ABSTRACT
        This paper describes social problems that ethnic
minorities are likely to experience in the 1980s and presents
guidelines for shaping educational policies and programs that will
help ethnic minority youths to experience more educational equity
during the remainder of the decade. The minority groups discussed are
those that are heavily concentrated below the poverty level and that
experience enormous social, economic, and educational problems.
Educational equity is defined in terms of output variables or the
effects of schooling, rather than in terms of input variables such as
expenditure per pupil and school facilities. Ethnic communities are
likely to continue to be characterized by both a substantial lower
class and a significant middle class throughout the 1980s. However,
the rate of growth of the middle class ethnic community is likely to
be slowed during much of the decade. The working class will remain a
significant segment of ethnic communities. The following issues,
which will continue to be important for the education of minorities
throughout the 1980s, are discussed and policy issues related to them
are presented: (1) teaching minority youths the basic skills; (2)
teaching English to children who speak other first languages; (3)
standardized testing of minority group populations; (4) minimal
competency testing; (5) preschool care and educational programs; (6)
private and public schools; and (7) ethnic studies programs in the
nation's schools and colleges. (Author/RM)

ED220366

Social Problems and Educational Equity in the Eighties *

James A. Banks

Professor of Education and Kellog Fellow

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington

SP 014 206

Abstract

The major goal of this paper is to describe the social problems that ethnic minorities are likely to experience in the 19?0s and to present guidelines for shaping educational policies and programs that are likely to help ethnic minority youths to experience more educational equity during the remainder of the decade. The ethnic minority groups discussed in this paper are those that are heavily concentrated below the poverty level and that experience enormous social, economic, and educational problems. Educational equity is defined in terms of output variables or the effects of schooling, rather than in terms of input variables such as expenditure per pupil and school facilities. Using this concept, educational equity exists only when the educational outcomes are roughly equal for individuals from diverse ethnic and social class groups.

An attempt is made in this paper to describe the complex status of ethnic minorities and to predict their social and economic statuses for the rest of the decade. Ethnic communities are likely to continue to be char-acterized by both a substantial lower class and a significant middle class throughout the 1980s. However, the rate of growth of the middle class ethnic commnity is likely to be slowed during much of the decade. The working class will remain a significant segment of ethnic communities. Educational policy and programs should reflect the tremendous diversity within ethnic groups since the various populations within ethnic com-munities often have different needs, aspirations, and educational goals.

The following issues, which will continue to be important for the edu-cation of minorities throughout the 1980s, are discussed and policy issues related to them are presented: (a) teaching minority youths the basic skills, (b) teaching English to children who speak other first languages, (c) standardized testing of minority group populations, (d) minimal com-petency testing, (e) preschool care and educational programs, (f) private and public schools, and (g) ethnic studies programs in the nation's schools and colleges.

Forecasting the 1980s

As historians and social scientists, we are considerably more comfortable describing the past and present than forecasting the future. Describing the past and present is risky enough. Attempts to forecast the future are fraught with difficulties. However, the social scientist must use the same modes of inquiry to forecast alternative futures that are used to describe the past and present. In the final analysis, scientific forecasting must result from a reflective study and analysis of the best historical and current data. The results of scientific forecasting are similar in other ways to other social science inquiries. Social scientists are likely to disagree about possible events in the future as strongly as they disagree about current issues such as affirmative action, school desegregation, and whether the importance of race in the United States is declining or inclining (see Willie, 1979).

Because of the continuity of the past, present, and future, my venture into forecasting social problems and educational issues in the 1980s will begin with a description of historical and current developments related to the status of minorities in the United States. I will then make some

reasoned predictions about the possible status of these problems and issues during the 1980s, and discuss their implications for the education of ethnic minorities. The major goal of this paper is to describe educational policies and guidelines that will help minority youths to experience increased educational equity in the 1980s. After examining policy alternatives and issues related to a problem, I will describe guidelines for shaping policies that are most likely to result in more educational equity for minority group populations.

Ethnic Minority Groups

The way in which ethnic minority youths and educational equity are defined in this paper needs to be clarified. I am using ethnic minority in a more limited way than I have used this concept in previous writings (Banks, 1979; Banks, 1981). I am primarily concerned with ethnic minorities who are members of groups that experience serious problems in the nation's schools, who are heavily represented among the unemployed, and who are highly concentrated in families that are below the poverty level. This definition excludes highly successful ethnic minority groups such as Jewish Americans, Japanese Americans, and Chinese Americans, but includes groups such as Blacks, Indians, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans. The issues discussed in this paper are most pertinent to these four latter groups.

The focus on social problems related to Blacks, Chicanos, Indians, and Puerto Ricans is not meant to suggest that ethnic minority students who are

Japanese, Chinese, and Jewish do not experience problems in school or in

the larger society. Students of American ethnicity, such as Sue (1981),

Pang (1981), Kitano (1976), and Greenbaum (1974), have described many of

the sociological and psychological factors that influence, often nega-

tively, the experiences of these youths in school and in the larger

society. However, these groups do not have the serious social, economic,

and educational problems that characterize Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos,

and Indians.

Educational Equity

The success that many middle class Black, Chicano, Indian, and Puerto

Rican individuals experienced in the 1970s, and the acid debate over

affirmative action, sometimes give the impression that these groups now

experience equal educational opportunities. However, I am defining educa-

tional equity primarily in terms of educational outputs. This means that

groups such Blacks, Chicanos, and Indians can be said to have equal educa-

tional opportunity only when the leading indicators of educational

achievement, such as completion of college, scores on the College Board,

and numbers in graduate school, are roughly equal to these indicators for

Whites. This definition of educational equity focuses primarily on the

results and effects of schooling rather than on input variables such as

expenditure per pupil, teachers' salaries, and supplies (Coleman, 1969,

pp. 9-24).

When using this definition to determine educational equity, the multiple indicators of educational attainment must be viewed as an inter-related whole. Any one measure of achievement can be misleading. By 1979, the per cent of Blacks completing high school approached 80 per cent of the percentage for Whites (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 149). This was up from 50 per cent of the percentage for Whites in 1970. This is a seem-ingly dramatic increase in educational equity for Blacks. However, when one looks at other indices of educational achievement, such as mean scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), and the per cent of Black and White college graduates in 1979, the gains in educational equity for Blacks since 1960 look less impressive. In 1969, the per cent of Blacks who completed four or more years of college was about 38 per cent of the percentage for Whites. In 1979, that per cent had increased to 46 (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 149). There were still substantial discrepancies between mean scores for Blacks and Whites on standardized tests such as the SAT and the College Board.

Thus, while the percentage gap between Blacks and Whites in completing high school closed substantially between 1960 and 1979, the gap in college completion closed only slightly. Wide gaps in Black and White achievement on standardized aptitude tests also remained.

It makes a tremendous difference, when designing educational policies, if educational equity is defined primarily in terms of output rather than input variables. When educational equity is conceptualized in terms of

output variables, equity has been attained when schools and colleges serving different socioeconomic and ethnic groups are equal in terms of variables such as teachers' pay, facilities, supplies, and mean expenditure for each child.

In the 1950s, after the Brown Decision, it was popular to define educational equity in terms of input variables because Black Southern schools had been unequal to White schools in terms of these variables since the "separate but equal" supreme court ruling in Plessy vs. Ferguson in 1896. After 1954, major efforts in the southern and border states were concentrated on obtaining equal pay for Black teachers, and equal supplies, textbooks, and facilities for Black schools.

Impressive gains were made in equalizing input variables for schools serving low income and minority group populations during the 1960s and 1970s. Many schools in economically depressed areas used funds authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to make their input variables more equal to those of schools in more economically advantaged areas. By the end of 1979, the federal government had, under the authorization of this act, granted $23.2 billion to local school districts (Graham, 1980).

In 1966, the massive and controversial "Coleman Report" (Coleman et al., 1966) indicated that input variables such as school facilities and curriculum are not the most important correlates of academic achievement.

Coleman concluded that variables such as the verbal ability of teachers,
the children's sense of control of their environment, and the educational
background of the children's fellow classmates were the most important
correlates of academic achievement.

The gains made in equalizing school input variables such as teachers'
salaries and facilities during the 1960s and 1970s, the findings of the
influential Coleman Report, and the continuing failure of many minority
youths to attain educational parity with White middle class youths have
made the input notion of educational equity insufficient for the 1980s.
Increasingly during the 1960s and 1970s, educators realized that children
who were socialized within a family and community culture highly incon-
gruent with the culture of the schools were likely to experience more
problems attaining academic success than children socialized in communities
very similar to the school culture.

Consequently, in order for many Hispanic children socialized in the
barrio to attain academic skills on parity with middle class Anglo youths,
the school culture--which is primarily White and middle-class in its norms,
goals, and expectations (Greenbaum, 1974)--has to make some major changes
in the way it delivers educational services. Merely treating most Hispanic
children "equal" or "the same" as White middle class children will not help
many of them attain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to function
successfully within our highly technological society. Because of differen-
ces in motivational styles, languages, and values, Hispanic and Anglo stu-

dents may often have to be taught differently the same skills and knowledge
(Gay, 1981; Vasquez, 1979).

In other words, children from some ethnic groups, because of their
different historical, cultural, and social experiences, may have different
educational entitlements and needs. To reflect cultural democracy and pro-
mote educational equity, the school may be required to treat some groups of
children differently from other groups.

The Jews, the Japanese, and the Chinese have been very academically
successful in the United States; yet, these groups have never experienced
federally mandated bilingual programs in the public schools (each of these
groups did establish private, after-school language schools). This does
not necessarily mean, however, that many Hispanic children do not need
bilingual education in order to attain educational parity with other
students. Some Hispanic students may need bilingual programs while other
may not.

To promote educational equity during the 1980s, it is essential for
educators to formulate policy and programs based on an output conception of
educational equity, to develop sophisticated and fair ways to determine
educational entitlements and needs, and to formulate educational policy and
programs that reflect the enormous diversity both between and within ethnic
groups such as Blacks, Indians, and Chicanos.

Education and Schooling

Educational equity will exist in our nation when the leading indicators of educational attainment are about the same for all ethnic and social class groups. However, the common schools are only one of the important educational institutions in society. The family, the mass media, the community, the church, and the youth culture play important roles in educating our youths (Cremin, 1976). In some ways, these are more important educational institutions than schools.

Because the common school is only one of the important educational institutions in society, it is important for policy makers to realize both the possibilities and limitations of schools in bringing about equal educational opportunity. Schools can and should play cogent roles in educating our youths (Graham, 1980), despite the arguments by the revisionist historians and economists to the contrary (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; see Ravitch, 1978). However, it is limited in achieving its goals to the extent that other institutions promote norms, behaviors, and values that contradict those promoted by the school.

Within the last decade, the school has been handicapped in helping children to attain basic reading, writing, and mathematical skills because it has received little help or support from the family, the community, and from other important social institutions. The school's efforts to teach children American Creed values such as justice and equality are often

undercut by practices in the larger society that contradict those teach-
ings. Admittedly, the public school has not distinguished itself by its
efforts to promote American Creed values. Nevertheless, it rarely gets
much community support or encouragement when it tries to teach them.

This paper necessarily focuses on the role of the common school in
bringing about educational equity. However, federal policy makers should
keep in mind the severe limitations under which schools work, the high
expectations the public today has for the nation's public schools, and the
entent to which the common schools are a reflection of society. Our high
expectations for the common schools should be tempered by these realities. .

Full educational equity for minority youths is not likely to be
achieved until other institutions within society, in addition to the common
schools, implement reforms that support those that are proposed in this
paper for schools. We should also realize that the notion of equal educa-
tional opportunity itself is an ideal type and process concept. It is an
ideal we should work toward and a continuing process.

The Complex Status of Minorities

It is difficult to describe the social, economic, and educational
status of minorities today and to forecast their status for the rest of the
decade. A brief review of the various studies and commentaries on the
status and progress of Blacks since 1960 indicates the difficulty of this
task.

Social sicentists, such as Wilson (1978) and Scammon and Wattenberg (1973), have focused on Black progress since the 1960s. Hill (1979b) discusses how Blacks have lost gains in the last two decades. Willie (1979) and Jones (1981) describe the complexity of the status of Blacks during the 1960s and 1970s.

These social scientists reached conflicting conclusions using similar data. Social scientists such as Willie and Jones, however, come closer to reality when they describe both the progress and regression Blacks have experienced since the 1960s. Other minorities, such as Chicanos, Indians, and Puerto Ricans, have also experienced progress and setbacks since the 1960s. Sowell (1981), in a Wall Street Journal editorial, discusses the extent to which some averagely qualified minorities were disadvantaged by affirmative action programs. He points out, however, that minorities with superior qualifications often benefited from these programs.

One of the problems in social science is that writers tend to describe ethnic minorities as monolithic groups, rather than as groups with enormous social class, regional, cultural, and linguistic diversity. One consequence of the tendency to describe these groups as monolithic is making oversimplified and misleading statements such as "Blacks made continuous progress during the 1960s and 1970s," "Chicanos steadily regressed during the 1970s," and "Indian children have low self-concepts."

These kinds of statements, which many social scientists make, frequently conceal more than they reveal and often reinforce harmful educa-

tional practices. Many educators accept the popular notion that nearly
every Black and Chicano student is poor and often act on this premise.
Other educators believe that almost all Chicano children speak barrio
Spanish and need bilingual education to achieve in school.

During the 1980s, educational policy related to ethnic minorities
should reflect the tremendous social class, regional, and cultural dif-
ferences within ethnic groups. Most Puerto Ricans, Blacks, Chicanos, and
Indians are at the lower rung of the social and economic ladder; yet there
are significant middle classes within each of these groups that, to some
extent, have different values, interests, behavior, and educational needs
from their lower class kin.

While middle class ethnic individuals usually have a sense of people-
hood and identify with their ethnic groups, they also have strong social
class interests that bind them in many ways to other middle class groups.
Often middle class ethnic individuals find that their class interests
conflict with their ethnic allegiances. Not infrequently, middle class
ethnics find that their class interests are more important to them than
their ethnic attachments. Middle class Blacks and Chicanos often move to
suburban communities and send their children to private schools, not to
enhance their ethnic identification, but to live in ways they consider
consistent with their class status. Many middle class Black and Chicano
parents are probably more interested in their children attaining the skills
they need to get into Harvard or Stanford the they are in whether the

school is sympathetic to Black English or barrio Spanish. Middle class
Black and Chicano parents are deserting the public schools as are White
middle class parents. Ethnicity remains a cogent factor in American
society; however, it is often mediated by class interests.

Shaping and implementing educational policy for minorities in the 1980s
will become increasingly complex as more members of lower status ethnic
groups join the middle class. This kind of class mobility increases the
complexity of educating minorities because most middle class Blacks,
Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans want to retain their ethnic identities, but at
the same time they desire the full benefits and opportunities that are con-
comitant with their class status. Many middle class minority parents send
their children to prestigious private elementary and high schools and
encourage them to apply to Harvard, but at the same time expect them to be
able to relate well to their cousins in the inner city and to be active (in
the case of Blacks) in the Black church, which is a very ethnic institu-
tion. Educators focused their efforts on helping lower-status minority
children during the 1960s and 1970s. Middle class minority children often
became invisible, or the school assumed that they, too, were poor and
"culturally deprived." Educators should be keenly sensitive to the class
diversity within minority communities.

The Multiple Social Classes in Ethnic Communities

Despite the gains that minorities have experienced since the 1960s, there is still tremendous poverty among Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians. The income gap between Whites, Blacks, and Spanish-origin persons remains wide. In 1978, the median income for Whites, Spanish-origin persons, and Blacks were, respectively, $18,368, $12,566, and $10,879 (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 452). Even though a higher percentage of Blacks had completed four years of high school than Hispanics, and had a higher median years of school completed, they had a lower median income.

Blacks fare worse on all of the important economic indicators than both Whites and persons of Spanish origin. Spanish-origin persons are far worse off economically than Whites of non-Spanish origin.   In 1979, over 22 per cent of Black families earned less than $5,000 compared to 14.6 percent for persons of Spanish origin, and 6.5 per cent for Whites (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 466). The per cent of both Blacks and Whites who are below the poverty level has significantly decreased since 1959; yet the number of Blacks and Hispanics who remain at this level is substantial. In 1959, 18.1 per cent of Whites and 56.2 per cent of Blacks were below the poverty level. In 1969, those percentages had dropped to 8.9 and 30.9, respectively. In 1978, 2.6 per cent of persons of Spanish origin were below the poverty level (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 466).

The per cent of female-headed households has increased significantly
for all American families since 1960. In 1960, 9.3 per cent of American
families were headed bv females. That per cent increased to 14.6 in 1979.
During this same period, the per cent of White families with female heads
increased from 8.1 to 11.6, and the per cent of Black familes with female
heads increased from 20.9 to 40.5 (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 452).

In addition to revealing some significant changes in American society
within the last two decades, the above statistics also reveal the sad eco-
nomic plight of many Black Americans. The fact that the number of black
families with female heads nearly doubled between 1960 and 1979 is an
alarming and stark statistic. However, statistics such as this one do not
reveal the total picture of Black America during the last two decades.
There is a significant Black lower class that this kind of statistic
describes. However, it does not describe the significant Black middle
class that has grown since 1960.

There are large lower classes and significant middle classes in the
Black, Puerto Rican, Chicano, and Indian communities. To describe some of
these segments and not the others will result in the perpetuation of myths
and stereotypes about ethnic communities. In 1979, 13.4 per cent of Black
families earned over $25,000. In the same year, 7.9 per cent of the Black
population had completed four or more years of college (Bureau of the
Census, 1980, p. 149). Ten per cent of teachers, except college and uni-
versitv, were Black in 1979; 6.8 per cent of college and university teachers
were Black (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 419).

There are, of course, other important segments and classes within eth-
nic minority communities other than the very poor and the middle class,
such as laborers and kindred workers, sales workers, clerical and kindred
workers, and craft and kindred workers. Families within these categories
of workers make up substantial and important segments of ethnic
communities. The educational needs of minorities within these social class
groups also need to be considered when educational policy is shaped for the
1980s. In many working class ethnic families in which both parents work,
their children do not qualify for special programs that benefit children
from poorer families. Yet their families often do not have enough money
and other resources to support educational experiences, enrichment
activities, and college tuition for them as do middle class parents. Con-
sequently, children from working class ethnic families are often at a
disadvantage because they are from stable homes with two working parents,
yet their parents do not make enough money to provide them with the educa-
tional opportunities they need and deserve.

Educational Issues in the 1980s

The first part of this paper describes the major concepts, ethnic minority youths and educational equity, and the projected status of minorities in the 1980s. This part describes educational issues related to minorities that will be of concern throughout the decade. Successful policies related to these issues must be implemented if ethnic minority students are to experience increased educational equity during the 1980s (see Figure 1).

Teaching Minority Youths the Basic Skills

Ways to help minority youths in all social class groups to attain basic skills in reading, mathematics, and writing will be an important educational issue throughout the 1980s. Because of many complex social reasons, including the fact that the schools are now graduating more students from high schools than ever before in the nation's history, including more minorities--American students often score lower on standardized measures of achievement than they did in the 1960s. The average score for college-bound seniors on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) consistently declined from 1967 to 1979 (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 164). However, as Graham (1980) points out, the general decline in American students' mean academic achievement is not as easy to describe as it is often assumed, and it has not been uniform across subject areas and grade levels. She writes:

Figure 1
School Variables that Promote Educational Equity

Educational Equity is conceptualized as equal achievement
outcomes in this paper. However, it is hypothesized that
the changes described in the squares are necessary for the
school to help minority youths to attain skills and atti-
tudes equal to those of other children.

EQUAL

EDUCATIONAL

OUTCOMES

TEACHING MINORITY

YOUTHS THE BASIC

SKILLS AND AMERICAN

CREED VALUES

Higher Teacher Expectations and Positive Attitudes	Teaching and Motivational Techniques are Consistent with Cultures of Ethnic youths
The Promotion of Language Diversity in the school	Standardized Tests Reflect Cultural Diversity	The Curriculum reflects the diversity in American Society

Although the accusation [the failure to make students literate] is made
universally, I believe the charge should be leveled principally at the
junior and senior high schools. There the inadequacy in academic per-
formance is most startling. The National Assessment of Educational
Progress, which began testing a national sample of students in 1970,
has recorded gains in reading achievement for nine-year-olds throughout
the testing period. Declines have occurred, however, in writing, some
kinds of reading, and in knowledge of science among thirteen-year-olds.
Seventeen-year-olds have similarly shown declines in science and
writing, while reading levels remain about the same. SAT scores, which
ostensibly measure quite different matters, have also declined during
the decade (p. 126-127).

Poor minority youths score less well on standardized measures of

achievement than middle class White youths. They are probably more vic-

timized by skill deficiencies than are White middle class youths. There

are probably many complex reasons for the chronic unemployment rate among

minority teenagers, including racial discrimination and the cultural dif-

ferences between the teenagers seeking jobs and the employers. However,

poor basic skills is probably a significant factor. In 1979, 13.9 per cent

of White youths between the ages of 16 to 19 were unemployed. The per cent

of unemployed minority youths between these ages was 33.6, which is more

than double the per cent for Whites (Bureau of the Census, 1980, p. 398).

Hill (1979a), however, seriously questions the extent to which skill

deficiencies can explain the high unemployment rate among minority youths.

He writes:

The statistical evidence strongly contradicts the popular belief that
persistent high unemployment among black youth is primarily due to
their educational or skill deficiencies--when job opportunities are
greater for white youth with lower educational attainment. White high
school dropouts have lower unemployed rates (22.3%) than black youth
with college education (27.2%). (pp. 78-79)

Defining the Basic Skills

Considerable controversy abounds, not only about the most effective ways to teach minority youths the basic skills, but about ways in which the concept of basic skills should be defined. Many active citizen groups have a limited concept of basic skills, by which they mean fundamental reading, writing, and mathematical skills. These groups have put considerable pressure on the public schools to define the basic skills in this limited way and to test students for their mastery of them. These pressure groups are likely to remain active throughout the 1980s.

Many professional educators believe that it is a serious mistake to define basic skills in such a way that they are limited to fundamental skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. They believe that these skills are very important, but are not sufficient to help children function as effective citizens in the next century. Other skills which educators consider essential are skills in reflective thinking, moral analysis, decision making, literary analysis, and social participation and action.

To function successfully within our complex society, students need to master the basic skills, conceptualized in a way that includes reading, writing, and mathematics, as well as other important skills. Youths who are members of groups that are victims of racial discrimination will especially need skills in decision making, social action, and reflective thinking if they are going to be able to bring about changes that will

further eliminate inequity in our society. Minority youths who have fun-
damental skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, but who have neither
the ability nor the will to contribute to the enhancement of social justice
in America, will be unable to make their maximum contributions to society.
A federal policy which promotes a comprehensive view of basic skills and
literacy is needed for the 1980s.

Theories for Teaching the Basic Skills to Minorities

Since the 1960s, several theories designed to help minority youths
attain basic skills and other important learning outcomes have emerged.
Each of these theories are based on particular assumptions and goals.
Several of the more influential theories are discussed below and summarized
in Table 1. However, absent are the genetic theory, popularized bv
Arthur R. Jensen (1969), the revisionist theory (Bowles & Gintis, 1976;
Katz, 1975), and theories developed by writers such as Jencks et al.
(1972). These latter theories have influenced educational thought but have
had less impact on educational practice than the theories described in
Table 1.

Jensen (1969) focuses on the limits that heredity places on minority
children's abilities to achieve at high levels. The revisionists, and
writers such as Jencks et al. (1972), emphasize the limited effects of
schooling. None of these theories, including those discussed below, are
mutually exclusive. Cultural deprivation teaching strategies, for example,

can be used in a desegregated school. Cultural difference teaching techniques can enhance the effectiveness of desegregated classrooms. However, these theories, summarized in Table 1, are sufficiently different to warrant conceptual distinctions.

The Cultural Deprivation Theorists

Cultural deprivation was one of the first theories concerned with the education of lower class students to emerge in the 1960s. Cultural deprivation theorists assume that lower class youths are not achieving well in school because of family disorganization, poverty, the lack of effective concept acquisition, and because of other intellectual and cultural deficits which these children experience during their first years of life.

Cultural deprivation theorists assume that a major goal of school programs for "culturally deprived" children is to provide them with cultural and other experiences that will compensate for their cognitive and intellectual deficts. Deprivation theorists assume that lower class children can learn the basic skills taught by the schools, but that these skills must often be taught using intensive, behaviorally oriented instruction (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966). Write Bereiter and Englemann:

> From the beginning there is a lag in learning that must be overcome if
> disadvantaged children are to emerge from school with the same skills
> and knowledge as more privileged children. If the lag is to be made up
> during the school years, then schools for disadvantaged children have
> to provide higher-quality instruction and faster-paced education than
> that provided for advantaged children. Another possible solution is to

Table 1

THEORIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS

Theory	Major Assumptions	Major Goals	Some Major Researchers
Cultural Deprivation	The cultures in which lower class youths are socialized are deprived. Consequently, these students have serious cognitive deficits when they enter school. Intensive instruction is needed for these children to perform on parity with other children.	To compensate for the cognitive and emotional deficits that lower class youths have by providing them with cultural experiences that will enrich their languages, enhance their concept attainment abilities, and augment their self-concepts. To increase the academic achievement of disadvantaged youths by providing them with intensive, behaviorally oriented instruction.	Betty Caldwell Carl Bereiter Martin Deutch Siegfried Engelman Frank Reissman
Integration	The most important correlate of academic achievement for minority youths is the social class composition of the school. Racial integration not only improves the performance of minority children, but has important positive social outcomes for both minority and majority group children. It helps	To increase the achievement of minority group children by placing them in desegregated school environments To improve the racial attitudes and human relations skills of all children so that various ethnic and racial groups will live in our society more harmoniously.	Robert L. Green Thomas F. Pettigrew Ray C. Rist Charles V. Willie

25

Table 1 (continued)
THEORIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF ETHNIC MINORITY GROUPS

Theory	Major Assumptions	Major Goals	Some Major Researchers
Integration Cont.	students to develop the social skills and racial attitudes needed to live in a multiracial and multiethnic society.		
Cultural Difference Cultural Pluralism Bicultural	Minority youths have rich and diverse ethnic cultures that have values, languages, and behavioral styles that are functional for them and valuable for American society	To change the school so that it respects and legitimizes the cultures of children from diverse ethnic groups. To make use of the cultures of ethnic youths to successfully teach	Roger D. Abrahams Joan C. Baratz Courtney B. Cazden Asa G. Hilliard, III William Labov John U. Ogbu Jane R. Mercer Manuel Ramirez Muriel Saville-Troike
Multicultural	Minority youths should become multicultural-- able to function success- fully within the main- stream society within their own ethnic commu- nity and within other ethnic subsocieties.	them the basic skills and the values needed to make changes within our society to make it more consistent with American Creed values.	

:

provide this kind of education before the school years--the motivating
idea for preschool education for disadvantaged children (p. 6).

The landmark and widely quoted publication that articulates the

assumptions, methods, and goals of the cultural deprivation approach is The

Culturally Deprived Child by Frank Reissman (1962). Another important

publication in the movement resulted from the "Research Conference on

Education and Cultural Deprivation," held at the University of Chicago,

8-12 June 1964. This conference, which was supported by the U.S. Office of

Education, was attended by leading social scientists and educators. The

major goal of the conference was to describe the problems of educating

"disadvantaged" populations, and to make policy recommendations to local,

state, and national agencies.

In the book based on the conference, Compensatory education for

cultural deprivation (Bloom, Davis, & Hess, 1965), the authors describe

the unique characteristics of culturally deprived children:

> We refer to this group as culturally disadvantaged or culturally
> deprived because we believe the roots of their problem may in large
> part be traced to their experiences in homes which do not transmit the
> cultural patterns necessary for the types of learning characteristic of
> the schools and the larger society (p. 4).
>
> A large proportion of these youths come from homes in which the
> adults have a minimal level of education. Many of them come from homes
> where poverty, large family size, broken homes, discrimination, and
> slum conditions further complicate the picture (p. 5).
>
> What is needed to solve our current as well as future crises in
> education is a system of compensatory education [emphasis added] which
> can prevent or overcome earlier deficiencies in the development of each
> individual (p. 6).

Most of the compensatory educational programs that emerged during the

1960s, such as Head Start, Follow-Through, and Upward Bound, were strongly

undergirded by the assumptions, goals, and methods of the cultural depri-

vation theorists. Carl Bereiter and Seigfried Engelmann (1966) developed

a widely used method to teach young children basic skills in mathematics,

reading, and the language arts. Some of the assumptions that underlie

their program are evident in the following statement about the intellectual

abilities of lower class youths:

> On general intelligence tests, disadvantaged children typically have 5
> to 15 IQ points below average. An average of 15 points on such scales
> is grave indeed, and it is found regularly among Southern Negro
> children and appears to be characteristics of Puerto Rican immigrant
> children. Such a deficit places the average of the group on what is
> now coming to be considered the borderline of <u>mental deficiency</u>,
> [emphasis added], so that roughly half of the children in such groups
> fall into the mentally retarded range (Bereiter & Engleman, 1966,
> p. 4).

The Integrationists

Another group of social science and educational theorists argue that

the most effective way to help minority youths to attain higher levels of

academic achievement is to place them in higher status, racially integrated

schools. The integrationists, citing data gathering by Coleman (1966), in

his massive study, <u>Equality</u> <u>of</u> <u>Educational</u> <u>Opportunity</u>, and the eanalysis

of the Coleman data by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (196"), chaired

by Thomas F. Pettigrew, argue that the social class and racial composition

of the school are the most important correlates of academic achievement for

Black and other minority students. Another important goal of the integra-

tionists is to improve the racial attitudes and human relations skills of

both Anglo and ethnic minority students so that they can live more har-

moniously in our pluralistic society. Robert L. Green (1977), a leading

integration theorist, comments on the positive benefits of school

desegregation:

> The findings on changes in achievement following desegregation indicate
> that black student achievement will improve, and white student achieve-
> ment will be unchanged or may show improvement. There are also other
> reasons that desegregation is in our best interests. The Kerner
> Commission warned that unless children of different races had the
> opportunity to interact in the educational setting, the racial atti-
> tudes produced by three centuries of myth, ignorance, and bias would be
> perpetuated. J. Kenneth Morland has shown that by the end of high
> school in a segregated school system, black children develop favorable
> attitudes about their own racial group but highly unfavorable attitudes
> about whites. Similarly, white children consistently show, from ele-
> mentary school through high school, a favorable ranking of their own
> race and unfavorable ranking of blacks . . . . There is reason to hope
> . . . that integration in our school systems may foster more tolerance
> for and understanding of cultural and racial differences in society.
> The improvements in interracial attitudes can be both immediate and
> long lasting (p. 227).

The integrationist's strategy for improving the education of minority

children evoked considerable controversy during the 1970s, and experienced

a number of setbacks in major cities in the North and West because of the

strong opposition to school desegregation among diverse social class and

ethnic groups. Coleman et al. (1975) strongly challenged the integration-

ist's theory by arguing that school desegregation drives Whites from the

cities, resulting in the resegregation of city schools. Derrick Bell

(1980) believes that desegregated schools are often hostile places for
Black students. Despite the attacks and setbacks they experienced during
the 1970s, the integrationist theorists, such as Pettigrew and Green (1976)
and Rist (1978), continue to discuss the positive consequences they believe
school integration can have for both minority and majority group children.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1976) strongly supports school
desegregation. Through its conferences and publications, the commission
tries to balance much of the negative publicity given in the popular press
to school desegregation by describing school districts in which desegrega-
tion has been successfully implemented, such as in Seattle, Washington and
in Little Rock, Arkansas.   Writes the commission (1976, p 8),
"Despite   the   publicity given to violence in Pontiac, Boston, and
Louisville, numerous communities have implemented the law peacefully.
Although largely ignored by politicians and the national press, these com-
munities represent in many ways the real story of desegregation today."

The Cultural Difference Theorists

Categorizing the cultural pluralism, bicultural, and multicultural
theorists into one group is, to some extent, misleading since there are
important differences among these theorists. Cultural pluralists, such as
Barbara A. Sizemore (1973) and Derrick Bell (1980), for example, are often
strong critics of the effects of school desegregation; whereas bicultural

theorists, such as Alfredo Castaneda and Manuel Ramirez (1974), rarely
discuss school desegregation.

Categorizing these theorists into one group is done here because of the
beliefs, assumptions, and goals they share, and because it is beyond the
scope of this paper to discuss their works in length. All of these theo-
rists strongly reject the assumptions of the cultural deprivation theorists
and argue that educational programs for minorities should be based on dif-
ferent premises.

The cultural pluralism, bicultural, and multicultural theorists are
cultural difference theorists who reject the idea that minority youths have
cultural deficits. They argue that ethnic groups such as Blacks, Chicanos,
Puerto Ricans, and Indians have strong, rich, and diverse cultures. These
cultures, argue the cultural difference theorists, consist of languages and
dialects that are rich and elaborate (Smitherman, 1977), and of values,
behavioral styles, and perspectives that can enrich the lives of all
Americans (Forbes, 1973). Ethnic minority youths, argue these theorists,
fail to achieve highly in school not because they have deprived cultures
but because they have cultures that are different from the school's culture
(Baratz & Baratz, 1970).

Cultural difference theorists believe that the schools often fail to
help minority children to achieve at high levels because they ignore their
cultures and rarely use teaching technique and styles that are consistent

with the culture, lifestyles, and values of minority youths. Research by
bicognitive theorists suggests that ethnic minority and Anglo-American stu-
dents often differ in their cognitive styles and that most teachers have
cognitive styles that match those of Anglo-American students (Ramirez &
Castañeda, 1974).

Ramirez and Castañeda (1974) have found that Mexican American youths
tend to be more field-sensitive than field-independent in their cognitive
styles. Anglo American students tend to be more field-independent. Field-
sensitive and field-independent students differ in behavior and character-
istics. Field-sensitive students tend to like to work with others to
achieve a common goal and are more sensitive to the feelings and opinions
of others than are field-independent students. Field-independent students
prefer to work independently and to compete and gain individual recogni-
tion. Students who are field-independent are more often preferred by
teachers and tend to get higher grades. Research on motivational styles
(Vasquez, 1979), language (Labov, 1970), and patterns of mental abilities
(Stodolsky & Lesser, 1967), also describe important differences in Anglo
and ethnic minority youths which have important pedagogical implications.

Theories for Educating Minorities in the 1980s

The cultural deprivation theory was the most frequently discussed, and
presumably the most widely used, theory for educating lower class minority
youths during the 1960s, especially after passage of the Elementary and

Secondary Education Act (1965), which provided millions of dollars for edu-
cational reform. The Coleman Report, issued in 1966, gave further impetus
to the integrationist's strategy for improving the educational achievements
of minority students. The cultural difference theories arose to challenge
the cultural deprivation position. Valentine's book, Culture and poverty:
Critique and counter-proposals (1968), was one of the first important
theoretical statements to reject the cultural deprivation theory.

Each of these theories are being used to educate lower class and min-
ority youths. This trend is likely to continue during the remainder of the
decade. The cultural deprivation theory, which was harshly criticized
during the late 1970s by many ethnic minority scholars, is likely to gain
more legitimacy during the 1980s because of the heavy emphasis today on
concepts such as "the economic underclass" and "female-headed household."
The integrationist theory is likely to experience continued setbacks during
the 1980s. Research related to cultural differences theories is likely to
continue during the 1980s, although the advocates of these theories are
likely to have increasingly less influence in the national media and in
educational circles throughout the 1980s.

Federal policy should encourage the development, testing, and evalua-
tion of diverse theories for educating minority youths. Approaches and
strategies that are encouraged by the federal government should respect
the rich cultural diversity of minority children, encourage schools to
legitimatize the cultures of these students, and promote the democratic
ideals of the nation state.

Teaching English to Children who Speak Other First Languages

The 1980 census indicates that there are over 14 million Hispanics in the United States. Because of the high birthrate among this population and the continuing immigration from Mexico, the number of Hispanics is likely to increase significantly during the 1980s. Many Hispanic children are reared in homes where the first language spoken is Spanish. Many children who are members of other ethnic groups, especially the recent Asian immigrants, are also raised in homes in which languages other than English are spoken. Throughout the 1980s, the issue of how best to teach English and the other basic skills to linguistic minority students will be an important and controversial issue.

Approaches to teaching English to students who speak other languages range from the strongly assimilationist "English Only" approach, to a method that tries to maintain students' native languages while teaching them English. Prior to the educational reforms of the 1960s, a strongly assimilationist view of language other than English was pervasive in the public schools. A "No Spanish Rule" was often harshly enforced in many schools in Texas and in other parts of the Southwest. Children who were caught speaking Spanish during the school day were frequently punished and ridiculed.

The "Teaching English as a Second Language" approach is assimilationist-oriented since maintenance of the students' first languages is not an

important goal. Rather, the students' native languages are used as
vehicles to help them learn standard English.

The "Bilingual-Bicultural" approach differs from both of the preceding
approaches since its goal is to have students master standard English while
at the same time maintaining and improving their native languages (U.S.
Commission on Civil Rights, 1975). Another important goal of this approach
is to help students learn more about both of the cultures in which the two
languages are imbedded.

A federal policy is needed in the area of second language education
that will serve the best interests of language minority students and
language majority students, as well as the nation state. The "English
Only" approach is probably unacceptable to many Americans today because it
blatantly violates cultural democracy and fairness. The "Teaching English
as a Second Language" approach can help students to learn standard English;
however, children may lose their native languages with this approach.

The "Bilingual-Bicultural" approach seems to offer the most benefits to
all groups of students and to the nation. It helps language minority stu-
dents to maintain competency in their first languages and cultural ties
with their ethnic communities. In effective bilingual-bicultural programs,
both the minority languages and English are taught to both language minor-
ity and language majority students. Both groups of students also learn
more about each other's culture. By acquiring a second language, language

majority students become more ethnically literate, better able to function
effectively within diverse cultural settings, and better able to understand
and appreciate their own unique cultural and linguistic characteristics.
There is a tremendous need for our nation's citizens to increase their
language com~tency and literacy. The President's Commission on Foreign
Language and International Studies (1979) wrote cogently about the cultural
and linguistic illiteracy that plagues the nation. The commission wrote:

> Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security. At a time when
> the resurgent forces of nationalism and of ethnic and linguistic
> consciousness so directly affect global realities, the United States
> requires far more reliable capacities to communictae with its allies,
> analyze the behavior of potential adversaries, and earn the trust and
> sympathies of the uncommitted. Yet, there is a widening gap between
> these needs and the American competence to understand and deal success-
> fully with other peoples in a world of flux.

Standardized Testing

Ethnic minorities, such as Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and
Indians, continue to score far below Whites on I.Q. and other standardized
tests. Consequently, they are frequently placed in low academic tracts
where teachers have low academic expectations for them. Students do not
achieve at their highest possible levels with these expectations and nega-
tive attitudes (Leacock, 1969). Research by multicultural theorists such
as Jane R. Mercer (1974) and Robert L. Williams (1974) indicates that
minorities often score poorly on standardized measures of academic apti-
tude, not because they actually have less academic potential than White
students but because they are not "test wise," and because these tests use

examples from the mainstream culture, which most of these students do not

know as well as they know their own cultures.

Mercer (1974) summarizes some of her research that documents the harm-

ful effects that standardized testing often has on minority group children.

> There were four-and-a-half times more Mexican-American children and
> twice as many Black children labeled mentally retarded as would be
> expected in the school population, and only half as many Euro-American
> children . . . . These objective consequences reveal one of the latent
> functions of I.Q. testing in the public schools--the maintenance of the
> subordinate social position of certain minority groups. The educa-
> tional system functions as a primary institution in allocating persons
> to adult social statuses (p. 82-83).

Despite their harmful consequences for many minority group children,

more rather than fewer standardized tests are likely to be given to all

groups of students during the 1980s. Increasingly, the results of these

kinds of tests will be used to make important decisions about students at

earlier and earlier points in their lives. As colleges are forced to cut

enrollments because of declining resources, they are likely to require

increasingly higher standardized scores for admissions and placement.

Thus, minorities are likely to be especially victimized during the 1980s by

standardized tests and test results. Federal policies need to address this

important problem if many of the educational opportunities gained by minor-

ities during the 1960s and 1970s are not going to be deeply eroded.

Attempts to end the testing of minority students is probably not a

reasonable policy to pursue. Standardized tests are institutionalized in

most schools and colleges, and important decisions are based on them.

Researchers such as Williams (1974) and Mercer (1974) attempted to develop
alternative measures for minority group populations. While the results of
these efforts are promising, considerably more attention needs to be
devoted to alternative ways to identify promising minority students and
those who need educational remediation. Existing standardized aptitude
tests often do not reveal the high academic aptitude of many minority group
students. This is a serious and continuing problem which merits con-
siderable discussion, research, and action at the local, state, and federal
levels.

Minimal Competency Testing

The issue of minimal competency testing will continue to be an impor-
tant and controversial issue in the 1980s. This movement emerged largely
as a response to the public outcry and disappointment over the constantly
declining scores of high school graduates on the Scholastic Aptitude Test
and other measures of academic achievement. Data produced by the National
Assessment of Educational Progress program has enabled Americans to keep a
constant eye on the educational progress of a national sample of students.

The many complex factors that have contributed to the constantly
declining scores of students has not been well understood by the public.
Consequently, the public is demanding that schools define a minimal level
of competency for high school graduates and require graduates to attain
these competencies. This issue will remain problematic in the 1980s

because educators are having a difficult time determining a definition of
"minimal competency," and in assessing minimal competency skills in the
basic skills area. Many leaders are concerned that the initiation of mini-
mal competency testing on a large scale will substantially reduce the
number of minority youths who will be able to graduate from high school,
and consequently will further deny them job opportunities. Federal
assistance is needed in this area to help communities to resolve this
problem in a way that is satisfactory to the public and yet that enhances
rather than denies minority and other youths equal education opportunities.

Preschool Care and Educational Programs

Since the 1960s, the number of female heads of households has substan-
tially increased. Also, the number of women in the work force has
increased. These trends are likely to continue during the 1980s because of
changing values, lifestyles, and because of the pernicious effects of an
inflated economy.

As more families become headed by females and as more women gain full-
time employment, the issue of parenting and day care for preschool children
will become an increasingly important social and educational issue. This
problem is especially acute in the Black community, where the per cent of
female-headed households increased from 20.9 to 40.5 from 1960 to 1979.

This problem is further complicated by the possibility that welfare
reform during the 1980s may make it necessary for many mothers on welfare

to gain full-time work. Children experience critical development points, both cognitively and emotionally, during their first years of life. Preschool and daycare programs in the United States vary tremendously in quality, and in general are not consistent with the quality of the other levels of education in the nation.

Alternative models for providing effective day care for young children need to be developed, tested, and evaluated. Models where private industry assumes a major responsibility for the day care needs of its workers need to be studied and examined for their possible contribution to an effective solution to this problem. Because of declining enrollments in most public schools systems throughout the United States, many school districts have vacated buildings that might be converted to successful centers for preschool programs sponsored by other agencies and institutions.

Private and Public Schools

About 10 per cent of the elementary and high school students in the United States attend private schools. This per cent is likely to increase during the 1980s because of the public's rising disillusionment with the perceived quality of the nation's public schools. The recent study by Coleman, Hoffer, and Kilgore (1981) provides research support for many of the widely held premises about private schools. These researchers con-cluded that (a) private schools produce better cognitive outcomes than public schools, (b) private schools provide a safer, more disciplined, and

more ordered environment than do public schools, and (c) non-Catholic pri-
vate schools have lower teacher/student ratios than do public schools.
However, Catholic schools have higher teacher/student ratios than do public
schools. These researchers also concluded that non-Catholic private school
students have both higher levels of self-esteem and fate control than stu-
dents in public or Catholic schools.

The policy issues related to private and public schools are made more
complex by other findings in the Coleman study. Private schools enroll a
smaller percentage of Black students than do the public schools, but Black
students are more segregated in public than in private schools. Private
schools are also strongly divided along religious lines. While the
majority of Catholics attend public schools, over 90 per cent of the stu-
dents who attend Catholic schools are Catholic. Coleman et al. also found
that private schools have a narrow range of extracurricular activities and
fewer course offerings in vocational and other nontraditional subject
areas.

Coleman et al. believe that their research findings provide more sup-
port for policies that will increase rather than decrease the role of pri-
vate schools in American education. They write:

> It is hard, however, to avoid the overall conclusion that the factual
> premises underlying policies that would facilitate the use of private
> schools are much better supported on the whole than those underlying
> policies that would constrain their use. Or, to put it another way,
> the constraints imposed on schools in the public sector . . . seem to
> impair their functioning as educational institutions, without providing

the more egalitarian outcomes that are one of the goals of public schooling (p. xxix).

The Coleman et al. study added fuel to a fire that was already burning over issues related to public and private schools. Many professional educators harshly criticized Coleman et al.'s findings and argued that the study was designed to undercut support for the public school and to bolster the growing political support for tax credits for private school tuition. Supporters of private schools have eagerly endorsed the findings and often cite them in public forums. However, the issues concerning the role of private and public schools in American education are far larger and more complex than the Coleman et al. study, and are likely to demand a con- siderable amount of public attention in the 1980s.

Government policies should be devised that will promote pluralism in American education, and yet try to improve the public schools (and/or the public perceptions of them), so that public confidence in public education can be restored and the desertion of the public schools by the middle class will be slowed. Middle class parents from diverse racial and ethnic groups are deserting the public schools in increasing numbers because they are losing faith in the public school's ability to teach their children the basic skills and to help them acquire values they deem important.

Coleman et al.'s study (1981) indicates that:

At the middle and higher income levels, the increase in probability of enrollment of blacks with increase in income is higher than that of whites. At virtually all income levels, both the probability of

enrollment of Hispanics and the increase in that probability with
income are higher than for non-Hispanic Whites (p. xxviii).

This evidence suggests that middle class minorities may be more eager to
send their children to private schools than are Whites with comparable
incomes.

Unless decisive steps are taken to improve the public perception of the
nation's common schools, restore confidence in them among middle class
populations, and make them safer places for children and teachers, the
exodus of middle class parents from the public schools is likely to esca-
late during the 1980s. If this happens, within a few decades, our public
schools will be attended primarily by White and minority poor. This would
be a serious consequence for our nation. The public school is one of the
few institutions in our society where there is still the possibility that
children can be brought together to learn the ideals of American democracy
within the context of racial, ethnic, and social class diversity.
Admittedly, the school has not come anywhere near to fulfilling this
possibility. However, the dream still lives.

Ethnic Studies Programs

One result of the ethnic revitalization movements of the 1960s and
1970s was the establishment of ethnic studies programs within the common
schools and colleges and/or the inclusion of ethnic content into the main-
stream curricula of these institutions. Advocates of ethnic studies

programs and curricula argued, during the first phase of these programs,
that ethnic studies courses and programs were needed to help minority
youths to gain a sense of pride in their past and to better understand the
experiences of their peoples. As these programs were developed, however,
educators increasingly began to state that the information and concepts
they taught were beneficial for all students and not just for ethnic
minorities.

Courses and programs related to ethnic studies also became more
scholarly and intellectually rigorous during the late 1970s and early
1980s. This trend will continue. In the 1980s, because of declining
resources and the low status that ethnic studies courses programs typically
have within their institutions, and because of the conservative political
atmosphere in the nation, ethnic studies face the possibility of severe
reductions in most institutions and elimination in others. Policies need
to be devised and implemented that will help educators assess the status of
these programs and courses, determine their strengths and weaknesses, and
ascertain which aspects of them should be retained and which can make the
best contribution to educational equity and the liberal education of all
students in the nation's common schools and colleges.

Summary

While it is difficult for social scientists to forecast the future, the
same inquiry modes that are used to describe the past and present must be
used to depict possible futures. An examination of the past and present
status of ethnic minority groups that have enormous social, economic, and
educational problems suggests that their status will not change signifi-
cantly during the remainder of the decade. These groups are likely to be
characterized by a large lower class and a significant middle class
throughout the 1980s. However, the rate of growth of the middle class
within ethnic minority communities is likely to be slowed for much of the
decade. The working class will also remain a significant segment of ethnic
communities.

Educational policy and programs during the 1980s should be designed to
increase educational equity for minority group populations. Equity should
be defined primarily in terms of the results of schooling. To help minor-
ities experience increased educational equity in the 1980s, educational
policy should reflect the enormous diversity both between and within ethnic
groups. The following educational issues require attending and effective
policies if minorities are to experience increased educational equity in
the 1980s: (a) teaching minority youths the basic skills, (b) teaching
English to children who speak other first languages, (c) standardized
testing of minority group students, (d) minimal competency testing,

(e) preschool care and educational programs, (f) private and public

schools, (g) ethnic studies programs.

(38)G

References

Banks, J. A. Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. Boston:
Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Banks, J. A. Teaching strategies for eti.. : studies (2nd ed.). Boston:
Allyn and Bacon, 1979.

Baratz, S. S., & Baratz, J. C. Early childhood intervention: The social
science base of institutional racism. Harvard Educatonal Review, 1970,
40, 29-50.

Bell, D. (Ed.). New perspectives on school desegregation. New York:
Teachers College Press, 1980.

Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. Teaching disadvantaged children in the
preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bloom, B., Davis, A., & Hess, R. Compensatory education for cultural
deprivation. New York: Holt, 1965.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. Schooling in capitalist America. New York:
Basic Books, 1976.

Bureau of Census. Statistical abstract of the United States.
Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Coleman, J. S. The concept of equality in educational opportunity. In
Equal educatonal opportunity. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,
1969.

Coleman, J. S. et al. Equality of educational opportunity.

    Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coleman, J. S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S. Public and private schools. A

    report to the National Center for Education Statistics by the National

    Opinion Research Center, Chicago, March 1981.

Coleman, J. S., Kelley, S. D., & Moore, J. A. Recent trends in school

    integration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American

    Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1975.

Cremin, L. A. Public education. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Forbes, J. D. Teaching Native American values and cultures. In

    J. A. Banks (Ed.), Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies.

    Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1973.

Gay, G. Interactions in culturally pluralistic classrooms. In J. A. Banks

    (Ed.), Education for the 80s: Multiethnic education. Washington D.C.:

    National Education Association, 1981.

Graham, P. A. Whither equality of educational opportunity? Daedalus,

    1980, 109, 115-132.

Green, R. L. The urban challenge: Poverty and race. Chicago: Follett,

    1977.

Greenbaum, W. America in search of a new ideal: An easay on the rise of

    pluralism. Harvard Educat⁻nal Review, 1974, 44, 411-440.

Hill, R. B. The illusion of Black progress: A statement of facts. In

    C. V. Willie, Caste and class controversy. Bayside, N. Y.: General

    Hall, Publishers, 1979(a).

Hill, R. B. The widening gap. Washington, D.C.: National Urban League
    Research Department, 1979(b).

Jencks, C. et al. Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and
    schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jensen, A. R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement?
    Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1-123.

Jones, F. C. External crosscurrents and internal diversity: An assessment
    of Black progress, 1960-1980. Daedalus, 1981, 110, 71-101.

Katz, M. B. Class, bureaucracy, and schools. (Expanded ed.) New York:
    Praeger, 1975.

Kitano, H. H. L. Japanese Americans: The evolution of a subculture (2nd
    ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Labov, W. The logic of nonstandard English. In F. Williams (Ed.),
    Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme. Chicago: Markham
    Publishing Company, 1970.

Leacock, E. B. Teaching and learning in city schools. New York: Basic
    Books, 1969.

Mercer, J. R. Latent functions of intelligence testing n the public
    schools. In L. P. Miller (Ed.), The testing of Black students.
    Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Pang, V. O. The self-concept of Japanese American and White American
    children in the fourth through sixth grade as measured by a modified
    Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale. Unpublished doctoral
    dissertation, University of Washington, 1981.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Green, R. L. School desegregation in large cities:
A critique of the Coleman "white flight" thesis. Harvard Educational
Review, 1976, 46, 1-53.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies.
Strength through wisdom: A critique of U.S. Capability.
Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Ramirez, Manuel, III, & Castañeda, A. Cultural democracy, bicognitive
development, and education. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Ravitch, D. The revisionists revised. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Reissman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper, 1962.

Rist, R. C. The invisible children: School integration in American
society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Scammon, R. M., & Wattenberg, B. J. Black progress and liberal rhetoric.
Commentary, April 1973, pp. 35-44.

Sizemore, B. A. Shattering the melting pot myth. In J. A. Banks (Ed.),
Teaching ethnic studies: Concepts and strategies. Washington, D.C.:
National Council for the Social Studies, 1973.

Smitherman, G. Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America.
New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1977.

Sowell, T. Affirmative action harms the disadvantaged. The Wall Street
Journal, 28 July 1981, p. 26.

Stodolsky, S. S., & Lesser, G. Learning patterns of the disadvantaged.
Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 546-593.

Sue, D. W. <u>Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice</u>.
New York: Wiley, 1981.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. <u>A better chance to learn: Bilingual-
Bicultural education</u>. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing
Office, 1975.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. <u>Fulfilling the letter and spirit of the
law: Desegregation of the nation's public schools</u>. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. <u>Racial isolation in the public schools</u>.
Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Valentine, C. A. <u>Culture and poverty: Critique and counter-proposals</u>.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Vasquez, J. A. Bilingual education's needed third dimension. <u>Educational
Leadership</u>, 1979, <u>37</u>, 166-168.

Williams, R. L. The problem of match and mismatch in testing Black
children. In L. P. Miller (Ed.), <u>The testing of Black students</u>.
Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Willie, C. V. <u>Caste and class controversy</u>. Bayside, N. J.: General Hall,
Publishers, 1979.

Wilson, W. J. <u>The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing
American institutions</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Sue, D. W. <u>Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice</u>.
New York: Wiley, 1981.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. A better chance to learn: Bilingual-
Bicultural education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing
Office, 1975.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Fulfilling the letter and spirit of the
law: Desegregation of the nation's public schools. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Racial isolation in the public schools.
Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Valentine, C. A. Culture and poverty: Critique and counter-proposals.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Vasquez, J. A. Bilingual education's needed third dimension. Educational
Leadership, 1979, 37, 166-168.

Williams, R L. The problem of match and mismatch in testing Black
children. In L. P. Miller (Ed.), The testing of Black students.
Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Willie, C. V. Caste and class controversy. Bayside, N. J.: General Hall,
Publishers, 1979.

Wilson, W. J. The declining significance of race: Blacks and changing
American institutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.