

DEI in Humanities

Ang, I., Brand, J., Noble, G., & Wilding, D. (2002). Living diversity: Australia's multicultural future. *Humanities & Social Sciences Papers*, 19, (11-73).

This article gives an excellent example of the Australian journey into multiculturalism. It is an excellent reference to read due to the fact that the United States could work towards being in the same situation in a short time. This article gives insight to the transition into being a multicultural society with some resistance still present and what to do about it. The implications of the issues in Australia are also discussed along with possible solutions to those issues. The article describes the existence of cultural boundaries and how they have changed as the younger generation has grown with them. The situations, solutions, and ideas this article presents is a very interesting comparison to see the transition that may happen when moving to a multicultural society.

Holloway, J. S. (2006). The black scholar, the humanities, and the politics of racial knowledge since 1945. In D. A. Hollinger (Ed.). *The Dynamics of Inclusion Since World War II* (pp. 218-246). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

This chapter selection depicts the historical barriers black individuals have had to face in order to access the realms of academic scholarship. Today, black scholars and black studies still seem to enjoy only minimal operating room. But as much as they may feel over-scrutinized, black scholars and black studies programs also enjoy a kind of exaggerated prominence. Part of this hypervisibility is due to their post-civil rights urge to reward black excellence wherever they find it; much of this hypervisibility is due to the ways in which university administrators still look to black studies programs and their very diverse but typically majority black faculties to stand for something more than mere scholarship.

Rosenberg, R. (2006). Women in the humanities: Taking their place. In D. A. Hollinger (Ed.). *The Dynamics of Inclusion Since World War II* (pp. 247-269). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

The humanities academy in the 1940s was an overwhelmingly masculine enterprise, more so, indeed, than it had been a generation before, because of the success of “professionalization”: women were moved out of jobs in English, history, and philosophy, even at many women’s colleges. Women were not able to reverse this trend until the late 1950s, when government funding and an expanding economy finally helped them begin to increase their share of Ph.D.’s and faculty positions.² Women did more than increase their numbers. Inspired by the civil rights and feminist movements, in which they became central actors in the 1970s, they founded journals, created new academic programs, and questioned traditional approaches to scholarship in every discipline, from English to philosophy. They challenged traditional canons, attacked accepted disciplinary distinctions, called for greater diversity, and pioneered new methods. Above all, in an intellectual community that celebrated Olympian detachment, they championed personal engagement.

Srole, C. (1994). Pedagogical response to student diversity: History and language. *The History Teacher*, 28(1), 49-55.

In academic discourse, language and history content blend: historians borrow the tools of one to probe the meaning of the other. History professors use words ranging from archaic terms and labels (like mercantilism) to academic jargon (like agency and family economy). Some terms come from other disciplines; others are acronyms. They also employ metaphors, colloquial terms, cultural idioms, and precise vocabulary to enliven their analysis of history. Building student vocabulary enables faculty and students to surmount language and cultural barriers that distract from content acquisition. Through defining and embedding, we help students increase their vocabulary as they learn content better. To teach these skills, we must *disclose* the goals and techniques of each task, *label* tasks so students can recall and use them again, *model* tasks, and give students lots of *practice*. Such guidance demonstrates our commitment to educating culturally diverse student bodies of second language and working-class students by teaching to our audience.

Van Slych, P. (2006). Learning communities and the future of the humanities. *Profession*, 163-176.

For those unfamiliar with the structure of learning communities, here is a brief primer. Courses from a range of departments (most often those that meet developmental, core, or major requirements) are clustered around a common theme and offered to the same cohort of students. Faculty members teaching in each community develop cross-disciplinary assignments and activities that address this theme. Some learning communities have team-taught classes; others

offer separate classes but have a reflective seminar hour in which students are invited to apply, integrate, and synthesize concepts from the different fields. Many introductory learning communities are followed (two or four years later) by a capstone seminar in which multidisciplinary perspectives are reinforced. Learning communities overcome disciplinary boundaries without promoting discord by taking over the subject area of another department (and this is no "minor curricular point" [Menand 14]); the playing field is level, and there is no need for dramatic changes in institutional structure.

Zenderland, L. (2006). Constructing American studies: Culture, identity, and the expansion of the humanities. In D. A. Hollinger (Ed.). *The Dynamics of Inclusion Since World War II* (pp. 273-313). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Leila Zenderland concentrates on the expansion of American studies in the post-World War II era. Notwithstanding their prewar precedents, American studies programs within universities can in many ways be considered a product of World War II. Though in the 1930s about seven institutions had begun to offer degrees in American civilization, largely by integrating coursework in American history and American literature, more than a dozen new programs were introduced in the 1945–46 school year alone. Within three years of the war's end, sixty American institutions, both large and small, were offering B.A. degrees in this interdisciplinary field, and about fifteen offered M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. Zenderland shows the phases of academic scholarship as it moved away from the study of "culture as a whole" to more specialized studies of culture and its parts.