

Multicultural Policy as Social Activism: redefining who 'counts' in multicultural education

LAURI JOHNSON

State University of New York at Buffalo, 475 Baldy Hall, Buffalo, New York 14260,
USA (e-mail: lauridj@acsu.buffalo.edu)

ABSTRACT Theory and research in multicultural education in the USA has largely focused on curriculum and pedagogical issues, with little attention to the development and implementation of multicultural policy. This case study of multicultural policy in the New York City schools examines the social and political context and the role of community involvement in multicultural policy development during three historical periods: (1) the intercultural education movement of the 1930s and 1940s; (2) the community control movement of the 1960s; and (3) the Children of the Rainbow curriculum controversy in the 1990s. A historical analysis indicates that multicultural policy development has served as a significant organizing tool in the empowerment of community groups who were disenfranchised and marginalized by the school system and a key public arena to 'advance the conversation' about effective educational practices that promote diversity. The article concludes with a synthesis of common principles regarding local multicultural policy development and a call for civic engagement in the policy development process.

The development and implementation of multicultural educational policy in the USA has received little attention by either policy analysts or multiculturalists (Grant & Millar, 1992). While mainstream multiculturalists have developed theoretical models which advocate the transformation of schools so that all students receive an equal opportunity to learn and are empowered (Sleeter & Grant, 1999; Banks & Banks, 2001), efforts to promote and research multicultural practices in schools have largely focused on curricular and pedagogical issues.¹ Banks's (1995) model, for example, has identified five dimensions of multicultural education: (a) curriculum integration; (b) the knowledge construction process; (c) prejudice reduction; (d) an equity pedagogy; and (e) an empowering school culture and social structure. Multicultural education researchers and practitioners, however, have focused primarily on the first four dimensions, investigating curriculum issues (Gay, 1994a), delineating culturally responsive pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2000), analyzing the knowledge construction process (J. A. Banks, 1996), and synthesizing the research on prejudice reduction techniques and programs (Stephan, 1999). In

addition, multiculturalists and other progressive educators have challenged colleges of education to 'teach for social justice' (Cochran-Smith, 1999; Oakes & Lipton, 1999) and address racism and white privilege in teacher education programs (Sleeter, 1996; Howard, 1999). Perhaps least theorized and investigated, however, has been Banks's (1995) fifth dimension, the development of an empowering school culture and social structure and the role of multicultural policy in this process.²

In this article I argue that multicultural policy matters. In the past it has often served as a significant organizing tool in the 'politics of recognition' and the empowerment of community groups who have been disenfranchised and marginalized by the school system. In the future, multicultural education policy development constitutes a key public arena to 'advance the conversation' about effective educational practices that promote diversity. To illustrate, I provide a brief overview of the historical development of multicultural education policy in the USA and a case study of multicultural policy in the New York City schools during three historical periods. I conclude with a synthesis of initial findings about local multicultural policy development and a call for civic engagement in the policy development process.

Descriptions of educational policy analysis in the policy literature range from a narrow focus on examining the language of official policy documents to a broad investigation of policy that includes the official enactments, expressed intentions, and the actions and inactions of government in relation to a public problem (Fowler, 1999). Cornbleth and Waugh (1993, 1995) caution us, however, that where multicultural policy is concerned, the process of policy-in-the-making may be more significant than the final product. In this historical case study of multicultural policy in the New York City schools I examined policy documents when available, but also focused on extensive archival materials to document the social, political, and historical context of multicultural policy-making and the influence of educators, community advocates, and parents on the policy-making process. Primary data sources for this study included school board minutes, school district reports, official correspondence, newspaper articles, and archival photographs related to teacher union efforts, community organizing activities, and the New York City Board of Education's response to diversity issues from the 1930s through the 1990s.³

The Development of Multicultural Education Policy at the Federal and State Levels

A historical view of the development of US multicultural education policy highlights the influence of the changing socio-political context on the conditions of citizenship, access to public educational institutions, and the inclusion of diverse cultural knowledge and languages in the curriculum. The definition of who constitutes an American citizen and whose culture and language 'counts' in the schools has varied in different historical periods.

Independence from Britain required the founding fathers to define political membership in the new republic. Congress enacted the Naturalization Act of 1790, which required that applicants for naturalized citizenship must reside in the USA for

two years as well as provide ‘proof’ of good character in court. They also had to be white and male. The Naturalization Act excluded from citizenship not only enslaved Africans and nonwhite immigrants but also American Indians, who were regarded as members of tribes or ‘domestic foreigners’ (Takaki, 1993).

Race-based Educational Policies

Since the Civil War and emancipation, race-based educational policies have continued to be defined in the USA in relation to African Americans—desegregation, civil rights, and affirmative action. The legacy of 200 years of slavery and subsequent Jim Crow laws in the late 1800s created a system of *de jure* segregation in Southern schools and largely segregated residential neighborhoods in the North and Midwest that ensured *de facto* segregation. There is growing historical evidence that Mexican American and Asian American students also experienced segregated schooling, often justified on educational grounds because of cultural and linguistic differences (see, for example, Nakanishi & Nishida, 1995; Donato, 1997; San Miguel, 2001).

The federal government did not acknowledge racial or cultural diversity in educational policy until after the landmark 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* decision which declared separate but equal education unconstitutional. Much of the educational policy in the 1960s and 1970s was aimed at dismantling segregation and increasing the access of students of color in higher education through Affirmative Action. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination in schools, stating that ‘No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance (US House of Representatives, 1975, p. 40).

In their initial study of national and state policies on multicultural education Giles and Gollnick (1977) concluded:

Legislative intent of both federal and state laws appears most often to be concerned with protecting the rights of cultural and ethnic minorities in an effort to ensure equal educational opportunity rather than preparing all students to know about and function effectively in a multicultural society. (p. 156)

The federal courts played a key role in advancing and enforcing these race-based policies. However, in many school districts court-ordered desegregation efforts and special programs designed to promote integration (e.g. magnet schools) were abandoned when the court order was lifted (Taylor, 1998).

Policies for Cultural Diversity

Gollnick’s (1995) most recent examination of US multicultural education policy at the federal and state level found little support for promoting cultural diversity. In the 1970s and 1980s most federal education legislation focused on compensatory

education, transitional bilingual education, and assistance for the education of students with disabilities. At the state level, 35 states had at least a minimal multicultural curriculum policy in place by the mid 1990s. Policy documents at the state level have generally been limited to guidelines that recommend the inclusion of diverse racial and cultural groups in the school curriculum but fail to challenge institutional inequities. Most state policies do not have ‘teeth’ to insure implementation, although Nebraska’s policy, for example, mandates that school districts in the state provide annual evidence that multicultural education is being taught or they will lose their accreditation (Nebraska Department of Education, 1993).

Multicultural Policy at the Local Level—the New York City case

Efforts to formulate multicultural policy in local school districts have tended to be reactive and crisis oriented, generally arising during periods of racial and ethnic conflict (Placier *et al.*, 1997). Implementation of multicultural policies at the local level has often been met with political controversy, resulting in the ‘watering down’ or the abandonment of the original multicultural policy (see, for example, Agard-Jones, 1993; Cornbleth & Waugh, 1995; Perry & Delpit, 1997). Historical efforts to formulate multicultural policy in the New York City schools have been no exception, often developed in the face of highly publicized racial and ethnic discrimination, community demands for a more inclusive curriculum, and the political recognition of marginalized groups.

Three historical periods in the New York City schools will be profiled to illustrate how the process of delineating who is included (and who is not) in our conceptions of multicultural education and our local school district policies has changed over time.⁴ In the late 1930s and early 1940s intercultural education served as a vehicle to promote the language and culture of white ethnic groups in the wake of international anti-Semitism. Couched as ‘cultural pluralism,’ school assemblies and in-service courses highlighted the cultural contributions of immigrant groups (usually European) in school assemblies and the curriculum. By the mid 1960s the community control movement heightened public awareness of issues of institutional racism in the educational system and provided a political power base for African American teachers, parents, and community members. In the early 1990s, the Multiculturalism policy and the Children of the Rainbow curriculum further expanded our definition of who ‘counts’ in multicultural education, legitimizing the inclusion of gay and lesbian concerns under the multicultural umbrella.

Educating for Democracy: the intercultural education movement in the 1930s and 1940s

By the mid 1930s New York City was a city of immigrants, and educators were concerned about how the children of immigrants would develop positive self-images and embrace democracy (i.e. the ‘second generation problem’). Montalto (1981) describes three examples of early efforts to promote cultural diversity in the New York City schools in the 1920s and 1930s: the study of immigrant languages, the use

of the school assembly to develop appreciation for ethnic cultures, and the provision of in-service courses for teachers in intercultural education.

Political events in Europe in the late 1930s also contributed to the local policy context. With a large Jewish community and a substantial Jewish teaching force, New York City residents followed the rise of Nazism closely. On November 8 and 9 in 1938 scores of Jews were beaten and hundreds of Jewish temples and businesses in Germany and Austria were vandalized during a government-sponsored pogrom termed *Kristallnacht* (i.e. the night of broken glass). These events outraged and galvanized the Jewish and progressive political community in New York City. There were mass demonstrations throughout the month, including a faculty and student strike at Hunter College, the shutdown of over 30,000 small retail stores one afternoon in protest, a rally of 20,000 at Madison Square Garden, and a resolution by 2700 members of the Protestant Teachers' Association expressing 'unsparing condemnation' of anti-Jewish persecutions.⁵ On December 14, 1938, after a report of anti-Semitic incidents in the vicinity of several high schools, New York City Board of Education member Johanna M. Lindlof introduced a resolution that mandated 'tolerance' assemblies in the schools:

Resolved: That in every public school in the city of New York assemblies be devoted to the promulgation of American ideals of democracy, tolerance, and freedom for all men; that these assemblies be devoted to making the children of our nation aware of the contributions of all races and nationalities to the growth and development of American democracy; that the programs for all these assemblies be based on the social and political history of the United States; and that these programs present the contributions of all races and nationalities in a way such as to develop esteem, respect, good will, and tolerance among students and teachers in all the schools ...⁶

In 1939 and 1940 Rachel Davis DuBois, a Quaker and founder of the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, offered in-service classes in intercultural education to New York City teachers as part of the district's citywide 'alertness' staff development program. DuBois's development of year-long school assembly programs, intercultural curriculum materials, and a national weekly radio program entitled 'Americans All, Immigrants All,' which focused on the history, achievements, and contributions of specific ethnic groups, had a significant national influence on the intercultural education movement (C. A. M. Banks, 1996).

By World War II union leaders and community advocacy groups in Harlem also played an important role in intercultural efforts. The Harlem Committee of the Teachers' Union of New York City sponsored in-service courses on Black History and Race Relations with guest scholars from Columbia University and the City University of New York. They also instituted an ongoing study of bias and prejudice in textbooks used in the New York City schools. From 1941 to 1947 the Citywide Citizens' Committee on Harlem also worked to promote African American history and race relations. Fueled by racial uprisings in Harlem in 1935 and 1943, the organization included prominent African American political and labor leaders such

as Adam Clayton Powell Jr and A. Phillip Randolph, Black intellectuals such as Lawrence Dunbar (L. D.) Reddick, director of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture of the New York Public Library, and white liberals such as Algernon Black of the Ethical Culture Society and Frank Karelsen of the Public Education Association. With the belief that ‘there must be a constant re-educating of the white population of the city in respect to the Negro and his rights, privileges, achievement, and background’,⁷ the committee advocated for school building improvements, reduced class size, additional guidance counselors, and teacher in-service courses on intercultural education.

Through its education committee headed by Frank Karelsen and L. D. Reddick, the Citywide Citizens’ Committee on Harlem funded a human relations counselor in a racially diverse school in Washington Heights, pressured the New York City Board of Education to establish an Advisory Committee on Human Relations, produced an intercultural curriculum guide entitled *Unity through Understanding*, and instituted an effective public education campaign to improve race relations which included booklists, public forums, and radio programs to promote African American literature and history (Johnson, 2002b).

The intercultural education movement in New York City continued into the late 1940s but lost school district support by 1948 when intercultural courses were criticized as ‘subversive and un-American’ and several union leaders as well as scholars who were frequent guest speakers in intercultural in-service workshops were subject to ‘red baiting’ during the Cold War era (Johnson, 2002b).

Giving ‘Voice’ to the Black Community: the community control movement in the 1960s

Although there were ongoing school desegregation battles (largely unsuccessful) throughout the late 1950s and early 1960s, a focus on multicultural issues rose to the forefront in the New York City schools during the community control movement in 1965. Often characterized as a ‘turf’ battle between the largely Jewish teachers’ union (UFT) and the Black community, issues identified by African American teachers and community leaders during the community control movement would fall squarely within the current multicultural agenda. Those issues included more teachers of color, more culturally responsive curriculum and instruction, fiscal equity for poor African American and Latino children, and narrowing the racial achievement gap (Podair, 2002).

An outgrowth of civil rights organizing and the rise of the Black Power movement, the African American Teachers’ Association and community leaders boycotted the Oceanhill–Brownsville schools in Brooklyn with demands for more Black and Latino administrators and the infusion of Black history in predominantly Black schools (Podair, 2002). The New York City Board of Education responded in 1967 by creating an experimental local community district in the Brooklyn neighborhood with expanded powers to hire and fire teachers and administrators. When the community district council involuntarily transferred 18 white teachers accused of undermining the goals of the experiment in community control, the UFT staged a contentious strike that heightened the racial tensions in the city (Fantini *et al.*,

1970). As a result of this movement, several key aspects of decision-making were decentralized and 32 community school districts were created throughout the city.

The goals and motivation of the community control movement remain contested amongst New York City educators, in part based on one's political orientation. While New York City union leaders characterize this period as a failed effort at 'decentralization' (Lucinda Manning, UFT archivist, personal communication), some urban education scholars and activists contend that New York City's community control movement illustrates how schools serving poor people can best be improved by providing parents with the organizational capacity to exert control and hold the schools accountable (Noguera, 2001a). 'Ocean Hill-Brownsville' continues to remain a rallying cry and symbol of the ongoing struggle for authentic participation and decision-making by parents of color in their neighborhood schools (see, for example, Margonis & Parker, 1999; Hess, 1999), despite recent attempts to scapegoat and blame parents of color and community members for the failures of urban education as justification for the state legislature's decision to place control of the school bureaucracy in the hands the new mayor of New York City (Berger, 2002).

Including (and Excluding) the Children of the Rainbow in the 1990s

In 1989, in response to a state-wide curriculum movement to infuse multiple historical perspectives into the New York State social studies curriculum, the New York City Board of Education adopted the most comprehensive and inclusive multicultural policy in a US school district to date. The policy rejected the view that 'schools should seek to melt away cultural differences or merely tolerate cultural diversity.' Instead, cultural diversity was to be viewed as 'a valuable resource that should be preserved and extended.' The policy also recognized 'the impact of racism' and encouraged 'a variety of teaching strategies to address differences in learning styles' and 'opportunities for all students to become bilingual/proficient in at least two languages.' Perhaps most significantly, this inclusive approach to multicultural education explicitly delineated the need for curriculum development, staff training, and the involvement of community-based organizations, with a special emphasis on how to deal with 'conflict arising from bias and discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, gender, age, sexual orientation, and/or handicapping conditions' (New York City Board of Education, 1989).

This policy was enacted in the wake of two separate and highly publicized beating deaths of young African American men in white neighborhoods in the late 1980s. In addition, the rising incidence of AIDS, particularly amongst teenagers, contributed to the development of a politicized gay and lesbian community in New York City, including an active Gay and Lesbian Teachers' Association. In response, Joseph Fernandez, the new Chancellor of the New York Public Schools, promoted diversity efforts and supported condom distribution and AIDS education in the public schools (Karp, 1995).

Utilizing a common implementation strategy, a series of multicultural curriculum guides entitled *Children of the Rainbow* was developed by the Office of Multicultural Education as technical resources to enable local community districts to implement

the multicultural policy (New York City Board of Education, 1990, 1991). The brief mention of gay and lesbian-headed families and a bibliography that included a handful of children's books that depicted children with 'two mommies' or 'two daddies' proved to be the most controversial aspect of the new curriculum.

In 1992 an evaluation of multicultural education programs in the 32 community districts of New York City was conducted to determine how the 1989 policy was being implemented. The results of a survey completed by district multicultural coordinators indicated that the 'contributions' approach to multicultural curriculum was the most common implementation strategy (Crowley & Garcia, 1992). Many schools 'bought into' existing programs sponsored by the central district (e.g. a conflict resolution curriculum that emphasized mediation skills) and implemented these programs as their primary multicultural curriculum. Although the multicultural action plan that was developed as a result of the policy included a focus on 'education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist' (Sleeter & Grant, 1999) and a social action approach to curriculum implementation (Banks, 2001), there was little evidence that systematic societal inequalities were addressed in the New York City community school districts surveyed.

Opposition to the Children of the Rainbow curriculum guide by conservative community school board members, clergy, and their parent allies pressured the New York City Board of Education to revise the Multiculturalism policy in 1995. The revised policy statement, ironically retitled as the 'Restatement and Strengthening of Policy on Multicultural Education' (New York Board of Education, 1995), limited the curriculum focus to ethnic, racial, and linguistic groups and eliminated the categories of sexual orientation, gender, religion, age, and handicapping conditions from the policy statement. While the Board of Education also issued a separate 'Anti-discrimination' policy statement in 1995 that included all of the previously protected groups (as required by New York City law), the bifurcation of the concept of multicultural education from anti-discrimination sent a clear message to school district officials, administrators and teachers that the multicultural education curriculum should only focus on racial, ethnic, and linguistic groups (not sexual orientation or gender) and eliminate prejudice reduction strategies. In addition, the statement in the original policy document about 'developing a multicultural perspective which interprets history and culture from a variety of perspectives' was modified to include the phrase 'consistent with factual evidence' in a veiled critique of an African-centered approach to Egyptian history that had come under criticism in the New York State social studies curriculum a few years previously. This 1995 multicultural policy statement remains in effect today, although few teachers and administrators who have entered the school system since the Children of the Rainbow controversy are aware of the policy.

Common Principles of Multicultural Policy Development and Implementation

A US panel of scholars in multicultural education recently questioned, 'What do we know about education and diversity and how do we know it?' and generated several

essential principles about teaching and learning to promote diversity (Banks *et al.*, 2001). If we asked the same question about multicultural policy, this preliminary analysis of three historical periods in the New York City schools identifies some nascent principles about multicultural policy-making and implementation.

Multicultural policy often develops in highly politicized contexts. Multicultural educational policy in New York City developed in response to high-profile racial and ethnic conflicts.⁸ The development of policy in these contexts may serve at least three purposes: For the school district, development of the policy demonstrates they have 'done something' in response to the incidents; for marginalized community groups there is recognition that their concerns have been heard (i.e. tangible recognition they have been given 'voice'); for teachers and administrators, the multicultural policy delineates guidelines and procedures that tell them 'what action to take' in response to emotionally charged situations.

The larger national political climate influences local multicultural policy formulation and implementation. The attention and emphasis placed on diversity issues in the society at large signals the importance given to multicultural education and the resources made available to local school districts. Historically, multicultural educational policy development has been most active during periods of progressive national politics. This was, perhaps, most evident during the intercultural education movement in the late 1930s and early 1940s, when other local school districts such as Detroit, Michigan, Gary, Indiana, and Toledo, Ohio also enacted school district policies to promote cultural pluralism due to advocacy by progressive superintendents, teacher union activists, and community organizations (Johnson, 2002a). Multicultural policies and practices do not disappear altogether during periods of political conservatism, however. Some educators may continue to implement multicultural education in their individual classrooms and schools but it becomes difficult to enact large systemic initiatives.

A gap exists between multicultural policy and practice. Just as there is a gap between multicultural theory and practice (Gay, 1994b), there is often a gap between multicultural policy and practice. Implementation efforts usually focus on curriculum infusion and staff development utilizing a contributions approach (Banks, 2001), even when the stated policy is more far ranging. This gap between stated diversity policies and practices was also noted in Britain during the 1980s and early 1990s (Troyna, 1992). To help bridge this gap, some policy analysts point to the importance of advocates and leadership at the school district level who can keep multicultural education visible and garner resources for implementation (see, for example, Murtadha-Watts, 1999).

Multicultural policy may be largely symbolic. The symbolic value of multicultural policy development may be more significant than the actual policy adopted. In these three historical periods community groups used the media and the policy development process to promote their issues and debate their concerns in the public arena. Smith *et al.* (1999) refer to the symbolic nature of the policy development process as 'political spectacle.' The failure of the New York City Board of Education to allocate resources for policy implementation or provide an accountability plan to monitor policy underscores the largely symbolic nature of these multicultural policy

initiatives. Yet advocating for multicultural policies remains one of the few avenues for marginalized parents and community groups to gain a hearing from school district officials. While this historical advocacy has helped expand our definitions of multicultural education and gained some concessions from district officials, multicultural policy formation appears to have little lasting effect on restructuring power relationships or altering the dominant discourses about whose history and culture 'counts' in the school curriculum. Thus, each subsequent generation of parent and community activists must continue to press their concerns to keep diversity issues on the educational agenda.

Implications for Future Multicultural Policy-making

In an effort to 'push the boundaries' of mainstream multicultural education research beyond curriculum and pedagogical issues, I advocate for a multifaceted approach to the study and development of multicultural policy which combines scholarship with social activism. First, utilizing the consensus panel approach (Banks *et al.*, 2001), a multidisciplinary panel of multiculturalists, educational historians, and policy analysts could jointly examine the knowledge base on multicultural policy, past and present. Because diversity policies in the USA continue to remain under-theorized, a comparative policy approach and the inclusion of international multiculturalists on this panel might prove particularly helpful. In an area where there have been few studies, joint investigation and policy dialogue across disciplines, sites, and socio-historical contexts could help develop essential principles, identify implementation issues, and envision new multicultural policies at the local, state, national, and international level.

Secondly, I suggest that in our own historical moment we multiculturalists must revisit our social activist roots and connect with diverse parents and community organizations to identify their equity concerns (Sleeter, 1995, 1996) and learn to participate more effectively in current local, state, and national policy debates (Crawford, 2001). As affirmative action is dismantled, bilingual education policies rolled back, the racial achievement gap widens (Gay, 2001; Noguera, 2001b), and decision-making in urban districts becomes increasingly centralized in the hands of mayors and business officials (Berger, 2002), now is not the time to be silent. As educators and university faculty we can't do it alone. We must acknowledge that it is often the professional educators who stand in the way of the development of progressive multicultural educational policies. For example, in the urban school district where my younger son attends school, over the past two years a coalition of parents, teachers, administrators, and university faculty has conducted an ongoing series of community dialogues where diverse stakeholders raise issues of concern and discuss urban school reform on an equal footing. In these dialogues, a multiracial coalition of parents and community members has consistently underscored the importance of caring, respectful teachers and culturally relevant curriculum and instruction as critical elements necessary to increase student achievement in urban schools. Despite resistance, these parents lobbied for the development of a new

parent involvement policy and continue to advocate for curriculum revisions and staff development initiatives that promote diversity (Johnson, 2001).

Finally, in the spirit of those multiculturalists and community activists who have gone before, I advocate for the 'scholarship of civic engagement.' I believe we should pool our university resources (e.g. time, money, research expertise, political connections) to examine how all of our children are faring in today's schools, to provide technical assistance to local school districts, and to advocate for progressive multicultural policies that incorporate culturally inclusive curriculum, culturally responsive pedagogy, and equitable assessment practices. This 'scholarship of civic engagement' might also include rethinking the faculty reward system to give credit and recognition to emerging scholars for the application and dissemination of knowledge through outreach and community service (see, for example, Driscoll & Lynton, 1999).

In summary, to paraphrase the words of a teacher union activist who promoted intercultural education in New York City in the late 1940s, we need more multicultural policy, not less. When the Associate Superintendent of the New York City schools cancelled city-wide intercultural education courses in 1947 because they were judged to be 'subversive and un-American,' the participating teachers fought back with petitions, telegrams, and protest letters challenging the Board of Education to 'display more courage, not less' in the face of conservative criticism.⁹ As a former administrator who promoted diversity issues in the New York City schools and an emerging scholar in multicultural education, I stand on the shoulders of the pioneering scholars and community activists who have gone before, and hope that I can summon at least as much resolve. I believe we need more multicultural education and the policies that promote it, not less. As multiculturalists, if we do not advocate for multicultural practices and policies in our schools, who will?

Notes

- [1] 'Mainstream' multicultural educational models as developed by James Banks, Geneva Gay, Carl Grant and Christine Sleeter during the 1970s and 1980s continue to be the most widely disseminated examples of multicultural education in the USA, although each of these scholars has expanded and altered their conceptualizations over the years. While other models of multicultural education such as critical multiculturalism (May, 1999) and anti-racism have been influential internationally and are beginning to make inroads (see, for example, Kailin, 2002), my findings indicate that mainstream multicultural education has had the most influence on the development of multicultural policy at the state and local level in the USA.
- [2] Scholars and practitioners in educational administration have increasingly advocated for a 'leadership for social justice' and the examination of race and gender issues in policy (see, for example, Marshall, 1993; Murtadha-Watts, 1999; Young & Laible, 2000) but these conversations have largely taken place at educational administration conferences, in leadership and policy journals, and in Division A (Educational Administration) and Division L (Educational Policy and Politics) sessions at the annual meetings of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Multiculturalists, on the other hand, are often situated in Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and present in Division B (Curriculum Studies), Division G (Social Context of Education), and Division K (Teaching and Teacher Education) at AERA. There have been few opportunities for cross-disciplinary conversa-

- tions between educational leadership/policy scholars and multiculturalists that might deepen our understanding of issues in multicultural policy analysis and development.
- [3] Correspondence, investigative reports, curriculum bulletins, and school board minutes were located in the New York City Board of Education archives, Special Collections, Teachers College, Columbia University; newspaper articles and photographs chronicling community organizing activities in Harlem and Brooklyn were found at the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library; teacher union newsletters, reports, and correspondence related to the intercultural education and the Community Control movements were found in the Teachers' Union archives, Kheel Center for Labor-Management, Cornell University and the UFT archives, Tamiment Library, New York University.
- [4] There have been other significant multicultural policy initiatives in New York City which might also be examined, e.g. the involvement of ASPIRA (a Latino advocacy group) in the 1970s court decree which mandated transitional bilingual education.
- [5] *New York Times*, November 20, 1938, p. 37; November 22, 1938, p. 6; November 24, 1938, p. 7.
- [6] *City of New York Board of Education Journal*, 1938, v. 2, p. 2705.
- [7] 'Origins, Gains, and Goals: Citywide Citizens Committee on Harlem Brochure' (1945), Microfiche SC 000,995, Schomburg Center for the Study of Black Culture, New York Public Library.
- [8] See Johnson and Joshee (2000) for a discussion of a similar finding in the development of multicultural policy in Canada.
- [9] Letter from Rose Russell to the Board of Superintendents and the Board of Education, December 12, 1947. Correspondence 1944–1953 (IV.C.2[I], Box #1), New York City Board of Education Archives, Teachers College, Columbia University.

References

- AGARD-JONES, L. (1993) Implementing multicultural education: the New York City experience, *Multicultural Education*, 1, pp. 13–15.
- BANKS, C.A.M. (1996) The intergroup education movement, in: J. A. BANKS (Ed.) *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge, & Action: historical and contemporary perspectives* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- BANKS, J.A. (1995) Multicultural education: historical development, dimensions, and practice, in: J. A. BANKS & C. A. M. BANKS (Eds) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (New York, Macmillan).
- BANKS, J.A. (Ed.) (1996) *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge, & Action: historical and contemporary perspectives* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- BANKS, J.A. (Ed.) (2001) *Cultural Diversity and Education: foundations, curriculum, and teaching*, 4th edn (Boston, MA, Allyn & Bacon).
- BANKS, J.A. & BANKS, C.A.M. (Eds) (2001) *Multicultural Education: issues and perspectives*, 4th edn (New York, John Wiley & Sons).
- BANKS, J.A., COOKSON, P., GAY, G., HAWLEY, W.D., IRVINE, J.J., NIETO, S., SCHOLFIELD, J.W. & STEPHAN, W.G. (2001) *Diversity with Unity: essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society* (Seattle, WA, Center for Multicultural Education).
- BERGER, J. (2002) The odd circle of school control, *New York Times*, 16 June, p. 20.
- COCHRAN-SMITH, M. (1999) Learning to teach for social justice, in: G. GRIFFIN (Ed.) *The Education of Teachers: 98th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 1* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).
- CORNBLETH, C. & WAUGH, D. (1993) The great speckled bird: education policy-in-the-making, *Educational Researcher*, 22, pp. 31–37.
- CORNBLETH, C. & WAUGH, D. (1995) *The Great Speckled Bird: multicultural politics and education policymaking* (New York, St Martin's Press).

- CRAWFORD, J. (2001) *At War with Diversity: U.S. language policy in an age of anxiety* (Clevedon, Multilingual Matters).
- CROWLEY, P.M. & GARCIA, M.L. (1992) New curriculum developments: an investigative survey of New York City's community school districts' response to the Chancellor's Action Plan for Multicultural Education, paper presented at *Teachers College, Columbia University Conference on Urban Education*, New York.
- DONATO, R. (1997) *The Other Struggle for Equal Schools: Mexican Americans during the Civil Rights era* (Albany, NY, State University of New York Press).
- DRISCOLL, A. & LYNTON, E. (1999) *Making Outreach Visible: a guide to documenting professional service and outreach* (Washington, DC, American Association for Higher Education).
- FANTINI, M., GITTELL, M. & MAGAT, R. (1970) *Community Control and the Urban School* (New York, Praeger).
- FOWLER, F. (1999) *Policy Studies for Educational Leaders* (Paramus, Prentice-Hall).
- GAY, G. (1994a) *At the Essence of Learning: multicultural education* (West Lafayette, IN, Kappa Delta Pi).
- GAY, G. (1994b) Bridging multicultural theory and practice, *Multicultural Education*, 3, pp. 4–9.
- GAY, G. (2000) *Culturally Responsive Teaching: theory, research, and practice* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- GAY, G. (2001) Educational equity for students of color, in: J. A. BANKS & C. A. M. BANKS (Eds) *Multicultural Education: issues & perspectives* (New York, John Wiley & Sons).
- GILES, R.H. & GOLLNICK, D.M. (1977) Ethnic/cultural diversity as reflected in federal and state educational legislation and policies, in: F. H. KLASSEN & D. M. GOLLNICK (Eds) *Pluralism and the American Teacher: issues and case studies* (Washington, DC, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education).
- GOLLNICK, D.M. (1995) National and state initiatives for multicultural education, in: J. A. BANKS & C. A. M. BANKS, *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (New York, Macmillan).
- GRANT, C. & MILLAR, S. (1992) Research and multicultural education: barriers, needs, and boundaries, in: C. GRANT (Ed.) *Research and Multicultural Education* (London, Falmer Press).
- HESS, G.A. (1999) Community participation or control? From New York to Chicago, *Theory Into Practice*, 38, pp. 217–224.
- HOWARD, G.R. (1999) *We Can't Teach What We Don't Know: white teachers, multiracial schools* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- JOHNSON, L. & JOSHEE, R. (2000) A comparative view of multicultural policy in the United States and Canada: symbol or substance? Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans.
- JOHNSON, L. (2001) Partnerships for parent involvement: using a parent needs assessment to leverage school reform, paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Seattle.
- JOHNSON, L. (2002a) 'America never was America to me': the politics of recognition and multicultural policy in the United States, paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, April.
- JOHNSON, L. (2002b) 'Making democracy real': teacher union and community activism to promote diversity in the New York City public schools, 1935–1950, *Urban Education*, 37, pp. 566–587.
- KAILIN, J. (2002) *Antiracist Education: from theory to practice* (Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield).
- KARP, S. (1995) Trouble over the rainbow, in: D. LEVINE, R. LOWE, B. PETERSON, & R. TENERIO (Eds) *Rethinking Schools: an agenda for change* (New York, The New Press).
- LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (1995) Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy, *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, pp. 465–491.
- MARGONIS, F. & PARKER, L. (1999) Choice: the route to community control? *Theory Into Practice*, 38, pp. 203–208.

- MARSHALL, C. (Ed.) (1993) *The New Politics of Race and Gender: the 1992 yearbook of the Politics of Education Association* (Washington, DC, Falmer Press).
- MAY, S. (Ed.) (1999) *Critical Multiculturalism: rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (London, Falmer Press).
- MONTALTO, N.V. (1981) Multicultural education in the New York City public schools, 1919–1941, in: D. RAVITCH & R. K. GOODENOW (Eds), *Educating an Urban People: the New York City experience* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- MURTADHA-WATTS, K. (1999) Negotiating the primacy of culture, race, and class with city school accountability policy formation, paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the University Council of Education Administration*, Minneapolis, MN.
- NAKANISHI, D. & NISHIDA, T. (1995) *The Asian American Educational Experience: a sourcebook for teachers and students* (New York, Routledge).
- NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1993) *Rule 16: approval of school district multicultural education programs, Title 92, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 16* (Lincoln, NB, Nebraska Department of Education).
- NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION (1989) *Statement of Policy on Multicultural Education and Promotion of Positive Intergroup Relations* (New York, New York City Board of Education).
- NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION (1990) *Children of the Rainbow: kindergarten* (New York, New York City Board of Education).
- NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION (1991) *Children of the Rainbow: first grade* (New York, New York City Board of Education).
- NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION (1995) *Restatement and Strengthening of Policy on Multicultural Education* (New York, New York City Board of Education).
- NOGUERA, P. (2001a) Transforming urban schools through investments in the social capital of parents, in: S. SAEGERT, J. P. THOMPSON & M. R. WARREN (Eds) *Social Capital and Poor Communities* (New York, Russell Sage Foundation).
- NOGUERA, P. (2001b) The racial achievement gap: how can we assure an equity of outcomes? Invited Address for Urban Education Month, Urban Education Institute, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY.
- OAKES, J. & LIPTON, M. (1999) *Teaching to Change the World* (New York, McGraw-Hill).
- PERRY, T. & DELPIT, L. (Eds) (1998) *The Real Ebonics Debate: power, language, and the education of African American children* (Boston, MA, Beacon Press).
- PLACIER, M., HALL, P.M. & DAVIS, B.J. (1997) Making multicultural education policy: the transformation of intentions, in: P. M. HALL (Ed.) *Race, Ethnicity, and Multiculturalism: policy and practice* (New York, Garland).
- PODAIR, J.E. (2002) *The Strike that Changed New York: blacks, whites, and the Oceanhill-Brownsville crisis* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press).
- SAN MIGUEL, G. (2001) *Brown, Not White: school integration and the Chicano movement in Houston* (College Station, TX, Texas A & M University Press).
- SLEETER, C. (1995) An analysis of the critiques of multicultural education, in: J. A. BANKS & C. A. M. BANKS (Eds) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (New York, Macmillan).
- SLEETER, C.E. (1996) *Multicultural Education as Social Activism* (Albany, NY, State University of New York Press).
- SLEETER, C. & GRANT, C. (1999) *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: five approaches to race, class, and gender*, 3rd edn. (Upper Saddle River, NJ, Merrill).
- SMITH, M.L., HEINECKE, W. & NOBLE, A.J. (1999) Assessment policy and political spectacle, *Teachers College Record*, 10, pp. 157–191.
- STEPHAN, W. (1999) *Reducing Prejudice and Stereotyping in the Schools* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- TAKAKI, R. (1993) *A Different Mirror: a history of multicultural America* (Boston, MA, Little Brown).

- TAYLOR, S.J.L. (1998) *Desegregation in Boston and Buffalo: the influence of local leaders* (Albany, NY, State University of New York Press).
- TROYNA, B. (1992) *Racism in Children's Lives: a study of mainly-white primary schools* (London, Routledge).
- US HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. (1975) *A Compilation of Federal Education Laws as Amended through December 31, 1974* (Washington, DC, US Government Printing Office).
- YOUNG, M. & LAIBLE, J. (2000) White racism, antiracism, and school leadership preparation, *Journal of School Leadership*, 10, pp. 374–415.

