



Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice

James A. Banks

Review of Research in Education, Vol. 19. (1993), pp. 3-49.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0091-732X%281993%2919%3C3%3AMEHDDA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-N>

Review of Research in Education is currently published by American Educational Research Association.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aera.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Chapter 1

Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice

JAMES A. BANKS

University of Washington, Seattle

The heated discourse on multicultural education, especially in the popular press and among nonspecialists (Gray, 1991; Leo, 1990; Schlesinger, 1991), often obscures the theory, research, and developing consensus among multicultural education specialists about the nature, aims, and scope of the field. Gay (1992), as well as Banks (1989a), has noted the high level of consensus about aims and scope in the literature written by multicultural education theorists. Gay, however, points out that there is a tremendous gap between theory and practice in the field. In her view, theory development has outpaced development in practice, and a wide gap exists between the two.

Gibson (1976) reviewed the multicultural education literature and identified five approaches. She noted how the approaches differ and how they overlap and interrelate. In their review of the literature published 11 years later, Sleeter and Grant (1987) also identified five approaches to multicultural education, four of which differ from Gibson's categories. Sleeter and Grant noted the lack of consensus in the field and concluded that a focus on the education of people of color is the only common element among the many different definitions of multicultural education. Although there are many different approaches, statements of aims, and definitions of multicultural education, an examination of the recent literature written by specialists in the field indicates that there is a high level of consensus about its aims and goals (Banks, 1989a; Bennett, 1990; Nieto, 1992; Parekh, 1986; Sleeter & Grant, 1988; Suzuki, 1984).

A major goal of multicultural education, as stated by specialists in the field, is to reform the school and other educational institutions so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality. Another important goal of multicultural education—revealed in this literature—is to give both male and female students an equal chance to experience educational success and mobility

(Klein, 1985; Sadker & Sadker, 1982). Multicultural education theorists are increasingly interested in how the interaction of race, class, and gender influences education (Banks, 1989a; Grant & Sleeter, 1986; Sleeter, 1991). However, the emphasis that different theorists give to each of these variables varies considerably.

Although there is an emerging consensus about the aims and scope of multicultural education (Banks, 1992), the variety of typologies, conceptual schemes, and perspectives within the field reflects its emergent status and the fact that complete agreement about its aims and boundaries has not been attained (Baker, 1983; Banks, 1988a; Bennett, 1990; Garcia, 1991; Gollnick & Chinn, 1990). Because of its forensic and polarized nature, the current acrimonious debate about the extent to which the histories and cultures of women and people of color should be incorporated into the study of Western civilization in the nation's schools, colleges, and universities has complicated the quest for sound definitions and clear disciplinary boundaries within the field (Asante, 1991; Asante & Ravitch, 1991; Ravitch, 1990; Schlesinger, 1990).

GOALS AND SCOPE

There is general agreement among most scholars and researchers that, for multicultural education to be implemented successfully, institutional changes must be made, including changes in the curriculum; the teaching materials; teaching and learning styles; the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors of teachers and administrators; and the goals, norms, and culture of the school (Banks, 1992; Bennett, 1990; Sleeter & Grant, 1988). However, many school and university practitioners have a limited conception of multicultural education, viewing it primarily as curriculum reform that involves changing or restructuring the curriculum to include content about ethnic groups, women, and other cultural groups. This conception of multicultural education is widespread because curriculum reform was the main focus when the movement first emerged in the 1960s and 1970s (Blassingame, 1972; Ford, 1973) and because the multiculturalism discourse in the popular media has focused on curriculum reform and largely ignored other dimensions and components of multicultural education (Gray, 1991; Leo, 1990; Schlesinger, 1990, 1991).

If multicultural education is to become better understood and implemented in ways more consistent with theory, its various dimensions must be more clearly described, conceptualized, and researched. Multicultural education is conceptualized in this review as a field that consists of the five dimensions formulated by Banks (1991a, 1992). The dimensions are based on his research, observations, and work in the field from the late 1960s (Banks, 1970) through 1991 (Banks, 1992). Because of the limited scope of this review, no attempt is made to comprehensively review the

research in each of the five dimensions. Rather, a selected group of studies in each of the dimensions is reviewed. Race, ethnicity, class, gender, and exceptionality—and their interaction—are each important factors in multicultural education. However, this review focuses on racial and ethnic groups. It is not possible within one review to examine each of the other variables in sufficient depth.

THE DIMENSIONS OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

The dimensions of multicultural education used to conceptualize, organize, and select the literature for review in this chapter are (a) content integration, (b) the knowledge construction process, (c) prejudice reduction, (d) an equity pedagogy, and (e) an empowering school culture and social structure. Each of the dimensions is defined and illustrated, and a brief overview of each major section of the chapter is presented. The interrelationship of the five dimensions is discussed later.

Content Integration

Content integration deals with the extent to which teachers use examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups to illustrate key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories in their subject area or discipline. In many school districts, as well as in popular writings, multicultural education is viewed only or primarily as content integration. The widespread belief that content integration constitutes the whole of multicultural education might be an important factor that causes many teachers of subjects such as mathematics and science to view multicultural education as an endeavor primarily for social studies and language arts teachers.

The historical development of content integration movements is discussed, beginning with the historical work of George Washington Williams (1882, 1883), the first African-American historian in the United States (Franklin, 1985). The early ethnic studies movement, which began with Williams, continued quietly until the ethnic studies movement of the 1960s and 1970s began. The rise and fall of the intergroup education movement is also described in this section.

Knowledge Construction

The knowledge construction process describes the procedures by which social, behavioral, and natural scientists create knowledge and how the implicit cultural assumptions, frames of references, perspectives, and biases within a discipline influence the ways that knowledge is constructed within it (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Gould, 1981; Harding, 1991; Kuhn, 1970). When the knowledge construction process is implemented in the

classroom, teachers help students to understand how knowledge is created and how it is influenced by the racial, ethnic, and social-class positions of individuals and groups.

This section describes how the dominant paradigms about ethnic groups that were established by mainstream social scientists were challenged by revisionist social scientists in the 1960s and 1970s; many of these revisionists were scholars of color (Acuña, 1972; Blassingame, 1972; Ladner, 1973), whereas others were not (Daniels, 1988; Genovese, 1972; Levine, 1977). Literature that illustrates how paradigm shifts are taking place and describes models that can be used to teach students to understand the knowledge construction process is also described in this section.

Prejudice Reduction

The prejudice reduction dimension of multicultural education describes the characteristics of children's racial attitudes and strategies that can be used to help students develop more democratic attitudes and values. Researchers have been investigating the characteristics of children's racial attitudes since the 1920s (Lasker, 1929). Since the intergroup education movement of the 1940s and 1950s (Miel with Kiester, 1967; Trager & Yarrow, 1952), a number of investigators have designed interventions to help students to develop more positive racial attitudes and values. This section briefly reviews selected studies on the characteristics of children's racial attitudes and studies that describe the results of interventions designed to help students to acquire more democratic racial attitudes (Banks, 1991b).

Equity Pedagogy

An equity pedagogy exists when teachers use techniques and methods that facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups. This section consists of a review of selected studies of approaches, theories, and interventions that are designed to help students who are members of low-status population groups to increase their academic achievement (Delpit, 1988; Ogbu, 1990; Shade, 1989).

The literature reviewed in this section is discussed within a historical context. The kinds of theories that have been constructed to help teachers develop more effective strategies for use with students of color and low-income students have varied throughout time. In the early 1960s, the cultural deprivation paradigm was developed (Bloom, Davis, & Hess, 1965; Davis, 1948/1962; Riessman, 1962). The cultural difference theory emerged in the 1970s and challenged the cultural deprivationists (Baratz & Baratz, 1970; Ginsburg, 1972; Ramírez & Castañeda, 1974). Today, the

“at-risk” conception has emerged, which is akin to the cultural deprivation paradigm (Cuban, 1989; Richardson, Casanova, Placier, & Guilfoyle, 1989).

Empowering School Culture

The concept of an empowering school culture and social structure is used in this chapter to describe the process of restructuring the culture and organization of the school so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality and cultural empowerment (Cummins, 1986). Creating an empowering school culture for students of color and low-income students involves restructuring the culture and organization of the school.

Among the variables that need to be examined in order to create a school culture that empowers students from diverse ethnic and cultural groups are grouping practices (Braddock, 1990; Oakes, 1985), labeling practices (Mercer, 1989), the social climate of the school, and staff expectations for student achievement (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979). This section reviews literature that focuses on institutionalized factors of the school culture and environment that need to be reformed in order to increase the academic achievement and emotional growth of students from diverse ethnic, racial, and social-class groups.

Limitations and Interrelationship of the Dimensions

The dimensions typology is an ideal-type conception in the Weberian sense. It approximates but does not describe reality in its total complexity. Like all classification schemas, it has both strengths and limitations. Typologies are helpful conceptual tools because they provide a way to organize and make sense of complex and disparate data and observations. However, their categories are interrelated and overlapping, not mutually exclusive. Typologies are rarely able to encompass the total universe of existing or future cases. Consequently, some cases can be described only by using several of the categories.

The dimensions typology provides a useful framework for categorizing and interpreting the extensive and disparate literature on diversity and education. However, the five dimensions are conceptually distinct but highly interrelated. Content integration, for example, describes any approach that is used to integrate content about racial and cultural groups into the curriculum. The knowledge construction process describes a method in which teachers help students to understand how knowledge is created and reflects the experiences of various ethnic and cultural groups.

Content integration is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the

knowledge construction process (i.e., content integration can take place without the knowledge construction process). Teachers can, for example, insert content into the curriculum about Mexican Americans without helping students to view the content from Mexican-American perspectives. However, the knowledge construction process cannot be included in the curriculum without content integration first taking place.

Some of the publications examined for this review crossed several of the categories. Cooperative learning techniques can help students to increase their academic achievement, as well as to develop more positive racial attitudes. Consequently, some cooperative learning studies can be categorized as both equity pedagogy and prejudice reduction strategies (Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Slavin, 1985).

Criteria for selecting studies in each of the five dimensions included the extent to which the study or publication (a) is a prototype of the particular dimension being discussed; (b) has been influential in the field, as determined by the extent to which it is cited and has contributed to the theoretical and empirical growth of the field; and (c) has promise, in my judgment, of contributing to the future development of theory, research, and practice in multicultural education.

CONTENT INTEGRATION

The literature on content integration focuses on what information should be included in the curriculum, how it should be integrated into the existing curriculum, and its location within the curriculum (i.e., whether it should be taught within separate courses or as part of the core curriculum). Another important issue discussed in this literature is who should be the audience for ethnic content (i.e., whether it should be for all students or primarily for students of color).

An exhaustive body of literature exists that describes the various debates, discussions, and curricula that focus on the integration of content about ethnic groups and women into school, college, and university curricula (Banks, 1991c; Butler & Walter, 1991; Lauter, 1991). The scope of this section is limited primarily to a description of the literature that focuses on the integration of content about racial and ethnic groups into the curriculum. The literature that describes the effects of curricular materials on students' racial and ethnic attitudes is reviewed in the section that discusses the prejudice reduction dimension.

The Need for a Historical Perspective

It is important to view the movements by ethnic groups to integrate school, college, and university curricula with ethnic content from a historical perspective (see Table 1). A historical perspective is necessary to

TABLE 1
Landmark Events and Publications in the Historical Development of Ethnic Studies and Multicultural Education

Year(s)	Event/publication
1882–1883	<i>History of the Negro Race in America</i> by George Washington Williams
1896	<i>The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America 1638–1870</i> by W. E. B. DuBois
1899	<i>The Philadelphia Negro</i> by W. E. B. DuBois
1915	The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History is founded in Chicago
1916	<i>The Journal of Negro History</i> begins publication
1921	The Associated Publishers is established
1922	<i>The Negro in Our History</i> by Carter G. Woodson and Charles C. Wesley
1929	<i>Race Attitudes in Children</i> by Bruno Lasker
1930	<i>Mexican Immigration to the United States</i> by Manuel Gamio
1933	<i>The Mis-Education of the Negro</i> by Carter G. Woodson
1936	Eugene Horowitz's study of young children's attitudes toward the Negro
1937	<i>The Negro History Bulletin</i> , designed for schools, begins publication
1939	<i>Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel</i> by Horace Mann Bond; first reported study by Kenneth B. and Mamie P. Clark on young children's racial attitudes
1941	<i>Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class</i> by Allison Davis, Burleigh B. Gardner, and Mary R. Gardner
1944	<i>An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy</i> by Gunnar Myrdal with Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose
1945	<i>Democratic Human Relations: Promising Practices in Intergroup and Intercultural Education in the Social Studies</i> , 16th yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, edited by Hilda Taba and William Van Til; <i>Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City</i> by St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton
1947	A review of research on intergroup education is published in the <i>Review of Educational Research</i> by Lloyd A. Cook; first edition of <i>From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans</i> by John Hope Franklin
1950	<i>College Programs in Intergroup Relations</i> by Lloyd A. Cook; <i>The Authoritarian Personality</i> by T. W. Adorno et al.
1951	<i>Intergroup Relations in Teacher Education</i> by Lloyd A. Cook
1952	<i>Intergroup Education in Public Schools</i> by Hilda Taba, Elizabeth H. Brady, and John T. Robinson; <i>They Learn What They Live: Prejudice in Young Children</i> by Helen G. Trader and Marian R. Yarrow; <i>Race Awareness in Young Children</i> by Mary Ellen Goodman
1954	<i>The Nature of Prejudice</i> by Gordon W. Allport
1962	<i>Social-Class Influences Upon Learning</i> by Allison Davis
1965	<i>Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation</i> by Benjamin S. Bloom, Allison Davis, and Robert Hess
1966	<i>Equal Education Opportunity</i> by James Coleman et al.
1972	<i>Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America</i> by Christopher Jencks et al.
1973	<i>No One Model American</i> (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education); <i>Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies</i> , National Council for the Social Studies 43rd yearbook, edited by James A. Banks
1974	<i>Cultural Democracy, Bicultural Development, and Education</i> by Manuel Ramirez and Alfredo Castañeda; <i>The Next Generation: An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood</i> by John U. Ogbu; <i>Students' Right to Their Own Language</i> , a position statement by the National Council of Teachers of English

(continued)

TABLE 1 (continued)

Year(s)	Event/publication
1975	<i>Adolescent Prejudice</i> by Charles Y. Glock, Robert Wuthnow, Jane A. Piliavin, and Metta Spencer, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
1976	<i>Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education</i> , a position statement issued by the National Council for the Social Studies; <i>Race, Color, and the Young Child</i> by John E. Williams and J. Kenneth Morland—a synthesis of research conducted in the late 1960s and 1970s on young children's racial attitudes
1977	<i>Multicultural Education: Commitments, Issues and Applications</i> , edited by Carl A. Grant, published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; <i>Pluralism and the American Teacher: Issues and Case Studies</i> , edited by Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick, published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; <i>Pluralism in a Democratic Society</i> , edited by Melvin M. Tumin and Walter Plotch, sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; <i>Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education</i> , issued by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, includes a requirement for multicultural education in teacher education programs
1983	<i>Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms</i> by Shirley Brice Heath
1985	<i>Beginnings: The Social and Affective Development of Black Children</i> , edited by Margaret B. Spencer, Geraldine K. Brookins, and Walter R. Allen
1988	<i>The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935</i> by James D. Anderson
1989	<i>A Common Destiny: Blacks and American Society</i> , edited by Gerald D. Jaynes and Robin M. Williams, Jr., National Research Council report
1991	<i>Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American Identity</i> by William E. Cross, Jr.

provide a context for understanding the contemporary developments and discourse in multicultural education and to effectively restructure schools, colleges, and universities to reflect multicultural issues and concerns. Contemporary reformers need to understand, for example, why the intergroup education movement of the 1940s and 1950s ultimately failed (Cook, 1947; Taba & Wilson, 1946) and why early ethnic studies leaders such as Woodson (1919/1968), DuBois (1935), Wesley (1935), and Franklin (1947), and their successors, were able to quietly continue the early ethnic studies movement with publications, research, and teaching from the turn of the century to the 1960s, when the new ethnic studies movement began.

At least a partial explanation is that the early ethnic studies movement was sustained by ethnic self-help organizations such as the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH; now the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History) and the Associated Publishers—two organizations cofounded and headed by Woodson. The Associated Publishers published many important and seminal works by

and about African-American scholars such as Woodson (1919/1968), Wesley (1935), and Bond (1939). African-American schools and colleges were the major consumers of Black scholarship during the first decades of the 20th century. Ethnic community support might be essential for sustaining interest in ethnic studies and multicultural concerns over the long haul. Further investigations are needed to determine the different fates of the early ethnic studies and the intergroup education movements.

African Americans led the movement that pushed for the integration of ethnic content into the curriculum during the 1960s and 1970s. Consequently, it is appropriate to provide a brief historical discussion of the movement to integrate the curriculum with ethnic content, using African Americans as a case study.

The Early Ethnic Studies Movement

The Black studies movement that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s has historical roots in the early national period (Brooks, 1990; White, 1973; Woodson, 1919/1968). It is more directly linked to the work in ethnic studies research and the development of teaching materials by African-American scholars such as Williams (1882–1883), Woodson and Wesley (1922), and DuBois (1935, 1973). Scholars such as Williams, Wesley, Woodson, and DuBois created knowledge about African Americans that could be integrated into the school and college curriculum. Educators such as Woodson and Wesley (1922) worked to integrate the school and college curriculum with content about African Americans during the early decades of the 20th century.

Brooks (1990, p. 75) discusses the early history of schools for African-American children. He points out that from slavery to today, Black education has been characterized by desegregation in the colonial and early national periods, a push for segregation in the early 1800s, a movement toward desegregation during the 1950s and 1960s, and another swing toward segregation today.

The first public schools that were organized in Massachusetts and Virginia in the 1640s were desegregated (Brooks, 1990; White, 1973; Woodson, 1919/1968). However, because of the discrimination that African Americans experienced in these schools, they took the leadership in establishing separate schools for their children. When the city of Boston refused to fund separate schools for African-American children in 1800, the Black community set up its own schools and hired the teachers. In 1818, the city of Boston started funding separate schools for African-American children. The first schools established for African Americans in the South after the Civil War were segregated by laws formulated by White legislators.

Separate schools for African Americans proved to be a mixed blessing,

especially in the southern states and later in northern cities. In the South, African-American schools and other institutions were separate and unequal. African-American schools were unequal in terms of expenditures spent per pupil, the salaries of teachers and administrators, and the quality and newness of textbooks and other teaching materials (Anderson, 1988; Bond, 1939).

Although separate Black public schools in the South had African-American teachers and administrators, their schools boards, curricula, and textbooks were White controlled and dominated. Consequently, integration of the curriculum with content about African Americans was problematic. In his influential book, *Mis-Education of the Negro*, Woodson (1933) stated that schools and colleges were miseducating African Americans because they were taught about European civilization but not about the great African civilizations and cultures of their own people. He described what he felt were the harmful effects of neglecting Black history and civilization on the thinking and self-esteem of African-American youth.

From 1920 until his death in 1950, Woodson probably did more than any other individual to promote the study and teaching of African-American history in the nation's schools and colleges. He spent most of his career writing histories, editing journals, and building ASNLH. Woodson taught high school in Washington, D.C., from 1909 to 1918, and received his doctorate in history from Harvard in 1912. He was one of the founders of ASNLH and established the *Journal of Negro History* in 1916. He also established the Associated Publishers, a subsidiary of ASNLH, in 1921, which published a score of histories about African Americans, many of them written by Woodson and his historian colleagues.

Woodson's books were widely used in African-American high schools and colleges. He started Negro History Week (now National Afro-American History Month) in 1926 to promote the study and teaching of African-American history in the elementary and secondary schools. In 1937, he started publishing the *Negro History Bulletin* to provide historical materials for use by elementary and secondary school teachers. Other early African-American scholars, such as Williams (1882–1883), DuBois (1935), Wesley (1935), Quarles (1953), and Logan (1954), played key roles in creating the scholarship needed to develop teaching materials for the schools and colleges. However, none of these scholars were as directly involved as Woodson was in promoting the inclusion of content about African Americans into the curriculum of the nation's schools and colleges.

The Intergroup Education Movement

The intergroup education movement, although not a direct link to the work of early African-American scholars such as Woodson, Wesley,

DuBois, and Logan, is an important precedent to the ethnic studies movement that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. The intergroup education movement is linked to the work of these scholars because content about religious, national, and racial groups was one of the variables it used to reduce prejudice and discrimination (Cook & Cook, 1954; Trager & Yarrow, 1952). It is linked to the contemporary multicultural education movement because it shared many of the goals of today's multicultural education movement and experienced many of the same problems (Taba & Wilson, 1946; Banks, 1988b).

The social forces that gave rise to the intergroup education movement grew out of the consequences of World War II. The demands of the war created job opportunities in the North and the West that were not available in the South. Consequently, many African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Whites living in rural areas migrated to northern and western cities to find jobs in war-related industries. Ethnic and racial tension developed as Anglos and Mexican Americans in western cities and African Americans and Whites in northern cities competed for jobs and housing. These tensions resulted in a series of racial incidents and riots that stunned the nation.

Intergroup education emerged as an educational response to the racial and ethnic tension in the nation (Taba, Brady, & Robinson, 1952). One of its major goals was to help reduce prejudice and create interracial understanding among students from diverse national, religious, and racial groups (Cook & Cook, 1954; Taba & Wilson, 1946). Several national organizations, such as the Progressive Education Association (Locke & Stern, 1942), the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS; Taba & Van Til, 1945), and the American Council on Education (Cook, 1950), sponsored projects, activities, and publications in intergroup education. Projects and activities were developed for both elementary and secondary schools (Taba et al., 1952), as well as for teachers colleges (Cook, 1951).

Many of the intergroup education publications, like multicultural education publications today, were practical sources that described ways to set up an intergroup relations center (Clinchy, 1949), identified objectives and methods for schools (Vickery & Cole, 1943), described curricula and units for schools (Taba, 1950, 1951, 1952), and described intergroup education programs and projects in colleges and universities (Cook, 1951). Some of these publications were based on intergroup theories developed by social scientists such as Louis Wirth (1928) and Gordon W. Allport (1954).

Some of the nation's leading social scientists and philosophers participated in the development of theoretical ideas about the reduction of interracial tensions during the intergroup education era. Louis Wirth, the University of Chicago sociologist, and Gordon W. Allport, the Harvard

social psychologist, contributed chapters to a book edited by Lloyd A. Cook (1952), a leading intergroup educator. Wirth's paper was titled "Freedom, Power and Values in Our Present Crisis"; Allport's was called "Resolving Intergroup Tension: An Appraisal of Methods."

Alain Locke, the African-American philosopher of Howard University, coedited a background book on intergroup education for the Progressive Education Association (Locke & Stern, 1942). This comprehensive book on race and culture consists of reprinted articles by some of the leading social scientists of the day, including Ruth Benedict, Franz Boas, John Dollard, E. Franklin Frazier, Melville J. Herskovits, Otto Klineberg, Ralph Linton, and Margaret Mead.

Allison Davis, the noted African-American anthropologist at the University of Chicago, wrote a chapter for NCSS's 16th yearbook. Davis was coauthor of *Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class*, a classic study of an old southern city (Davis, Gardner, & Gardner, 1941). The chapter is titled "Some Basic Concepts in the Education of Ethnic and Lower-Class Groups." Davis urged social studies teachers to teach students "a devotion to democratic values, and group disapproval of injustice, oppression, and exploitation" (Taba & Van Til, 1945, p. 278). He also believed that teachers should teach social action: "Teach the underprivileged child to learn to help organize and improve his community" (p. 279). The fact that scholars of Davis's and Locke's stature contributed to books on intergroup education sponsored by educational organizations indicated that some of the leading social science scholars of the 1940s believed that they should become involved in a major social problem facing the nation and the schools.

Several landmark studies in race relations were published during the intergroup education era. Jewish organizations, such as the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, sponsored several of these studies. One important factor that contributed to the rise of the intergroup education movement was anti-Semitism in Western nations, which reached its peak in Germany during World War II. Jewish organizations were especially interested in taking actions and sponsoring research that would ease racial tension and conflict. They were poignantly aware of the destructive power of ethnic hate (Wyman, 1984).

In 1950, *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) was published. In this landmark study, the authors identify the personality factors that contribute to the formation of prejudice. Although they overemphasize personality factor explanations of prejudice and give insufficient attention to structural factors, their study remains an important one.

Allport's seminal study, *The Nature of Prejudice*, was published in 1954. In this book, Allport formulates his influential principles about ways

to create effective intergroup interactions. He states that effective contact situations must be characterized by equal-status, cooperative rather than competitive interactions, and by shared goals. Positive interracial contact must also be sanctioned by authorities. Allport's principles are highly influential in social science research today and provide an important theoretical base for the work of researchers such as Cohen (1972), Aronson and Bridgeman (1979), and Slavin (1985).

Important theoretical and research work related to children's racial attitudes was also completed during the intergroup education period. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith sponsored an important study by Goodman that was published in 1952. This study provided evidence that supported earlier findings by researchers such as E. L. Horowitz (1936), R. E. Horowitz (1939), and a series of studies by Kenneth B. and Mamie P. Clark (1939a, 1939b, 1940, 1947). These studies established the postulate that preschool children have racial awareness and attitudes that mirror those of adults.

Intergroup educators wanted to help students to develop more democratic racial attitudes and values (Cook, 1947; Taba & Wilson, 1946). Investigations designed to determine the effects of curricular interventions on students' racial attitudes were an important part of the intergroup education movement. Significant intervention studies conducted during this period include those by Trager and Yarrow (1952) and by Hayes and Conklin (1953). Most of these studies support the postulate that multicultural lessons, activities, and teaching materials, when used within a democratic classroom atmosphere and implemented for a sufficiently long period, help students to develop more democratic racial attitudes and values. Studies both prior to and during this period established that children internalize the attitudes of adults that are institutionalized within the structures and institutions of society (Clark & Clark, 1947; Goodman, 1952; E. L. Horowitz, 1936).

Important textbooks and reports published during the intergroup education era include those by Locke and Stern (1942), Cook (1950), Taba et al. (1952), and Cook and Cook (1954), which reveal that intergroup educators emphasized democratic living and interracial cooperation within mainstream American society. The ethnic studies movements that both preceded and followed the intergroup education movement emphasized ethnic attachment, pride, and empowerment. The focus in intergroup education was on intercultural interactions within a shared, common culture (Cook, 1947; Taba & Wilson, 1946).

The Early Ethnic Studies and Intergroup Education Movements Compared

Woodson (1933) and DuBois (1973) were concerned that African Americans develop knowledge of Black history and culture, and a commitment

to the empowerment and enhancement of the African-American community. This was in contrast to the emphasis in intergroup education, which promoted a weak form of diversity and the notion that “we are different but the same.”

The Sleeter and Grant (1987) typology consists of five categories: (a) teaching the culturally different, (b) human relations, (c) single-group studies, (d) multicultural education, and (e) education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. Most of the literature and guides that were produced during the intergroup education era can be classified as human relations. In this approach, according to Sleeter and Grant (1987, p. 426), multicultural education is “a way to help students of different backgrounds communicate, get along better with each other, and feel good about themselves.”

Like the human relations books and materials examined by Sleeter and Grant that were published in the 1970s and 1980s, intergroup education materials devote little attention to issues and problems such as institutionalized racism, power, and structural inequality. However, unlike most of the human relations materials examined by Sleeter and Grant, some of the materials published during the intergroup education period are based on theories developed by psychologists and social psychologists (Taba, 1950, 1951; Taba & Wilson, 1946).

The intergroup education publications and projects emphasized interracial harmony and human relations. The early ethnic studies advocates endorsed ethnic empowerment and what Sleeter and Grant call “single-group studies.” Thus, the aims and goals of the intergroup education and ethnic studies movements were quite different. The ethnic studies movement emphasized the histories and cultures of specific ethnic groups (single-group studies). Taba and Wilson (1946) identified the following focuses in intergroup education: concepts and understandings about groups and relations, sensitivity and goodwill, objective thinking, and experiences in democratic procedures.

The racial backgrounds and cultural experiences of the leaders of the two ethnic studies movements and those of the leaders of the intergroup education movement were important factors that influenced the goals, aims, and nature of these movements. Most of the influential leaders of the early ethnic studies movement in the United States and the one that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s were people of color. Most of the leaders of the intergroup education movement were White liberal educators and social scientists who functioned and worked within mainstream colleges, universities, and other institutions and organizations. Hilda Taba (who taught at the University of Chicago and directed the Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools Project for the American Council on Education) and Lloyd A. Cook (who taught at Wayne State University and directed

the College Programs in Intergroup Relations project) were the most prolific and noted intergroup education leaders.

The different cultural experiences, perceptions, and values of the leaders of the ethnic studies and intergroup education movements significantly influenced their perceptions of the goals of citizenship education and the role of ethnic content in instruction. Ethnic studies scholars and educators probably endorsed a more pluralistic view of citizenship education than did intergroup educators because they worked and functioned primarily outside mainstream institutions and believed that parallel ethnic institutions were essential for the survival and development of ethnic groups in the United States. The experiences of most intergroup educators in mainstream institutions influenced their view that assimilation into mainstream culture and its institutions was the most appropriate way to resolve ethnic tensions.

The history of the early ethnic studies and intergroup education movements and an analysis of current curriculum reform efforts reveal that movements related to the integration of ethnic content into the curriculum move cyclically from a single-group to an intergroup focus. The fact that single-group studies movements continue to emerge within a society with a democratic ethos suggests that the United States has not dealt successfully with the American dilemma related to race that Myrdal (with Sterner & Rose, 1944) identified nearly 50 years ago.

The Ethnic Studies Movement of the 1960s and 1970s

An important vision within the intergroup education ideology was interracial harmony and desegregation. Another name for the movement was *intercultural education*. Intergroup education emerged when the nation was sharply segregated along racial lines and was beginning its efforts to create a desegregated society. The early goal of the civil rights movement of the 1960s was racial desegregation. However, many African Americans had grown impatient with the pace of desegregation by the late 1960s. Imbued with racial pride, they called for Black power, separatism, and Black studies in the schools and colleges that would contribute to the empowerment and advancement of African Americans (Car-michael & Hamilton, 1967).

When the civil rights movement began, the intergroup education movement had quietly died without a requiem. The separatist ideology that emerged during the 1970s was antithetical to the intergroup education vision. The America envisioned by most intergroup educators was a nation in which ethnic and racial differences were minimized and all people were treated fairly and lived in harmony.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, sometimes in strident voices, African Americans, frustrated with deferred and shattered dreams, de-

manded community control of their schools, African-American teachers and administrators, and the infusion of Black history into the curriculum. At the university level, frequent demands included Black studies programs and courses, heritage rooms or houses, and Black professors and administrators. During this period, there was little demand for the infusion of ethnic content into the core or mainstream curriculum—that demand would not emerge until the 1980s and 1990s. Rather, the demand was primarily for separate courses and programs (Blassingame, 1971; Ford, 1973; Robinson, Foster, & Ogilvie, 1969).

As schools, colleges, and universities began to respond to the demand by African Americans for curriculum changes, other ethnic groups of color that felt victimized by institutionalized discrimination in the United States began to demand similar programs. These groups included Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, American Indians, and Asian Americans. A rich array of books, programs, curricula, and other materials that focused on the histories and cultures of ethnic groups of color were edited, written, or reprinted between the late 1960s and the early 1970s.

One important development during this period was the reprinting of books and research studies that had been written during the early and more silent period of ethnic studies. A few of these publications had remained in print for many years, and had been best-sellers at all-Black colleges; such books were John Hope Franklin's popular history, *From Slavery to Freedom*, first published in 1947, and *The Souls of Black Folk* by W. E. B. DuBois, first published in 1953.

However, more frequent was the reprinting of long-neglected works that had been produced during the earlier period of ethnic studies. George Washington Williams's *History of the Negro Race in America* (1882–1883) was reissued by Arno Press in 1968. Important earlier works on Hispanics reprinted during this period included the book by Carey McWilliams (1949), *North from Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States*, which provides an informative overview of Hispanic groups in the United States. Manuel Gamio's (1930) *Mexican Immigration to the United States* is a well-researched description of the first wave of Mexican immigrants to the United States. Two important earlier works on Filipino Americans were also reissued during this period: *Filipino Immigration to the Continental United States and Hawaii*, by Bruno Lasker (1931), and *Brothers Under the Skin*, by Carey McWilliams (1943).

More important than the books that were continually printed or reprinted was the new crop of publications that focused primarily on the struggles and experiences of particular ethnic groups. The emphasis in many of these publications was on ways that ethnic groups of color had been victimized by institutionalized racism and discrimination in the United States. The quality of this rash of books varied widely. Some were

more carefully researched than others. However, they all provided perspectives that gave Americans new ways to view the history and culture of the United States. Many of these books became required reading in ethnic studies courses and degree programs. Among the significant books of this genre are *Japanese Americans*, by Harry H. L. Kitano (1969); *The Story of the Chinese in America*, by Betty Lee Sung (1967); *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*, by Rudy Acuña (1972); *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, by Vine Deloria, Jr. (1969); and *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*, by Michael Novak (1971), a highly rhetorical and ringing plea for justice for White ethnic groups such as Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Slavs.

The Evolution of Multicultural Education

The intergroup education movement is an important antecedent of the current multicultural education movement but is not an actual root of it. The current multicultural education movement is directly linked to the early ethnic studies movement initiated by scholars such as Williams (1882–1883) and continued by individuals such as DuBois (1935), Woodson (1919/1968), Bond (1939), and Wesley (1935). The major architects of the multicultural education movement were cogently influenced by African-American scholarship and ethnic studies related to the other ethnic minority groups in the United States.

Baker (1977), Banks (1973), Gay (1971), and Grant (1973, 1978) have each played significant roles in the formulation and development of multicultural education in the United States. Each of these scholars was heavily influenced by the early work of African-American scholars and the African-American ethnic studies movement. They were working in ethnic studies prior to participating in the formation of multicultural education. Other scholars who have helped to fashion multicultural education since its inception were also influenced by the African-American ethnic studies movement, including James B. Boyer (1974), Asa Hilliard III (1974), and Barbara A. Sizemore (1972).

Scholars who are specialists on other ethnic groups, such as Carlos E. Cortés (1973; Mexican Americans), Jack D. Forbes (1973; American Indians), Sonia Nieto (1986; Puerto Ricans), and Derald W. Sue (1981; Asian Americans), also played early and significant roles in the evolution of multicultural education.

The first phase of multicultural education emerged when educators who had interests and specializations in the history and culture of ethnic minority groups initiated individual and institutional actions to incorporate the concepts, information, and theories from ethnic studies into the school and teacher education curricula. Consequently, the first phase of multicultural education was ethnic studies.

A second phase of multicultural education emerged when educators interested in ethnic studies began to realize that inserting ethnic studies content into the school and teacher education curricula was necessary but not sufficient to bring about school reform that would respond to the unique needs of ethnic minority students and help all students to develop more democratic racial and ethnic attitudes. Multiethnic education, the second phase of multicultural education, emerged. Its aim was to bring about structural and systemic changes in the total school that were designed to increase educational equality.

A third phase of multicultural education emerged when other groups who viewed themselves as victims of the society and the schools, such as women and people with disabilities, demanded the incorporation of their histories, cultures, and voices into the curricula and structure of the schools, colleges, and universities. The current, or fourth, phase of multicultural education consists of the development of theory, research, and practice that interrelate variables connected to race, class, and gender (Banks & Banks, 1993; Grant & Sleeter, 1986). It is important to note that each of the phases of multicultural education exists today. However, the later phases tend to be more prominent than the earlier ones, at least in the theoretical literature, if not in practice.

During the 1970s, a number of professional organizations, such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and NCSS, issued position statements and publications that encouraged schools to integrate the curriculum with content and understandings about ethnic groups. In 1973, AACTE published its brief and widely quoted statement, *No One Model American*. That same year, the NCSS 43rd yearbook was titled *Teaching Ethnic Studies: Concepts and Strategies* (Banks, 1973). The following year, NCTE (1974) issued *Students' Rights to Their Own Language*. An early landmark conference on multicultural education through competency-based teacher education was sponsored by AACTE in 1974 (Hunter, 1974). In 1976, NCSS published *Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education* (Banks, Cortés, Gay, García, & Ochoa, 1976). This publication was revised and reissued in 1992 with a title change ("Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education"; NCSS Task Force, 1992).

Several landmark developments in the emergence of multicultural education occurred in 1977. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) published a book on multicultural education (Grant, 1977). That same year, AACTE published *Pluralism and the American Teacher: Issues and Case Studies*. This book resulted from its conference series on the topic that was supported by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (Klassen & Gollnick, 1977). AACTE, using the

grant funds, established the Ethnic Heritage Center for Teacher Education, its unit that sponsored the conferences and the book. One of the most influential developments that occurred during the early emergence of multicultural education was the issuance of *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education* by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1977. These standards required all of its member teacher education institutions, which consisted of about 80% of the teacher education programs in the United States, to implement components, courses, and programs in multicultural education. The standards were later issued in revised form (NCATE, 1987).

Many professional associations, school districts, and state departments of education published guidelines and teacher's guides to help school districts integrate content about ethnic groups into the elementary and high school curriculum. The United Federation of Teachers published *Puerto Rican History and Culture: A Study Guide and Curriculum Outline* (Aran, Arthur, Colon, & Goldenberg, 1973). This curriculum guide, like most materials produced by professional organizations, school districts, and commercial publishers during this period, focused on one ethnic group. Publications and materials that focused on more than one ethnic group were developed later. One of the first publications to recommend a multiethnic approach to the study of ethnic groups was the NCSS 1973 yearbook (Banks, 1973). The guides and books published during this period varied in quality. Many were produced quickly, but others provided teachers with sound and thoughtful guidelines for integrating their curricula with ethnic content.

Research Developments Since the 1960s

A rich array of research in the social sciences, humanities, and education focusing on people of color has been published since 1960. Much of this research challenges existing interpretations, paradigms, assumptions, and methodologies and provides important data on long-neglected topics (Gates, 1988; King & Mitchell, 1990; Slaughter, 1988). The three decades between 1960 and 1990 were probably the most productive research period in ethnic studies in the nation's history. St. Claire Drake (1987, 1990), shortly before his death, completed a massive two-volume anthropological study, *Black Folk Here and There*. Bernal's (1987, 1991) comprehensive two-volume work, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*, challenges existing historical interpretations about the debt that ancient Greece owes to Africa, and supports earlier works by African and African-American scholars such as Diop (1974) and Van Sertima (1988). Many of the insights from this new scholarship are being incorporated into the school, college, and university curriculum.

THE KNOWLEDGE CONSTRUCTION PROCESS

The ethnic studies research and literature published during the 1960s and 1970s (Acuña, 1972), like the ethnic studies scholarship in the early decades of the century (DuBois, 1935; Woodson, 1919/1968), challenged some of the major paradigms, canons, and perspectives established within mainstream scholarship (Blea, 1988; Gordon, 1985; Gordon, Miller, & Rollock, 1990; Ladner, 1973). Ethnic studies scholarship also challenges some of the key assumptions of mainstream Western empiricism (Gordon & Meroe, 1991).

The construction of descriptions and interpretations of the settlement of the West and of slavery are two examples of how people of color have been described and conceptualized in mainstream U.S. history and social science. Frederick Jackson Turner (1894/1989) constructed a view of the settlement of European Americans in the West that has cogently influenced the treatment and interpretation of the West in school, college, and university textbooks (Sleeter & Grant, 1991). Turner described the land occupied by the Indians as a wilderness to which the Europeans brought civilization. He also argued that the wilderness in the West, which required individualism for survival, was the main source of American democracy. The view of the West that Turner constructed is one of an empty wilderness that lacked civilization until the coming of the Europeans. Although revisionist historians have described the limitations of Turner's theory, its influence on the curricula of the nation's elementary and high schools, and on textbooks, is still cogent.

The treatment and interpretation of slavery within mainstream U.S. scholarship provide another revealing example of how ethnic groups of color have been depicted in such scholarship. Ulrich B. Phillips's interpretation of slavery remained the dominant one from the time his book was published in 1918 to the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, when the established slavery paradigm was revised by a new generation of historians (Blassingame, 1972; Genovese, 1972; Stampp, 1956). Phillips's interpretation of slavery, which is essentially an apology for southern slaveholders, was one of the major sources for the conception of slaves as happy, contented, and loyal to their masters that dominated textbooks in the 1950s and 1960s (Banks, 1969).

The description of the settlement of Europeans in the western United States and the treatment of slavery in U.S. scholarship from the turn of the century to the 1950s indicate the extent to which knowledge reflects ideology, human interests, values, and perspectives (Habermas, 1971). Yet, a basic assumption of Western empiricism is that knowledge is objective and neutral and that its principles are universal (Kaplan, 1964). Multicultural scholars (Acuña, 1972; Hilliard, Payton-Stewart, & Wil-

liams, 1990; King & Mitchell, 1990)—like critical theorists such as Habermas (1971) and Giroux (1983) and feminist postmodernists such as Farganis (1986), Code (1991), and Harding (1991)—reject these assumptions about the nature of knowledge.

Multicultural scholars maintain that knowledge reflects the social, cultural, and power positions of people within society, and that it is valid only when it “comes from an acknowledgement of the knower’s specific position in any context, one always defined by gender, class, and other variables” (Tetreault, 1993, p. 142). Multicultural and feminist theorists maintain that knowledge is both subjective and objective and that its subjective components need to be clearly identified (Code, 1991; hooks, 1990; King & Mitchell, 1990). Multicultural theorists also contend that by claiming that their knowledge is objective and neutral, mainstream scholars are able to present their particularistic interests and ideologies as the universal concerns of the nation-state (Asante, 1991; Hilliard et al., 1990). According to Gordon and Meroe (1991, p. 28):

We often wonder if the socially adapted human being, who happens to be a scholar, is truly capable of discarding her or his individual frame of reference when it comes to the study of a subject to which she or he has chosen to commit her or his life’s work. This is a precarious and dangerous situation because too many times “objectivity” has served as a mask for the political agenda of the status quo, thus marginalizing and labeling the concerns of less empowered groups as “special interests.”

A number of conceptualizations have been developed by multicultural and feminist theorists that are designed to help teachers acquire the information and skills needed to teach students how knowledge is constructed, how to identify the writer’s purposes and point of view, and how to formulate their own interpretations of reality.

Four approaches used to integrate ethnic content into the elementary and high school curriculum and to teach students about ethnic groups were conceptualized by Banks (1989b): contributions, additive, transformation, and social action. The contribution approach focuses on heroes and heroines, holidays, and discrete cultural elements. When using the additive approach, teachers append ethnic content, themes, and perspectives to the curriculum without changing its basic structure. In the transformation approach, which is designed to help students learn how knowledge is constructed, the structure of the curriculum is changed to enable students to view concepts, issues, events, and themes from the perspectives of various ethnic and cultural groups. In the social action approach, which is an extension of the transformation approach, students make decisions on important social issues and take action to help solve them.

Tetreault (1993) describes a model for teaching content about women

that is also designed to help students understand the nature of knowledge and how it is constructed. In this curriculum model, the teacher moves from a male-defined curriculum to one that is gender balanced. The phases are as follows: contributions curriculum, bifocal curriculum, women's curriculum, and gender-balanced curriculum. In the contributions curriculum, a male framework is used to insert women into the curriculum; the world is viewed through the eyes of women and men in the bifocal curriculum; subjects of primary importance to women are investigated in the women's curriculum; and the gender-balanced curriculum investigates topics and concepts that are important to women but also considers how women and men relate to each other.

PREJUDICE REDUCTION

The prejudice reduction dimension of multicultural education is designed to help students develop more democratic attitudes, values, and behaviors (Gabelko & Michaelis, 1981; Lynch, 1987). Researchers and educators who are concerned about helping students develop more democratic attitudes and behaviors have devoted much of their attention to investigating how children develop racial awareness, preferences, and identification (Clark, 1963; Katz, 1976; Milner, 1983; Phinney & Rotheram, 1987). This discussion is divided into two sections: (a) the nature of children's racial attitudes and identities and (b) the modification of students' racial attitudes.

The Nature of Children's Racial Attitudes

A common belief among elementary school teachers is that young children have little awareness of racial differences and positive attitudes toward both African Americans and Whites. Many teachers with whom I have worked have told me that because young children are unaware of racial differences, talking about race to them will merely create racial problems that do not exist. This common observation by teachers is inconsistent with reality and research.

During a period of nearly 50 years, researchers have established that young children are aware of racial differences by the age of 3 (Phinney & Rotheram, 1987; Ramsey, 1987) and have internalized attitudes toward African Americans and Whites that are established in the wider society. They tend to prefer white (pinkish colored) stimulus objects, such as dolls and pictures, to brown dolls and pictures, and to describe white (pinkish) objects and people more positively than brown ones.

Early studies by Lasker (1929) and Minard (1931) indicate that young children are aware of racial differences and that children's racial attitudes are formed early in life. Studies by E. L. Horowitz (1936) and R. E.

Horowitz (1939) indicate that both African-American and White nursery school children are aware of racial differences and show a statistically significant preference for Whites. The Horowitzes interpreted their findings to mean that the African-American children in their studies evidenced self-rejection when they showed a White bias in their responses to stimulus objects and pictures.

In a series of pioneering studies conducted between 1939 and 1950, Kenneth B. and Mamie P. Clark confirmed the findings of the Horowitzes and gave considerable support to the self-rejection paradigm first formulated by the Horowitzes (Cross, 1991). The Clarks are usually credited with originating the self-rejection paradigm; however, Cross states that the Horowitzes, and not the Clarks, created the paradigm. Nevertheless, the famous Clark studies gave the self-rejection paradigm its widest visibility and credibility.

In the series of studies conducted by the Clarks, African-American nursery school children were the subjects; the stimuli were brown and white (pinkish) dolls. The Clarks studied racial awareness, preference, and identification (Clark & Clark, 1939a, 1939b, 1940, 1947). They concluded that the children in their studies had accurate knowledge of racial differences, sometimes made incorrect racial self-identifications, and often expressed a preference for white. The Clarks concluded that many of the African-American children in their studies evidenced self-rejection.

The self-rejection paradigm associated with the Clarks has had a cogent influence on research and the interpretation of research on children's racial attitudes and self-esteem for nearly a half century. A series of significant and influential studies during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s confirmed the early studies by the Horowitzes and the Clarks (Morland, 1966; Porter, 1971; Radke & Trager, 1950; Williams & Morland, 1976)—that young children are aware of racial differences and that both African-American and White children tend to evidence a white bias.

The self-rejection paradigm has been strongly challenged during the last decade on both methodological and interpretative grounds (W. C. Banks, 1976; Cross, 1991; Spencer, 1987). During the 1980s and 1990s, Spencer (1982, 1985, 1987) and Cross (1985, 1991) developed concepts and theories and conducted research that challenge the interpretation that the Horowitzes and the Clarks used to explain their findings. They have made a useful distinction between *personal* and *group* identity and have reinterpreted the early findings, as well as their own research findings, within this new paradigm.

An important group of studies by Spencer (1982, 1985, 1987) indicates that young African-American children can distinguish their personal and group identities. They can express high self-esteem and a white bias at the same time. She formulates a cognitive theory to explain these findings:

African-American children often make white bias choices because they have learned from the wider society (a cognitive process) to make these choices, not because they reject themselves or have low self-concepts. In other words, the children are choosing the "right" answer when asked to select the white or colored stimulus. Research by Banks (1984) supports the postulate that African-American children make choices related to race that indicate that personal and group identity are distinguished. Cross (1991) also provides strong theoretical and empirical evidence to support this conceptual distinction.

The Modification of Children's Racial Attitudes

Studies designed to modify children's racial attitudes have been conducted at least since the 1940s (Agnes, 1947; Jackson, 1944). However, the literature that describes the characteristics of children's racial attitudes is much richer than the modification literature. In two recent comprehensive reviews of the modification literature, Banks (1991b, in press) identifies four types of modification studies: (a) curricular intervention studies, (b) reinforcement studies, (c) perceptual differentiation studies, and (d) cooperative learning studies.

Curricular studies are the earliest type of intervention studies; they date back to the intergroup education period of the 1940s (Agnes, 1947; Jackson, 1944). In their studies, Agnes and Jackson concluded that reading materials about African Americans helped students develop more positive racial attitudes. However, most of the early studies have serious methodological problems. One of the most well-designed and important studies of the intergroup education period was conducted by Trager and Yarrow (1952). They found that a democratic curriculum had a positive effect on the racial attitudes of both students and teachers. Hayes and Conklin (1953) also found that an intercultural curriculum had a positive effect on the racial attitudes of students. The experimental treatment took place over a 2-year period. However, the description of the intervention is imprecise.

Studies of the effects of units, courses, and curriculum materials have also been conducted by Fisher (1965); Leslie and Leslie (1972); Yawkey (1973); Lessing and Clarke (1976); Litcher and Johnson (1969); Litcher, Johnson, and Ryan (1973); and Shirley (1988). Most of these studies provide evidence for the postulate that curricular materials and interventions can have a positive effect on the racial attitudes of students. However, the studies by Lessing and Clarke (1976) and Litcher et al. (1973) had no measurable effects on the racial attitudes of students.

In an important study, Litcher and Johnson (1969) found that multiethnic readers had a positive effect on the racial attitudes of second-grade White students. However, when they replicated this study using photo-

graphs rather than readers (Litcher et al., 1973), no significant effects were attained. The investigators believe that the shorter duration of the latter study (1 month compared with 4) and the different ethnic compositions of the cities in which the studies were conducted may explain the conflicting findings in the two studies. In summarizing the effects of curriculum intervention studies, Banks (1991b, p. 464) concludes:

The studies . . . indicate that curriculum intervention can help students to develop more positive racial attitudes but . . . the effects of such interventions are likely not to be consistent. . . . The inconsistencies may be due in part to the use of different measures to assess attitude change and because the duration of the interventions has varied widely. The duration of the intervention has rarely been varied to determine the effects.

Williams and his colleagues have conducted a series of reinforcement studies with young children since the 1960s (Williams & Edwards, 1969; Williams & Morland, 1976). These experiments are designed to reduce white bias in young children. In the typical design of these experiments, the children are given pictures of black and white animals or objects and are reinforced for choosing the black objects or animals and for describing them positively. When they choose the white objects or animals, they receive negative reinforcement or no reinforcement. Williams and his colleagues (Williams, Best, Wood, & Filler, 1973; Williams & Edwards, 1969) have found that these types of interventions reduce white bias in children and that the children's responses are generalized from objects and animals to people. Laboratory reinforcement studies by other researchers have generally confirmed the findings by Williams and his colleagues (Hohn, 1973; Parish & Fleetwood, 1975; Parish, Shirazi, & Lambert, 1976).

Katz and her colleagues have conducted a series of studies that have examined the perceptual components of the racial attitudes of young children. In one study she confirmed her predictions that young children can more easily differentiate the faces of in-group members than the faces of out-group members and that if young children are taught to differentiate the faces of out-groups, prejudice is reduced (Katz, 1973). She and Zalk (Katz & Zalk, 1978) examined the effects of four different interventions on the racial attitudes of second- and fifth-grade White students: (a) perceptual differentiation of minority group faces, (b) increased positive racial contact, (c) vicarious interracial contact, and (d) reinforcement of the color black. Each of the interventions reduced prejudice. However, the most powerful interventions were vicarious contact and perceptual differentiation.

Most of the research on cooperative learning has been conducted since the 1970s. Cooperative learning studies tend to support the postulate that cooperative learning situations, if based on the principles formulated by

Allport (1954), can increase the academic achievement of minority students and help all students to develop more positive racial attitudes and cross-racial friendships (Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Cohen, 1972; Slavin, 1979, 1985). Cohen (1972) emphasizes the importance of providing students with experiences that will prepare them for equal-status interactions prior to assigning group tasks to students from different races. Her research indicates that if this is not done, both minority and White students will expect the White students to dominate the group situation. She calls this phenomenon *interracial interaction disability* and has demonstrated that pregroup treatment activities can enable African-American students to experience equal status in group situations with Whites (Cohen, 1972; Cohen & Roper, 1972).

EQUITY PEDAGOGY

When the civil rights movement began in the 1960s, much attention was focused on poverty in the United States. In *The Other America*, Michael Harrington (1962) stirred the nation's conscience about the plight of poor people in the United States. Educational concepts and theories developed that reflected the national concern for low-income citizens and were designed to help teachers and other educators to develop teaching techniques and strategies that would improve the academic achievement of low-income students.

The Cultural Deprivation Paradigm

The educational theories, concepts, and research developed during the early 1960s reflected the dominant ideologies of the time, as well as the concepts and theories used in the social sciences to explain the behavior and values of low-income populations. Social scientists developed the *culture of poverty* concept to describe the experiences of low-income populations (Lewis, 1965). In education, this concept became known as *cultural deprivation* or *the disadvantaged*. Cultural deprivation became the dominant paradigm that guided the formulation of programs and pedagogies for low-income populations during the 1960s (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966; Bloom et al., 1965; Crow, Murray, & Smythe, 1966; Riessman, 1962).

A paradigm can be defined as a system of explanations that guides policy and action (Kuhn, 1970). When a paradigm becomes established and dominates public discourse, it becomes difficult for other systems of explanations to emerge or to become institutionalized. When one paradigm replaces another, Kuhn states, a scientific revolution takes place. However, in education and the social sciences, rarely does one paradigm replace another. More typically, new paradigms compete with established

ones and they coexist. At various times in the history of the education of low-income populations since the 1960s, particular paradigms have been dominant at different times. However, the educational landscape is usually characterized by competing paradigms and explanations.

A paradigm is not only a system of explanations, it is also a perspective on reality and reflects the experiences, perceptions, and values of its creators (Code, 1991; Harding, 1991). The cultural deprivation theorists, unlike the geneticists (Herrnstein, 1971; Jensen, 1969), believe that low-income students can attain high levels of academic achievement but that socialization experiences in their homes and communities do not enable them to attain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that middle-class children acquire and that are essential for academic success. Cultural deprivation theorists consequently believe that the major focus of educational reform must be to change the students by enhancing their early socialization experiences.

Cultural deprivation and disadvantaged theorists believe that the school must help low-income students to overcome the deficits that result from their early family and community experiences. The focus on the deficits of low-income children often prevents cultural deprivation theorists from seeing their strengths. The emphasis on the students' deficits also does not allow the deprivationists to seriously consider structural changes that are needed in schools.

When it emerged, the cultural deprivation paradigm was the most enlightened and liberal theory about educating low-income populations of the day. Some of the nation's most eminent and committed social scientists contributed to its formulation. Allison Davis did pioneering work on the education of low-income students (Davis, 1948/1962). Davis was one of the organizers of the landmark Research Conference on Education and Cultural Deprivation, held at the University of Chicago in June of 1964. Some of the nation's most eminent educators and social scientists participated in this conference, including Anne Anastasi, Basil Bernstein, Benjamin Bloom, Martin Deutsch, Erik Erikson, Edmund W. Gordon, Robert Havighurst, and Thomas Pettigrew. In the book based on the conference, Bloom et al. (1965, p. 4) defined *culturally deprived* children:

We refer to this group as culturally disadvantaged or deprived because we believe the roots of their problem may in large part be traced to their experiences in homes which do not transmit the cultural patterns necessary for the types of learning characteristic of the schools and the larger society.

The Bloom et al. (1965) book was highly influential among educational leaders.

Another influential book resulted from a conference held 2 years earlier

at Teachers College, Columbia University, led by A. Harry Passow (1963), who edited the book *Education in Depressed Areas*. Like the Chicago conference, the Teachers College conference included papers by some of the nation's leading social scientists and educators, including David P. Ausubel, Kenneth B. Clark, and Robert J. Havighurst.

Probably the most influential book published for teachers was *The Culturally Deprived Child* by Frank Riessman (1962), which was used widely in teacher preparation and in-service programs. He told teachers to respect low-income students and pointed out that he thought *culturally deprived* was an inappropriate term but was using it because it was popular. He wrote: "The term 'culturally deprived' refers to those aspects of middle-class culture—such as education, books, formal language—from which these groups have not benefited" (p. 3). Implicit in this statement is the assumption that a student must be middle class to have a culture.

The Cultural Difference Theorists

When the 1970s began, a new group of scholars strongly challenged the explanations and values that underlie the cultural deprivation paradigm. Some of the critics of the cultural deprivationists used powerful language in their critiques (Baratz & Baratz, 1970; Ryan, 1971). Head Start preschool programs were funded generously during the war on poverty of the 1960s. The most popular educational models used in these programs were based on the cultural deprivation paradigm. One of the most commercially successful of these programs was marketed as Distar, and was popularized by Bereiter and Engelmann (1966). In a highly influential article published in the *Harvard Educational Review*, Baratz and Baratz (1970) argued that many of these programs and models were an expression of institutional racism. Ryan (1971) stated that middle-class professionals were blaming the poor, who were victims.

The critics of the cultural deprivationists constructed a different explanation for the school failure of low-income students. They contend that these students are not having academic success because they experience serious cultural conflicts in school. The students have rich cultures and values, but the schools have a culture that conflicts seriously with the cultures of students from low-income and ethnic minority groups (Hale-Benson, 1982; Shade, 1982).

In developing their concepts and theories about the rich cultures of low-income students and students of color, the cultural difference theorists make use of ethnic culture far more than do cultural deprivationists (Ramírez & Castañeda, 1974). The cultural deprivationists focus on social class and the culture of poverty and tend to ignore ethnic culture as a variable. The cultural difference theorists emphasize ethnic culture and devote little attention to class. Ignoring the ethnic cultures of students has evoked much of the criticism of the cultural deprivationists. The lack

of attention to social class is problematic in the cultural difference literature (Banks, 1988b). Cultural difference theories have developed lists of cultural characteristics designed to help teachers build on the cultural strengths of ethnic students (Hale-Benson, 1982; Ramírez & Castañeda, 1974). However, the lists become problematic when teachers interpret them as static characteristics that apply to all members of the ethnic group (Cox & Ramírez, 1981).

The most influential work related to the cultural difference paradigm deals with learning styles, teaching styles, and language (Heath, 1983). In their seminal book, Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) delineate two major types of learning styles, *field independent* and *field sensitive*. They describe theoretical and empirical evidence to support the postulate that traditional Mexican-American students tend to be more field sensitive in their learning styles than Anglo students. The school, however, most often uses a field-independent teaching style. Consequently, Mexican-American students tend not to achieve as well as Anglo students. Ramírez and Castañeda state that the school should help all students, including Mexican-American and Anglo students, to become bicultural in their learning styles.

Theories similar to the one described by Ramírez and Castañeda have also been formulated by Hale-Benson (1982) and Shade (1982, 1989). Hale-Benson (1987, p. 123), for example, states that the African-American child, more than the Anglo child, tends to be "highly affective, expresses herself or himself through considerable body language . . . [and] seeks to be people oriented." Shade (1982), in a comprehensive review article, summarizes an extensive body of research that supports the cultural learning style concept. In a study by Damico (1985), African-American children took more photographs of people and Anglo children took more photographs of objects, thus confirming her hypothesis that African-American students are more people oriented than object oriented and that Anglo children are more object oriented.

Kleinfeld (1975, 1979) has spent much of her career researching the characteristics of effective teachers of Native American students. She has become skeptical of the learning style concept and its usefulness in instruction. After they reviewed the few studies of the educational effects of adapting instruction to Native American learning styles, she and Nelson (Kleinfeld & Nelson, 1991, p. 273) conclude that "virtually no research has succeeded in demonstrating that instruction adapted to Native Americans' visual learning style results in greater learning." The few weak studies reviewed by Kleinfeld and Nelson do not constitute a sufficient reason to abandon the learning style paradigm. However, the paradigm is a contentious one. Both its advocates and its critics are strongly committed to their positions.

The controversy about learning style theory and research is difficult to resolve. Banks (1988b) examined the research literature on learning style to determine the extent to which learning style is a variable related to class and ethnicity. He concluded that the issue is a complex one, and that class mobility mediates but does not eliminate the effects of ethnic culture on the learning characteristics of Mexican-American and African-American students.

Some researchers believe that the best way to understand the learning characteristics of students of color is to observe and describe them in ethnographic studies, rather than classifying them into several brief categories. These researchers believe that thick descriptions of the learning and cultural characteristics of ethnic minority students are needed to guide educational practice. Important and influential ethnographic studies of the cultural characteristics of students of color have been conducted by researchers such as Ogbu (1974), Heath (1983), and Philips (1983).

Since the 1960s, cultural difference theorists have done rich and pioneering theoretical and empirical work on the language characteristics of ethnic minority students. Prior to the 1960s, most teachers considered the version of English spoken by most low-income African Americans as an abnormal form of standard English. Within the last three decades, linguists have produced a rich body of literature that documents that Black English (Ebonics) is a legitimate communication system that has its own rules and logic (Heath, 1983; Labov, 1969; Smitherman, 1977; F. Williams, 1970). Spanish-speaking children were prohibited from speaking their first language in schools of the Southwest for many decades. However, research in recent decades has revealed that it is important for the school to recognize and make use of children's first languages (Ovando & Collier, 1985).

The Rebirth of the Cultural Deprivation Paradigm

The history of the ethnic studies and intergroup education movements indicates that ideas related to these movements reemerge cyclically. We can observe a similar phenomenon in cultural deprivation. The cultural difference paradigm dominated discourse about the education of ethnic groups throughout much of the late 1970s and the early 1980s. However, since the late 1980s the cultural deprivation/disadvantaged conception has been exhumed and given new life in the form of the novel concept "at-risk" (Richardson et al., 1989; Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989). Like cultural deprivation, the definition of at-risk is imprecise. The term is used to refer to students who are different in many ways (Cuban, 1989).

One of the reasons that at-risk is becoming popular is that it has become a funding category for state and federal educational agencies. When a term becomes a funding category, it does not need to be defined precisely

to attain wide usage and popularity. One reason that at-risk is politically popular is that it can be used to refer to any population of youth experiencing problems in school. Consequently, every interest group can see itself in the term. Yet, the term is a problematic one, as Cuban (1989) points out in a thoughtful article. However, it is becoming increasingly popular among both researchers and practitioners (Richardson et al., 1989; Slavin et al., 1989). The term *disadvantaged* has also reemerged from the 1960s. Disadvantaged children are the subject of a recent and informative book by Natriello, McDill, and Pallas (1990).

AN EMPOWERING SCHOOL CULTURE AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The four dimensions of multicultural education discussed above—content integration, the knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, and an equity pedagogy—each deal with an aspect of a cultural or social system: the school. However, the school can also be conceptualized as one social system that is larger than its interrelated parts (e.g., its formal and informal curriculum, teaching materials, counseling programs, and teaching strategies). When conceptualized as a social system, the school is viewed as an institution that “includes a social structure of interrelated statuses and roles and the functioning of that structure in terms of patterns of actions and interactions” (Theodorson & Theodorson, 1969, p. 395). The school can also be conceptualized as a cultural system (Bullivant, 1987) with a specific set of values, norms, ethos, and shared meanings.

A number of school reformers have used a systems approach to reform the school in order to increase the academic achievement of low-income students and students of color. There are a number of advantages to approaching school reform from a holistic perspective. To effectively implement any reform in a school, such as effective prejudice reduction teaching, changes are required in a number of other school variables. Teachers, for example, need more knowledge and need to examine their racial and ethnic attitudes; consequently, they need more time as well as a variety of instructional materials. Many school reform efforts fail because the roles, norms, and ethos of the school do not change in ways that will make the institutionalization of the reforms possible.

The effective school reformers constitute one group of change agents that has approached school reform from a systems perspective. This movement emerged as a reaction to the work of Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972); their studies indicate that the major factor influencing student academic achievement is the social-class composition of the students and the school. Many educators interpreted the research by Coleman et al. and Jencks et al. to mean that the school can do little to increase the academic achievement of low-income students.

Brookover (Brookover & Erickson, 1975) developed a social psycho-

logical theory of learning that states that students internalize the conceptions of themselves that are institutionalized within the ethos and structures of the school. Related to Merton's (1968) self-fulfilling prophecy, Brookover's theory states that student academic achievement will increase if the adults within the school have high expectations for students, clearly identify the skills they wish them to learn, and teach those skills to them.

Research by Brookover and his colleagues (Brookover et al., 1979; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979) indicates that schools populated by low-income students within the same school district vary greatly in student achievement levels. Consequently, Brookover attributes the differences to variations in the school's social structure. He calls the schools in low-income areas that have high academic achievement *improving* schools. Other researchers, such as Edmonds (1986) and Lezotte (1993), call them *effective* schools.

Brookover and his colleagues (Brookover et al., 1979; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979) have identified the characteristics that differentiate effective from ineffective schools. Staff in effective or improving schools emphasize the importance of basic skills and believe that all students can master them. Principals are assertive instructional leaders and disciplinarians and assume responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic skills objectives. Also, staff members accept the concept of accountability, and parents initiate more contact than in nonimproving schools.

Edmonds (1986), who was a leading advocate of effective schools as an antidote to the doom that often haunts inner-city schools, identified characteristics of effective schools similar to those formulated by Brookover and his colleagues. Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, and Smith (1979) studied 12 secondary schools in an urban section of London. They concluded that some schools were much better than others in promoting the academic and social success of their students. Effective schools researchers have conducted a large number of studies that provide support for their major postulates. However, some educators have a number of concerns about the effective schools movement, including the use of standardized tests as the major device to ascertain academic achievement (Bliss, Firestone, & Richards, 1991; Cuban, 1983; Purkey & Smith, 1982).

Comer (1988) has developed a structural intervention model that involves changes in the social psychological climate of the school. The teachers, principals, and other school professionals make collaborative decisions about the school. The parents also participate in the decision-making process. Comer's data indicate that this approach has been successful in increasing the academic achievement of low-income, inner-city

students. He started the program in New Haven, Connecticut, that is now being implemented in a number of other U.S. cities using private foundation support.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Research

The historical development of multicultural education needs to be more fully described. Careful historical descriptions and analyses will help the field to identify its links to the past, gain deeper insights into the problems and promises of multicultural education today, and plan more effectively for the future. Studies are needed to determine the details of the teaching of African-American history in the schools and colleges from the turn of the century to the 1960s. Studies are also needed to determine the extent to which the intergroup education movement intersected with the ethnic studies tradition initiated by George Washington Williams in 1882 and continued by his successors until the new ethnic studies movement began in the 1960s. The role of African-American institutions, such as churches, schools, sororities, fraternities, and women's clubs, in promoting the study and teaching of African-American history also needs to be researched.

The broad outlines of the early ethnic studies movement related to African Americans have been described here. Studies are needed that will reveal the extent to which scholarship and teaching sources about other ethnic groups, such as American Indians and Mexican Americans, were developed from the turn of the century to the 1960s and 1970s.

A comprehensive history of the intergroup education movement is needed. We also need to determine the extent to which intergroup education practices became institutionalized within the typical school. The publications reviewed for this chapter indicate that intergroup education was often implemented as special projects within schools that were leaders in their cities or districts. Many of the nation's schools were tightly segregated when the movement arose and died, especially in the South. The geographical regions in which intergroup education project schools were located, as well as the types of schools, are important variables that need to be investigated.

Other important issues that warrant investigation are: (a) the reasons why the movement had failed by the time the new ethnic studies movement emerged in the 1960s, and (b) why its leaders, such as Hilda Taba, Lloyd A. Cook, and William Van Til, did little work in intergroup education after the mid-1950s. Seemingly, intergroup education was not a lifetime commitment for its eminent leaders. In the 1960s, Taba became a leading expert and researcher in social studies education. However, in

her posthumously published book, coauthored with Deborah Elkins (Taba & Elkins, 1966), *Teaching Strategies for the Culturally Disadvantaged*, Taba incorporated concepts and strategies from the intergroup education project that she directed in the 1940s, funded by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and sponsored by the American Council on Education. Intergroup education concepts and aims also had a significant influence on her famous social studies curriculum (Taba, 1967). This curriculum focuses on thinking, knowledge, attitudes, feelings, and values, as well as on academic and social skills. These components are similar to the aims that Taba stated for intergroup education in an article she coauthored with Harold W. Wilson (Taba & Wilson, 1946).

Empirical studies need to be undertaken of each of the five dimensions of multicultural education described in this chapter. Content integration studies, using both interview and ethnographic techniques, should describe the approaches that teachers use to integrate their curricula with ethnic content, the problems they face, and how they resolve them. The major barriers that teachers face when trying to make their curricula multicultural also need to be identified.

The knowledge construction process is a fruitful topic for empirical research. Most of the work related to this concept is theoretical and philosophical (Code, 1991; Gordon, 1985; Harding, 1991). This concept can be investigated by interventions that present students with documents describing different perspectives on the same historical event, such as the Japanese-American internment, the Westward Movement, and Indian Removal. Studies could be made of teacher questions and student responses when discussing the conflicting accounts.

Both studies that describe students' racial attitudes and intervention studies designed to modify them need to be conducted. A literature search using ERIC, PsychLit, and Sociofile revealed that few intervention studies related to children's racial attitudes have been conducted since 1980. Most of the studies related to children's racial attitudes reviewed here were conducted before 1980. Since 1980, there has been little support for research in race relations; consequently, there are few studies. Perhaps multicultural researchers could implement small-scale observational studies funded by civil rights organizations. Jewish civil rights organizations funded a number of important studies during the intergroup education era.

Research related to effective teaching strategies for low-income students and students of color (equity pedagogy) needs to examine the complex interaction of race, class, and gender, as well as other variables such as region and generation (Grant & Sleeter, 1986). The rising number of outspoken African-American conservatives, such as Carter (1991), Sowell (1984), Steele (1990), and Wortham (1981), should help both the research

and wider community understand the enormous diversity within the African-American community. Conservative Mexican-American writers, such as Rodriguez (1982) and Chavez (1991), reveal the ideological and cultural diversity within the Mexican-American community.

Since the 1960s, diversity within U.S. ethnic minority groups has increased greatly, as a significant number of African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans have joined the middle class and the exodus to the suburbs (Wilson, 1987). White flight has become middle-class flight. A sharp class schism has developed within ethnic minority communities (Wilson, 1987). Consequently, research on people of color—especially studies on learning styles and their cultural characteristics—that does not examine class as an important variable is not likely to result in findings that are helpful and generalizable.

Practice

The most important implication of this research review is that multicultural education must be conceptualized and implemented broadly if it is to bring about meaningful changes in schools, colleges, and universities. Several serious problems result when multicultural education is conceptualized only or primarily as content integration. Teachers in subjects such as mathematics and science perceive multicultural education, when it is conceptualized only as content integration, as appropriate for social studies and language arts teachers but not for them.

When multicultural education is narrowly conceptualized, it is often confined to activities for special days and occasions, such as Martin Luther King's birthday and Cinco de Mayo. It may also be viewed as a special unit, an additional book by an African-American or a Mexican-American writer, or a few additional lessons. The knowledge construction dimension of multicultural education is an essential one. Using this concept, content about ethnic groups is not merely added to the curriculum. Rather, the curriculum is reconceptualized to help students understand how knowledge is constructed and how it reflects human interests, ideology, and the experiences of the people who create it. Students themselves also create interpretations. They begin to understand why it is essential to look at the nation's experience from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives to comprehend fully its past and present.

The research reviewed in this chapter indicates that children come to school with misconceptions about outside ethnic groups and with a white bias. However, it also indicates that students' racial attitudes can be modified and made more democratic and that the racial attitudes of young children are much more easily modified than the attitudes of older students and adults (Katz, 1976). Consequently, it suggests that if we are to help students acquire the attitudes needed to survive in a multicultural and

diverse world, we must start early. Beginning in kindergarten, educators need to implement a well-conceptualized and sequential curriculum that is multicultural.

A school experience that is multicultural includes content, examples, and realistic images of diverse racial and ethnic groups. Cooperative learning activities in which students from diverse groups work to attain shared goals is also a feature of the school, as well as simulated images of ethnic groups that present them in positive and realistic ways. Also essential within such a school are adults who model the attitudes and behaviors they are trying to teach. Actions speak much louder than words.

Jane Elliott (as described in Peters, 1987) has attained fame for a simulated lesson she taught on discrimination that is described in the award-winning documentary *The Eye of the Storm*. One day Elliott discriminated against blue-eyed children; the next day brown-eyed children experienced the sting of bigotry. In 1984, 11 of her former third graders returned to Riceville, Iowa, for a reunion with their teacher. This event is described in another documentary, *A Class Divided*, in which the students describe the power of a classroom experience that had taken place 14 years earlier.

Elliott, who taught third grade in an all-White town, was moved to act because of the racial hate she observed in the nation. Racial incidents are on the rise throughout the United States (Altbach & Lomotey, 1991). The research reviewed in this chapter, and in two previous reviews (Banks, 1991b, in press), can help empower educators to act to help create a more democratic and caring society. Jane Elliott acted and made a difference; she is a cogent example for us all.

REFERENCES

- Acuña, R. (1972). *Occupied America: The Chicano's struggle toward liberation*. San Francisco: Canfield Press.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Norton.
- Agnes, M. (1947). Influences of reading on the racial attitudes of adolescent girls. *Catholic Educational Review*, 45, 415-420.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Altbach, P. G., & Lomotey, K. (Eds.). (1991). *The racial crisis in American higher education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1973). *No one model American*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Aran, K., Arthur, H., Colon, R., & Goldenberg, H. (1973). *Puerto Rican history and culture: A study guide and curriculum outline*. New York: United Federation of Teachers.
- Aronson, E., & Bridgeman, D. (1979). Jigsaw groups and the desegregated classroom: In pursuit of common goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 438-446.

- Asante, M. K. (1991). The Afrocentric idea in education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60, 170–180.
- Asante, M. K., & Ravitch, D. (1991). Multiculturalism: An exchange. *The American Scholar*, 60, 267–276.
- Baker, G. (1977). Multicultural education: Two preservice approaches. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28, 31–33.
- Baker, G. (1983). *Planning and organizing for multicultural instruction*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Banks, J. A. (1969). A content analysis of the Black American in textbooks. *Social Education*, 33, 954–957, 963.
- Banks, J. A. (1970). *Teaching the Black experience: Methods and materials*. Belmont, CA: Fearson.
- Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (1973). *Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies* (43rd yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Banks, J. A. (1984). Black youths in predominantly White suburbs: An exploratory study of their attitudes and self-concepts. *Journal of Negro Education*, 53, 3–17.
- Banks, J. A. (1988a). *Multicultural education: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1988b). Ethnicity, class, cognitive, and motivational styles: Research and teaching implications. *Journal of Negro Education*, 57, 452–466.
- Banks, J. A. (1989a). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 2–26). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1989b). Integrating the curriculum with ethnic content: Approaches and guidelines. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 189–207). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1991a). The dimensions of multicultural education. *Multicultural Leader*, 4, 5–6.
- Banks, J. A. (1991b). Multicultural education: Its effects on students' ethnic and gender role attitudes. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 459–469). New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (1991c). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. (1992). Multicultural education: Approaches, developments, and dimensions. In J. Lynch, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Cultural diversity and the schools, Vol. 1, Education for cultural diversity: Convergence and divergence* (pp. 83–94). London: The Falmer Press.
- Banks, J. A. (in press). Multicultural education for young children: Racial and ethnic attitudes and their modification. In B. Spodek (Ed.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children*. New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A., Cortes, C. E., Gay, G., Garcia, R. L., & Ochoa, A. S. (1976). *Curriculum guidelines for multiethnic education*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Banks, W. C. (1976). White preference in Blacks: A paradigm in search of a phenomenon. *Psychological Bulletin*, 83, 1170–1186.
- Baratz, S. S., & Baratz, J. C. (1970). Early childhood intervention: The social science base of institutional racism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40, 29–50.
- Bennett, C. I. (1990). *Comprehensive multicultural education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of knowledge: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bernal, M. (1987, 1991). *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization* (Vols. 1 & 2). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Blassingame, J. W. (Ed.). (1971). *New perspectives in Black studies*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Blassingame, J. W. (1972). *The slave community: Plantation life in the ante-bellum South*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blea, I. I. (1988). *Toward a Chicano social science*. New York: Praeger.
- Bliss, J. R., Firestone, W. A., & Richards, C. E. (Eds.). (1991). *Rethinking effective schools: Research and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bloom, B. S., Davis, A., & Hess, R. (1965). *Compensatory education for cultural deprivation*. New York: Holt.
- Bond, H. M. (1939). *Negro education in Alabama: A study in cotton and steel*. Washington, DC: The Associated Publishers.
- Boyer, J. B. (1974). Needed: Curriculum diversity for the urban economically disadvantaged. *Educational Leadership, 31*, 624–626.
- Braddock, J. H. II. (1990). Tracking the middle grades: National patterns of grouping for instruction. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*, 445–449.
- Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference*. New York: Praeger.
- Brookover, W. B., & Erickson, E. (1975). *Sociology of education*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University.
- Brooks, R. L. (1990). *Rethinking the American race problem*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bullivant, B. M. (1987). *The ethnic encounter in the secondary school*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Butler, J. E., & Walter, J. C. (Eds.). (1991). *Transforming the curriculum: Ethnic studies and women's studies*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. V. (1967). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America*. New York: Vintage.
- Carter, S. L. (1991). *Reflections of an affirmative action baby*. New York: Basic Books.
- Chavez, L. (1991). *Out of the barrio: Toward a new politics of Hispanic assimilation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Clark, K. B. (1963). *Prejudice and your child*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1939a). The development of consciousness of self and the emergence of racial identification in Negro preschool children. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 591–599.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1939b). Segregation as a factor in the racial identification of Negro preschool children. *Journal of Experimental Education, 8*, 161–163.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1940). Skin color as a factor in racial identification and preference in Negro children. *Journal of Negro Education, 19*, 341–358.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1947). Racial identification and preference in Negro

- children. In T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 169–178). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Clinchy, E. R. (1949). *Intergroup relations centers*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Company.
- Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Cohen, E. G. (1972). Interracial interaction disability. *Human Relations*, 25, 9–24.
- Cohen, E. G., & Roper, S. S. (1972). Modification of interracial interaction disability: An application of status characteristics theory. *American Sociological Review*, 37, 643–657.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. G., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Comer, J. P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*, 259, 42–48.
- Cook, L. A. (1947). Intergroup education. *Review of Educational Research*, 17, 267–278.
- Cook, L. A. (1950). *College programs in intergroup relations*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Cook, L. A. (1951). *Intergroup relations in teacher education: An analytical study of intergroup education in colleges and schools in the United States: Functions, current expressions, and improvements*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Cook, L. A. (Ed.). (1952). *Toward better human relations*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Cook, L., & Cook, E. (1954). *Intergroup education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cortés, C. E. (1973). Teaching the Chicano experience. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies* (pp. 181–199). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Cox, B. G., & Ramírez, M. III. (1981). Cognitive styles: Implications for teaching ethnic studies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Education for the 80s: Multiethnic education* (pp. 61–71). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1985). Black identity: Rediscovering the distinction between personal identity and reference group orientation. In M. B. Spencer, G. K. Brookins, & W. R. Allen (Eds.), *Beginnings: The social and affective development of Black children* (pp. 155–171). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cross, W. E., Jr. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African American identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Crow, L. D., Murray, W. I., & Smythe, H. H. (1966). *Educating the culturally disadvantaged child: Principles and programs*. New York: David McKay.
- Cuban, L. (1983). Effective schools: A friendly but cautionary note. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64, 695–696.
- Cuban, L. (1989). The “at risk” label and the problem of urban school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 780–801.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18–36.
- Damico, S. B. (1985). The two worlds of school: Differences in the photographs of Black and White adolescents. *The Urban Review*, 17, 210–222.
- Daniels, R. (1988). *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- Davis, A. (1962). *Social class influences upon learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1948)
- Davis, A., Gardner, B. B., & Gardner, M. R. (1941). *Deep South: A social anthropological study of caste and class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1969). *Custer died for your sins: An Indian manifesto*. New York: Avon.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280–298.
- Diop, C. A. (1974). *The African origin of civilization: Myth or reality*. New York: Lawrence Hill.
- Drake, St. C. (1987, 1990). *Black folk here and there* (Vols. 1 & 2). Los Angeles: University of California, Center for Afro-American Studies.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1935). *Black reconstruction*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1953). *The souls of Black folk*. New York: The Blue Heron Press.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1973). *The education of Black people: Ten critiques, 1906–1960*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Edmonds, R. (1986). Characteristics of effective schools. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *The school achievement of minority children* (pp. 93–104). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Farganis, S. (1986). *The social construction of the feminine character*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Fisher, F. (1965). *The influence of reading and discussion on the attitudes of fifth graders toward American Indians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Forbes, J. D. (1973). Teaching Native American values and cultures. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies* (pp. 201–225). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Ford, N. A. (1973). *Black studies: Threat -or- challenge*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.
- Franklin, J. H. (1947). *From slavery to freedom: A history of Negro Americans*. New York: Knopf.
- Franklin, J. H. (1985). *George Washington Williams: A biography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gabelko, N. H., & Michaelis, J. U. (1981). *Reducing adolescent prejudice: A handbook*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gamio, M. (1930). *Mexican immigration to the United States: A study of human migration and adjustment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garcia, R. L. (1991). *Teaching in a pluralistic society: Concepts, models, strategies* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper/Collins.
- Gates, H. L., Jr. (1988). *The signifying monkey: A theory of African-American literary criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gay, G. (1971). Ethnic minority studies: How widespread? How successful? *Educational Leadership*, 29, 108–112.
- Gay, G. (1992). The state of multicultural education in the United States. In K. Adam-Moodley (Ed.), *Education in plural societies: International perspectives* (pp. 47–66). Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detselig.
- Genovese, E. D. (1972). *Roll, Jordan, roll: The world the slaves made*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gibson, M. A. (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 7, 7–18.

- Ginsburg, H. (1972). *The myth of the deprived child: Poor children's intellect and education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Goodman, M. A. (1952). *Race awareness in young children*. New York: Collier.
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (1990). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Gordon, E. W. (1985). Social science knowledge production and the Afro-American experience. *Journal of Negro Education*, 54, 117–133.
- Gordon, E. W., & Meroe, A. S. (1991). Common destinies—Continuing dilemmas. *Psychological Science*, 2, 23–30.
- Gordon, E. W., Miller, M., & Rollock, D. (1990). Coping with communicentric bias in knowledge production in the social sciences. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 14–19.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: Norton.
- Grant, C. A. (1973). Black studies materials do make a difference. *Journal of Educational Research*, 66, 400–404.
- Grant, C. A. (Ed.). (1977). *Multicultural education: Commitments, issues, and applications*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Grant, C. A. (1978). Education that is multicultural: Isn't that what we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29, 45–48.
- Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Race, class, and gender in education research: An argument for integrative analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 195–211.
- Gray, P. (1991, July 8). Whose America? *Time*, pp. 12–17.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hale-Benson, J. (1982). *Black children: Their roots, culture and learning styles* (Rev. ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hale-Benson, J. (1987). Black children: Their roots, culture, and learning styles. In J. B. McCracken (Ed.), *Reducing stress in young children's lives* (pp. 122–129). Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harrington, M. (1962). *The other America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hayes, M. L., & Conklin, M. E. (1953). Intergroup attitudes and experimental change. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 22, 19–36.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Herrnstein, R. J. (1971). *I. Q. in the meritocracy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Hilliard, A. G. III. (1974). Restructuring teacher education for multicultural imperatives. In W. A. Hunter (Ed.), *Multicultural education through competency-based teacher education* (pp. 40–55). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Hilliard, A. G. III, Payton-Stewart, L., & Williams, L. O. (Eds.). (1990). *Infusion of African and African American content in the school curriculum*. Morristown, NJ: Aaron Press.
- Hohn, R. L. (1973). Perceptual training and its effect on racial preference of kindergarten children. *Psychological Reports*, 32, 435–441.
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End Press.

- Horowitz, E. L. (1936). The development of attitude toward the Negro. In *Archives of Psychology* (No. 104). New York: Columbia University.
- Horowitz, R. E. (1939). Racial aspects of self-identification in nursery school children. *Journal of Psychology*, 7, 91-99.
- Hunter, W. A. (Ed.). (1974). *Multicultural education through competency-based teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Jackson, E. P. (1944). Effects of reading upon the attitudes toward the Negro race. *The Library Quarterly*, 14, 47-54.
- Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 1-123.
- Kaplan, A. (1964). *The conduct of inquiry: Methodology for behavioral science*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Katz, P. A. (1973). Perception of racial cues in preschool children: A new look. *Developmental Psychology*, 8, 295-299.
- Katz, P. A. (Ed.). (1976). *Towards the elimination of racism*. New York: Pergamon.
- Katz, P. A., & Zalk, S. R. (1978). Modification of children's racial attitudes. *Developmental Psychology*, 14, 447-461.
- King, J. A., & Mitchell, C. A. (1990). *Black mothers to sons: Juxtaposing African American literature with social practice*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kitano, H. H. L. (1969). *Japanese Americans: The evolution of a subculture*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Klassen, F. H., & Gollnick, D. M. (Eds.). (1977). *Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies*. Washington, DC: Ethnic Heritage Center for Teacher Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Klein, S. S. (Ed.). (1985). *Handbook for achieving sex equity through education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kleinfeld, J. (1975). Effective teachers of Eskimo and Indian students. *School Review*, 83, 301-344.
- Kleinfeld, J. (1979). *Eskimo children on the Andreafsky*. New York: Praeger.
- Kleinfeld, J., & Nelson, P. (1991). Adapting instruction to Native Americans' learning styles: An iconoclastic view. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22, 273-282.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed., enlarged). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Labov, W. (1969). *The study of nonstandard English*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ladner, J. A. (Ed.). (1973). *The death of White sociology*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lasker, B. (1929). *Race attitudes in children*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Lasker, B. (1931). *Filipino immigration to the continental United States and Hawaii*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lauter, P. (1991). *Canons and contexts*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leo, L. (1990, November 12). A fringe history of the world. *U. S. News and World Report*, pp. 25-26.

- Leslie, L. L., & Leslie, J. W. (1972). The effects of a student centered special curriculum upon the racial attitudes of sixth graders. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 41, 63-67.
- Lessing, E. E., & Clarke, C. (1976). An attempt to reduce ethnic prejudice and assess its correlates. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 1, 3-16.
- Levine, L. W. (1977). *Black culture and Black consciousness: Afro-American folk thought from slavery to freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, O. (1965). *La vida: A Puerto Rican family in the culture of poverty—San Juan and New York*. New York: Random House.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1993). Effective schools: A framework for increasing student achievement. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 303-316). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Litcher, J. H., & Johnson, D. W. (1969). Changes in attitudes toward Negroes of White elementary school students after use of multiethnic readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 60, 148-152.
- Litcher, J. H., Johnson, D. W., & Ryan, F. L. (1973). Use of pictures of multiethnic interaction to change attitudes of White elementary school students toward Blacks. *Psychological Reports*, 33, 367-372.
- Locke, A., & Stern, B. J. (Eds.). (1942). *When people meet: A study in race and culture contacts*. New York: Progressive Education Association.
- Logan, R. W. (1954). *The betrayal of the Negro*. New York: Collier.
- Lynch, J. (1987). *Prejudice reduction and the schools*. New York: Nichols.
- McWilliams, C. (1943). *Brothers under the skin*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- McWilliams, C. (1949). *North from Mexico: The Spanish-speaking people of the United States*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Mercer, J. R. (1989). Alternative paradigms for assessment in a pluralistic society. In J. A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 289-304). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: The Free Press.
- Miel, A., with Kiester, E., Jr. (1967). *The shortchanged children of suburbia: What schools don't teach about human differences and what can be done about it*. New York: The American Jewish Committee.
- Milner, D. (1983). *Children and race*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Minard, R. D. (1931). *Race attitudes of Iowa children*. Iowa City: University of Iowa.
- Morland, J. K. (1966). A comparison of race awareness in northern and southern children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 36, 22-31.
- Myrdal, G., with the assistance of Sterner, R., & Rose, A. (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1977). *Standards for the accreditation of teacher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1987). *NCATE standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for the Social Studies Task Force on Ethnic Studies. (1992). Curriculum guidelines for multicultural education. *Social Education*, 56, 274-294.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (1974). *Students' right to their own language*. Urbana, IL: Author.

- Natriello, G., McDill, E. L., & Pallas, A. M. (1990). *Schooling disadvantaged children: Racing against catastrophe*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nieto, S. (1986). Excellence and equity: The case for bilingual education. *Bulletin of the Council on Interracial Books for Children*, 17, 3-4.
- Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.
- Novak, M. (1971). *The rise of the unmeltable ethnics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1974). *The next generation: An ethnography of education in an urban neighborhood*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1990). Overcoming racial barriers to equal access. In J. I. Goodlad & P. Keating (Eds.), *Access to knowledge: An agenda for our nation's schools* (pp. 59-89). New York: The College Board.
- Ovando, J., & Collier, V. P. (1985). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Parekh, B. (1986). The concept of multicultural education. In S. Modgil, G. Verma, K. Mallick, & C. Modgil (Eds.), *Multicultural education: The inter-minable debate* (pp. 19-31). Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.
- Parish, T. S., & Fleetwood, R. S. (1975). Amount of conditioning and subsequent change in racial attitudes of children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 43, 907-912.
- Parish, T. S., Shirazi, A., & Lambert, F. (1976). Conditioning away prejudicial attitudes in children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 43, 907-912.
- Passow, A. H. (Ed.). (1963). *Education in depressed areas*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Peters, W. (1987). *A class divided: Then and now* (Expanded ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Philips, S. U. (1983). *The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian reservation*. New York: Longman.
- Phillips, U. B. (1918). *American Negro slavery*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.
- Phinney, J. S., & Rotheram, M. J. (Eds.). (1987). *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Porter, J. D. R. (1971). *Black child, White child: The development of racial attitudes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1982). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. *Educational Leadership*, 40, 64-69.
- Quarles, B. (1953). *The Negro in the Civil War*. New York: Da Capo Press.
- Radke, M. J., & Trager, H. G. (1950). Children's perceptions of the social roles of Negroes and Whites. *Journal of Psychology*, 29, 3-33.
- Ramírez, M., & Castañeda, A. (1974). *Cultural democracy, bicultural development, and education*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ramsey, P. G. (1987). Young children's thinking about ethnic differences. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 56-72). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ravitch, D. (1990). Diversity and democracy: Multicultural education in America. *American Educator*, 14, 16-48.
- Richardson, V., Casanova, U., Placier, P., & Guilfoyle, K. (1989). *School children at risk*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Riessman, F. (1962). *The culturally deprived child*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Robinson, A. L., Foster, C. C., & Ogilvie, D. H. (Eds.). (1969). *Black studies in the university*. New York: Bantam.
- Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez: An autobiography*. Boston: David R. Godine.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ryan, W. (1971). *Blaming the victim*. New York: Vintage.
- Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (1982). *Sex equity handbook for schools*. New York: Longman.
- Schlesinger, A., Jr. (1990, Summer). When ethnic studies are un-American. *Social Studies Review: A Bulletin of the American Textbook Council*, pp. 11–13.
- Schlesinger, A., Jr. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.
- Shade, B. J. (1982). Afro-American cognitive style: A variable in school success? *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 219–244.
- Shade, B. J. (Ed.). (1989). *Culture, style, and the educative process*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Shirley, O. L. B. (1988). *The impact of multicultural education on self-concept, racial attitude, and student achievement of Black and White fifth and sixth graders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi.
- Sizemore, B. A. (1972). Social science and education for a Black identity. In J. A. Banks & J. D. Grambs (Eds.), *Black self-concept: Implications for education and social science* (pp. 141–170). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Slaughter, D. T. (Ed.). (1988). *Black children and poverty: A developmental perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Slavin, R. E. (1979). Effects of biracial learning teams on cross-racial friendships. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71, 381–387.
- Slavin, R. E. (1985). Cooperative learning: Applying contact theory in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 45–62.
- Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Madden, N. A. (1989). *Effective programs for students at risk*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (1991). *Empowerment through multicultural education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*, 7, 421–444.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1988). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current textbooks. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (pp. 78–110). New York: Routledge.
- Smitherman, G. (1977). *Talkin and testifying: The language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sowell, T. (1984). *Civil rights: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: William Morrow.
- Spencer, M. B. (1982). Personal and group identity of Black children: An alternative synthesis. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 106, 59–84.
- Spencer, M. B. (1985). Cultural cognition and social cognition as identity correlates of Black children's personal-social development. In M. B. Spencer, G. K. Brookins, & W. R. Allen (Eds.), *Beginnings: The social and affective development of Black children* (pp. 215–234). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spencer, M. B. (1987). Black children's ethnic identity formation: Risk and re-

- silence of castelike minorities. In J. S. Phinney & M. J. Rotheram (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 103–116). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Stampp, K. M. (1956). *The peculiar institution: Slavery in the antebellum South*. New York: Vintage.
- Steele, S. (1990). *The content of our character: A new vision of race in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Sue, D. W. (Ed.). (1981). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Sung, B. L. (1967). *The story of the Chinese in America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Suzuki, B. H. (1984). Curriculum transformation for multicultural education. *Education and Urban Society*, 16, 294–322.
- Taba, H. (1950). *With a focus on human relations: A story of the eighth grade*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Taba, H. (1951). *Diagnosing human relations needs*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Taba, H. (1952). *Curriculum in intergroup relations: Case studies in instruction*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Taba, H. (1967). *Teacher's handbook for elementary social studies*. Palo Alto, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Taba, H., Brady, E. H., & Robinson, J. T. (1952). *Intergroup education in public schools*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Taba, H., & Elkins, D. (1966). *Teaching strategies for the culturally disadvantaged*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Taba, H., & Van Til, W. (Eds.). (1945). *Democratic human relations* (16th year-book). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Taba, H., & Wilson, H. (1946). Intergroup education through the school curriculum. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 244, 19–25.
- Tetreault, M. K. (1993). Classrooms for diversity: Rethinking curriculum and pedagogy. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 129–148). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Theodorson, G. A., & Theodorson, A. G. (1969). *A modern dictionary of sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Trager, H. G., & Yarrow, M. R. (1952). *They learn what they live: Prejudice in young children*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Turner, F. J. (1989). The significance of the frontier in American history. In C. A. Milner II (Ed.), *Major problems in the history of the American West* (pp. 2–34). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath. (Original work published 1894)
- Van Sertima, I. (Ed.). (1988). *Great Black leaders: Ancient and modern*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Africana Studies Department.
- Vickery, W. E., & Cole, S. G. (1943). *Intercultural education in American schools: Proposed objectives and methods*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Wesley, C. H. (1935). *Richard Allen: Apostle of freedom*. Washington, DC: The Associated Publishers.
- White, A. O. (1973). The Black leadership class and education in antebellum Boston. *Journal of Negro Education*, 42, 505–515.
- Williams, F. (Ed.). (1970). *Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company.
- Williams, G. W. (1882–1883). *History of the Negro race in America from 1619 to 1880: Negroes as slaves, as soldiers, and as citizens* (2 vols.). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

- Williams, J. E., Best, D. L., Wood, F. B., & Filler, J. W. (1973). Changes in the connotations of racial concepts and color names: 1963–1970. *Psychological Reports*, 33, 983–996.
- Williams, J. E., & Edwards, C. D. (1969). An exploratory study of the modification of color and racial concept attitudes in preschool children. *Child Development*, 40, 737–750.
- Williams, J. E., & Morland, J. K. (1976). *Race, color, and the young child*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wirth, L. (1928). *The ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Woodson, C. G. (1968). *The education of the Negro prior to 1861*. New York: Arno Press. (Original work published 1919)
- Woodson, C. G. (1933). *Mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: The Associated Publishers.
- Woodson, C. G., & Wesley, C. H. (1922). *The Negro in our history*. Washington, DC: The Associated Publishers.
- Wortham, A. (1981). *The other side of racism: A philosophical study of Black race consciousness*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Wyman, D. S. (1984). *The abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941–1945*. New York: Pantheon.
- Yawkey, T. D. (1973). Attitudes toward Black Americans held by rural and urban White early childhood subjects based upon multi-ethnic social studies materials. *Journal of Negro Education*, 42, 164–169.

Manuscript Received February 5, 1992

Revision Received June 22, 1992

Accepted July 10, 1992