

## **50 Years After *Brown v. Board of Education*: The Promise and Challenge of Multicultural Education**

**Sabrina Zirkel\***

*Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center*

**Nancy Cantor**

*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

*We discuss the legacy of Brown for today's students and today's schools, and find that legacy is more psychological than legal. The decision does more to highlight issues of equity in education and how that influences students' identity, motivation, and aspirations than it does help us find legal means of addressing these concerns. The manuscripts presented in this issue articulate how today's students experience these issues. The manuscripts focus on several important aspects of interethnic contact in education: the processes by which interethnic contact leads to attitude and behavior change towards outgroup members, the effect of racial and ethnic integration on educational and developmental outcomes for students of color, and the promise that multicultural multiracial educational environments hold for all students.*

In 2004, we celebrate the 50th anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954)*, the Supreme Court decision that ordered the desegregation of public schools throughout the United States. Given the central role that Isidor Chein, Kenneth B. Clark, and Stuart Cook played, on behalf of SPSSI, in creating the social science briefs for *Brown v. Board of Education* (see, e.g., Benjamin & Crouse, 2002; Jackson, 1998, 2000), we feel that it is especially important that SPSSI and *JSI* take this opportunity to examine

---

\*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sabrina Zirkel, Director, Social Transformation Program, Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, 450 Pacific Ave., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94133-4640 [e-mail: szirkel@saybrook.edu].

We would like to thank Lisa Brown, Gretchen Lopez, and four anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on previous drafts of this manuscript.

the legacy of this landmark case on its golden anniversary. We take this as an opportunity to reflect on the meaning and implications of *Brown* for today's students and today's schools.

There are a multitude of ways to examine the legacy of *Brown*—and every anniversary, many people do (see, e.g., Martin, 1998 for a compilation of anniversary editorials in the *New York Times*; see also, "History," 2002; Kluger, 1977 on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of *Brown v. Board*; Lagemann & Miller, 1996 on the 40th anniversary). Many of these anniversary commemorations lament the slow progress towards racial justice in education that we have made in the intervening years (Lagemann & Miller, 1996; see also Fischer et al., 1996) and some point out that we actually seem to be moving *backwards*, away from a commitment to racial integration in schools (Orfield, 2001; Orfield & Eaton, 1996). These are valuable and important critiques, but we have chosen a different approach for this issue. We have chosen to examine what happens when racial and ethnic integration in educational settings *does* occur—what impact does it have on students, and how what is the value of working towards full integration in the 21st century?

The primary concern that the psychological briefs brought to the court in the *Brown* case was the psychological impact of state-supported and state-mandated segregation. The report argued that the best psychological knowledge at the time suggested that those subjected to prejudice, discrimination, and legal segregation would experience numerous problems as a direct result, including internalized self hatred, "defeatist attitudes," a lowering of personal ambitions and education aspirations, and would generally be "encumbered" by the experience (*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954, as cited in Martin, 1998, p. 144). The social science brief pointed out, also, that racism and segregation have negative psychological consequences for White or majority group members as well. Such consequences include: "being taught to gain personal status in an unrealistic and nonadaptive way" (*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954, as cited in Martin, 1998, p. 144), which can lead to "guilt feelings, rationalizations and other mechanisms which they must use in an attempt to protect themselves from recognizing the essential injustice of their unrealistic fears and hatreds of minority groups" (*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954, as cited in Martin, 1998, p. 145). The social science brief also argued that racism and segregation were distorting White Americans' relationship to authority in unhealthy ways (*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954, as cited in Martin, 1998, p. 145). Regarding relations *between* ethnic groups, the brief noted, "Segregation leads to a blockage in the communication and interaction between the two groups. Such blockages tend to increase mutual suspicion, distrust, and hostility" (*Brown v. Board of Education* 1954, as cited in Martin, 1998, p. 145). These arguments are surprisingly contemporary. We choose to honor the legacy of *Brown* by examining current research regarding what happens when those "blockages" are removed, and when communication and interaction between ethnic groups take place in educational settings.

### Background Information

In recent years, it has become fashionable for scholars to criticize the Supreme Court decision in *Brown*. Critics have argued that the legal decision was weaker than it should have been (Balkin, 2001; Benjamin & Crouse, 2002; Patterson, 2001), ineffective (Orfield & Eaton, 1996), uninspiring (Wilkinson, 1979), ambivalent about the implementation of the changes it was ordering (as evidenced by the Court not ordering an immediate end to segregation, and instead ordering states to proceed with the oxymoronic “all deliberate speed;” *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954 see, e.g., Benjamin & Crouse, 2002, but cf. Kluger, 1977 for a different interpretation of that move), and bland and non-confrontational in its language, thus avoiding any statement that the United States Constitution is “color blind” (Patterson, 2001; Scott, 1997). Critiques of the science behind the social science brief in *Brown* were long levied by those who supported segregation (see, e.g., Kluger, 1977; Patterson, 2001), but in recent years, critiques of the data have been heard by those on the left as well (see, e.g., Scott, 1997). The critique by the left points out that a focus on the psychological data in the decision implies that if the data had not demonstrated harm, school segregation might be legal. There is no question that the decision in *Brown* represented a compromise position, a compromise designed to achieve unanimity in the decision (Brown, 1996; Kluger, 1977; Patterson, 2001).

Nevertheless, we feel that these critiques of both the *Brown* decision and the social scientists that helped make it possible represent a revisionist history. Compromise certainly made the decision “weaker” than it might have been or even than we might now wish it had been. However, we should remind ourselves that this decision is remembered as extremely important to many African American families at the time (Gates, 1994; Hunter-Gault, 1991; but cf. Hurston, 1954 who, writing at the time of the decision, wrote passionately about feeling that only harm could come from sending Black children to schools where White teachers and students did not want them). Its implementation required nothing short of the National Guard to enforce. Jackson (2000) said it well: “Clark and his colleagues clearly recognized what we in the 21st century appear to have forgotten: The elimination of legal segregation was a necessary step on the road toward racial justice. That the road is a long and difficult one should not blind us to the necessity and value of that very first step” (p. 257).

Whatever its faults or weaknesses, the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* was, by all accounts, a landmark decision which many have called the defining U. S. legal decision of the 20th century (Benjamin & Crouse, 2002; Kluger, 1977). As social scientists focused on issues of ethnicity and education, we feel that the *Brown v. Board* decision held several strengths: (a) the decision highlighted the human suffering caused by racism and its correspondent racial segregation (although it failed to recognize the psychological harm done to

Whites noted in the social science brief); (b) it clarified that state sponsored segregation (and racism) were inherently more harmful than segregation that occurred without the force of law; (c) it articulated the central role that education had come to play in modern life and concluded that opportunity for all required an end to racial segregation in education; and (d) many argue that *Brown v. Board* and its aftermath provided the fuel and the encouragement necessary to further the civil rights work of the 1960s, which in turn led to the Civil Rights Acts (1964, 1991), the Voting Rights Act (1965), the Fair Housing Act (1968) and related legislation. Finally, of particular importance to social scientists, it was the first Supreme Court decision to be based, at least in part, on social science data and evidence. Indeed, we find that the modern legacy of the *Brown* decision is more psychological than legal. It serves as a symbolic turning point after which we could no longer ignore the psychological implications of racism and discrimination.

A primary issue in the *Brown v. Board* case was the role that segregation played, and by extension, racial integration would play, in the personality, motivational, educational, and professional development of people of color (Clark, 1988; Clark & Clark, 1947; Deutscher & Chein, 1948). One hope and expectation of the proponents of *Brown* was that school integration and contact between “the races” would lead to a lessening of racist attitudes among Whites and ultimately to more integration in other aspects of society (Martin, 1998, p. 149; Patterson, 2001; see also Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). In this issue, we examine whether and when these hopes regarding the outcomes of integration are realized.

### **Current Status of Integration and Racial Justice in Education**

In examining the state of racial integration and racial justice in education today, there is much to be discouraged about. Schools in most areas of the United States remain largely segregated by race (“Compelling Need,” 1999; Fischer, et al., 1996; Guinier & Torres, 2002; Orfield & Eaton, 1996), and although this segregation is not state enforced, states and school districts have fought for and won the right to dismantle their efforts to desegregate their schools (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). Some have even argued that, in light of our failed attempts at integrated schools, racial justice would have been better served if the 1954 decision of the Court had upheld the “separate but equal” provision of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), because what we now have is separate but *unequal* (e.g., see Bell, 2001). Even within integrated schools, students are often either resegregated by academic tracking (Fischer, et al., 1996; Oakes, 1996, Wells, 1996) or resegregate themselves along racial and ethnic lines (Tatum, 1997; this issue). Students of color are disproportionately likely to find themselves in poorly-funded schools with few facilities and resources (Fischer, et al., 1996; Glickstein, 1996) or assigned to non-college preparatory courses of study (Fischer, et al., 1996). Desegregation efforts have often been met with “White flight” from public schools (Orfield, 2001). Those students of color

who do make it to college are disproportionately likely to drop out before receiving their degree (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Steele, 1997). Du Bois' oft quoted prediction that, "the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line" (Du Bois, 1903/1986, p. 359) may simply have been an understatement: The problem continues into the 21st Century.

And yet. And yet despite all this, we still find reason to hope. Students of color represent two to three times the percentage of college graduates, four to seven times the percentage of law graduates, and two to four times the percentage of medical school graduates than they did in 1960 (Bowen & Bok, 1998). Elementary (Houlette, Gaertner, Johnson, Banker, Riek, & Dovidio, this issue) and secondary schools, as well as colleges (Guinier & Torres, 2002; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, this issue; Nagda, Kim, & Truelove, this issue; Schoem & Hurtado, 2001) and graduate schools are making real efforts to improve the educational experiences of students of color. Affirmative action, of course, has been an effective (Bowen & Bok, 1998; "Compelling Need," 1999) but politically beleaguered (Guinier & Torres, 2002; Niemann & Maruyama, in press) means of redressing racial disparities in education, as have multicultural curricular requirements in many high schools and colleges. Recent efforts at several state supported universities include reflecting on and subsequently changing admissions criteria in ways that will ensure fair admission of students from a broader range of the respective state's high schools (see e.g., Geiser & Studley, 2001; Guinier & Torres, 2002; Kirlander & Yun, 2000; Kornhaber, 1999; Lavergne & Walker, 2000).

In addition, changing demographics in the United States means that *de facto* segregation of schools based on housing patterns is less possible than it used to be, and will eventually become impossible in many areas. The percentage of people of color in the United States is rising. The 2000 census reveals that people of color now represent nearly one-third of the U. S. population, half the population of Texas, and more than half of the population of California, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002a). Projections are that people of color will represent more than half of the total U.S. population by about the time of the 100th anniversary of *Brown* (U. S. Census Bureau, 2002b). Put simply, racial and ethnic integration in schools is part of our lives today and it will certainly be even more a part of our future. What are the implications of this greater integration for interracial attitudes and behavior and for the psychological and educational outcomes of all students? Those fighting on behalf of *Brown* argued clearly that integration would, if designed well, improve the psychological outcomes of all students and would also improve relations between ethnic groups as well (Allport, 1954/1979; Clark, 1953).

Equal access to educational opportunities for all students was a primary goal of *Brown*. Issues of equal access remain a problem today and are discussed at length in other places (e.g., Fischer, et al., 1996; Lagemann & Miller, 1996; Orfield & Eaton, 1996). Our focus in this issue is on another concern that was central to

those—Black and White alike—who were working towards overturning segregation in schools and elsewhere. Their goal was also the conceiving and realization of a new multiracial society in which increasing levels of integration would end racism over time, thereby alleviating the psychological suffering caused by segregation and racism (see, e.g., “History,” 2002; Jackson, 2000). Fifty years after *Brown v. Board* (1954), the issue of race in education is no longer simply one of access—although access issues do, of course, remain. The issue at the time of *Brown* was whether to “let Blacks in.” Today, we are focused on a broader range of ethnic groups and in a higher goal than simply “letting people in”—we ask questions about how to create educational institutions that serve all students equally well. In 1954 we did not ask whether the schools young Oliver Brown and others would enter would welcome them and nurture them—or whether the schools would adapt a curriculum that made equal sense to all groups. Today, we ask such questions.

### Current Issues and Research

Several reviews of the literature suggest that school desegregation does, in fact, lead to better educational outcomes for African American students (Wells, 1996) and that inter-ethnic contact does lead to improved race relations and decreased levels of prejudice (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Pettigrew (1998) notes that although a wide variety of data suggest that interracial contact leads to reduced levels of prejudice and discrimination (see also Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000 for a review of the data), the generalizability of these data are hampered by at least two problems. One problem is a selection bias, in that the most prejudiced individuals avoid racially integrated contexts. (A related problem as described in Wells, 1996 and similar data is that Black students attending mixed schools were also attending wealthier schools). Thus, we don’t know how studies of the effects of integration generalize to settings with more prejudiced individuals. A second problem is that few studies have focused on the processes by which this change occurs. As a consequence, we know little about what aspects of integrated environments are important for creating change. Additionally, few studies have looked at the educational and developmental outcomes of diverse learning environments for White students (but cf. “Compelling Need,” 1999; Gurin, et al., this issue; Lopez, this issue; Nagda, et al., this issue). Several of the pieces in this issue address these points.

The focus of the manuscripts in this issue is twofold. First, several manuscripts elucidate some of the processes by which attitude and behavior change occurs as a result of interethnic contact. These manuscripts examine these processes in a variety of educational settings—from elementary school through college—and provide an opportunity to examine change in settings in which participants had varying degrees of choice in the decision to participate in interethnic contact.

Secondly, several manuscripts outline some of the challenges to be encountered in creating multicultural educational environments in which everyone does not necessarily share the same goals. True integration and multicultural education requires changing institutions—at a deep level—to better meet the needs, expectations, and desires of all students (see also Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1999).

### *Multicultural Education as Change Agent*

Educators often argue for the importance of multicultural education, and many high schools and colleges have included a course in some aspect of “diversity” in their graduation requirements or have made concerted efforts to ensure that issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation are integrated into the overall curriculum. Several of the manuscripts in this issue highlight the ways that multicultural education and curriculum can boost the academic relevance of the curriculum for students of color and also improve the attitudes towards and relations between ethnic groups and create valuable learning experiences for all. Researchers point to a variety of benefits to the educational experience of all students when they encounter an ethnically diverse educational environment, including: greater intellectual engagement, more active thinking, more growth in intellectual and academic skills among all students (Gurin, in “Compelling Need,” 1999), greater cross-racial socializing (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Gurin in “Compelling Need,” 1999), and better preparation for living in a diverse and democratic society (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Gurin in “Compelling Need,” 1999; Gurin, et al., this issue). These data were cited by the majority opinion of the 6th Circuit Court’s opinion in *Grutter v. Bollinger & James, et. al.* (2002), upholding the right of the University of Michigan to use race as a factor in law school admissions. Several manuscripts in this issue focus on how ethnically diverse educational environments combined with multicultural curriculum and/or interventions designed to connect students across ethnic groups can have profoundly positive effects on students’ development and on improving an awareness of issues of race in society and race relations more generally. Gurin, et al., (this issue) provide a theoretical model of the link between diverse educational settings with a multicultural curriculum and the development of democratic sentiments and ideals and increased civic participation. In doing so, they take up issues central to the original social science brief in *Brown* (1954)—the role that race relations play in individual psychological development and in the development of democratic citizens. They then test this model in two cohorts of college students, providing strong evidence for the lasting effect of multicultural curriculum on student development.

Multicultural learning environments can—just as a proponents of *Brown* hoped all those years ago—promote better inter-racial relationships and reduced levels of racial prejudice among students (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp,

2000). Although there is much hand wringing about students segregating themselves by race and ethnicity within schools, this is not the complete picture. The evidence is that most students in diverse educational settings do report “knowing well” students of other ethnic backgrounds during their college years (Bowen & Bok, 1998), and they do develop lasting relationships with peers of different racial and ethnic backgrounds (Bowen & Bok, 1998; “Compelling Need,” 1999). In her longitudinal study of in-group and outgroup attitudes, Lopez (this issue) reports that both interethnic group contact on campus and multicultural curriculum served to improve intergroup attitudes among college students, but the amount of change and the precise influences on change varied by ethnic group. Lopez discusses the implications of these findings for facilitating change in other educational settings. Similarly, Nagda, et al. (this issue) demonstrate that real and lasting change in interethnic relationships can come from confronting issues of race relations directly through a series of intergroup dialogues. In a pre-test/post-test study, they examine how different aspects of carefully constructed intergroup learning communities affect students’ critical consciousness, perspective taking, communication, and motivation to effect greater racial justice. The Common In-group Identity Model (CIIM; Gaertner, Dovidio, & Bachman, 1999) provides a framework for efforts to improve and foster intergroup relations through multi-ethnic groups working towards superordinate goals (see also Aronson, 1997; Sherif, 1958). Houlette, et al. (this issue) report on an elementary school intervention consistent with the CIIM in which students are encouraged to expand their identified social circle further and further to include an ever wider variety of peers. In a different vein, Tatum (this issue) highlights the developmental importance of same-race friendships and urges us to understand their meaning for students.

Zirkel (this issue) argues that schools are less threatening and alienating for students of color if they can build social connections with peers in school. School-based friendships facilitate adolescent students’ feelings of being connected to and belonging at school (e.g., Cohen, Steele, & Ross, 1999; McNeely, Nonnemaker, & Blum, 2002; Moody & Bearman, 2002). An important backdrop of her study is that it takes place in elementary and junior high schools in the years following a Northeastern city’s move to use busing to desegregate their schools. Busing created newly diverse schools in which students of color represented approximately 50% of the student body (though, importantly, far less of the faculty and the administration). She finds that for students of color in her sample—but not White students—making social connections and developing meaningful friendships at school was an important ingredient to “taking on an academic identity.” This academic identity was expressed in a greater interest in and enjoyment of academic activities and more reported academic goals. At the same time, the general pattern was the students of color reported significantly fewer friends at school. These data speak to the potential value of an intervention like that described in Houlette et al. (this issue), wherein a classroom intervention led to students being more likely

to look beyond their own ethnic group when thinking about “their most preferred playmate.”

Identity processes are an important part of adolescent development for all, but issues of racial and ethnic identity development play an especially important role in development for students of color (Phinney, 1996; Roberts, Phinney, Masse, Chen, Roberts, & Romero, 1999; Rowley, Sellers, Chavous, & Smith, 1998; Sellers, Chavous, & Cooke, 1998). Tatum (this issue) describes the predicament of African American students in predominantly White high schools and communities and the difficulties they experienced in developing a strong racial identity in an environment that didn't always offer opportunities to make these explorations. This developmental task was then postponed until their college years, when opportunities to explore and examine their racial identity emerged. Many students, all of whom were attending a small predominantly White college, reported wishing that they had chosen an historically Black college instead. The feelings expressed were that historically Black colleges would have provided more opportunities for exploring racial and ethnic identity issues and also better opportunities for dating and socializing. Her work highlights some of the positive psychological consequences that a multi-ethnic environment, multicultural curriculum, and available, ethnically-matched role models (see also Zirkel, 2002) would provide students earlier in their educational careers.

### *Multicultural Education: Innovations and Challenges*

Truly multicultural educational institutions are those that are created, organized, and run by members of all ethnic groups and designed to thoughtfully address the educational needs and concerns of all. This ideal is not always achieved. Several of the manuscripts in this issue provide an opportunity to learn from continuing places of conflict and well-meaning efforts that have not worked. For example, many campuses have learned that admission is only the first part of the equation to graduating more students of color. Retention is just as, if not more, critical. Brower and Ketterhagen (this issue) examine college retention efforts and the academic performance and retention of African American students at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and predominantly white institutions (PWIs) and White students at PWIs. A consistent finding in the literature is that African American students' academic performance and academic development is stronger at HBCUs than at PWIs (Allen, 1992; Bohr, Pascarella, Nora, & Terenzini, 1995; Cokley, 2000; Davis, 1995; DeSousa & Kuh, 1996; Watson & Kuh, 1996), just as more women leaders in business, government, and science and engineering come from women's colleges than coeducational institutions (Streitmatter, 1999). Brower and Ketterhagen (this issue) find that that retention efforts at HBCUs and PWIs are focused on very different aspects of the educational experience, and that these differences play a role in the academic success and retention of

African American students. These data highlight one example of how schools sometimes seek to recruit more diverse student bodies but don't always design programs that specifically match the needs of all students. These data dovetail with Tatum's article (this issue) in highlighting the ongoing importance and value of HBCUs and the continuing need for PWIs to examine how well they serve their students of color and where there is still room for improvement.

Many have called for more teachers of color at every level of the educational process, from elementary school through graduate and professional school (Hurtado et al., 1999). This call is usually based on the belief that faculty of color will better know how to serve students of color, that students of color may feel more connected to faculty of color, and that students of color are more likely to feel represented and respected if they see faculty "like them" on the school grounds or the college campus (see also Zirkel, 2002). Brown and Dobbins (this issue) unpack one aspect of this issue: student trust of faculty. Expectations that faculty are fair and are not prejudiced is essential for creating a "safe" and non-threatening academic environment for students of color (McNeely et al., 2002; Steele, 1997). Brown and Dobbins report a series of experimental studies illustrating the mistrust and sometimes hidden conflicts between White faculty and students of color. These studies highlight the need for training in issues of diversity for all faculty so that they can understand the social context of their interactions with students. They provide, also, an empirical background for understanding why recruiting and retaining diverse faculty is an essential aspect of creating a multicultural learning environment. Gaines (this issue) discusses how complex, difficult, and heated it can be for an African American professor to frankly discuss issues of racism and prejudice in the classroom at predominantly White colleges and universities. It is particularly difficult to do without tenure. His piece underscores the necessity of confronting these issues in classrooms precisely *because* they are so difficult to discuss, and highlights how evaluation of faculty needs to be sensitive to these difficult teaching dynamics.

Discussing elementary and secondary education, Hurtado and Vega (this issue) and Tatum (this issue) highlight the ways that better understanding of and work with students of color will happen as a direct result of talking to those students and their families about what they need—such a simple intervention, but one that doesn't happen often enough. Tatum (this issue) helps us to understand the loss created when students of color felt no room in high school to explore their own ethnic identity. They also underscore how our efforts to push for "full integration" and our hand-wringing about students separating themselves by ethnic development can sometimes choke off students' healthy efforts to resolve this aspect of development.

In California, one-third of all people (and an even greater percentage of school age children), identify as Latino/a (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002a). Hurtado and Vega (this issue) highlight the ways that language, culture, and English acquisition function in the educational and home lives of immigrant students in California. They

demonstrate that although English acquisition does take place, students do not move to English monolingualism, but rather to a bilingual biculturalism. This bilingualism is an important part of young immigrants' adaptation efforts and identity development (Phinney, Horenzyk, Leibkind, & Vedder, 2001; Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001). At the same time, California recently passed legislation banning bilingual education for most students. Hurtado and Vega discuss some of the ways that Latino/a and other immigrant students could greatly benefit from more thoughtful and nuanced efforts to support and utilize this bilingualism, rather than segregating heritage languages as something that happens only at home.

### Conclusions

*Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) opened the door to widespread social change that is, perhaps only now, 50 years later, beginning to reach its true fruition. It was a symbolic beginning to one of the greatest national and international sea changes in attitudes, belief, and behavior in modern life. K. Brown (1996) points out that although we cannot look to *Brown* for guidance about how to proceed in creating fully integrated schools and universities, we can look to it for inspiration. *Brown* did not provide any guidance in how to create fully multicultural school environments, nor was that its goal. In fact, the decision itself only referred to the experience of African Americans and Whites, leaving out all other groups. At the same time, *Brown* provided us with a rationale for and a first step towards racial justice in education. *Brown* opened the way for us to bring questions of identity, intergroup relations, and the psychology of prejudice and discrimination to the forefront of discussions that educators and the public have regarding educational policy. We argue that it is this legacy of *Brown*—the psychological rather than the legal—that is most important, on this 50th anniversary, as we think about how to move forward. The articles in this issue articulate this vision of the legacy of *Brown*—what happens when integration does occur, and what are some of the best efforts we can engage in to further full racial and ethnic integration in schools?

We find that creating multicultural educational environments that promote successful outcomes for all students requires thoughtful planning. This includes creating new policies and procedures rather than simply importing strategies that have worked for White students. It also does not mean providing, *laissez-faire*, a setting in which students of various ethnic backgrounds can meet and interact on their own. Instead, the best multicultural learning environments are ones in which administrators and faculty encourage and arrange interaction in a variety of planful ways—from organizing campus dialogs to creating projects for students to work on together. We find that when thoughtful plans for creating more interethnic contact are implemented, prejudice and discrimination on campus is lessened and achievement for all students improves.

## References

- Allen, W. R. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly White and historically Black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 26–44.
- Allport, G. W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. (Original work published in 1954).
- Aronson, E. (1997). *The jigsaw classroom: Building cooperation in the classroom, 2nd ed.* NY: Longman Press.
- Balkin, J. M. (Ed.). (2001). *What Brown v. Board of Education Should Have Said: The Nation's Top Legal Experts Rewrite America's Landmark Civil Rights Decision*. NY: New York University Press.
- Bell, D. A. (2001). dissenting. In J. M. Balkin (Ed.) *what Brown v. Board of Education Should have Said: The nation's top legal experts rewrite America's landmark civil rights decision*. (pp. 185–200). NY: New York University Press.
- Benjamin, L. T., Jr., & Crouse, E. M. (2002). The American Psychological Association's response to *Brown v. Board of Education*: The case of Kenneth B. Clark. *American Psychologist*, 57, 38–50.
- Bohr, L., Pascarella, E. T., Nora, A., & Terenzini, P. T. (1995). Do Black students learn more at historically Black or predominantly White colleges? *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 75–85.
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The Shape of the River*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown, K. (1996). Revisiting the Supreme Court's opinion in *Brown v. Board of Education* from a multiculturalist perspective. In E. C. Lagemann & L. P. Miller (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: The challenge for today's schools*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C.A. §2000e *et seq.* (West Legal Dictionary (1985): Constitutional: Discrimination, para. 1)
- Civil Rights Act of 1991, (Pub. L. 102–166).
- Clark, K. B. (1988). *Prejudice and your child* (3rd ed.). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1947). Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In T. N. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology* (pp. 169–178). NY: Holt.
- Clark, K. (1953). The effects of segregation and the consequences of desegregation: A social science statement. Appendix to appellant's brief: *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1953). *Minnesota Law Review*, 37, 427–439.
- Cohen, G., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. D. (1999). The mentor's dilemma: Providing critical feedback across the racial divide. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 1302–1318.
- Cokley, K. (2000). An investigation of academic self-concept and its relationship to academic achievement in African American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 26, 148–164.
- Compelling Need for Diversity in Higher Education (1999). Legal brief reported in *Grutter v. Bollinger & James, et al.* 0170P FED App. (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).
- Davis, J. E. (1995). College in Black and White: Campus environment and academic achievement of African American males. *Journal of Negro Education*, 63, 620–633.
- DeSousa, D. J., & Kuh, G. D. (1996). Does institutional racial composition make a difference in what Black students gain from college? *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 257–267.
- Deutscher, M., & Chein, I. (1948). The psychological effects of enforced segregation: A survey of social science opinion. *Journal of Psychology*, 26, 259–287.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1986). *The souls of black folk*. NY: The Library of America. (Original work published in 1903.)
- Fair Housing Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C.A. § 3601 *et seq.* (West Legal Dictionary (1985): Constitutional: Discrimination, para. 1).

- Fischer, C. S., Hout, M., Sánchez Jankowski, M., Lucas, S. R., Swidler, A., & Voss, K. (1996). *Inequality by design: Cracking the bell curve myth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Bachman, B. A. (1999). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common ingroup identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 271–290.
- Gates, H. L. (1994). *Colored people: A memoir*. NY: Vintage Books.
- Geiser, S., with Studley, R. (2001, October 29). UC and the SAT: Predictive validity and differential impact of the SAT I and SAT II at the University of California. Retrieved May 16, 2002, from the University of California Office of the President Web site: <http://www.ucop.edu>
- Glickstein, H. A. (1996). Inequities in educational funding (pp. 122–128). In E. C. Lagemann & L. P. Miller (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: The challenge for today's schools*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Grutter v. Bollinger & James, et al. 0170P FED App. (6th Cir. 2002).
- Guinier, L., & Torres, G. (2002). *The miner's canary: Enlisting race, resisting power, and transforming democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvard University Civil Rights Project. (2002, January). *The impact of racial and ethnic diversity on educational outcomes: Cambridge, MA school district*. Retrieved on May 6, 2003, from the Civil Rights Project Harvard University Web site: <http://www.law.harvard.edu/civilrights/publications>
- History of Psychology: The Contributions of Kenneth B. and Mamie Phipps Clark. (2002). [Special section]. *American Psychologist*, 57(1), 19–59.
- Hunter-Gault, C. (1992). *In my place*. NY: Random House.
- Hurston, Z. N. (1954, August 11). Court order can't make races mix [Letter to the editor]. In Martin (Ed.), *Brown v. Board of Education: A brief history with documents* (pps. 209–212). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press. (Reprinted from *Orlando Sentinel*, The Public Thought).
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education* (Ashe-Eric Higher Education Report Volume 26, No. 8). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Jackson, J. P., Jr. (1998). Creating a consensus: Psychologists, the Supreme Court, and school desegregation, 1952–1955. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54, 143–177.
- Jackson, J. P., Jr. (2000). The triumph of the segregationists? A historiographical inquiry into psychology and the litigation. *History of Psychology*, 3, 239–261.
- Kirlaender, M., & Yun, J. T. (2000, August). *Is diversity a compelling educational interest? Evidence from metropolitan Louisville*. Forward by Gary Orfield. Retrieved May 2, 2002, from the Civil Rights Project of Harvard University Web site: <http://www.law.harvard.edu/civilrights/publications/louisville.html>
- Kluger, R. (1977). *Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education, the epochal Supreme Court decision that outlawed segregation, and of black America's century-long struggle for equality under law*. NY: Random House.
- Kornhaber, M. I. (1999, January 14). *Reconfiguring admissions to serve the mission of selective public higher education* (Working paper). Retrieved May 2, 2002, from the Civil Rights Project of Harvard University Web site, <http://www.law.harvard.edu/civilrights/publications/workingpapers/kornhaber.html>
- Lagemann, E. C., & Miller, L. P. (1996.). *Brown v. Board of Education: The challenge for today's schools*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lavergne, G. M., & Walker, B. (2000, November). *Implementation and results of HB 588 at the University of Texas at Austin, Report Number 3: Academic performance and persistence of top 10% students, academic year 1999–2000 and Fall 2000*. Retrieved May 6, 2002, from the University of Texas, Austin Web site: <http://www.utexas.edu/student/research/reports/admissions/HB588-report3.html>
- Martin, W. E., Jr. (1998). *Brown v. Board of Education: A brief history with documents*. NY: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.
- McNeely, C. A., Nonnemaker, J. M., & Blum, R. W. (2002). Promoting student attachment to school: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *Journal of School Health*, 72, 138–146.

- Moody, J., & Bearman, P. S. (2002). *Shaping school climate: School context, adolescent social networks, and attachment to school*. Unpublished manuscript, Ohio State University.
- Niemann, Y. F., & Maruyama, G. (in press). Inequities in higher education: issues and promising practices in a world ambivalent about affirmative action. *Journal of Social Issues*.
- Oakes, J. (1996). Two cities' tracking and within school segregation. In E. C. Lagemann & L. P. Miller (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: The Challenge for Today's Schools* (pp. 81–90). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Orfield, G. (2001, July). *Schools more separate: Consequences of a decade of resegregation*. Retrieved May 2, 2002, from The Civil Rights Project of Harvard University Web site: <http://www.law.harvard.edu/civilrights/publications>
- Orfield, G., & Eaton, S. E. (1996). *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*. NY: The New Press.
- Patterson, J. T. (2001). *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights milestone and its troubled legacy*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. P. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *The Claremont Symposium on applied social psychology: Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). Understanding ethnic diversity: The role of ethnic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 143–152.
- Phinney, J. S., Horenzyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 493–510.
- Phinney, J. S., Romero, I., Nava, M., & Huang, D. (2001). The role of language, parents, and peers in ethnic identity among adolescents in immigrant families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30, 135–153.
- Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Roberts, R. E., Phinney, J. S., Masse, L. C., Chen, Y. R., Roberts, C. R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19, 301–322.
- Rowley, S. J., Sellers, R. M., Chavous, T. M., & Smith, M. A. (1998). The relationship between racial identity and self-esteem in African American college and high school students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 715–724.
- Schoem, D., & Hurtado, S. (Eds.). (2001). *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and the workplace*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Scott, D. M. (1997). *Contempt and Pity: Social Policy and the Image of the Damaged Black Psyche 1880–1996*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Sellers, R. M., Chavous, T. M., & Cooke, D. Y. (1998). Racial ideology and racial centrality as predictors of African American college students' academic performance. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24, 8–27.
- Sherif, M. (1958). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 349–356.
- Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52, 613–619.
- Streitmatter, J. L. (1999). *For girls only: Making the case for single-sex schooling*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). "Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" *And other conversations about race*. NY: Basic Books.
- U. S. Census Bureau (2002a). State and county quick facts. Retrieved May 15, 2002 from <http://www.census.gov>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2002b). *Projections of the resident population by race, Hispanic origin, and nativity: middle series, 2050–2070*. Population Projections Program, Population Division, U. S. Census Bureau. Retrieved May 15, 2002 from <http://www.census.gov/population/projections/nation/summary/np-t5-g.pdf>
- Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1973 *et seq.* (West Legal Dictionary, Constitutional: Discrimination, para. 1).

- Watson, L. W. & Kuh, G. D. (1996). The influence of dominant race environments on student involvement, perceptions, and educational gains: A look at historically black and predominantly white liberal arts institutions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37, 415–424.
- Wells, A. S. (1996). Reexamining social science research on school desegregation: Long versus short-term effects. In E. C. Lagemann & L. P. Miller (Eds.) *Brown v. Board of Education: The challenge for today's schools* (pp. 91–106). NY: Teachers College Press.
- Wilkinson, J. H., III (1979). *From Brown to Bakke: The Supreme Court and school desegregation, 1954–1978*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Zirkel, S. (2002). Is there a place for me? Role models and academic identity among White students and students of color. *Teachers College Record*, 104, 357–376.

SABRINA ZIRKEL is Associate Professor and Director of the Social Transformation Program at Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center. She received her PhD in Psychology from the University of Michigan in 1991. Her primary research interests are in identity development and change and, especially, on how identity is shaped by social structure. Of particular interest in this area is the development of academic and professional identities among women and students of color in adolescence and adulthood. She has published a recent article on role models and achievement among students of color in *Teachers College Record* and work on social intelligence and identity development in adolescence and young adult development in *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Social Cognition*, *The Handbook of Personality Psychology*, and the *Handbook of Emotional Intelligence*.

NANCY CANTOR is Chancellor of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. She received her PhD in Psychology in 1978 from Stanford University. Since that time, she has been Professor and served administratively at the University of Michigan and Princeton University. As Vice Provost and then Provost of the University of Michigan, she was instrumental in U of M's fight to defend their affirmative action policies before she moved to the University of Illinois. She is widely published. She co-authored a monograph with John Kihlstrom entitled *Personality and Social Intelligence*, and published scores of peer-reviewed articles and book chapters. Her research and theoretical work have focused on developing her social intelligence model of personality in which she examines individuals' flexible and functional efforts to adapt to current situations and normative developmental life tasks.

Copyright of Journal of Social Issues is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.