place on Saturdays for this reason. Whenever teachers are to be involved in a presentation outside their own district, most need special permission. Different schools have different policies about
how many days a teacher may be absent to engage in such activities, even if substitute pay is provided by a project. Two of the seven teachers were restricted in ability to miss days because they teach in one of the lowest-performing schools (on the basis of standardized test scores) in the district, where the policy is to maximize the time teachers spend with their students.

Some of the teachers in the Project have had personal responsibilities that limit the time they can devote to *Bridging Cultures* outside of their normal working hours. For example, one teacher has two small children. She recalls contributing to the preparation of a script and outline for a presentation in Ohio but was unable to attend because of her familial obligations. Another teacher has had to assume a great deal of responsibility for her ailing mother (encroaching on Saturday availability), and yet another has a new baby. Even when they have not been able to attend a meeting, these teachers have remained part of the group through phone calls and written communication—continuing to share their thinking and documentation of their classroom innovations.

**LIMITATIONS OF EVALUATION METHODS**

The researchers designed instruments that proved very useful for evaluating the effects of the Project on the core participating teachers. However, we did not develop uniform instruments for evaluation of workshops and presentations outside the core group. There are pros and cons to tailoring an evaluation to a particular setting or audience, but we would like to have been able to make more comparisons than we can with existing data. Fortunately, some questions have remained relatively constant across all evaluation forms: We have nearly always asked for an overall response to the presentation and an assessment of its applicability to the respondent’s work. We have consistently used a 1-5 Likert-type scale. We have always posed at least one open-ended question, which has yielded some very interesting data. Nevertheless, in retrospect, we wish we had developed a single instrument that was always administered. It could have been supplemented with specific additional questions as needed. In addition, it would have been ideal, given adequate funding, to have some outside evaluation of the Project.

**LIMITED FUNDING**

As it has become apparent that we need to develop videotapes—something that can quickly consume tens of thousands of dollars—we realize that additional funding is a necessity. Ideally, funding for videotapes should have been built into the initial budgets or outside money sought early on for that purpose. We have applied for a total of six small grants and received three: one through CSUN that gave Carrie Rothstein-Fisch time to conduct observations and interviews; one through the Sage Foundation that will support some time for the writing of two books; and most re-
ently, one from the Language Minority Research Institute that provides for examining the impact of *Bridging Cultures* education on immigrant Latino parents.
What Would We Do Differently Next Time?

TO IMPROVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Core Teacher Workshops

On the basis of teachers’ suggestions, we would extend the length of each workshop by at least an hour to accommodate additional discussion and informal interaction. Teachers thought the experience might have been improved by including administrators as well as non-bilingual teachers from diverse backgrounds who teach immigrant students. In a new collaboration, we would consider having a more diverse group of teachers; however, we believe that it would be more effective to work with teachers and administrators separately—occasionally bringing them together.

Ongoing Meetings

We have learned that communication may be somewhat more fragile than we realized. We would want to address communication issues introduced by differences in cultural backgrounds, personality, and perceived status more consistently and earlier in the process than we did this time. Staff researchers need to be aware that even if teachers contribute to planning meetings and take turns leading meetings, the staff researchers will probably still be perceived as being in charge. With that perception may come hesitation on the part of teachers to question processes or intervene.

Other Presentations/Workshops

Actually, we have made many course corrections along the way as members of the group have made more and more presentations. One concrete step we are taking is to seek funding to make a series of three videotapes: 1) to introduce the Project and its framework, 2) to show extended examples of what Bridging Cultures classrooms look like (to illustrate strategies in organization and instruction), and 3) to show how to work with parents successfully. Also, we would make stronger efforts to network with people interested in the framework and the Project earlier in the process so that they have a community with whom to continue the dialogue/conversation. An interactive site on the WestEd Web page is one possible answer (now being addressed). In addition, we can insist on having enough time to do a presentation that allows for extended discussion and planning for follow-up, probably a three-hour or larger time slot. In general, these single presentations probably ought to be used to get people interested in participating in a more extended professional development process.

TO REACH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

One clear conclusion is that students could probably benefit from more opportunities to observe and interact in contexts where the framework can
elucidate cross-cultural relationships. Perhaps extended discussions where students with personal or professional experience that highlights the interplay of individualism and collectivism can share with others with less experience would deepen students’ understanding.

Another element of impact on university students has to do with the degree to which their own instructors use culturally-responsive strategies in pre-service courses. University students would be well served if their professors themselves had the deep knowledge of cultural value differences afforded by the Bridging Cultures framework. Professors who have attended conference workshops claim that they will include Bridging Cultures content in their classes, and the Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module is one first step toward larger scale efforts to increase the impact of the Bridging Cultures Project on pre-service educators and university students. But the impact on teacher educators may be limited to those with a strong interest in culture to begin with, indicated by their inclination to select a conference workshop on culture.

A more widespread approach to increasing the impact of Bridging Cultures on university students would be to incorporate it into basic texts used in educational psychology or multiculturalism courses that are required in teacher credential programs. When education students are routinely exposed to and held accountable for theories and frameworks, they tend to learn them. Caution must be observed, however, insofar as the framework is not a curriculum per se but a way of organizing cultural tendencies. If textbook authors gravitate to the framework and include it as a lens for viewing other theories of development and learning, we believe students will benefit. The Guide is useful in moving the reader from awareness to understanding—and, we hope, to meaningful and purposeful action. Thus, widespread dissemination of the Guide and the Module may go a long way toward supporting pre-service educators and university students.

**TO DOCUMENT IMPACT ON STUDENTS IN BRIDGING CULTURES CLASSROOMS**

In a future research and development effort, we would likely work at the level of a whole school and thus be able to follow the same or similar cohorts of students over a period of years. We could designate some direct indicators of achievement and factors associated with achievement to examine systematically. Teachers could keep baseline data on homework return and the like for a period of time before the Project began. Other baseline data could be collected as well so that changes could be more clearly attributed to Bridging Cultures if they did occur (granting that multiple influences will always make these relationships hard to “prove”). The kinds of student impact teachers have identified would be a starting point for areas of inquiry in the new research. For example, it would be useful to document the kind and amount of parent involvement, degree and form of students helping students, and the like. We could also identify a compari-
son school for which we would examine the same indicators and factors. The Isaac study (1999) could be replicated. Such an approach would be superior to making inferences on the basis of teacher report alone.

TO IMPROVE DISSEMINATION EFFORTS

First, as mentioned, we would look for funding to support video development much earlier in the process, so that we were videotaping examples of teachers’ innovations and interactions from the start (assuming teachers gave permission). Second, we would organize an Advisory Committee early on in the research and development process; one charge of the group would be to assist us in selective dissemination to important networks of educators.
Possible Future Research and Development

What follows below are some ideas for expanding the Bridging Cultures Project. They are not necessarily in order of feasibility or importance.

EXPAND THE PROCESS TO A WHOLE SCHOOL

This was discussed earlier under the topic of “student impact.” Scaling up the long-term professional development and teacher research to a whole school would allow us to work on ways to reach not only the most motivated, expert teachers. We could examine what works with teachers of various types (grade levels, experience, ethnicity/culture, level of interest, attitudes) and gain some understanding of the dynamics of such a project at the school level. It would also allow for following students over a period of years with different teachers. Finally, such a project might provide opportunities to intersect with groups like the parent-teacher organization and to work with administrators, teachers, and parents at the level of school policy.

STUDY APPLICABILITY OF THE FRAMEWORK TO OTHER POPULATIONS

One persistent and important question that arises from this work is to what degree is it informative for teachers in understanding the broader diversity of their classrooms? For example, many participants in professional development workshops have asked about applicability of the individualism/collectivism framework to understanding conflicts faced by African-American students or students from other ethnic groups. Although we have some initial ideas about how to answer this question, we know that additional research needs to be done to answer the question in the same depth as it has been answered for immigrant Latino students. With regard to American Indian students whose families hold traditional values, there are many parallels in experience with the public schools. However, these relationships to the dominant society cannot be understood without reference to issues of racism and the histories of these groups. Certainly, immigrant and non-immigrant Latinos are faced with some of the same issues.

EXPLORE IMPACT OF BRIDGING CULTURES ON CONTENT-AREA INSTRUCTION

It has been suggested that we link the Bridging Cultures Project to other, large-scale research efforts. For example, we could investigate how Bridging Cultures knowledge on the part of teachers influences the ways they teach mathematics and language arts curricula. Our observational and interview data demonstrate that there are natural ways to foster improved academic achievement guided by the framework, resulting in improved subject area competencies.
INVESTIGATE LEVEL OF STEREOTYPING AMONG BRIDGING CULTURES PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOPS, COURSES

A question that has to do with the methodology of working with teachers is how can we avoid stereotypes while using heuristics such as the individualism/collectivism framework to help us understand deep values that groups tend to have? This Project would address concerns of those who fear that categorical frameworks like the individualism/collectivism framework inevitably lead to stereotyping. We would have to gather some baseline data on participants’ tendencies to stereotype and compare those results with performance on a comparable instrument post-Bracing Cultures training. Perhaps a simple pre-and post-course measure could be developed to be used in all workshops and courses.

INFLUENCE TEACHER EVALUATION AND CREDENTIALING POLICIES

What might happen if an understanding of culture based in part on the Bridging Cultures Project became part of the standardized testing for teachers? Teacher competency tests could emphasize the role of culture with both general and specific ideas that would be at an appropriate level for novice teachers. Bridging Cultures content could be included on California’s CLAD and B-CLAD tests, for example, which are used to certify teachers to teach cross-culturally and bilingually.

MOVE BEYOND THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

We know very little about how teachers’ knowledge of the framework might affect students in middle and high schools. What are the implications of conflicts between individualism and collectivism as youth are pulled, perhaps even more overtly, toward a culture that is different from their home cultures? The implications of this conflict during the period of identity development seem especially worth investigating. Likewise, Bridging Cultures seems like a natural component for Head Start programs. Parents would not yet have been alienated by the formality of public schools, but could be empowered to understand the culture of the school in their own neighborhood—and perhaps early in their own development as parents—so that they could understand how the value of systems of individualism and collectivism affect child development and education.

INVESTIGATE HOW MUCH ONGOING SUPPORT IS NECESSARY

How much collaboration and ongoing collegial meeting is necessary to support a deep understanding and effective application of this framework? What is the minimum interaction with Bridging Cultures concepts necessary to understand them at a deep enough level to apply them intelligently? Because people’s previous knowledge and experience certainly influence their ability to grasp and apply Bridging Cultures concepts, it might be
useful in future teacher-research efforts (particularly those that involve whole school faculties or groups mixed as to motivation) to get more baseline data on teachers. What do they know about culture in general? What is their understanding of the role of culture in child-rearing and schooling?

**DO MORE COMPARISONS OF BRIDGING CULTURES AND NON-BRIDGING CULTURES CLASSROOMS**

One piece of research that naturally suggests itself entails additional observation and videotaping in pairs of classrooms—*Bridging Cultures* and non-*Bridging Cultures*. Comparisons could be made on instructional practices, classroom organizational patterns, interactions with parent volunteers, and many other important elements of education. This could be done in conjunction with the whole-school project mentioned above.

**TRY THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WITH ADMINISTRATORS**

Teachers (both *Bridging Cultures* teachers and others) have long told us that if we do not “get to administrators,” we will not have the full impact we might on developing cross-cultural understanding in schools. A few presentations have been made to administrators, and the responses suggest that they would be a receptive group. The California School Leadership Academy (housed at WestEd) has offered to work with *Bridging Cultures* to integrate *Bridging Cultures* content into their professional development courses, and it would be a likely organization through which to reach large numbers of administrators.

**EXTEND THE OUTREACH OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO SCHOOL COUNSELORS**

While school counselors have represented a smattering of attendees at presentations, efforts to reach them in larger numbers ought to be made. To judge from the interest of Rothstein-Fisch’s graduate counseling students, the framework and school examples are extremely germane to these professionals.

**TRY THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WITH A NEW CADRE OF TEACHERS**

*Bridging Cultures* teachers have, from the beginning, suggested that we consider working with groups that represent mixed ethnicities and different ranges of student populations—culturally and chronologically. The whole-school project would present one opportunity to do so, but there are advantages to having teachers from different schools, in that teachers are likely to feel freer expressing themselves and local politics can be kept at bay.
DEVELOP PARENT WORKSHOPS/CURRICULUM

At least one Bridging Cultures teacher has developed workshops for parents around issues of volunteering in the school and participating in parent-teacher conferences. Others have incorporated discussion of the individualism/collectivism framework as it applies to specific issues that come up with parents. Reaching parents and families of students is an obvious extension of the professional development we have done and could probably be easily designed by the core teachers, given time and support. As mentioned, a small grant will support a controlled investigation of the effects of parent workshops about individualism/collectivism. This research will take place during school year 2001-2002 (see Appendix D, Berta Guzman and Veronica Martinez’s project to teach parents about individualism and collectivism so that the conflicts between home and school can be reduced.

DEVELOP PRE-SERVICE EDUCATION COURSE ON WORKING WITH PARENTS

The Bridging Cultures team has been in conversation with members of a school reform network in Los Angeles that has identified the need for a pre-service course for teachers on how to work with parents—especially cross-culturally. Despite the difficulties of getting a university course approved through normal institutional channels, this group has hopes of succeeding through a strong affiliation it has with three southern California state universities. Their belief is that existing Bridging Cultures materials could be used as the core of a course.

INVESTIGATE IMPACT OF BRIDGING CULTURES TEACHER AWARENESS ON STUDENT IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT

Numerous educators believe, on the basis of some research, that ethnic/cultural identity development is crucial to school success. At least in theory, more culturally-appropriate instruction ought to strengthen identity development. We would have to collaborate with a scholar in this area to carry out a project to investigate this relationship (e.g., Dr. Rosa Hernandez Sheets at San Francisco State University).

DEVELOP VIDEOTAPES ON CLASSROOM PRACTICES, WORKING WITH PARENTS

We have discussed this topic more than once. It is clear from numerous evaluations and recommendations of the Dissemination Round Table that visual representations of teachers’ practices would greatly complement our written materials. In brief, the Project would ideally develop at least three videotapes: 1) introduction to Bridging Cultures—the framework and the project and its outcomes; 2) examples of Bridging Cultures practices in Bridging Cultures teachers’ classrooms; and 3) working with par-
ents—including examples of how Bridging Cultures teachers have expanded ways of relating to parents and perhaps interviews with parents about their perceptions of their children’s classrooms. A videotape on cross-cultural parent-teacher conferences would be one entrée into discussing many of the issues that can arise between home and school.
Appendix A
A Brief History of the Project

The first several months of the Bridging Cultures Project were devoted to building the team of educators who would carry out the research and development described in the body of this report. Patricia Greenfield, Carrie Rothstein-Fisch, Elise Trumbull, and Blanca Quiroz met several times to plan the Project. Teachers from three districts were selected, based on recommendations from their schools and prior knowledge of their work by the researchers (hereafter called “staff researchers”). A series of three professional development workshops was designed, and logistics such as dates and places for meeting were determined.

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

As mentioned, the primary purpose of the Project was to support teachers to deepen their understanding of cultural differences and the role of culture in child-rearing and schooling, with a view to improving instruction for immigrant Latino students. Classroom research prior to the Project showed that conflicts in values involving immigrant Latino students, their parents, and teachers could be explained with reference to differences between collectivism and individualism—the dominant value system of the immigrant Latino families and schools, respectively (Greenfield, Quiroz, & Raeff, 2000; Raeff, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2000). Therefore, Bridging Cultures staff researchers were interested in how teachers would apply research and theory on these value systems in their own classrooms—becoming, in effect, teacher-researchers. The hope was that teachers would find the individualism–collectivism framework useful for understanding cultural patterns and identifying new ways to build cross-cultural bridges in the classroom. Another purpose of the Project was to validate a professional development process and materials that could be used with other teachers. It was also hoped that the small group of teachers could become a cadre of experts on the Project, assuming that the professional development proved useful to them.

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

This kind of collaboration between teacher-researchers and staff researchers yields many benefits: access to different types of resources (intellectual and material); sharing of different perspectives, experience, and skills (including enhanced research skills for teachers and enhanced understanding of classroom realities for researchers); and synergistic learning based on the variety and richness of input of all participants. It offers an opportunity for teachers to make their own tacit knowledge explicit, share their insights and observations, and profit from the constructive criticism of colleagues and others. With the support and input of others, teachers can try out innovations they may be hesitant to try otherwise. Collaboration
also brings with it several challenges: establishing a common purpose, ensuring that all participants share equally in the “profits” or positive outcomes of the collaboration, and minimizing the unconscious perpetuation of status differences that can demoralize and diminish participation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Research on Individualism and Collectivism

Individualism and collectivism were originally conceived of as one of four sets of dimensions of cultural variation\(^{17}\) by Hofstede (1980, 1983), who assessed the degree of individualism and collectivism of 66 countries. The continuum he proposed has been used to describe the extent to which a culture emphasizes self or group goals. Individualism is representative of mainstream United States culture. In fact, the United States is considered to have the most individualistic culture of the more than 80 countries Hofstede studied, according to his research.

The principal developmental goal within an individualistic system is independence. This contrasts with the value system of collectivism, whose principal developmental goal is interdependence. Collectivism is representative of many immigrant cultures in the United States—in fact, of a great many cultures. Indeed, over 70% of the world’s cultures could be described as collectivistic (Triandis, 1989). Table A1 summarizes the features of individualism and collectivism. One can see how the elements numbered 3-6 flow from the core value of focus on either the individual or the group.

The Bridging Cultures framework is both economical and generative. It is economical because it incorporates and explains the relationship among many elements that have been previously regarded as separate, such as conceptions of schooling and education, attitudes towards the family, expectations for role maintenance and flexibility (including sex roles), duties toward elders, authority structures, attitudes toward discipline, ways of dealing with property, and many aspects of communication. The framework is generative because it suggests interpretations of and explanations for an infinite set of possible interactions among students in a classroom, between teacher and student(s), between teacher and parents, and between school and community.

An inherent risk in using the framework is of artificially dichotomizing people or cultures. No culture or person is altogether individualistic or collectivistic; rather the relative balance of these constellations of values varies so that one could say that members of a particular culture tend to be

\(^{17}\) Hofstede (1991) defined individualism and collectivism as follows: “Individualism pertains to societies in which the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family. Collectivism, as its opposite, pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty” (p. 51).
more or less individualistic or collectivistic than the members of another culture. In other words, there are predictable patterns within cultures. Various factors influence the degree to which people from a culture are more or less individualistic or collectivistic. In terms of the immigrant Latino population in the U.S., for example, the degree of individualism or collectivism exhibited by an individual is influenced by length of time in the U.S., level of formal education, socioeconomic status, and rural versus urban background. Nevertheless, despite its limitations, the framework is a useful tool for pointing to likely sources of conflict as well as likely sources of potential harmony because so many students in our schools come from cultures that are a great deal more collectivistic than the dominant U.S. culture. Deep values tend to persist across generations, despite changes in economic status or geography.

THE BRIDGING CULTURES TEAM

Staff Researchers

A group of four researchers, named in Table A2, came together: a cultural developmental psychologist (Greenfield); an applied psycholinguist (Trumbull); an educational psychologist/teacher-educator (Rothstein-Fisch); and a Latin American Studies graduate student, who is a former bilingual teacher (Quiroz). We represented the European-American and immigrant Latino populations whose school conflicts we would be addressing. We refer to this group as “staff researchers” because the teacher subjects became Bridging Cultures researchers themselves. In the fifth year of the Project, two young researchers joined the WestEd staff and have assisted with this report (Rebeca Diaz-Meza and Aida Hasan, who are co-authors).
Teachers

The workshop participants included seven elementary school bilingual teachers serving predominantly immigrant Latino families. Teachers were selected to participate on the basis of their interest in better serving Latino students. Four of the teachers are Latino; three are European-American. Two teachers were born in Mexico, one in Peru, and one in Germany, although all of these had immigrated to the United States as young children, between two and eight years of age. Three teachers were born in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Partner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WestEd</td>
<td>Elise Trumbull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Language and Cultural Diversity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Patricia Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Blanca Quiroz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Department of Latin American Studies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>Carrie Rothstein-Fisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>Department of Educational Psychology and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Marie Altchech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Stoner Ave. School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Catherine Daley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Magnolia Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Kathryn Eyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Hoover Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Pearl Saitzyk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Westminster Ave. School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Giancarlo Mercado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Nietos School District (Whittier, CA)</td>
<td>Westminster Ave. School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View School District (Oxnard, CA)</td>
<td>Elvia Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View School District (Oxnard, CA)</td>
<td>Ada S. Nelson Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View School District (Oxnard, CA)</td>
<td>Amada Pérez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View School District (Oxnard, CA)</td>
<td>Mar Vista Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six female and one male teacher have participated in the Project (Table A2). The teachers’ grade assignments range from kindergarten to fifth grade, with every grade level represented by at least one teacher. This has remained true, even with changes in grade assignment, until the current school year (2000-01), when there is no first-grade teacher. All teachers are bilingual (to varying degrees) in English and Spanish. The teachers were all
experienced in their profession, with years of teaching ranging from five to 21 (mean=12.7) in the first year of the Project. (This information and additional data were gathered through a teacher questionnaire administered at the first workshop, described below. See Appendix B.)

**Undergraduate and Graduate Students**

As the Project developed, several students of Professors Greenfield and Rothstein-Fisch became involved. Two UCLA students were the videographers for the workshops and one meeting. Three other students of Dr. Greenfield contributed to the research on *Bridging Cultures* by either conducting research or interpreting and writing about existing data.

Once the Project began to generate success with in-service teachers, Dr. Rothstein-Fisch started to take it to her courses with pre-service and in-service teachers and school counselors at California State University, Northridge. Perhaps a third of these students are actually new in-service teachers who are continuing to work on a credential. Since the spring of 1997, she has incorporated a *Bridging Cultures Module* into 15 different courses on child development and educational psychology.

Currently, 15 graduate students in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling at California State University, Northridge, are conducting research on the effects of the *Bridging Cultures* framework on home-school communication, on training school counselors, and on new home support for literacy in the early grades.

**THE THREE WORKSHOPS**

Beginning in the fall of 1996, three four-hour workshops, which took place on Saturday mornings, were conducted over a period of three months. Each session took place in a small private library at UCLA and was videotaped. A modest stipend was provided each teacher for participating in the three workshops. The professional development approach was thoroughly documented and included teacher evaluations of its effectiveness.

The three workshops were designed to include a combination of direct presentation (as with the theory and research) and opportunities for whole-group discussion, small-group or pair activities, and individual reflection. The presentation of the research and theory was complemented with visual material (charts, graphs) and supported with follow-up readings. Discussions were scaffolded with key questions but were allowed to move in directions teachers thought important. Small-group and pair activities allowed intensive discussion and seemed to engage a couple of teachers who were less vocal in the group. Reflections took the form of short writ-

---

18 In California, many teachers have emergency credentials because of a lack of credentialed teachers.
ing exercises focused on a single question. We built in considerable informal “schmoozing” time into each workshop, starting with breakfast at 9:30 and ending with lunch, which began around 1:00. In short, we tried to provide many ways to participate in order to accommodate more than one learning style and needs for both formal and informal participation. We wanted to make these Saturday workshops intellectually exciting, inviting, and nurturing for teachers. The Saturday workshops always ran overtime because teachers chose to stay and talk beyond the designated hours.

Professional Development Approach and Methods

The approach of the staff researchers toward professional development was a constructivist one, with emphasis on teachers’ own inquiry and reflection. That is to say, we sought to promote interaction among teachers and between teachers and staff researchers and to support teachers’ making sense of the research and readings on their own terms. Likewise, we expected that teachers’ interpretations of what they were learning would lead to a range of changes in thinking and action. There was no prescriptive outcome of the workshops. While the staff researchers had established ideas of broad implications of the individualism/collectivism framework and the empirical research based on it for the classroom, there was no predetermined set of practices teachers would be expected to embrace. If the professional development workshops “worked,” the result would be a cadre of teachers who engaged in thoughtful inquiry in their classrooms and schools and who could consciously reflect on what they were observing (including their own actions).

After the Workshops

At the conclusion of the third workshop, it was clear that teachers wanted to continue to be involved, and the group planned together how it would collaborate. As teachers’ roles changed, interviews and questionnaires developed by staff researchers included questions about their involvement in professional development activities in their schools and their use of ethnography. In a sense, the evaluation grew “organically” with the Project. The same tools envisioned from the beginning (harmonious with an ethnographic perspective) have been used throughout the Project. Briefly, ethnography is “the art and science of describing a group or culture” (Fetterman, 1988, p. 11). To understand teachers’ changes in thinking and practice (were they to occur), staff researchers would have to understand the cultural contexts in which teachers operated and interpret any changes in terms of those contexts.

The Ongoing Meetings

Between September 1996 and December 2000, the teacher researchers and staff researchers met a total of 24 times. Meetings were scheduled for approximately every two to three months, and staff researchers mapped
out plans for documenting teachers’ reports of their thinking and practice, as well as what was going on in their classrooms more generally. All but two of the meetings (which include the initial three workshops) have been on Saturdays from 9:30-1:30. The others were on Sunday afternoons. These meetings present opportunities to deepen understanding of culture and for teachers to learn from and support each other. The primary purpose of these meetings has been for teachers to share with each other and with researchers what they are doing in the classroom that reflects application of the Bridging Cultures framework of individualism and collectivism and to examine their practices for a) cultural appropriateness and b) effects on classroom interactions and learning (or effects on relationships with parents). Sometimes teachers and researchers debate the appropriateness of an intervention, referring to the framework and research for insights.

Several meetings have had a formal topic, such as “assessment,” “language arts instruction,” or “math and science instruction” and have been chaired by a teacher. They have also been used as an opportunity for formal discussion of literature the group has read, as in the case of exploring how the framework might apply to African-American students and families. Readings from Gloria Ladson-Billings, Janice Hale-Benson, and others formed the basis of a discussion that included African-American colleagues of the core teachers and staff researchers. To learn about Korean roots of child rearing and schooling, the group read chapters and articles about Korean-American and Korean culture by authors such as Uichol Kim and Syoo-Hyang Choi and heard from the two Korean-American graduate students, as well as a visiting professor from Korea who was spending a semester at CSUN, Dr. Soon-Ohk Hong.

Meetings have also kept the staff researchers aware of the daily realities of teaching and stimulated questions about how knowledge of culture is important to understanding effects of such events affecting classrooms as a new California statewide testing program, new mandates related to literacy instruction, and major shifts away from a bilingual education model to an English-as-a-second-language model of teaching immigrant students.
Appendix B
Publications of the Bridging Cultures Project

ALREADY PUBLISHED


Rothstein-Fisch, C. (under review). Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module. Expected to be co-published by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (Mahwah, NJ) and WestEd (San Francisco).


BOOKS IN PREPARATION
(Underwritten by a grant from the Sage Foundation)

Greenfield, P.M. (Ed.). Untitled. This book will present a set of research papers on Bridging Cultures, including the papers listed below under “Conference Papers.”

Rothstein-Fisch, C., Trumbull, E., Greenfield, P.M., & Quiroz, B. Untitled. This book will present themes in teacher change, as exhibited by the seven core Bridging Cultures teachers and documented through observations, interviews, surveys, and discussions.

CONFERENCE PAPERS TO BE PUBLISHED
(in P. M. Greenfield (Ed.), in preparation, above)


Appendix C
Presentations of the *Bridging Cultures* Framework

[See following pages]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Fall/96</td>
<td>Organizing and Managing the Classroom Environment</td>
<td>LAUSD Intern Program</td>
<td>Daley</td>
<td>1st-yr intern teachers, in-service, seeking-credential</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>25-30 District Intern Program evaluations (DI office)</td>
<td>ongoing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  6/20/97</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures in the Classroom</td>
<td>Jean Piaget Society Annual Conference Santa Monica, CA</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Trumbull Quiroz Greenfield</td>
<td>university faculty, other researchers, graduate students &amp; teachers</td>
<td>about 30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>poster session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  7/17/97</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Conflict Prevention through Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>National Institute for Dispute Resolution Irving, TX</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Quiroz Daley Mercado</td>
<td>teachers, administrators, and some social service personnel</td>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>2 sets: conference form 44 BC form 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Fall/97</td>
<td>Organizing and Managing the Classroom Environment</td>
<td>LAUSD Intern Program</td>
<td>Daley</td>
<td>1st-yr intern teachers, in-service, seeking-credential</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>25-30 District Intern Program evaluations ongoing course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  9/4/97</td>
<td>The Bridging Cultures Project</td>
<td>California Bilingual County Coordinators Network Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>Bilingual County Coordinators Network: Teacher Training Program directors, directors from major cities</td>
<td>approx. 50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  9/13/97</td>
<td>Overview of the Bridging Cultures Project: Opportunity for Collaboration</td>
<td>Northern California Comprehensive Center Retreat Half Moon Bay, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>professional development professionals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>informal, at the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  9/22/97</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Teacher Training Module</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Walsh</td>
<td>pre-service teachers in child development &amp; educational psychology courses at CSUN</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Psychological Foundations of Education K-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **BC Module**: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module
- **CC Roots**: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Presenters</strong></th>
<th><strong>NAEYC</strong>: National Association for the Education of Young Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altchech, Marie</td>
<td>Daley, Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Kathryn</td>
<td>Fiero, Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Steve</td>
<td>Geary, Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez, Elvia</td>
<td>Isaac, Adrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun, Catalina</td>
<td>Mercado, Giancarlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson-Barber, Sharon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Deborah</td>
<td>Pérez, Amada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiroz, Blanca</td>
<td>Singer, Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saizyk, Pearl</td>
<td>Trumbull, Elise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salcido, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Susan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9/24/97 second of 2 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10/24/97 2 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10/24/97 second of 2 sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10/29/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11/19/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12/12/97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-CLAD</th>
<th>Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAD</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-CLAD Module: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module**

**CC Roots: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altchech, Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley, Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Kathryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiero, Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary, Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield, Patricia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez, Elvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac, Adrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun, Catalina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado, Giancarlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson-Barber, Sharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Deborah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pérez, Amada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiroz, Blanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saizyk, Pearl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salcido, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer, Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull, Elise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

B-CLAD Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
CLAD (as above)
CSUN California State University, Northridge
LAUSD Los Angeles Unified School District
NAEYC National Association for the Education of Young Children
UCLA University of California, Los Angeles
USC University of Southern California

**Presenters**

Altchech, Marie
Daley, Catherine
Eyler, Kathryn
Fierro, Becky
Flores, Steve
Geary, Patrick
Greenfield, Patricia
Hernandez, Elvia
Isaac, Adrienne
Jun, Catalina
Mercado, Giancarlo
Nelson-Barber, Sharon
Park, Deborah
Pérez, Amada
Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
Saitzyk, Pearl
Salcido, Patricia
Singer, Michelle
Trumbull, Elise
Walsh, Susan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Home-School Communication in Action</td>
<td>New Voices, Fresh Perspectives Bay Region IV Diversity Coalition Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull Pérez</td>
<td>administrators, parents, students</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>student voice conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>Master’s students in early childhood education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Applied Child Development for Parent and Child Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cross-cultural Roots of Minority Child Development</td>
<td>Mt. St Mary's College Southern CA campus</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>teachers in Master’s Program</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Child and Adolescent Development across Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Getting Volunteers into the Classroom</td>
<td>Ada S. Nelson Elementary School Whittier, CA</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>teachers, administrators</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>History/Social Science with an Emphasis on Diversity</td>
<td>LAUSD Intern Program</td>
<td>Mercado</td>
<td>teachers working on cross-cultural credential</td>
<td>approx. 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B-CLAD credentialing course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Introducing the <em>Bridging Cultures Guide</em></td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>Bilingual County Coordinators Network: Teacher Training Program directors, directors from major cities</td>
<td>approx. 50</td>
<td>informal, conversation/questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures in Cross-Cultural Parent-Teacher Conferences</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>teacher educators at CSUN &amp; its Channel Islands Campus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 evaluations</td>
<td>Applied Child Development for Parent and Child Educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **B-CLAD**: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- **CLAD**: (as above)
- **CSUN**: California State University, Northridge
- **LAUSD**: Los Angeles Unified School District
- **NA**: not available
- **NAEYC**: National Association for the Education of Young Children
- **UCLA**: University of California, Los Angeles
- **USC**: University of Southern California

**Presenters**

- Altchech, Marie
- Daley, Catherine
- Eyler, Kathryn
- Fiero, Becky
- Flores, Steve
- Geary, Patrick
- Greenfield, Patricia
- Hernandez, Elvia
- Isaac, Adrienne
- Jun, Catalina
- Mercado, Giancarlo
- Nelson-Barber, Sharon
- Park, Deborah
- Pérez, Amada
- Quiroz, Blanca
- Saizyky, Pearl
- Salcido, Patricia
- Singer, Michelle
- Trumbull, Elise
- Walsh, Susan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures between Home and School</td>
<td>NAEYC Miami, FL</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>early childhood program administrators, professors, researchers</td>
<td>150+</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>many more than expected; at least 75 signed up for additional handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures between Home and School: Action Strategies for Teachers</td>
<td>Annual Pacific Education</td>
<td>Trumbull Pérez Nelson-Barber</td>
<td>teachers, administrators from U.S. Pacific entities (Guam, Marshall Islands, etc.)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14短反射</td>
<td>for teachers: strategies on how to integrate local culture into curriculum materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Infusing Diversity into Your Social Science Curriculum</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Mercado</td>
<td>K-12 teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>California History and Social Science Project course (ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Organizing and Managing the Classroom Environment</td>
<td>LAUSD Intern Program Audubon Middle School</td>
<td>Daley</td>
<td>1st yr intern teachers, in-service, seeking credential</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The Benefits of Group Conferencing</td>
<td>Stoner Avenue School Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Altchech</td>
<td>K-5 teachers</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Teacher Research: Bridging Cultures in the Classroom</td>
<td>National Association for Multicultural Education St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>Trumbull Altchech</td>
<td>teachers, multicultural ed. coordinators, administrators</td>
<td>approx. 25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Seeking Ways to Link Bridging Cultures Training with Other Culture-Related Training</td>
<td>Northern California Comprehensive Assistance Center San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Altchech, Marie Daley, Catherine Eyler, Kathryn Fierro, Becky Flores, Steve Geary, Patrick Greenfield, Patricia Hernandez, Elvia Isaac, Adrienne Jun, Catalina Mercado, Giancarlo Nelson-Barber, Sharon Park, Deborah Pérez, Amada</td>
<td>staff developers</td>
<td>approx. 8</td>
<td>oral feedback incorporated into planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-CLAD</th>
<th>Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAD</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
<td>National Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>USC</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presenters**

Altchech, Marie Daley, Catherine Eyler, Kathryn Fierro, Becky Flores, Steve Geary, Patrick Greenfield, Patricia

Hernandez, Elvia Isaac, Adrienne Jun, Catalina Mercado, Giancarlo Nelson-Barber, Sharon Park, Deborah Pérez, Amada

Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie Quiroz, Blanca Saitzyk, Pearl Salcido, Patricia Singer, Michelle Trumbull, Elise Walsh, Susan

**BC Module:** Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module

**CC Roots:** Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>11/18/98</td>
<td>Bridging Home and School Cultures</td>
<td>NAEYC Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>early childhood educators, program administrators</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>11/25/98</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: A Framework for Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>Ann Martin Children’s Center Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>tutors, educational therapists</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>informal at time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures</td>
<td>Mar Vista Elementary School Oxnard, CA</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>teachers, administrators</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2/3/99</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures in the Classroom</td>
<td>Sonoma County Office of Education: Annual Para-Educator Conference Santa Rosa, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>para-educators &amp; teachers they work with (nearly all paras are from “non-mainstream” cultures)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2/6/99</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures Project Workshop Series (trainer of trainers)</td>
<td>LAUSD Training Project UCLA</td>
<td>Greenfield Rothstein-Fisch Mercado Pérez Daley</td>
<td>staff developers, Office of Intergroup Relations staff, CLAD/BCLAD trainers, District Intern Program teachers, other teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(varies per session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2/10/99</td>
<td>Individualism and Collectivism at Home and at School</td>
<td>Stanford University Stanford, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>students/pre-service educators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2/10/99</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures between Home and School: With Special Emphasis on the Role of School Counselors</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>School Counseling student interns</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-CLAD</th>
<th>Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development</th>
<th>not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAD</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
<td>National Association for the Education of Young Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BC Module:** Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module

**CC Roots:** Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development

**Presenters**

Altchech, Marie
Daley, Catherine
Eyler, Kathryn
Fiero, Becky
Flores, Steve
Geary, Patrick
Greenfield, Patricia
Hernandez, Elvia
Isaac, Adrienne
Jun, Catalina
Mercado, Giancarlo
Nelson-Barber, Sharon
Park, Deborah
Pérez, Amada
Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
Quiroz, Blanca
Saitzyk, Pearl
Salcido, Patricia
Singer, Michelle
Trumbull, Elise
Walsh, Susan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Conflict Resolution through Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>California Association for Bilingual Education Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Pérez Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>students/pre-service educators</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>half-day institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures Between Home and School</td>
<td>California Association for the Education of Young Children Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Trumbull</td>
<td>early childhood educators, administrators</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures Project Workshop Series (trainer of trainers)</td>
<td>LAUSD Training Project UCLA</td>
<td>Greenfield Rothstein-Fisch Pérez Daley</td>
<td>staff developers, Office of Intergroup Relations staff, CLAD/BCLAD trainers, District Intern Program teachers, other teachers</td>
<td>11 (varies per session)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Bridging Home-School Cultures for Children, Families, and Schools</td>
<td>Oxnard Community College: Early Childhood Education Course Oxnard, CA</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>early childhood education students</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>invited speaker to education course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures Project Workshop Series (trainer of trainers)</td>
<td>LAUSD Training Project UCLA</td>
<td>Greenfield Rothstein-Fisch Mercado Pérez Daley</td>
<td>staff developers, Office of Intergroup Relations staff, CLAD/BCLAD trainers, District Intern Program teachers, other teachers</td>
<td>approx. 10 (varies per session)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- B-CLAD: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- CLAD: (as above)
- CSUN: California State University, Northridge
- LAUSD: Los Angeles Unified School District
- UCLA: University of California, Los Angeles
- USC: University of Southern California

**Presenters**

- Altchech, Marie
- Daley, Catherine
- Eyler, Kathryn
- Fiero, Becky
- Flores, Steve
- Geary, Patrick
- Greenfield, Patricia
- Hernandez, Elvia
- Isaac, Adrienne
- Jun, Catalina
- Mercado, Giancarlo
- Nelson-Barber, Sharon
- Park, Deborah
- Pérez, Amada
- Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
- Quiroz, Blanca
- Saitzyk, Pearl
- Salcido, Patricia
- Singer, Michelle
- Trumbull, Elise
- Walsh, Susan

**BC Module:** Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module

**CC Roots:** Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48 4/15/99</td>
<td>How Bridging Cultures Has Altered Classroom Teaching</td>
<td>WestEd San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Mercado WestEd staff, outside evaluators</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>verbal report of high praise from WestEd staff</td>
<td>presenter one of several WestEd “clients” invited to respond to evaluators’ questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 4/18/99</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures in Education: Implicit Knowledge through Explicit Teaching</td>
<td>Society for Research in Child Development Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Greenfield Rothstein-Fisch Quiroz</td>
<td>psychologists, higher education faculty</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 4/20/99</td>
<td>From Altered Perceptions to Altered Practice: Teachers Bridge Cultures in the Classroom</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting Montreal, Canada</td>
<td>Trumbull Greenfield Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>educational researchers, university faculty</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 4/22/99</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures for LAUSD District Interns</td>
<td>LAUSD Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Fierro intern teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 5/3/99</td>
<td>Individualism and Collectivism in the Classroom</td>
<td>USC School of Education Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Daley pre -in-service teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>invited speaker to Education course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 5/22/99</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures Project Workshop Series (trainer of trainers)</td>
<td>LAUSD Workshop UCLA</td>
<td>Greenfield Rothstein-Fisch staff developers, Office of Intergroup Relations staff, CLAD/BCLAD trainers, District Intern Program teachers, other teachers</td>
<td>4 (varies per session)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- B-CLAD: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- CLAD (as above)
- CSUN: California State University, Northridge
- LAUSD: Los Angeles Unified School District
- B Module: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module
- CC Roots: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development

**Presenters**

- Altichech, Marie
- Daley, Catherine
- Eyler, Kathryn
- Fiero, Becky
- Flores, Steve
- Geary, Patrick
- Greenfield, Patricia
- Hernandez, Elvia
- Isaac, Adrienne
- Jun, Catalina
- Mercado, Giancarlo
- Nelson-Barber, Sharon
- Park, Deborah
- Pérez, Amada
- Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
- Quiroz, Blanca
- Saitzyk, Pearl
- Salcido, Patricia
- Singer, Michelle
- Trumbull, Elise
- Walsh, Susan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>5/26/99 Looking Through the Cultural Value Lens: Effects of a Teacher-Training Program on Student Relations inside Two Classrooms</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>UCLA students</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>presentation of honors thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>6/9-12/99 The Bridging Cultures Framework: A Key to Opening the Door of Cross-Cultural Understanding</td>
<td>NAEYC, Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>early childhood professors, program directors, administrators</td>
<td>about 70</td>
<td>44, sign-in sheet only</td>
<td>Hernandez contributed to presentation, sharing efforts to increase parent volunteers in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>6/17/99 The Bridging Cultures Project: Description, Examples and Opportunities Bridging Cultures with Classroom Strategies</td>
<td>CSUN, Ventura Campus, Ventura, CA</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>graduate students, virtually all teachers pre-K to Grade 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Foundations of Developmental Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Summer/99 Bridging Cultures with Classroom Strategies</td>
<td>California State University, Long Beach; Pacific Southwest Regional Technology Education Center; Center for Language Minority Education Research, Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>23 telementors (K-12 teachers), 4 CSULB administrators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>for public or private school teachers — strategies on how to diversify curriculum presentation and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Summer/99 2 sessions Infusing Diversity Into Your Social Science Curriculum</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Mercado</td>
<td>K-12 teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>History and Social Science Project; same students both sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **B-CLAD**: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- **CLAD**: (as above)
- **CSUN**: California State University, Northridge
- **LAUSD**: Los Angeles Unified School District
- **Legend Presenters**: Altchech, Marie; Daley, Catherine; Eyler, Kathryn; Fierro, Becky; Flores, Steve; Geary, Patrick; Greenfield, Patricia; Hernandez, Elvia; Isaac, Adrienne; Jun, Catalina; Mercado, Giancarlo; Nelson-Barber, Sharon; Park, Deborah; Pérez, Amada; Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie; Quiroz, Blanca; Saizyk, Pearl; Salcido, Patricia; Singer, Michelle; Trumbull, Elise; Walsh, Susan
- **CC Roots**: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Summer/99 second of 2 sessions</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Mercado</td>
<td>K-12 teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>History and Social Science Project; same students both sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9/22/99 2 sessions</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Geary</td>
<td>Master’s students in Early Childhood Program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Issues and Theories in Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>9/29/99 second of 2 sessions</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Geary</td>
<td>Master’s students in Early Childhood Program</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Issues and Theories in Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
<td>CSUN Channel Islands Campus</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>MA students in Early Childhood, pre-K through 4th grade teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Advanced Study in Child &amp; Adolescent Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>9/30/99</td>
<td>Ventura County Commission on Children and Families First</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>high ranking county officials, Proposition 10 (supervisors, superintendent of schools, school board member)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>State Proposition 10 presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>10/11/99 2 sessions</td>
<td>Oxnard Community College</td>
<td>Geary Jun</td>
<td>college students, Infant and Toddler class</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>10/11/99 second of 2 sessions</td>
<td>Oxnard Community College</td>
<td>Geary Jun</td>
<td>college students, Infant and Toddler class</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **BC Module**: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module
- **CC Roots**: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development

**Presenters**

- Altchech, Marie
- Daley, Catherine
- Eyler, Kathryn
- Fiero, Becky
- Flores, Steve
- Geary, Patrick
- Greenfield, Patricia
- Hernandez, Elvia
- Isaac, Adrienne
- Jun, Catalina
- Mercado, Giancarlo
- Nelson-Barber, Sharon
- Pérez, Amada
- Rubio, Laura
- Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
- Quiroz, Blanca
- Saizyky, Pearl
- Salcido, Patricia
- Singer, Michelle
- Trumbull, Elise
- Walsh, Susan

**Organization/Conference**

- B-CLAD Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- CLAD (as above)
- CSUN California State University, Northridge
- LAUSD Los Angeles Unified School District
- NAEYC National Association for the Education of Young Children
- UCLA University of California, Los Angeles
- USC University of Southern California

**Evaluation/Feedback**

- NA not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>10/27/99 2 sessions The Bridging Cultures Framework</td>
<td>CSUN at Channel Islands: “The Chicano Child” course</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>undergraduate &amp; graduate students</td>
<td>34/session</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>invited lecture for “Chicano Child,” taught by Kathleen Contreras (required for credential students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10/27/99 second of 2 sessions The Bridging Cultures Framework</td>
<td>CSUN at Channel Islands: “The Chicano Child” course</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>undergraduate &amp; graduate students</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>11/8/99 2 days The Bridging Cultures Framework Part II: Applications and Implications</td>
<td>CSUN at Channel Islands</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>elementary teachers, program directors, graduate students in Education</td>
<td>18, 18</td>
<td>18, 18</td>
<td>Advanced Child &amp; Adolescent Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>11/15/99 2 days Bridging Cultures between Home and School in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Ventura County Head Start</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch, Geary</td>
<td>teachers, program directors &amp; teacher assistants</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>71, 56</td>
<td>requested 2nd level workshop, summer class, Foundations of Early Childhood, Curriculum in Early Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>11/14/99 Bridging Home and School Cultures for Children and Parents from Spanish-speaking Backgrounds</td>
<td>NAEYC</td>
<td>Pérez, Geary</td>
<td>educators, researchers, administrators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **B-CLAD**: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- **CLAD**: (as above)
- **CSUN**: California State University, Northridge
- **LAUSD**: Los Angeles Unified School District
- **NAEYC**: National Association for the Education of Young Children
- **UCLA**: University of California, Los Angeles
- **USC**: University of Southern California

**Presenters**

Altchech, Marie  
Daley, Catherine  
Eyer, Kathryn  
Fiero, Becky  
Flores, Steve  
Geary, Patrick  
Greenfield, Patricia  
Hernandez, Elvia  
Isaac, Adrienne  
Jun, Catalina  
Mercado, Giancarlo  
Nelson-Barber, Sharon  
Park, Deborah  
Pérez, Amada  
Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie  
Quiroz, Blanca  
Saizyk, Pearl  
Salcido, Patricia  
Singer, Michelle  
Trumbull, Elise  
Walsh, Susan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>12/2/99</td>
<td>Update on the Bridging Cultures Project</td>
<td>California Bilingual County Coordinators Network San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>Bilingual County Coordinators Network: Teacher Training Program directors, directors from major cities</td>
<td>approx. 55 informal conversations</td>
<td>some had to leave before end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1/25/00</td>
<td>The Bridging Cultures Project: Improving Education for Immigrant Latino Students</td>
<td>CEBAS Hayward, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area principals</td>
<td>18 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>2/18/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Moving the Framework from Awareness to Understanding and Action</td>
<td>Head Start Follow Up</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Geary</td>
<td>Head Start teachers, administrators</td>
<td>18 NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2/26/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Literacy for Immigrant Latino Students</td>
<td>Southern CA Kindergarten Conference</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch Patricia Salcido Maria Paramo Garfio</td>
<td>educators, administrators</td>
<td>27 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3/2/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures between Home and School</td>
<td>Mills College Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>30 NA</td>
<td>Bay Area Action Research Teams working on school reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3/7/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures between Home and School</td>
<td>CSUN Rothstein-Fisch Geary</td>
<td>graduate students</td>
<td>15 15 Advanced Psychological Foundations of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3/8/00</td>
<td>Pilot-Testing the Bridging Cultures Module</td>
<td>CSUN Rothstein-Fisch Geary</td>
<td>graduate students in Education</td>
<td>25 yes</td>
<td>course taught by Susan DeGaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **B-CLAD**: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- **CLAD**: (as above)
- **CSUN**: California State University, Northridge
- **LAUSD**: Los Angeles Unified School District
- **UCLA**: University of California, Los Angeles
- **USC**: University of Southern California

**Presenters**

- Altchecch, Marie
- Daley, Catherine
- Eyler, Kathryn
- Fiero, Becky
- Flores, Steve
- Greenfield, Patricia
- Hernandez, Elvia
- Isaac, Adrienne
- Jun, Catalina
- Mercado, Giancarlo
- Nelson-Barber, Sharon
- Park, Deborah
- Pérez, Amada
- Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
- Quiroz, Blanca
- Saitzky, Pearl
- Salcido, Patricia
- Singer, Michelle
- Trumbull, Elise
- Walsh, Susan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4/26/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures between Home and School</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>undergraduate students in religious studies course</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>invited lecture for “Chicano Child,” taught by Kathleen Contreras (required for credential students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>4/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures and Technology</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>undergraduate &amp; graduate students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures and Technology</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>undergraduate &amp; graduate students</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4/28/00</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Values in the Education of Immigrant Mexican and Central American Children</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>researchers, teacher educators</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4/28/00</td>
<td>Using Cultural Knowledge to Inform Literacy Practices: Teacher Innovations from the Bridging Cultures Project</td>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>researchers, teacher educators</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Spring/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures through Technology</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>teachers, administrators</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Spring/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures through Technology</td>
<td>Pérez</td>
<td>teachers, administrators</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend</th>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-CLAD</td>
<td>Altchech, Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAD (as above)</td>
<td>Daley, Catherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Eyler, Kathryn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Fiero, Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flores, Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geary, Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hernandez, Elvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac, Adrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun, Catalina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercado, Giancarlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson-Barber, Sharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park, Deborah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pérez, Amada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quiroz, Blanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saitzyk, Pearl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salcido, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singer, Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trumbull, Elise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh, Susan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BC Module: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module
CC Roots: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5/11/00 2 sessions Bridging Cultures: It Works!</td>
<td>Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Conference Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch, Pérez, Trumbull</td>
<td>educational researchers, teachers &amp; all conference participants</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>5/11/00 second of 2 sessions Bridging Cultures: It Works!</td>
<td>Bay Area School Reform Collaborative Conference Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch, Pérez, Trumbull</td>
<td>educational researchers, teachers &amp; all conference participants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>5/19/00 Bridging Cultures; Classroom Examples</td>
<td>Kids First Conference Washington, DC</td>
<td>Altchech</td>
<td>district administrators, site administrators, policy makers, educational support providers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>7/10/00 Introduction to Bridging Cultures</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch</td>
<td>teachers in pre-service training</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Early/Middle Childhood Course, ACT Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Summer/00 Infusing Diversity into Your Social Science Curriculum</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Mercado</td>
<td>K-12 teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>California History and Social Science Project course (ongoing course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>8/4/00 Honoring Native Language and Culture in the Midst of Anti-immigrant Hysteria</td>
<td>National Council for Teachers of English; University of Utrecht in Netherlands Third Annual Conference for Global Conversations</td>
<td>Pérez, Flores</td>
<td>English/ESL teachers representing K-university, researchers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **B-CLAD**: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development
- **CLAD**: (as above)
- **CSUN**: California State University, Northridge
- **LAUSD**: Los Angeles Unified School District

**Presenters**

- Altchech, Marie
- Daley, Catherine
- Eyler, Kathryn
- Fierro, Becky
- Flores, Steve
- Geary, Patrick
- Greenfield, Patricia
- Hernandez, Elvia
- Isaac, Adrienne
- Jun, Catalina
- Mercado, Giancarlo
- Nelson-Barber, Sharon
- Park, Deborah
- Pérez, Amada
- Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie
- Quiroz, Blanca
- Saizyk, Pearl
- Salcido, Patricia
- Singer, Michelle
- Trumbull, Elise
- Walsh, Susan

**BC Module**: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module

**CC Roots**: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION/CONFERENCE</th>
<th>PRESENTERS</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>ATTENDEE NUMBER</th>
<th>EVALUATION/FEEDBACK</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>9/22/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures in Education: North American Connections</td>
<td>North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching &amp; North Carolina Center for International Understanding North Carolina</td>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield</td>
<td>teachers, administrators, school board member</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23 narratives, 31 short answer forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>9/27/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: Teacher Education Module Pilot Test</td>
<td>CSUN Rothstein-Fisch, Geary</td>
<td>school counselor interns (16), Development, Learning and Instruction (4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Advanced Psychological Foundations of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>10/19/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures Dissemination Round Table</td>
<td>WestEd San Francisco, CA Greenfield, Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Geary, Park, Pérez, Mercado, Altchech, Daley</td>
<td>teacher professional development professionals (university professors, county-level staff)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>11/11/00</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures: The Evolution of How School Counseling Students Understand Cultures</td>
<td>Western Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors Los Gatos, CA Rothstein-Fisch, Geary, Jun</td>
<td>school counselor educators, national leaders in school counseling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>11/11/00</td>
<td>second of 2 sessions</td>
<td>Western Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors Los Gatos, CA Rothstein-Fisch, Geary, Jun</td>
<td>school counselor educators, national leaders in school counseling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

B-CLAD: Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development

CLAD: (as above)

CSUN: California State University, Northridge

LAUSD: Los Angeles Unified School District

B. Module: Bridging Cultures Teacher Education Module

CC Roots: Cross-Cultural Roots of Minority Child Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altchech, Marie</td>
<td>Hernandez, Elvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley, Catherine</td>
<td>Quiroz, Blanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Kathryn</td>
<td>Saitzyk, Pearl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiero, Becky</td>
<td>Salcido, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Steve</td>
<td>Singer, Michelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary, Patrick</td>
<td>Trumbull, Elise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield, Patricia</td>
<td>Walsh, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures through Children’s Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Bridging Cultures through Children’s Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-CLAD</th>
<th>Bilingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLAD</td>
<td>(as above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUSD</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presenters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altchech, Marie</th>
<th>Hernandez, Elvia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daley, Catherine</td>
<td>Isaac, Adrienne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyler, Kathryn</td>
<td>Jun, Catalina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiero, Becky</td>
<td>Mercado, Giancarlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Steve</td>
<td>Nelson-Barber, Sharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary, Patrick</td>
<td>Park, Deborah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield, Patricia</td>
<td>Pérez, Amada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothstein-Fisch, Carrie</td>
<td>Quiroz, Blanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitzyk, Pearl</td>
<td>Salcido, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer, Michelle</td>
<td>Trumbull, Elise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Susan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation/Feedback**

- NA: Not available
Appendix D
Graduate Research Projects of Students at California State University, Northridge

Bertha Anguiano
*English Immersion for Students in Grades Two-Three: A Handbook for Teachers Who Want to Bridge Cultures*
Teachers need to be aware of students’ backgrounds in order to help them succeed both socially and academically. A handbook will be developed for teachers of grades 2-3 who teach English immersion. The goal would be to help bridge the home and school languages in explicit ways that honor rather than undermine the children’s first language or culture.

Patricia Chaparro
*Empowering Parents of Kindergarten Students with Strategies and Skills for Understanding School: Focus on Reading Readiness*
A series of evening workshops will be held for whole families that identify the school culture explicitly. Pre and post surveys will identify fears and concerns before and after the workshops.

Rosa Hernandez
*Reaching Across the Cultural Bridge to Collectivistic Families: Kindergarten Connections*
In this project, a two-way program of parent empowerment will evolve based on: 1) helping families with children in the same kindergarten class develop a bond of support and advocacy; and 2) making the culture of the school less threatening by demonstrating the mainstream ways of learning and teaching.

Rosaicela Magana
*Building Cultural Bridges between Home and School Literacy Efforts*
A series of workshops, offered at a wide variety of times, will be developed, implemented and assessed designed to enhance parents’ knowledge and effort in promoting literacy. While the parents may not feel it is their job to teach reading to their children (this is the teacher’s job), they can become much more informed of how children are engaging literacy in school and the impact that will have on their children’s entire education.

Janet Ramirez
*Assumptions of Cultural Compatibility: Harmony and Disharmony between Latino Teachers and their Latino Students*
What happens when Latino teachers are trained, unknowingly, to value individualistic traits that undermine the collectivistic values of the home? Teacher interviews and direct classroom observations will document ways that Latino teacher engages students and families from both individualistic and collectivistic ways.
Marybell Montes de Oca

The Role of Informal Discourse between Teachers and Parents: Bridging Cultures between Latino Parents and their Child’s Teacher

Parents will be interviewed about the role of informal discourse in understanding the school culture. Says de Oca,

*I personally can relate to my students’ parents because they remind me of my parents. I know my mother tried her best to keep up with schooling even though she didn’t speak English. I find myself speaking to the parents and helping them the way I wished my teachers could have helped my mother. Some teachers might find this difficult or time consuming. But for me, it is as natural as making enchiladas – it comes so easy.*

Jessica Krejdovsky

First Lessons in English Immersion for Students in Kindergarten and First Grade: A Handbook for teachers who want to Bridge Cultures

With Bertha Anguiano, strategies for maintaining both home and school languages and cultures will be described for teachers honoring the home language and values.

Maria Garfio

Using the Bridging Cultures Framework to Empower the Parents of Second Grade Spanish Readers

Says Garfio,

*It’s important to empower parents by providing them access to the school culture. Parents need to feel comfortable and knowledgeable with the school environment in order for them to advocate for their children. Being able to read successfully opens the doors for opportunities.*

Berta Guzman and Veronica Martinez

Empowering Parents of Migrant Preschoolers Using the Bridging Cultures Framework

With the emphasis on cultural values and the idea of creating bridges, migrant parents will learn about school first hand through a series of family workshops. Content of the workshops will be parent driven, emphasizing both individualism and collectivism. The entire family will be invited to learn about the culture of the school and to experience how teachers work with children in a migrant education program for preschoolers.

Lucy Beckley

Bridging Cultures between Home and School Literacy: Spanish Speaking First Graders and their Families

A series of workshops will be provided for families that feature ways that school and the home can foster literacy. The reading and writing scores of children whose families participate will be compared to those who do not in a pre- and post-test design. In addition, parent responses to questionnaires about how they feeling about their child’s education (pre and post test) will be included.
Catalina Jun  
Bridging Cultures through School Counselor Education  
(Thesis submitted 2000)  
This study assessed the impact of a three-hour Bridging Cultures training one year after students were exposed to the framework of individualism and collectivism. The results indicate that the 80% of the school counseling students found the Bridging Cultures framework helpful and could apply their knowledge of individualism and collectivism in their school-based fieldwork with students from elementary to high school.

J. Patrick Geary  
Bridging Cultures with Middle and High School Counselors and Administrators  
Secondary school counselors and administrators will participate in a three-hour Bridging Cultures presentation that outlines the framework of individualism and collectivism and how the framework has been useful with Elementary school teachers. The educators will be encouraged to consider how the framework might be useful in middle and high school outside of the classroom. A follow up meeting will be held one month later to discuss the outcomes and ideas generated. Participants will share how they have used the framework in counseling. Pre- and post-tests will be given to gauge the participants’ understanding of the concepts and the quantity of collectivistic friendly ideas that are developed and implemented in the school as a result of the training.

Deborah Park  
Cultural Harmony and Disharmony in two Classrooms: New Applications of the Bridging Cultures Framework  
This research is an exploratory study, still in its preliminary stage, on the framework of individualism and collectivism offered by the Bridging Cultures Project. Two classes are examined to note areas of cultural harmony and cultural conflict in the classroom. Classroom 1 consists of predominantly Latino students and is taught by a Korean American teacher. Classroom 2, a Korean/English Dual Language classroom, is made up of predominantly Korean students and is taught by a Korean American teacher. I examine the Korean American cultural influences on these teachers’ instruction. I am using qualitative methods of observations, interviews, and document analysis. With the findings, I hope to develop hypotheses for further investigations in the teachers’ role in bridging cultures in the classroom as well as make recommendations for reform for dealing with specifically the Korean American students.

Monique Zubkow  
The Bridging Cultures Framework in Barranquilla, Colombia: Individualism and Collectivism in Action  
This research will focus on the applicability of the Bridging Cultures framework to understanding education in this town in Colombia. The research design is under development.
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