Multiculturalism and Education: Historical Developments in the United States

Over the last two centuries the relationship between education and intergroup relations has changed dramatically in the United States, shaped not only by the dynamics of intergroup relationships but also by social, political, and economic forces. Historical accounts of multicultural education generally agree on the stages of its development after World War 1. However, less attention has been given to what might be called multicultural education's "pre-history": Intergroup relations and education preceding the great European immigration early in the twentieth century when there was not yet a formalized concept of multicultural or multiethnic education.

This early period was critical to shaping contemporary multicultural education in the United States. During these years a dominant view formed of how groups should relate and how schools should support these relationships. For example, in the nineteenth century, the conflict between what parents from various subordinate groups (ethnic, racial, religious, and economic) wanted for their children and what the Northern European, Protestant-dominated school systems taught, emerged as an important educational issue. Subordinate groups have continued to raise this issue over the last century. In one highly publicized case in New York City in the late 1960s, African American and Latino parents concerned about the gap between what they wanted for their children and what they saw the schools providing fought for community control of schools.

During the nineteenth century, under the prevailing dominant-subordinate group relations, the dominant group used schools to integrate and socialize children from various ethnic groups; supported boarding schools to break the cultural and tribal bonds of Native Americans; excluded as much as possible African Americans, who sought entrance into the education system with hopes schooling could lead to good jobs and social mobility; and largely ignored three hundred years of Hispanic presence and influence in America.

9

Emerging Dominant Group Values and Schooling

At the beginning of the nineteenth century schools played a limited role in most people's lives. Extended families and communities, not formal education, shaped values and prepared youth for a world of work still largely rural and based on the household. The importance of schools grew, and their relevance to intergroup relations became more critical, with two developments: a growing sense of what it meant to be a United States citizen, and the decline of the family as the center of economic activity. With these two developments, schools increasingly became the institution to enculturate the young to be Americans and to socialize future workers in the habits and attitudes needed in an industrializing economy (Lazerson 1977).

Diversity suffered as a particular model developed of what it meant to be an American citizen. Protestant values unrelated to a person's religion became the new ideals. Ironically, the separation of work and home intensified the family's role in the socialization of children; youngsters no longer moved in with other families to do apprenticeships at an early age, so an individual child's success became his or her family's responsibility (Lazerson 1977). Many immigrants held values which were shaped by rural, peasant cultures and which contrasted sharply to the values of the industrial work place and the increasingly bureaucratized schools which prepared youth for these factories and firms. Even as they struggled for economic survival, immigrants were attacked for possessing inferior cultural or child-rearing traits. Eventually, for the dominant group's educational bureaucracy, "differing cultural values and familial behavior patterns made ethnic groups and families the enemy" (Lazerson 1977, 21).

Religion, Bilingualism, and the Exclusion of African Americans

Tyack's study of urban schooling, *The One Best System* (1974), describes a nineteenth century system that homogenized most groups (including Catholics), gave concessions only to those groups with sufficient political power, and excluded African Americans.

Nineteenth-century American schools, with their mandate to prepare youth for citizenship, not only promoted Protestant values but also displayed anti-Catholic attitudes and disdain for the Irish and other immigrants. However, as the Catholic population grew—by 1907, 17 percent of the total U.S. population was Catholic compared to 1 percent a century earlier—Catholics established their own schools and eventually entered the mainstream culture. Group conflict, both between Protestants and Catholics and among different nationalities within Catholicism, prompted the formation of parochial schools. Various attempts at reconciliation, such as allowing clergy and nuns to teach in public school,

failed. Moreover, in cities with large groups of new immigrants, the model of territorial parishes gave way to parishes which were based on language and ethnicity, parishes where parents could enroll their children in schools over which they had some control. In Chicago in 1902, for example, over half of all Catholic parochial school children were in ethnically designated schools (Lazerson 1977).

Group power determined what individuals obtained from the education system. Urban political machines, which depended on the support and goodwill of neighborhood residents—many of them immigrants—supported religious and cultural minorities in their individual and group battles with public education. These politicians smoothed the interaction between immigrant ethnic groups and an increasingly bureaucratic, centralized education system with a pragmatic attitude: "If textbooks contained scurrilous comments about immigrants, then the textbooks should be removed from the schools" (Tyack 1974, 94–95).

For some groups, power meant that their children could be educated in their native tongue. In the mid-nineteenth century cities such as St. Louis and Cincinnati supported bilingual education efforts, principally for German, whose speakers held relatively high status and political power. By the end of the century, however, German groups, recognizing the importance of English for access and acceptance, were asking that their language be taught as an elective, not used as a language of instruction. The conflicts over instruction in languages other than English became a symbolic battle between those who wanted to impose a single standard of belief and those who supported pluralistic education (Tyack 1974, 109). The disappearance of bilingualism marked a decline in cultural pluralism in the schools that would not be reversed until the 1960s, when there emerged a renewed emphasis on multicultural education.

During the mid-nineteenth century the urban areas of the North saw mostly segregated schools for African Americans, even when the law required these institutions open to all children, as in New York after 1873. Moreover, where integration did occur, the dismantling of African-American schools meant that African American teachers lost jobs, because in integrated schools the staff were almost exclusively white. In one of the most segregated cases, the public schools in Pittsburgh, although enrolling nearly 3,000 African American students in 1908, did not have even one African American teacher (Tyack 1974, 117).

Assimilation and Differing Group Values toward Formal Schooling

As immigration increased in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many educators came to believe that an important purpose of public education was to assimilate the large number of immigrants and their children. Thus the relation between intergroup relations and education came to be one

in which public schools were openly an instrument for the dominant group to enculturate and socialize subordinate groups' young.

The schools taught attitudes, behaviors, and language needed for success in an urban, industrial society. However, these attitudes and behaviors, as well as the English language, were often at odds with parents' values. In response to the use of the public schools to mold immigrant children into middle-class, Protestant values and American cultural norms, individual groups organized their own education efforts. For example, Norwegians established colleges in the late nineteenth century and pushed for Norwegian studies at midwestern universities (Greene 1982).

Resistance to public education was particularly apparent in families from rural, peasant backgrounds, whose experiences and values differed from those of the school authorities. For example, there were wide differences between Southern Italian immigrants' cultural values about formal education and dominant American cultural values. Slavic immigrants, who considered the purpose of education to strengthen family and ethnic ties, often resisted formal education for their children. They did not view schooling as a means to advance in the job market; rather they believed that finding employment and working hard was the way to get ahead. As a result, Slavic children had lower educational achievement levels and left school early, a pattern that continued well into the twentieth century (Lazerson 1977, 29–30). These differences had several negative impacts. First, they accentuated the conflict between family loyalties and loyalties to America, whose dominant group now defined schooling in values for an individualistic, routinized work life. Second, with access to good jobs more closely linked to educational attainment, these differences put children of some ethnic groups at an economic disadvantage.

Dominant group educators, especially in the growing school systems in industrial cities, concerned themselves with assimilating European immigrants and gave little attention to African-American education. Few whites joined blacks in their fight for better education, and with no power to control schools, African Americans could not get the white establishment to take progressive steps such as hiring black teachers. Furthermore, educators did not use education to expose and correct racism. Instead, schools were used to "adjust" the African American child to white middle-class norms (Tyack 1974, 220) and to educate an African American elite to aspire to what whites had in a society that denied African Americans dominant group privileges (Woodson 1933). Northern, urban blacks who rejected segregation based on the experience of the South found that integration meant direct domination and degradation in white schools.

Education of Native Americans

From the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century, the dominant white society encouraged the assimilation of Native Americans.

Even progressive whites maintained that Native American culture would die out in the face of European civilization; they saw Native Americans as either assimilating into the dominant white society or vanishing. Education became an increasingly important part of the push for assimilation.

However, the United States government had little direct involvement in Native American education before the 1880s (Szasz 1974). Instead, missionaries were encouraged to go into areas populated by Native Americans, to enculturate them to European ways, and to convert them to Christianity (Holm 1979). By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, changing popular images and stereotypes about Native Americans resulted in several approaches to Native-American education (Holm 1979). The institutions that were fostered and emphasized at various times included off-reservation industrial boarding schools, day schools on the reservations, public schools (on reservations open to white settlement), and missionary schools.

The Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania was the first of the boarding schools to bring Native Americans into white culture, away from their families, to teach them vocational skills. In practice, the young Native Americans were trained for jobs not usually available on the reservations to which they returned.

However, in the early twentieth century some whites rejected the education strategy of enculturating Native American youth, turning away from the idea that they could be assimilated. The prominent stereotypes cast the youth as inferior persons from an inferior culture who needed only limited education (Holm 1979). With this considered, and because day schools were less expensive and were more acceptable by parents, day schools began to replace the boarding schools.

The popular image—"primitivism" leads to art—fueled an emphasis on the arts in schools for Native Americans. Likewise, there emerged a popular image of Native American athletic prowess which was nurtured by outdoor life, focusing attention on Native American student athletes and athletics.

In the 1920s and 1930s an emphasis on educational reform was put into action (Szasz 1974). In the 1930s the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Education Division attempted to be both assimilationist and preservationist, by developing a bilingual education program. Some efforts were made to teach Indian culture, but the values transmitted in the Indian Service schools were still those of the Anglo culture.

Education for Assimilation and for Economic Advancement

Although most educators spoke little about African Americans' involuntary segregated status, they deplored white ethnic groups who preserved their own isolated communities and believed schools should end this isolation (Tyack 1974,

232). And despite their resistance to Americanization, many immigrant parents eventually came to see formal education as the route to upward mobility.

In urban areas, the great migration from Europe brought overwhelming numbers of students into the schools. In New York just after the turn of the century more than two-thirds of all pupils had fathers born abroad (Tyack 1974, 230). Despite misgivings, immigrant parents began to see schooling as the route to new opportunities. In 1909 the literacy rate for children of immigrants was higher than that for children of native-born whites, reflecting increased enrollments of newcomers' children. In addition, for some immigrant families, school employment proved to be a route for socio-economic mobility, with their daughters and sons moving into teaching positions.

Although immigrants' children were successful moving into teaching, school administrators came largely from native-born families. The ward system found in many cities during the nineteenth century gave some power to the immigrant groups that were concentrated in particular neighborhoods. When the system was abolished and school boards were centralized in the name of reform, school administrators were drawn from the upper reaches of the occupational and social structure. However, whether from the dominant, native-born group, or from one of the subordinate white ethnic groups, the great majority of school professionals were ethnocentric in outlook: "In their demands for total assimilation, for Anglo-conformity, many educators went further; nothing less would satisfy them than assaulting all forms of cultural difference, than creating a sense of shame at being 'foreign' " (Tyack 1974, 235).

By the time the United States entered World War 1, despite the growth of Catholic schools and other educational alternatives, the goal of schools had more to do with "monocultural" education than with multicultural education. African Americans were on the outside in most systems, relegated to inferior schools, or, where schools were officially integrated, they were relegated to positions of little influence and had meager representation on teaching staffs. By many measures, including spending per pupil, the position of African Americans in education worsened early in the twentieth century (Berry and Blassingame 1982). The Nativist sentiment that arose during World War 1, which equated patriotism with accepting the complete cultural assimilation of Americanism, ended bilingual or bicultural programs.

The late 1910s and early 1920s were a low point in American tolerance of cultural diversity and multicultural or multiethnic education. The hysteria of World War 1 made ethnic identity suspect; the German language was dropped from many schools' curricula. Racist and Nativist sentiment grew in the years that followed the war; the Klu Klux Klan gained power and members. The economic collapse of the 1930s and the great surge of labor strength in the mid-1930s shifted the focus within intergroup relations to class issues and the workplace rather than the enculturation of children, bilingualism, and better education for African Americans, Native Americans, and women.

Nevertheless, many of the issues that would reemerge in the 1960s and 1970s had become part of the debate over intergroup relations and education: the extent to which education should be bilingual; whether subordinate groups are better served in the opportunity structure by implementing their own distinctive education; the extent to which the formal educational system should usurp the enculturation and socialization of children; and the overlap between cultural and economic issues.

Intercultural Education

In the late 1930s and 1940s the rise of fascism, concerns that Nazi propaganda was affecting people worldwide, and a feeling that ethnic loyalties might be useful in the fight against Nazism supported the development of intercultural education, the first well-defined educational approach to intergroup relations in the United States. With roots in the earlier cultural pluralism approach to intergroup relations, the movement sponsored programs in the nation's schools and included nonformal education efforts such as adult education, community forums, and workshops.

Intercultural education (frequently termed "intergroup education") flourished through the 1940s and into the early 1950s. The movement was basically of the liberal elite, backed strongly by mainstream religious groups, particularly Jewish groups concerned about the spread of Nazism (Glazer 1977). Government, except for school boards, played only a minor role.

Two themes ran through intercultural education: people should not be ashamed of their cultural heritage and people should tolerate racial, religious, and cultural differences. However, tolerance took precedence over the celebration of group differences, and assimilation was more important than pluralism. The intellectual issues behind the movement had largely to do with determining the nature of prejudice, finding effective means to change attitudes, and similar questions (Glazer 1977).

The movement was concerned with individuals and how they should treat one another rather than the study of group conflict and/or the search for equitable resolutions of the intergroup competition that had emerged in the nineteenth century. For the most part, the movement did not recognize or address group political or economic power. Instead, intercultural education advocates were interested in democratic human relations, full citizen rights for minorities, educating young people with the movement's values, and taking action (Cook 1947).

An editorial in a special issue of the *Harvard Educational Review* which was devoted to intercultural education expressed the importance of harmonious intergroup relations to democracy: "We cannot attain the full values of the

democratic way of life without intelligent and sensitive cooperation among the diverse groups which compose the American population." This view, it continued, contrasts with that prevailing in Nazi Germany: "In contrast to the authoritarian dogma of a master and subordinate groups, we in the United States are pledged to the dignity and worth of varied cultural groups" (MacCracken 1945, 76–78). Reflecting the movement's themes, the editorial reminded its readers that people do not have to give up their religion, national-origin group, or political party to become an American, and that a coming postwar period of readjustment between groups called for social sensitivity, patience, and social understanding.

By the mid-1940s intercultural education had attracted enough attention that educational journals devoted special issues to it, although the war limited the movement's diffusion into schools. A 1945 review of the movement's literature found almost nothing on either pre-service or in-service teacher training and showed that a third of the educational journals had carried nothing at all on intercultural education in the decade from the mid-1930s to the mid-1940s (Citron, Reynolds, and Taylor 1945).

In the late 1940s intercultural education moved into universities and teacher training institutions, with national organizations completing and publishing major studies. With funding from the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the American Council on Education's Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education carried out two projects to evaluate how various activities influenced attitudes toward others. One study was for elementary and secondary schools; the other, for teacher educators. The latter project, in 1950 reported to be the first project to improve teacher education for intergroup education, showed future teachers at twenty-four institutions the importance of eliminating prejudice in their students and developed techniques and tools to help them do this.[1]

Intercultural Education Distinct from Multicultural Education

A number of factors shaped intercultural education in ways distinct from the forms multicultural education would take in the 1960s and 1970s. These included the rise of fascism and World War 2, concern for the United States' image in the world, the influence of mainstream religious groups, and the growing influence of the social sciences.

As World War 2 approached, Americans were frightened by the power of Nazism, the susceptibility of industrialized societies to anti-Semitism, and the deception of Emperor worship. Proponents of intercultural education felt that they needed to counter Nazi propaganda that was spreading to the United States, that American values were at risk, and that wartime race riots in Detroit showed the fragility of America's intergroup relations. Thus the war effort was a unifying

force as the country came together to fight Germany and as schools, churches, and unions became more interested in furthering harmonious intergroup relations.

Intercultural education emphasized group relations and the right to religious freedom among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. Liberal religious groups supported the movement. Overall, contemporary multicultural education did not focus on organized, mainstream religion. In contrast to later approaches to intergroup relations, little attention was given to religion as a component of ethnicity.

Intercultural education supporters believed that good intergroup relations were a necessary step in keeping the United States strong. As they looked ahead to the post–World War 2 years, some saw that if America were to assume world leadership, the country would need to more fully live up to its democratic ideals. To many involved in the movement, living up to these ideals meant that all groups in America would need to be treated fairly. However, unlike later multicultural education efforts, the intercultural education movement was centered on the European immigrant and did not address structural racism, poverty, or the empowerment of subordinate groups.

Intercultural education did not emphasize control of knowledge and/or the importance of knowledge generated by members of subordinate groups. Instead, intercultural education supporters saw mainstream social sciences, which had just come into their own in the preceding decades, as an important asset to help the movement increase understanding and reduce tensions.

In the view of these supporters psychology could understand bigotry and discrimination. Likewise, anthropology could tell about the nature of culture and provide details on minority peoples who might be discriminated against, and sociology could describe urban problems and race relations. Among the most influential of the social scientists for the movement in the 1940s was Gunner Myrdal, a Swedish sociologist and author of a landmark study of race relations in the United States, *An American Dilemma*.

Intercultural education marshaled the social and biological sciences to provide scientific data to counteract bigoted attitudes and prejudice. At one extreme, intercultural education was pictured as a mental health program to immunize the unguarded against phobias of prejudice and emotion spread by demagogues, such as those who had infected the Germans and Japanese (Miller 1945).

Classroom and Community Activities

Intercultural education was presented to the classroom teacher of the 1940s and 1950s as a means to save cultural resources. The movement portrayed ethnic

group arts, crafts, recipes, and other contributions as kinds of "endangered species" to be introduced in the classroom and passed on to more children, lest these species become extinct. The movement's pedagogical materials offered ideas for class activities. A typical activity was described as giving African American children pride and white children "important knowledge," by doing a lesson on African-American history after "George Washington Carver's recipe for peanut butter candy has given them all a happy time together" (DuBois 1945, xiii). Such materials gave little or no attention to how various groups' cultures could alter the dominant group, or to the questions of who determines and defines what counts as knowledge; who determine what knowledge is to be transmitted; and who controls access to educational institutions.

The intercultural education movement's relationship to the community was different from that of later multicultural education efforts primarily because intercultural education proponents came from liberal community and religious groups which had little federal government support or initiative. A plan that originated in 1939 in Springfield, Massachusetts, exemplified this relationship.

The Springfield Plan was developed in a small city which had a comparatively diverse population, a history of educational innovation, and a solid manufacturing economy. Through the school system and communitywide efforts, Springfield's citizens sought to use intercultural education to improve the city's human relations. Leaders described it as parents and civic groups working with schools to develop effective democratic citizenship education (Granrud 1945).

The Springfield model emphasized educating students for democracy, thereby educating them for tolerance. A curriculum committee suggested ways to introduce intercultural education across the curriculum. Tolerance, the contributions and problems of racial and religious groups, and respect for the rights of all, were the guiding principles (Bach 1946). However, the plan did little to challenge the community's political or economic structure or to acknowledge subordinate groups' lack of power.

As manifested in the Springfield Plan and in other attempts, the intercultural education movement was as much a community organization phenomenon as it was a school-based movement. In one respect, the push by mainline liberal community groups (often religious) for cooperation and for racial and religious harmony in the schools is similar to African-American, Latino, feminist, and gay groups' advocacy efforts from the 1960s through the 1990s. These groups also desired to use the schools to advance intergroup relations and mutual respect. However, although the groups were advocating programs in the schools, intercultural education did not call for structural change or power sharing. Moreover, while intercultural education supported diversity to a degree, it appears essentially to have been assimilationist, bringing diverse groups under the umbrella of moderately liberal, middle-class American cultural values.

Movement supporters described themselves as working with their communities' schools to advance intercultural education, assuming that imparting such knowledge would change peoples' behaviors; but they made little mention of groups' economic status and/or how government policy or judicial decisions might contribute to intergroup relations. In particular, the hiring, placement, and other policy decisions of school districts do not seem to have been cause for action. The operations of one community group, the Pittsburgh Council on Intercultural Education, illustrate these points.

The Pittsburgh Council on Intercultural Education

In the first decades of the twentieth century Southern and Eastern Europeans and African Americans migrated to Pittsburgh in large numbers to work in the coal mines, steel mills, and other heavy industry. They were often directly recruited or encouraged to come by employers, particularly in times of labor strife. As a result, of the 1.4 million people in Pennsylvania's Allegheny County in 1940, 12 percent were foreign-born, another 14 percent were children of foreign-born parents, and 6.4 percent were African American (Jackson 1948). The intergroup relations and education issues outlined earlier correspond with the Pittsburgh experience.

A 1936 study of Pittsburgh made recommendations for assimilating ethnic groups more fully into the community. To help carry out these recommendations, the American Service Institute (ASI) was created in 1941. The ASI, along with the Pittsburgh Urban League, the Jewish Community Relations Council, and the Pittsburgh Round Table of Christians and Jews urged public schools to include intercultural education in the curriculum, which the superintendent announced he would do in 1943, based on observations of what had been done in Springfield.

In that year a community support committee of fifteen persons, appointed by the Board of Education, grew into the Pittsburgh Council on Intercultural Education. The council included representatives from ethnic, racial, religious, and socioeconomic groups. Its purpose was to promote adult and community education which supported intercultural education in the schools as part of a goal to encourage the schools to "get some understanding of cultural and racial factors into the school curriculum" (Jackson 1948, 27). The council worked through committees to place positive books on library shelves and to remove books that increased tension, to work with Parent Teacher Associations, to send out speakers, to get coverage from the radio and the press, and to get local universities to include intercultural content in their teacher education courses. The district's director of curriculum linked the board's efforts and those of the council. The group also emphasized in-service teacher education, particularly through summer institutes at major universities. For example, in 1945, twenty

teachers attended the University of Chicago with funds from the Frick Educational Commission.

The Pittsburgh case illustrates the relatively successful community approach of many intercultural education efforts as well as the movement's weaknesses. Among the weaknesses was an emphasis on harmony at the expense of justice. The council was dedicated to intergroup understanding in a city where the schools had virtually no African American administrators or teachers, but had to mediate the demands of minority groups who had grievances with the Board of Education. This mediation included convincing the minority press to interpret positively the schools' intercultural education efforts. Such was the case when an African-American newspaper complained about the use of "dialect songs" in the schools' Stephen Foster memorial program. The council brought harmony to the situation by pressuring the newspaper to be more positive but did nothing to change intergroup power relationships between Pittsburgh's white and African-American communities.

In an attempt to get some degree of understanding into the curricula and promote positive books in the library, the council advocated a limited view of cultural pluralism which largely ignored the political and economic barriers faced by Pittsburgh's white ethnic groups and African Americans. The national intercultural education movement was characterized by the same lack of attention to structural issues concerning intergroup relations.

Although the intercultural education movement took an interest in issues of race, that interest, as indicated earlier, was largely stimulated by an event which began in Europe, the rise of Nazism. This focus on the white ethnic experience and its European roots continued the position of the early cultural pluralist writers, such as Horace Kallen, who virtually ignored African Americans in their writing (Glazer 1977; Banks 1979).

Several factors contributed to the end of the intercultural education movement: mainstream educators never internalized the movement's ideology and assumptions nor understood how the movement could contribute to their schools, which, for the most part, educators perceived as virtually free from racial tension; urban racial tensions were subtle in the 1950s; and, intercultural education was based on special programs and funds which dried up, leaving no ongoing effort.

The 1950s: Setting the Stage for Multicultural Education

The concerns about fascism and the desire for interreligious and interracial understanding that drove the intercultural education movement declined in the 1950s, replaced by fear of the Soviet Union and anti-communism. At the same time, white Americans, benefitting from low-cost housing loans and subsidized

freeways, began to leave the central cities and move to the suburbs. Manufacturing jobs also left the cities, burdening them with greater numbers of poor people. Despite the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision desegregating schools, African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians, and other minority groups were often in legally segregated educational institutions. In the 1960s the civil rights movement and rising ethnic consciousness would challenge and change these conditions, in part with the help of additional favorable court decisions and government intervention in intergroup relations and education.

Housing patterns and economic conditions brought larger numbers of minorities into educational systems in major cities. But these systems, like others around the country, used textbooks and materials that reflected the experience and values of the dominant group, largely Protestant, white, and from professional and upper socio-economic classes. A significant contribution of multicultural education in the 1960s and 1970s was to make materials and textbooks more inclusive; the debate over content and curricula would rage through the 1990s.

During the 1950s and into the 1960s the social sciences provided intergroup relations and education with an intellectual foundation that attempted to make youngsters from minority backgrounds look and act like the dominant group. In response to the perceived deprivation of the subordinate groups, policymakers made extensive efforts to provide groups with programs that would relieve their "cultural poverty" and provide them with the values, discipline, or whatever else it was that the theory defined their cultures as lacking. Multicultural education was based on different assumptions; for example, it examined the implications for student learning of the differences between the culture of the school and the culture of the home. Bilingual and bicultural education became important programmatic manifestations of the new multicultural education approach.

The Rise of Multiethnic and Multicultural Education

In the early 1960s terms like "cultural pluralism" and "diversity" began to appear in the professional literature, although "little was articulated that precisely gave direction and definition to specific concepts and/or approaches that could be applied to educational practice" (Baker 1979, 253). The 1960s and 1970s brought rapid change to intergroup relations and their relationship with education. First came a multiethnic education approach in which the contributions of various ethnic groups were integrated into the curriculum. Beginning as a consolidation of Asian, Black, Hispanic, and Native American studies, this approach ultimately broadened to incorporate white ethnic studies.

By the late 1970s gender and religion were added to the multicultural education concept; the focus shifted from multiethnic education to multicultural education.

While the social and political forces drove the changes in intergroup relations and education, educational organizations issued documents which helped to define the concepts. One important statement was made by the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education in its publication *No One Model American*. This document defined multicultural education as education that values cultural pluralism, rejecting the view that schools should serve as institutions to eliminate differences. The publication contends that schools should preserve and extend cultural diversity to all students.

Four factors contributed to the rise of multiethnic education and its successor, multicultural education: the civil rights movement, a rise in ethnic consciousness, a more critical analysis of textbooks and other materials, and the loss of belief in theories of cultural deprivation. Each of these factors is discussed below.

The Civil Rights Movement

The civil rights movement—energized by the Montgomery bus boycott, marches, sit-ins and other events; supported after 1960 by court decisions and the federal government; and visible throughout the country on television—brought the issues of intergroup relations—including education—to national attention. The movement demonstrated that these issues did not so much call for fairness and tolerance by the dominant group, as the intercultural education movement had proclaimed, as they called for reconsideration of who held power, how that power was used, and subordinate groups' rights and resources. Desegregation of public schools was an important issue; some of the most dramatic civil rights events, such as the integration of Arkansas' Little Rock Central High School and the integration of southern universities, drew much attention. However, by the mid-1960s the civil rights movement shifted from passive perseverance to political power, self-determination, and cultural consciousness (Gay 1983). One historian of multicultural education locates the birth of this revitalization in the 1965 Watts riot in Los Angeles (Banks 1979).

Cultural Pluralism and Ethnic Consciousness

Cultural pluralism was also revived in the 1960s through the militant, ethnically conscious protests of African Americans who rejected assimilation. Self-determination became a subordinate group goal, and schools became part of the struggle for power, first for African Americans, then for Native Americans, Hispanics, and other minority groups. A multiethnic education movement, and then a multicultural education movement, emerged in response

to ethnic revitalization. Battles over education—namely, community control and desegregation—exposed the Anglocentric nature of schools, the bias and racism they passed on, and the terrible poverty produced by conditions existing in the cities (Suzuki 1984). Colleges which historically had educated large numbers of African Americans were one location for the emergence of this ethnic consciousness.

By the mid-1960s the civil rights movement had shifted emphasis from assimilation to Black self-identity. At the same time, many American colleges and university students were growing more rebellious, and African-American students were calling for increased attention to ethnic culture and consciousness.

Among the most striking examples of how college students moved from assimilationism to an emphasis on cultural pride and independence can be seen at Howard University in Washington, D.C. Howard had educated many of the African American elite, including civil rights lawyers and leaders, but in the 1960s its curriculum mirrored that of mainstream white institutions with few courses on African-American culture or history. Beginning in 1966 and for more than a year after that, Howard students argued that their university must become a "Black" university. Their demands culminated in the takeover of a campus building in the spring of 1968. Eventually, after the threat of police intervention and calls from members of Congress (which supplied half of Howard's funding) to end the occupation, the students withdrew. However, the following semester the University hosted the conference "Toward a Black University," marking movement toward the students' goal.

The issues raised at Howard regarding the content of the university's curriculum and whether there should be a distinctively African-American curricula remain at the center of the multicultural education debate today on the nation's campuses.

Multicultural Curricula and Materials

Multicultural education was also promoted by an analysis of curriculum materials. Subordinate group parents and community members found that their children's education in general, and their textbooks and other media in particular, conveyed distortions and inaccuracies about their history and heritage. Over the next decade the nation's education system gave a great deal more attention to inclusive materials and to shaping a curricula that reflected diversity. Even as many educators set about these tasks, for some parents and subordinate group communities, the appropriate response was to initiate more direct action in their local schools.

For these groups, their growing ethnic consciousness was often tied to a desire for control of their children's education. In the Oceanhill-Brownsville community in New York City, the conflict around "Who shall decide what is

taught?" mixed with school district politics. African American and Latino parents saw that their children were not achieving their potential and noted 80 percent of the teachers in neighborhood schools were white and 95 percent of the students were African American or Latino, so they demanded community control of local schools. An experimental program funded by the Ford Foundation enabled the local community to set up a community board which met opposition over the issue of transferring teachers. Eventually, the board's refusal to give in (and to let white teachers they had asked to transfer, return) led to a teacher walkout and a citywide teachers' strike. In the Oceanhill-Brownsville schools, which were now controlled by the community board, more emphasis was put on Black culture and history. A new cultural awareness developed. Ultimately, faced with the strike pressures, the central administration suspended the community board, ending one small but significant experiment in multicultural education. However, despite the short-term failure, the events demonstrated that issues of power and control would be central to intergroup relations and education in the 1960s and beyond. Ultimately, multicultural education would focus much more on empowerment and social change.

Rejection of Cultural Deprivation

Another factor in the emergence of multiethnic and then, multicultural, education was the rejection of the deprivation theory. In its place came concepts influenced by anthropology which saw the difficulties subordinate group children faced in schools not from the perspective of cultural deficiency but from the perspective of differences, or conflicts, between the culture of the school (primarily dominant group culture) and the culture of the home. Values, language, and cognitive styles and strategies became a new focus of attention.

Government Involvement in Multicultural Education

Beginning in the 1960s, government at all levels became more involved in multicultural education, particularly in bilingual education. On the federal level, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title 9, forbade racial and ethnic discrimination in programs receiving federal funds. Follow-up memoranda prohibited discrimination based on inability to speak English. Most important, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 gave funds to public school districts, thus providing a mechanism with which to enforce the 1964 act. The 1972 Ethnic Heritage Studies Act signified a policy under which education voluntarily maintains distinctive cultures. The Lau Supreme Court case (1974) established the principle that cultural factors and related student learning styles should be considered in a school's response to children with different language backgrounds. The 1974 Bilingual Education Act declared that the United States policy was to encourage bilingual education programs where appropriate. In

addition to the federal government's involvement, state education authorities and some local school boards mandated the teaching of multiethnic or multicultural education.

By the mid-1970s multicultural education seemed to be becoming a right with a high degree of government support (Glazer 1977). In a relatively short period of time it had progressed from minority studies for the most oppressed; to minority studies, integrated into the curriculum, for all; to bilingual studies; and, finally, to ethnic studies for all.

Current Definitions of Multicultural Education

Over the last several decades the concept "multicultural education" has been given many definitions. Moreover, diverse views of intergroup relations have shaped the concept in different ways. For example, persons who emphasize stratification and equality in intergroup relations define the term in one way; those who view intergroup relations as affirming differences but having integration as an ultimate goal define it in another. In the 1980s and 1990s the definition has generally broadened such that multicultural education encompasses concerns of many additional groups, including women, gays and lesbians, people with special education needs, and people of various age groups, including the very young and the elderly.

However, such a broad definition is not universal. Some have limited it to specific populations, such as ethnic groups. For example, Banks is concerned with multiethnic education and intergroup relations in regard to the relationship of ethnic groups in schools. He describes two extremes, the cultural pluralist ideology and the assimilationist ideology. The cultural pluralist sees ethnic groups as important in the competition for political and economic power. In this argument, the abilities of each member must be developed to aid the group struggle. The pluralist also sees education as culture-specific, stressing its allegiances and attachments, and giving persons skills to continue the group's fight for recognition and resources. In contrast, the assimilationist position sees one universal culture in which the schools' role is to enculturate young people into that culture and socialize them with skills needed for success. Banks (1979) suggests that multiethnic educators must move to a reconciliation which sees a universal culture with ethnic subgroups and subcultures. The emphasis on ideology, understandable in an era of separationism, should be de-emphasized.

In addition to making multicultural education more inclusive, some educators have promoted it as a reform movement for empowering students and changing the schools and society (Sleeter and Grant 1988). The full range of the concept, and related practice, can be seen a comprehensive five-part typology of multicultural education programs offered by Sleeter and Grant (1987, 422) based on their review of its literature through the mid-1980s. Their five categories include:

1. *Teaching the Culturally Different*. Transitions students from various groups into the mainstream.
2. *Human Relations*. Helps students from various groups get along better, but avoids dealing with social stratification and fails to link the practical with the theoretical.
3. *Single Group Studies*. Teaches about specific groups to promote pluralism, but doesn't emphasize social stratification and doesn't attend enough to multiple forms of human diversity.
4. *Multicultural Education*. Reforms the school through appropriate curricula and materials, affirmation of all students' languages, staff changes, and so forth to promote cultural pluralism and social equality.
5. *Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist*. Prepares students to promote cultural diversity and to challenge structural inequality.

Sleeter and Grant also describe multicultural education in the United States in the mid-1980s as a field without a journal or direct federal support which possesses a literature long on advocacy but short on research: Particularly in North America, England and Australia, the focus is on classroom and classroom teachers, and multicultural educators concerned with providing better education for students of color.

Entering the 1990s, multicultural education programs, in their continued fight for acceptance, face other challenges, one of which is financial. Despite federal and state mandates, individual school districts can only provide what they can afford. They must choose priorities as they allocate resources. In recent years multicultural education advocates have found themselves pitted against other groups in the battle for funds, such as supporters of scholars' programs, or special offerings for "gifted" students.

Another challenge for multicultural education has been the rightist ideology and the related decrease in support on the federal level for the rights of subordinate groups, and decreased interest in the plight of groups lacking political power and economic resources. In the 1980s schools were promoted as institutions for the teaching of vocational skills and for passing on "family" values rather than institutions for the teaching of diversity or social justice.

Conclusion

This chapter began with a discussion of multiculturalism and education by tracing the history of education and intergroup relations in the United States, noting the formation of the dominant group views in the nineteenth century and the exclusion of subordinate groups from any meaningful say in educational institutions and policy. We showed how concepts such as "melting pot,"

developed in the early twentieth century, continue to describe American approaches to intergroup relations and education; how the intercultural education movement of the 1940s differed from later multicultural and multiethnic education efforts; and how the civil rights movement, social science rejection of cultural deprivation, and the federal government influenced multicultural education through the 1980s. We concluded with a brief overview of the diversity of contemporary multicultural education efforts and the continued efforts to include more groups under the multicultural education umbrella.

The following chapters will reveal that multicultural education is only part of the story of the relationship between groups and education. The broader consideration is not limited to the classroom; it intersects issues related to group power, how groups have a say in what is taught and who teaches, and what counts as knowledge in societies around the world.