
Multicultural Education Policies in Canada and the United States



Edited by Reva Joshee and Lauri Johnson

Multicultural Education Policies
in Canada and the United States



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

We dedicate this volume to a friend and mentor who has been a beacon for many in the field of multicultural education, James A. Banks.

© UBC Press 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright (Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency), www.accesscopyright.ca.

16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100 percent post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free, with vegetable-based inks.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States /
Reva Joshee and Lauri Johnson, editors.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1325-9

1. Multicultural education – Canada. 2. Multicultural education – United States.
I. Joshee, Reva, 1960- II. Johnson, Lauri

LC1099.M8375 2007 370.117'0971 C2007-900346-X

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Additional support for this publication came from the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy and the Canadian American Studies Committee at the University at Buffalo.

Printed and bound in Canada by Friesens

Set in Stone by Blakeley

Copy editor: Sarah Wight

Proofreader: Gail Copeland

Indexer: Rebecca Lewis

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

604.822.5959 / Fax 604.822.6083

www.ubcpres.ca

Contents

Figures and Tables / viii

Foreword / ix

Charles Ungerleider

Acknowledgments / xv

Introduction: Cross-Border Dialogue and Multicultural Policy Webs / 3

Lauri Johnson and Reva Joshee

Part 1: Historical Context

1 Past Crossings: US Influences on the Development of Canadian Multicultural Education Policy / 17

Reva Joshee and Susan Winton

2 Diversity Policies in American Schools: A Legacy of Progressive School Leadership and Community Activism / 28

Lauri Johnson

3 We Are Already Multicultural: Why Policy and Leadership Matter / 42

Yoon K. Pak

Part 2: First Nations and Native American Education

4 First Nations Education Policy in Canada: Building Capacity for Change and Control / 51

Jan Hare

5 Policy Issues in the Education of American Indians and Alaska Natives / 69

John W. Tippeconnic III and Sabrina Redwing Saunders

- 6** What We Know about Native Participation in Higher Education / 83
Augustine McCaffery

Part 3: Immigrant and Language Education

- 7** Canadian Policies on Immigrant Language Education / 93
Tracey M. Derwing and Murray J. Munro
- 8** Language Education in the Conflicted United States / 107
Carlos J. Ovando and Terrence G. Wiley
- 9** A Critical Examination of Language Policies and Practices in Canada and the United States / 120
Karen M. Gourd

Part 4: Race-Based Policies

- 10** Race-Based Policies in Canada: Education and Social Context / 131
Adrienne S. Chan
- 11** Education, American Style: Race-Based School Policies and Practices in the United States / 146
Christopher M. Span, Rashid V. Robinson, and Trinidad Molina Villegas
- 12** Canadian and American Race-Based Education Policies / 159
Njoki Nathani Wane

Part 5: Employment Equity and Affirmative Action

- 13** Canada's Employment Equity Act: Perspectives on Policy and Implementation / 167
Carol Agocs
- 14** Critical Race Theory and Interest Convergence in the Backlash against Affirmative Action: Washington State and Initiative 200 / 188
Edward Taylor
- 15** Dialogue across Borders on Employment Equity/Affirmative Action / 204
Michelle Goldberg

Part 6: Extending the Dialogue

16 Institutional Racism in Education Policy and Practice:

A View from England / 217

David Gillborn

17 Multicultural Policies and Practices in North America:

A Dialogue with the View from England / 241

Catherine Cornbleth, Rinaldo Walcott, Carlos J. Ovando, and Terezia Zoric

Contributors / 248

Index / 252

Figures and Tables

Figures

- 16.1 Tiering in GCSE examinations / 225
- 16.2 Relative attainment by age and ethnicity / 227

Tables

- 7.1 Top ten source countries for Canadian immigrants, 2001 / 94
- 13.1 Representation of employees who are members of designated groups in firms covered by the Employment Equity Act, Canada, 1987 and 2001 / 174
- 16.1 Ethnic origin and GCSE attainment / 222

Foreword

Charles Ungerleider

Over the last sixty-five years, Canada has charted a course unique among nations in pursuit of a sometimes elusive and controversial vision of a multicultural society. In this vision, people retain their heritage languages and their cultural identifications while enjoying the full benefits of a citizenship founded on shared rights, freedoms, and obligations: “Canada, with its policy of ‘multiculturalism within a bilingual framework’ and its recognition of Aboriginal rights to self-government, is one of the few countries which has officially recognized and endorsed both polyethnicity and multinationality” (Kymlicka 1995, 22).¹

Canada’s journey toward the vision of a cohesive, multicultural society has taken a number of detours and experienced a number of delays. Not all Canadians have benefited equally from or embraced with enthusiasm the goals of multiculturalism. Nor have all of the implied promises of multiculturalism been fully realized. Some critics have said that multiculturalism has been a way for political parties to win the support of immigrants by offering them multicultural programs actually designed to promote their assimilation. Other critics have said that multiculturalism was an attempt to reduce anti-French feelings among nonfrancophones angered by Canada’s policies of bilingualism and biculturalism. Still others have expressed concern that the emphasis on multiculturalism might increase cultural group identification at the expense of Canadian social cohesion. Now, after more than thirty years of multiculturalism as *official* state policy, it is appropriate to ask what Canada has achieved that distinguishes it from the United States, where multiculturalism is neither an official nor unofficial state policy but where it is possible nonetheless to speak of multicultural policy.

This volume is dedicated to a cross-border dialogue on the development and impact of multicultural policies in Canada and the United States. As a border crosser, I am well positioned to comment on the benefits and pitfalls of cross-border dialogues – especially ones involving the United States and Canada. I was born and educated in the United States and have spent more

than half of my life in Canada. I often traverse what is frequently called “the longest undefended border in the world.” My educational preparation in political science, sociology, and education, and my vocation in applied sociology and educational research, incline me to the analysis of social phenomena and the application of such analyses to public policy.

In my capacities as associate dean for teacher education at the University of British Columbia and deputy minister of education for the Province of British Columbia I had many opportunities to host international visitors interested in various dimensions of Canadian society. Over time I came to realize that I was as much a beneficiary of these sessions as the visitors were. My ability to describe and explain the phenomena of interest to my guests improved over time. Recurrent themes included concern for Canadian identity, social cohesion, the role of the state in the lives of citizens, collective versus individual orientations, and policies that addressed issues of equity and social justice. The clarity of my expositions and their intelligibility to my visitors increased as I learned to connect them with contexts familiar to my visitors and identify important similarities and differences. Many of those conversations were catalytic in promoting my understanding. The questions prompted me to consider taken-for-granted experiences in new light or to penetrate surface understanding in search of deeper meaning. These sessions heightened my own understanding of familiar Canadian policies and practices as well as my appreciation of their strengths and shortcomings.

Identity was an inevitable point of entry to conversation with many visitors. Some visitors from the United States were interested in exploring the application of the “melting pot” to the Canadian context. In the United States, democracy was considered the crucible in which differences among immigrants would be melted and forged into a new American alloy. Many US visitors challenged the American melting pot shibboleth and were curious how – and how successfully – Canada had responded to the challenge of integrating newcomers into the social fabric and ensuring that Canadian society accommodated immigrants.

I explained that Canada has developed a different response to the questions of how much and what kind of diversity it can and should accommodate while preserving its identity and cohesion as a nation. Over the last sixty-five years, Canada has tried to become a society in which its citizens can retain the characteristics and values of the groups with which they identify. The belief – and *belief* is the operative word – is that Canadians should be able to retain the characteristics and values of their ancestors, so long as that retention does not create inequality.

Many visitors from the United States commented on the American penchant for, and preoccupation with, the individual. Some opined that the emphasis on the individual was attributable to two of the animating forces of the American state – liberty and the pursuit of happiness – and consequent

efforts to ensure that the rights of the individual take precedence over those of the group. These border crossers were eager to know how Canada managed the tensions between the individual and the group.

I acknowledged that Canada has tried – not always successfully – to achieve a balance between the rights of the individual and the rights of the group. Canadians enjoy protections of fundamental freedoms – of speech, association, and religion – similar to those enjoyed by Americans. But Canada recognizes group rights. What is addressed less formally in the United States, receives formal attention in the Canadian context. For example, Canada protects minority language education rights of French and English speakers as denominational, separate, and dissentient rights and privileges. Canadians value their multicultural heritage and mention it explicitly in their Constitution. Canadians seek to preserve and enhance links to their ancestral origins by ensuring that their Charter rights are interpreted in a manner consistent with that heritage. Treaty rights of Aboriginal peoples, their rights and freedoms enshrined in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, and the rights they have obtained or may obtain by means of land claims settlements are also guaranteed. Canadians have also committed themselves to addressing disparities by promoting equal opportunities for all Canadians no matter where they live. The Canadian government encourages economic development so that inequality of opportunity is reduced or eliminated. Essential public services, such as health care and education, are provided to all Canadians.

American visitors have observed that although recent immigration to the United States continues to belie the melting pot thesis, the United States still enjoys strong allegiance to the state – even among groups for whom the American dream has remained elusive. The apparent success of the United States in securing the attachment of newcomers is attributed to the communication of American norms and values, intensified in recent years by external threats. These values permeate the mass media, school, religion, and even the workplace to reinforce a “we-feeling” among Americans despite their social location or circumstance.

According to some of my border-crossing informants, the self-confidence of the United States is due to more than simply its military and economic might, though these factors certainly contribute to a strong national self-image. Its revolutionary origins contribute to an image of the United States as uncompromising. Its survival of a civil war – which they point out is commonly defined in moral rather than economic terms – seems designed to reinforce the image of an enduring and strong central government. Even its enduring racial conflict, they say, helps to contribute to the self-image of a nation struggling to ensure that freedom and equality triumph over bigotry and discrimination.

After spending some time in Canada, many of these same visitors observe that Canada’s sense of self seems weak in comparison with the United States.

Some ask directly what is on the minds of all who visit Canada: how does Canada manage to remain a socially cohesive society with an apparently weak sense of self in the face of such forces as regional alienation, Quebec nationalism, ethnocultural diversity, economic globalization, proximity to the most powerful nation on earth, and increasing individualism?

They observe that demographic and social patterns seem to militate against social cohesion of the Canadian state. They note that Canada is sparsely populated for its size, with its 32 million people living primarily in cities along a narrow corridor in close proximity to the US border. Canadian travel patterns seem to follow a geography that has them moving from north to south rather than east or west. So many Canadians live in Los Angeles someone quipped that it is Canada's second-largest city.

Many have observed that, unlike the United States, Canada is unable to sustain its population through childbirth alone. To maintain its population and a standard of living that depends on maintaining a workforce sufficiently large to support social services, Canada's survival depends on immigration. Immigrants have typically comprised about 15 percent of Canada's population. Recent immigration to Canada is about 18 percent of the population, while current US immigration is closer to 11 percent. Because a constant influx of newcomers is necessary for Canada's survival, ensuring the integration of immigrants into Canadian society is a continuing task.

While the United States has a strong, enduring, and reasonably well-integrated two-party political system at both the national and state levels, Canada's political landscape is more fragmented. Four official parties are represented in the House of Commons, each with a more or less regional base. The Conservative strength is in the West and East, the Liberal strength is in Ontario and Quebec, the Bloc Québécois is exclusive to Quebec, and the New Democratic Party is supported here and there outside of central Canada. These regional differences and party differentiation account for the fact that the Liberals formed a majority government in 2000 even though they earned only 40 percent of the popular vote. In more recent years these regional differences have led to two successive minority governments.

Canada's symbols are not evocative. Where the United States has the bald eagle, a commanding presence, Canadians have the beaver – a furry creature with a dental structure that is easily caricatured. Canada's flag is less than forty years old, and "O Canada" is sung in both official languages, each version conveying subtle and not-so-subtle differences in meaning.

Observers comment that the image of Canada communicated by its media is dominated by political fragmentation and differences. Whereas American media provide a clear and constant image of the United States, the image of Canada reflects its fragility. Observers are puzzled that even the national media – the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board of Canada – communicate different messages about Canada in English

and French. That Canadians have greater access to cable television networks than any other country in the world – many originating outside of Canada's borders – makes the communication of common norms and values tenuous. Canada has systematically fettered its national broadcasting service to the point that its audiences are small, demographically isolated, and linguistically fragmented. Despite assertions to the contrary, Canada has no national newspaper and no national news magazine to convey to Canadians a sense of themselves as a cohesive nation.

Canada's indigenous film industry is insignificant in comparison to that of the United States. Canadian films do not draw the audiences that films from the United States do. Canadian radio and television must meet quotas for the inclusion of "Canadian content," but no Canadian content quotas ensure that Canadian films receive screen time or distribution. Canada dares not even dream of invoking preferential measures for its film industry for, if it did, representatives of American producers would fly north to threaten Canadian policy makers and theatre owners with retribution.

Like the United States, Canada is a confederation. Like the US states, Canadian provinces have fought to retain and exercise powers not accorded to the Government of Canada and have successfully maintained their distinctive identities. While American politicians seem anxious to proclaim their allegiance to the United States, few Canadian politicians seem capable of seeing beyond the horizon of their local and regional interests. As a consequence, Canada's central institutions do not exert the influence that is exercised by the US federal government.

Canadians do not refer to the Government of Canada as their "national" government, since "nation" – in the Canadian context – refers to founding nations: English, French and more recently Aboriginal, implying differences based on ancestry. Consider that the provincial legislature of Quebec is called the National Assembly – proclaiming what many of its residents regard as both reality and aspiration.

As this volume makes clear, ironies are at work with respect to multicultural policies in both countries. For example, despite its self-definition as the crucible for ethnocultural differences, the United States is populated by people who cling tenaciously to their heritage cultures and languages. Neither sustained messages encouraging assimilation nor episodic attacks such as English-only laws seem capable of completely eradicating difference. In Canada, with its officially declared vision of a society in which it is permissible – even desirable – to retain one's cultural self-identification and home language, heritage-language retention beyond the second generation is infrequent and beyond the third a rarity, and exogenous marriage is commonplace.

This suggests that while our heritage culture and languages are important reference points for self-definition, they are susceptible to influence by the

context in which we find ourselves. It also suggests that the state – though influential – is not determinative in matters such as self-identification. The state can affect the environment in which ethnocultural identities develop and contend. But as the events of the last ten or fifteen years have shown, the state can neither eradicate ethnocultural identifications that provide salient points of self-reference or attachment for those who wish to retain them, nor cause them to flourish when they no longer serve us.

In addition to important insights into multiculturalism in the United States and Canada, this volume contains lessons for those interested in border-crossing policy analysis. The policies pursued under the ambit of multiculturalism are indicative of the value preferences at work when the policies were adopted and pursued. Policy change also reflects contemporary exigencies and values. Thus, it is important to inquire about the implications of the policies implemented at a particular time and the values that underpin them, as well as the universe of alternatives available to decision makers and the constraints – cultural, social, political, economic, and historical – under which they worked.

Border-crossing policy analysts should be sensitive to context. The successful analyst is part historian, part sociologist, part economist, and so on, avoiding the temptation to judge past decisions by today's standards. For if today's standards had existed at the time, it is likely that different decisions would have been made and different policies adopted. As this volume makes very clear, real-world policy making is temporally and contextually specific. It is the contextual sensitivity and temporal immediacy that cause the adrenalin rush for border-crossing policy analysts. Enjoy it!

Notes

- 1 Canada is a state that incorporates distinct and potentially self-governing groups – First Nations, Métis, Inuit, English, and French – as well as immigrants from many national communities. See Kymlicka 1995, 10-33.

References

Kymlicka, W. 1995. *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Acknowledgments

Earlier versions of many of the chapters in this book were presented at two Canada/US cross-border conferences. The first, "Canadian/US Conference on Multicultural Policy," was held on 8 June 2002 and sponsored by the Canadian Studies Center at the University of Washington. The second conference, "Dialogue on Multicultural and Diversity Policies in Canada and the United States: Symbol or Substance?," was sponsored by the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy at the University at Buffalo on 22-23 May 2003, with additional support from the Canadian American Studies Committee and the Graduate School of Education at the University at Buffalo.

Work like this inevitably involves a number of people, many of whom toil in the background with little recognition. In particular we'd like to thank Emily Andrew, Camilla Blakeley, Nadine Fabbri, Jane Goodlet, Becky Lewis, Laura Mangan, Kara Olidge, and Michael Stanford for their invaluable help at various points in this process. We thank the participants in the two conferences and the students in our three cross-border classes for their contributions to the dialogue. Many thanks as well to all of the contributors for their excellent work and cooperation. Most especially we'd like to thank our respective families for the support, understanding, and love that took us through the most difficult moments.



Introduction: Cross-Border Dialogue and Multicultural Policy Webs

Lauri Johnson and Reva Joshee

Since at least the 1990s there has been considerable interest in comparative studies of multicultural policies. In part this interest has been fuelled by a growing awareness of the multiethnic nature of most contemporary nation-states and the need to account for this aspect of pluralism in public policy. The Management of Social Transformations program of UNESCO, for example, was initiated in the 1990s to bring the attention of researchers and policy developers to issues of public policy in multiethnic societies (see, for example, Inglis 1996; Premdas 1998). The International Metropolis project, also launched in the 1990s, is dedicated to increasing knowledge on issues related to immigration and to providing a forum for discussions among researchers, policy developers, and nongovernmental organizations. It now involves participants from over twenty countries and several international organizations. As a result of these and other initiatives the past decade saw several international and comparative publications on multicultural policies (such as Inglis 1996; Wieviorka 1998; Young 1998) and immigration policies (such as Cohen and Layton-Henry 1997; Favell 2001; Joppke and Morawska 2003). While many of these works made some reference to education, it was not a central concern in much of this research.

Comparative multicultural education has attracted some interest since the 1970s – the beginning of the current era of multiculturalism in Canada and the United States (for example, Tonkin 1977). But sustained interest in comparative multicultural education has been a recent development (Sutton 2005). As Sutton notes, most of the current comparative work done in the name of multicultural education focuses on “issues of identity, diversity, and citizenship” (97). Typical comparative volumes present chapters on individual countries. Carl Grant and Joy Lei (2001), for example, edited an international volume that includes chapters on multicultural education in North America, South America, Europe, Asia, and Africa. More recently James Banks (2004) has prepared a volume on citizenship education in diverse societies that also includes chapters from each of these five continents. In addition, there have

been several works on comparative bilingual and multilingual education (for example, Baker and Jones 1998; Cenoz and Genesee 1998; Cummins and Corson 1997; Schiffman 1996). While the works on bilingualism and multilingualism recognize the multiethnic nature of societies, any discussion of policy is typically limited to language policy. Among the studies on language, only one has focused specifically on Canada and the United States (Ricento and Burnaby 1998). To date there has been no attempt to look in depth at the full array of multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States.

Despite a deep-rooted multicultural policy history (see Chapters 2 and 3), we live in a time when diversity initiatives do not receive much support in either of our countries. Some scholars attribute this to the recent neoliberal turn in political and popular thought (see, for example, Apple 2004; Ball 1998). Others contend that undermining diversity is consistent with the underlying premises of the democratic liberal state, which require drawing boundaries between those who are members and those who are not (for example, Cole 2000; Goldberg 2002). While we recognize these claims, we believe the competing impetus for equality, also foundational to the liberal democratic state, provides an avenue for work for diversity. As scholars interested in the study of multicultural and diversity policies, we are also activists committed to exploring ways to think about these policies that provide for possibility as well as critique. Our mutual quest has led us to engage in an extended dialogue over the last seven years about policy issues in our two countries, Canada and the United States, and to recognize the power of dialogue as a method for understanding policy. In the remainder of this introduction we recount briefly the major components of our own policy dialogue, speak to the insights we have gained through the process, and argue that systematic cross-border dialogue, as evidenced by the chapters in this book, is a productive approach to comparative policy study.

As policy researchers, we identify as pragmatic postpositivists. We are attracted to postpositivist approaches that emphasize critique and deconstruction and draw attention to issues of power and discourse. As activists, however, we feel compelled to use our insights to engage with policy developers in ways that will move the policy process forward. We are sympathetic with Piers Blaikie (2001, 2), who notes, "There comes a point in the deconstruction of policy truth claims and the rational model for policy making, when the reader asks, having witnessed another deft act of deconstruction, yet another description of contested terrains, 'So what?' and 'What now?'" Indeed, these are questions we have asked each other and our colleagues. In part our response to these questions has been a historical examination of diversity policies that allows us to examine issues of power, uncover the competing discourses that structured earlier struggles, and produce what Emery Roe (1994) might call new policy narrative contenders. By engagement in

cross-border policy dialogue we have attempted to use these alternate narratives to rethink current approaches to issues in multicultural education.

What Do We Mean by Policy Dialogue?

The term *policy dialogue* is used in a variety of ways in the literature. Several scholars talk about deliberation or discussion as a central component of their approaches to policy analysis (for example, DeLeon 1997; Dryzek 1990; Fischer and Forrester 1993; Mansbridge 1997; Reich 1990). As Yusuf Bangura (1997) notes, the literature outlines at least five different models of policy dialogue. Common to all models is the understanding that dialogue involves discussion about a specific policy issue that brings together individuals and groups deemed to be stakeholders. Bangura explains, "Policy dialogue is defined as an organized deliberation between two or more actors on the allocation of values that is likely to result in new policies or modifications of existing ones. Implicit in the concept of policy dialogue is a clarification of the issues and an understanding of the interests and concerns of contending parties" (5). While some of these elements apply to our notion of policy dialogue, in our current endeavour we are more concerned with dialogue as a process that allows us to engage across national contexts about common policy issues that may have had different trajectories in our two countries.

For us, policy dialogue is a process through which the parties involved convey their own sense of, position on, and story about an issue. Unlike a simple conversation or discussion, dialogue implies coming to new understandings about issues of common concern by listening, asking clarifying questions, recognizing and talking about points of disagreement, engaging in critique and reflection on our own national contexts, and moving the project forward by asking the question: what new insight does this bring to our policy project?

Our particular approach to cross-border policy dialogue demands first that we understand that the policy area under study is broader than simply one policy statement or group of policy statements. We believe that the entire context and scope of the policy area must be taken into account and that dialogue helps us to uncover the links between specific policies in each country, identifying the "policy webs" (Joshee and Johnson 2005) within each country and internationally.

Multicultural Policy Webs

Most studies of multicultural education in Canada and the United States focus on explicating different theoretical approaches (for example, Dei 1996; Sleeter 1996), critiquing work in the field (for example, Lesko and Bloom 2000; Rezai-Rashti 1995), understanding how multiculturalism looks in practice (for example, Hudak 2000; Solomon and Allen 2001), or some combination of the above. While all of these approaches have implications for policies,

policy is generally not their focal point. The few policy studies in multicultural education that do exist have generally taken a narrow view by starting from a discrete policy statement and making links between that statement and what is happening in classrooms and schools (for example, McCaskell 1995). Because the statements and practices rarely match, policy analysts conclude that there is resistance or a lack of commitment to implementing the policy, or that teachers lack multicultural resources and a sufficient knowledge base about diversity (for example, Echols and Fisher 1992; Harper 1997; Tator and Henry 1991). This approach to linking policy and practice does not account for the fact that multicultural policies are generally embedded in states and organizations with histories of racism and exclusion.

We believe that rather than being analyzed individually, diversity policies should be considered within the complex of policies that address the range of issues associated with multiculturalism. In both Canada and the United States, multicultural education is part of a larger complex of policies and programs meant to address social and cultural inequality. As Julia O'Connor (1998, 193) has noted with respect to education and class-based inequality, "Equality of educational opportunity does provide working-class children the right of access to a mobility route that is absent without such equality. The extent to which this right can be exercised is related to the degree of income inequality and the scope and effectiveness of programs directed to addressing this inequality." We believe that this parallels the reality of policies in multicultural education. Their relative success is dependent on the scope and effectiveness of other policies and programs addressing related concerns.

Considering policy in the context of a web of interrelated, ongoing policies (Oquist 2000) provides a powerful metaphor for thinking about and mapping multicultural education policies in both the United States and Canada. In our view, this web has rings that represent different levels at which policy is formally located, and cross-cutting threads that, while connected, are not necessarily straight lines. These threads represent policies at different levels that address similar issues but are not necessarily harmonious. The points at which the threads cross the rings represent discrete policy texts, each of which is the result of historical struggles. Significantly, the web draws our attention to the open spaces between the threads. In these spaces individuals have some freedom to act in ways that support, extend, or undermine stated policy objectives and to introduce new ideas that may influence the policy discourse. The web metaphor acknowledges that the policy process is complex and involves actors from both within and outside of the state.

The History of the Canada-US Dialogue

This ongoing dialogue about diversity policies in Canada and the United States began with a cross-border conference on multicultural education

organized by graduate students from the University of British Columbia and the University of Washington that took place in Vancouver, British Columbia, in June 1998. Out of the conference grew a cross-border course that was designed to allow students from the United States and Canada to learn together about multicultural education policy in both countries. The course has been conducted twice with students from the University of British Columbia and the University of Washington and once at the University of Toronto and the University at Buffalo, with students travelling between the two universities for classes. Students engage with readings on the historical bases for policy, federal policies in the United States and Canada, immigrant education, multiculturalism and antiracism in the schools, and multiculturalism in higher education. Working in cross-border groups to facilitate online dialogues, they end the class by creating presentations related to the five areas.

We also built on our growing understanding of the dialogue process through engagement in joint scholarship. In the fall of 1999 we co-wrote a paper comparing multicultural education policy and practice in New York City and Vancouver, British Columbia. It took us about four months to realize we had very different frames of reference, in terms of both our national contexts and our approaches to policy. In the end we wrote a draft that we presented as a work-in-progress at a conference but never finished, because we realized that presenting side-by-side examples of diversity policies was not enough. We needed to find a truly comparative approach to policy analysis, a way to think about how our understanding of what happened in one context might inform our understanding of what happened in the other.

The resolution to our dilemma came as a result of a fortuitous conversation about some historical work we had been doing separately, one examining the intercultural education movement in the United States in the 1930s and 1940s and the other the development of federal policy on multiculturalism and education in Canada. Comparing notes, we discovered that in the United States a radio program had been developed titled *Americans All, Immigrants All*, while in Canada a program called *Canadians All* was developed and broadcast in the 1940s. Working together with our colleague Yoon Pak from the University of Illinois, we eventually uncovered a number of links between the work of activists and educators in the United States and Canada at this time. Our ongoing conversations about this research led us to think more deeply about the differences and similarities between the two contexts. We developed a more comprehensive understanding of the historical development of diversity policies and started to articulate the multicultural policy web in each country. We were also reminded that though Canadians freely took from what was happening in the United States, Americans rarely paid much attention to what was happening in Canada, even when they were invited to participate. We were determined not to repeat this pattern.

By the spring of 2002 we had developed a plan for a publication that would bring together colleagues from the United States and Canada who could talk face-to-face on race-based policies, immigration and language policies, policies for First Nations and Native Americans, and employment equity and affirmative action policies. We chose these areas because multicultural education in both countries has a history of focusing on issues of culture, race, and ethnicity. In Canada, the official multicultural policies have been defined largely in these terms. In the United States, the origins of multicultural education are in the intercultural education movements of the 1930s (see Chapter 2), whose approaches and practices were revived and revised following the civil rights movement of the 1960s. Both movements were linked to struggles related to race, ethnicity, and language. While US multicultural education has expanded over the years to include gender, ability, sexual identity, and class, many still define it largely in terms of its original mandate (see, for example, Sutton 2005).

We began with a mini-conference sponsored by the Canadian Studies Center of the University of Washington in June 2002. A larger conference in May 2003, sponsored by the Baldy Center for Law and Social Policy at the University at Buffalo, brought together many of the people who contributed to this volume, as well as other scholars, educators, and activists. At this point we realized that we needed to think more deliberately about international rather than just cross-border dialogue. We also realized that whenever two people were involved in discussion we needed at least a third person to move us from discussion to dialogue. The third person helped us to read our papers together in a way that created new insights. This is the pattern you will encounter throughout this book.

Organization of the Text

This book aims to simulate a policy dialogue process to help us better understand the policy webs in Canada and the United States. To this end we have divided the book into parts by policy area; five include a chapter each on Canada and the United States, with a third dialogue chapter intended to draw insights from the previous two chapters and take our project forward. The first part of the book provides some historical context for what follows, the second examines policies for Native American and First Nations peoples, the third discusses policies for immigrants and language policies, the fourth investigates race-based policies, and the fifth looks at affirmative action and employment equity. Part 6 moves from our position in North America to examine race and policy in the United Kingdom, with a dialogue response by a panel of Canadian and American scholars. The chapter on England stands in dialogue with the previous five parts. Having thought through the issues related to multicultural education in Canada and the United States, we felt the need for a voice from outside to help us think again about the questions

we may have missed. A voice from Britain was the obvious choice because, as we see in Chapter 16, current policy trends in education in the United States and Canada echo earlier moves in the United Kingdom. The organization of the book responds to the question, What can we learn from these policy studies in relation to each other that we may not have learned from each individually? In this way we have attempted to bring our ongoing comparative policy dialogue to this book.

Part 1 explores the historical context of diversity policies. Both the chapter on Canada and the one on the United States find multicultural education more deeply rooted in the history of our respective countries than do conventional policy narratives. The stories begin in the 1930s and 1940s. Reva Joshee and Susan Winton link diversity work in Canada to work in the United States, showing how it was the source of a variety of initiatives that helped define early Canadian multicultural education policy. They postulate reasons why these initiatives took root in Canada in ways they did not in the United States and suggest that the comparatively deep roots of multiculturalism in Canada, no matter how symbolic in nature, persist in the face of the neoliberal assault on social justice and equity. Lauri Johnson's chapter shows that from the beginning multicultural education policy in the United States has been reactive, a strategy to address problems of racial conflict and intolerance by educating children about the equality of all. Johnson demonstrates historical moments that created spaces for innovative leadership and community activism around diversity issues. In her dialogue chapter, Yoon Pak reminds us that the work done in the name of multicultural education can exoticize and marginalize some groups through its own kind of myth making, underscoring the need to look at policies in connection with existing discourses and relations of power.

Part 2 introduces issues in the centuries-old struggles surrounding educational policies for Native American and First Nations peoples. Both chapters show that policies designed by the federal governments of the United States and Canada have largely failed by standard measures. Jan Hare points out that the Canadian government's policy stance of Indian control of Indian education will never be a reality until capacity building is introduced to the equation. She argues that earlier discourses of "civilizing," "assimilating," and "integrating" First Nations have effectively stripped these communities of the capacity to exercise true authority over their own education. John Tippeconnic and Sabrina Redwing Saunders suggest that we need to introduce new questions as well as new approaches into existing policy processes to address the issues facing American Indian and Alaskan Native communities in terms of schooling. Augustine McCaffery's dialogue chapter extends Tippeconnic and Saunders' discussion by considering the participation of American Indian and Alaskan Native students in higher education and connects the issue of capacity building to their participation in graduate education.

Part 3 examines immigrant and language policies. Tracey Derwing and Murray Munro note that the Canadian context differs from the United States because of Canada's official policy of bilingualism. While some programs encourage the acquisition and retention of languages other than English or French, the major focus of language policies for immigrants is on the acquisition of one of the two official languages. Yet there is little attention to ensure that students are given adequate instruction in English. Derwing and Munro warn that without serious and sustained attention to this matter Canada risks creating a perpetual immigrant underclass. Carlos Ovando and Terrence Wiley discuss the conflicted nature of language education policy in the United States. This conflict arises when a strong national identity, linked to a monolingual English populace, meets the ideal of equal educational opportunities for all. The continuing opposition to bilingual education in the United States indicates that this conflict is far from being resolved. In her dialogue chapter Karen Gourd notes that in both countries, language policies have served as both a means of control and a space for dissent and change. Educators need to be cognizant of this tension if they are to implement language programs that respond to the needs of learners and, where necessary, push the limits of existing policies.

Part 4 examines race-based policies. Adrienne Chan argues that Canadian policies have historically sanctioned race-based inequality, with patterns of segregation similar to those in the United States. Despite more recent race-based policies that attempt to create the conditions for racial equality, she posits that the discursive legacy of racialization continues to limit the educational experiences of students of colour. Christopher Span, Rashid Robinson, and Trinidad Molina Villegas demonstrate that race-based policies are deeply rooted in the US educational system and that historically race has played a more significant role in educational success than any other factor. Through the efforts of community and parent activists, policies that systematically segregated or denied education to minoritized racial groups were challenged and ultimately changed. In her dialogue chapter, Njoki Nathani Wane shows that we find greater similarity between the two countries in race-based policies than in any other area of policy related to multicultural education. The most notable differences arise between the racialized groups in each national context. That is, racism affects different racialized groups differently. Until we can have productive conversations about racism and race-based policies in multiracial settings, we will fail to move beyond understanding to action.

Part 5 moves us from discussions of policy in K-12 schools to an examination of an issue more central to the postsecondary realm: affirmative action and employment equity. Carol Agocs notes that, unlike affirmative action, employment equity policies in Canada do not address student recruitment at the postsecondary level. While employment equity policies apply to only a small percentage of the Canadian workforce, they have provided a

framework for thinking about equity beyond the more narrowly defined terms of multiculturalism policies. Centring her discussion on the parliamentary review of the federal Employment Equity Act, Agocs shows how larger political discourses inhospitable to diversity can limit possibilities for action. Edward Taylor's critical account of affirmative action policy, using the case of Washington State, shows how tenuous equity policies can be. Through the lens of critical race theory he argues that policies based in a liberal paradigm, like affirmative action, can be successful only to the extent that they benefit the White majority. He argues for a new paradigm based on racial realism. In her dialogue chapter, Michelle Goldberg draws on critical race theory and postpositivist approaches to policy to think more deeply about issues of discourse, particularly in relation to the dismantling of employment equity policies in the province of Ontario. Collectively these three chapters provide specific examples of how multicultural and diversity policies can be challenged and overturned. They also provide tools for activists to deconstruct prevailing discourses so we might mount our own challenges.

The final part of the book extends the cross-border dialogue to England, where the diversity of the student population provides similarities as well as contrasts to the US and Canadian contexts. David Gillborn asks us to consider a current incarnation of citizenship education, a movement that spurred the development of progressive diversity policies and practices in Canada in the 1940s and 1950s and is now being used in England to mask the fact that issues of racism in education are not being addressed. In their panel response, Catherine Cornbleth, Rinaldo Walcott, Carlos Ovando, and Terezia Zoric each reflect on the issues Gillborn raises in light of the United States and Canadian policy contexts. We end with the understanding that while diversity policies may not ensure that multicultural educational programs are enacted in schools, they can create spaces of possibility that exist when we recognize the limits of policy texts, the possibilities of prevailing discourses, and the necessity of everyday political action.

Conclusion

The current dominant ideology guiding educational policy development is rooted in a neoliberal approach that replicates existing inequalities based on race, class, and gender. This approach to policy making stands in stark opposition to efforts to create a more socially just society. As Apple (2004) notes, however, struggles for social justice in education continue. In this book we aim to document the erosion of diversity policies, as well as form cross-national alliances to continue the struggle for socially just policy making. Like Blaikie (2001), we believe we must advocate for the kinds of policies we believe are necessary. He argues, "It would seem ... that there are good rational grounds for talking reason to power, but also to engage policy actors with the demonstrable results of previous courses of action. Of course this

engagement will be political and involve alliance making across national boundaries and with a wide cast of actors in civil society" (7). A central challenge is that multicultural and diversity education policies have traditionally been studied in ways that produce few demonstrable results. Consequently, we cannot say with any certainty what difference a single multicultural education policy might make. But we do know from history and the present what can happen when social injustice is allowed to flourish. Using policy dialogue to compare the policy webs in both nations and examine their discursive struggles over time, we hope to show how a complex of policies can make a difference.

References

- Apple, M.W. 2004. Creating difference: Neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism, and the politics of educational reform. *Educational Policy* 18(1): 12-44.
- Ball, S.J. 1998. Big policies/small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education* 34(2): 119-27.
- Baker, C., and S.P. Jones. 1998. *Encyclopedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bangura, Y. 1997. *Policy dialogue and gendered development: Institutional and ideological constraints*. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. <http://www.unrisd.org>.
- Banks, J.A., ed. 2004. *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blaikie, P. 2001. *Is policy reform pure nostalgia? A Himalayan illustration*. Berkeley Workshop on Environmental Politics Working Paper 01-9. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California. <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/EnvirPol>.
- Cenoz, J., and F. Genesee, eds. 1998. *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cohen, R., and Z. Layton-Henry, eds. 1997. *The politics of migration*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Cole, P. 2000. *Philosophies of exclusion: Liberal political theory and immigration*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cummins, J., and D. Corson, eds. 1997. *Second language education*. Vol. 5 of *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dei, G.S. 1996. *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- DeLeon, P. 1997. *Democracy and the policy sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dryzek, J.S. 1990. *Discursive democracy: Politics, policy, and political science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Echols, F., and D. Fisher. 1992. School action plans and implementation of a district race relations policy. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 24(1): 58-78.
- Favell, A. 2001. Multicultural nation-building: "Integration" as public philosophy and research paradigm in Western Europe. *Swiss Political Science Review* 7(2): 116-24.
- Fischer, F., and J. Forrester. 1993. *The argumentative turn in policy analysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Grant, C.A., and J.L. Lei, eds. 2001. *Global constructions of multicultural education: Theories and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goldberg, D.T. 2002. *The racial state*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Harper, H. 1997. Difference and diversity in Ontario schooling. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation* 22(2): 192-206.

- Hudak, G.M. 2000. Reaping *The Harvest of Shame: Racism and teaching in a time of radical economic insecurity*. In *Multicultural curriculum: New directions for social theory, practice, and policy*, ed. R. Mahalingam and C. McCarthy, 286-301. New York: Routledge.
- Inglis, C. 1996. *Multiculturalism: New policy responses to diversity*. Management of Social Transformations (MOST) – UNESCO, policy paper no. 4. <http://www.unesco.org/most>.
- Joppke, C., and E. Morawska, eds. 2003. *Toward assimilation and citizenship: Immigrants in liberal nation-states*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joshee, R., and L. Johnson. 2005. Multicultural education in the United States and Canada: The importance of national policies. In *International handbook of educational policy*, ed. N. Bascia, A. Cummings, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood, and D. Livingstone, 53-74. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishing.
- Lesko, N., and L. Bloom. 2000. The haunting of multicultural epistemology. In *Multicultural curriculum: New directions for social theory, practice, and policy*, ed. R. Mahalingam and C. McCarthy, 242-60. New York: Routledge.
- Mansbridge, J. 1997. What does a representative do? Descriptive representation in communicative settings of distrust, uncrystallized interests, and historically denigrated status. Paper presented at the Canadian Centre for Philosophy and Public Policy conference on "Citizenship in Diverse Societies: Theory and Practice." 4-5 October, Toronto.
- McCaskell, T. 1995. Anti-racist education and practice in the public school system. In *Beyond political correctness: Toward the inclusive university*, ed. S. Richer and L. Weir, 253-72. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- O'Connor, J.S. 1998. Social citizenship and the welfare state, 1965-1995: Canada in comparative context. In *The vertical mosaic revisited*, ed. R. Heles-Hayes and J. Curtis, 108-231. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Oquist, P. 2000. Governance policy formulation and implementation. Paper presented at the seminar on "International Experiences on Good Governance and Fighting Corruption," 17 February, Bangkok. <http://www.info.tdri.or.th>.
- Premdas, R.R. 1998. *Public policy and ethnic conflict*. Management of Social Transformations (MOST) – UNESCO, discussion paper no. 12. <http://www.unesco.org/most>.
- Reich, R.B. 1990. Policy making in a democracy. In *The power of public ideas*, ed. R.B. Reich, 123-56. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rezai-Rashti, G. 1995. Multicultural education, anti-racist education and critical pedagogy: Reflections on everyday practice. In *Anti-racism, feminism and critical approaches to education*, ed. R. Ng, P. Staton, and J. Scane, 3-19. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishers.
- Ricento, T., and B. Burnaby, eds. 1998. *Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Roe, E. 1994. *Narrative policy analysis: Theory and practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schiffman, H.F. 1996. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Sleeter, C.E. 1996. *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Solomon, R.P., and A.M.A. Allen. 2001. The struggle for equity, diversity, and social justice in teacher education. In *The erosion of democracy: From critique to possibility*, ed. J.P. Portelli and R.P. Solomon, 217-44. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises.
- Sutton, M. 2005. The globalization of multicultural education. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 12(1): 97-108.
- Tator, C., and Henry, F. 1991. *Multicultural education: Translating policy to practice*. Ottawa: Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship.
- Tonkin, H. 1977. Language and the international context. *ADFL Bulletin* (Association of Departments of Foreign Languages) 9(2): 17-23.
- Wieviorka, M. 1998. Is multiculturalism the solution? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(5): 881-910.
- Young, C., ed. 1998. *Ethnic diversity and public policy: A comparative enquiry*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.