Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line...
Robert A Rhoads; Jodi L Anderson
Review of Higher Education; Summer 2003; 26, 4; Research Library
pg. 539

David Yamane. *Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line in Higher Education.* Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. 216 pp. Paper: $17.95. ISBN 0-8018-7099-2.

REVIEWED BY ROBERT A. RHOADS, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND INFORMATION STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, AND JODI L. ANDERSON, PH.D. CANDIDATE, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND INFORMATION STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

In *Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line in Higher Education,* David Yamane addresses a vital concern: How do we transform higher education curricula to reflect the diverse society in which we live? Yamane argues that issues related to multiculturalism, especially in the area of curricular reform, have touched off "culture wars" within the academy. Accordingly, he highlights the connection between education and politics, noting that debates over "multiculturalism in education are debates over who we Americans are and what we Americans should be" (p. 5). Yamane centers his inquiry around a particular manifestation of multiculturalism and the culture wars: "the debate over whether courses that focus on issues such as race/ethnicity, cultural diversity, cultural pluralism, and ethnic studies should be required for bachelor's degrees in American colleges and universities" (p. 6). He describes "multicultural general education requirements" as addressing the "curricular color line."

Here, Yamane borrows from W.E.B. Du Bois and his contention that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line,—the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea" (1903, p. 54). More specifically, Yamane sets his exploration of the color line within the context of university curriculum reform by studying the adoption of multicultural requirements at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and the University of California, Berkeley. Although he explores the role of student activists in the development of multicultural requirements, Yamane also emphasizes the connection of the Madison and Berkeley cases with the broader struggle to achieve racial equality.

He first provides background about student movements and multiculturalism, then discusses the context in which a student-led movement for curricular reform developed at Madison and the conditions under which students at Berkeley organized for multicultural curricular reform. Chapter 4 describes how both universities planned and adopted new curricular policies that included an ethnic studies requirement, while the next chapter considers the institutionalization of multicultural reforms at both institutions. The final chapter situates this study within the broader debates about higher education and multiculturalism. Yamane counters critics' assertions that multiculturalism has contributed to the decline of the traditional liberal arts education, arguing instead that the true threat is the growing vocationalization of higher education. He bases his case for multicultural curriculum reform on higher education's need to prepare students for citizenship in an increasingly diverse and interdependent society.

A shortcoming of the book is its overreliance on Levine's (1980) four-step model of academic innovation: (a) recognizing the need for change, (b) planning and formulating a means of satisfying the need, (c) initiating and implementing the plan, and (d) institutionalizing or terminating the new operating plan. Such a model assumes that academic institutions operate rationally, an assumption that runs contrary to a great deal of scholarly work on academic organizations. A rationalistic perspective of the academy also contradicts the essence of student movements, which suggests that change occurs from political pressure. Consequently, adopting multicultural general education requirements may not be about recognizing a particular need as much as about responding to pressures that students and student groups can bring to bear on curriculum.

Interestingly, Yamane cites some of the social movement literature but never acknowledges that sociologists have generally shifted their analyses away from rational choice perspectives toward the roles of identity and ideology in social reform (Calhoun, 1994; Laraña, Johnston, & Gusfield, 1994). A second point of concern is the lack of student voices throughout the text. We found it odd that the author went to the considerable trouble of interviewing 58 individuals involved in multicultural curriculum reform but that only five were students. A book focusing on "student movements" would benefit from rich interviews with student organizers engaged in such processes.

Despite these shortcomings, Yamane nonetheless provides insight into key processes associated with multicultural reform and curricular change. For example, *Student Movements for Multiculturalism* underscores the transformative capacity that students can exercise on academic concerns. At both Berkeley and Madison, students were the key players in challenging more traditional views of the curriculum. Yamane's discussion of how "Hamletic strategies" (procrastination and stalling) are often used to sidetrack innovation and reform is likewise an important contribution.

In conclusion, Yamane offers a rich account of student-initiated multicultural change at two

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

universities that historically have been major sites for student organizing. For scholars and practitioners interested in multiculturalism, student activism, and academic reform in general, *Student Movements for Multiculturalism* will be a helpful contribution.

REFERENCES

Calhoun, C. (Ed.). (1994). *Social theory and the politics of identity.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1903/1969). *The souls of black folk.* New York: New American Library.

Laraña, E., Johnston, H., & Gusfield, J. R. (Eds.). (1994). *New social movements: From ideology to identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Levine, A. (1980). *Why innovation fails.* Albany: State University of New York.

Stephen Brint (Ed.). *The Future of the City of Intellect: The Changing American University.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002. 392 pp. Paper: $24.95. ISBN 0-8047-4531-5.

REVIEWED BY JOHN R. THELIN, UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY AND ASHE PRESIDENT IN 1999–2000

Editor Stephen Brint has orchestrated a talented cast to probe and project the American university's future in the 21st century. The title pays homage to the "city of the intellect" terminology that Clark Kerr introduced in the concluding chapter of *The Uses of the University* 40 years ago. What makes this new work appealing is that the authors acknowledge Kerr's landmark work without pandering. Each selection is crisp and critical. In sum, they show that the study of higher education is no stranger to disciplinary rigor. Authors represent such fields as sociology, history, economics, rhetoric, political science, and psychology. Although the book is organized around a common theme, contributors avoid homogeneity; their respective tones range from the measured optimism of senior scholar Burton Clark to the justifiable skepticism of sociologist Randall Collins and the critical warnings of Sheila Slaughter.

Since the book was based on papers presented at a symposium at University of California, Riverside, it understandably has a West Coast character. Given the historical importance of the University of California as a prototype for the multi-versity, this emphasis makes sense. Balancing this regional flavor are Roger Geiger from Penn State, Richard Chait from Harvard, Andrew Abbott from the University of Chicago, David Collis from Yale, and Randall Collins from Penn. Brint, already well known as a sociologist and as coauthor, with Jerome Karabel, of *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900–1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989) brings comparable critical insight to the research university that he earlier used in analyzing the history and missions of community colleges.

Space limitations prevent comments on each selection. Suffice it to say that this anthology provides abundant food for thought about higher education. The caveat with this rich diet is that discussing the future leans toward "social science fiction" embellished by melodrama of either very favorable or very catastrophic projections. In fact, much of the future—as with the past and present—is banal. For example, whether in Kerr's original 1963 Godkin Lectures or 2002, futurologists seldom mention the quiet yet pervasive importance of an innovation such as Xerox which made cheap, quick, abundant photocopying a staple of institutional life—and also contributed the latent dysfunction of finding storage space for duplicate copies of every memo. More attention goes to the glamour of computers and a "digital revolution" than the accumulation of paper. In fact, both spectacular and pedestrian changes coexist.

Readers also must be on the alert when futurology merely confirms the obvious. This involves a grammatical sleight of hand in which an author takes an established practice and announces it as a prophecy. For example, we know today that "biological sciences are important." But one can be pseudo-profound by proclaiming, "In the not too distant future, biological sciences will be important." Mercifully, the essays commit only petty larceny on these foibles of futurism.

Richard Lanham, UCLA English professor emeritus turned entrepreneur, uses his essay on virtual universities to uncover the hypocrisies that universities invoke to maintain existing practices. Having made a good point, he then chides the university for being the only organization that is oblivious to efficiency. But is the university truly unique in this syndrome? Many modern organizations prize effectiveness far more than efficiency. When one is working on exciting projects, saving money is a peripheral consideration—whether it is NASA, NASCAR, the NFL, Lockheed, the Department of Defense, Haliburton Corporation, or a research park sponsored by the University of California. If you are on a roll, who cares how much it costs?

Various selections, including one by Lanham and others by, respectively, Carol Tomlinson-Keasey and David Collis, discuss the impact of new technology on teaching and learning. They hint at an understudied phenomenon: namely, the proposition that the physical design of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.