Mapping the Broad Field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education Worldwide

Mapping the Broad Field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education Worldwide: Towards the Development of a New Citizen

Edited by

Nektaria Palaiologou and Gunther Dietz

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS

PUBLISHING

Mapping the Broad Field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education Worldwide:
Towards the Development of a New Citizen,
Edited by Nektaria Palaiologou and Gunther Dietz

Multicultural and Intercultural Education Series
Series Editor: Nektaria Palaiologou

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4031-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4031-6

Dedicated to the many unknown people whose everyday fights and efforts give us hope to believe that modern diverse societies will continue to survive even when times are difficult, because positive human values that forge a link between us all cannot be defeated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

At this point at the end of the first decade of the 21st century it is a great pleasure for me as the current President of the International Association for Intercultural Education (IAIE) to report that we have as now been functioning for nearly three decades. The organization was formed by a small group of people at the Institute of Education, University of London, in 1982. This group included Pieter Batelaan (Netherlands), Steffan Lundgren (Sweden), Gerd Hoff (West Germany) and me from the UK. The organization was very active throughout the rest of the twentieth century with conferences, seminars and meetings in various places, ranging from Vancouver in Canada, to Washington in the United States, Adelaide in Australia and of course many countries in Europe. Additionally, the IAIE undertook various research and development projects sponsored by a large number of agencies. We considered these initiatives as important because of the levels of educational inequality, discriminatory practices of various kinds and the absence of social justice within societies.

It is therefore important that those struggles for greater freedom, greater levels of social equality, greater levels of human and social rights and democratic engagements in modern constitutional terms are based on substantive grounds although most of these problems remain with us, and many of the contributions presented here – resulting from the International Association for Intercultural Education (IAIE) and former Hellenic Institute of Migration Policy (IMEPO) joint International Conference on "Intercultural Education: Paideia, Polity, Demoi", which took place from 22nd until 26th June in Athens in 2009 – deal with these and similar issues.

In the European and the North American contexts the focus and discourse has been largely on the minorities and the immigrant communities, but I hope that we will now enhance our focus to include the subordinated indigenous peoples as well as the dominant and majority communities.

Firstly, we should between us start to broaden our work to make it more inclusive and comprehensive and work not just with pedagogues using deficit models of work, but with academic disciplines in the arts, humanities, social and hard sciences. This will make our work more

innovative, transformative, imaginative and creative and have a more realistic impact in improving the life chances of young people.

Secondly, this will enable our work to have more of an evidence base which would have to be taken seriously by academics, policy makers and practitioners. This evidence basis of the work may also include ethnographic, participatory, evaluative, statistical and action modalities and strategies.

Thirdly, the above strategies and a more well thought through collaborative and tactical approaches should be developed by us to ensure that issues of multiculturalism and interculturalism are not used by politicians and others in their 'cultural wars'. They do this to marginalize the substantive societal issues of inequalities, injustices, poverty and exclusion. We need to ensure that our field and our work is of central concern to most societies, public institutions, social and public policy.

Fourthly, we need to renew our efforts to ensure that multilingualism and its implication on our citizens lives are an issue which is not just given lip services. This approach has disenfranchised many millions of people from acquiring their full citizenship rights.

Fifthly, the focus of intercultural education has to move beyond the focus on 'ethnic' identities. In inter-generational terms communities have become fragmented, segmented, and identities range from singularized notions of self to those of being mestizo and hybrid, and these issues have profound impact on our work and on citizenship rights. This is also essential because millions of young people have developed autonomous peer group cultures which are not amenable to adult influences, whether that of teachers, youth workers or their parents. They are part of an excluded poor and minority group communities. They have been forced into leading criminalized lives and are involved in drugs and do not have an opportunity to improve their lives. What role can the IAIE, the education and social systems do to reverse this serious trend and try to bridge the massive gaps in equality?

All young people need to attend the common schools and higher education institutions to develop shared public values in diverse and democratic communities where the intercultural fabric is becoming weaker, conflictual and marginalized within the polity. Genocides are not just a remote possibility but are with us now. At this level it is important to create new political and academic spaces so that diverse groups can begin to develop initiatives to build shared educational and public values which decades of privatization have destroyed.

This should be replaced with the deepening of intercultural understandings and learning which create solidarities with shared and

common public values, active democratic and inclusive communities and institutions, to safeguard global stability and human rights on equal basis for all populations.

Through a critical lens on the intercultural and multicultural issues, the aim of this book is to highlight social, political and educational aspects in modern multicultural cities and to raise questions on the new type of citizen and civitas that has been emerged in modern demoi-societies.

The work of the two editors, Nektaria Palaiologou and Gunther Dietz, both current Board Members of the IAIE, with whom I cooperate closely as President of the IAIE and their work and efforts are well known to me, I would like to acknowledge their intellectual commitment as a new generation of academics who are working to broaden the international discourse in this field. This book on the intercultural and multicultural issues between the two continents, Europe and America, is an evidence of this development.

The contributions included in the book are invited chapters, many of which were presented at the International Conference on "Intercultural Education: Paideia, Polity, Demoi", in Athens in 2009, which gathered about 500 participants from all around the world.

I believe that Nektaria Palaiologou with this book is launching us into publishing of a sequel of volumes on "Intercultural Series", which can be based on IAIE's forthcoming Conferences. Gunther Dietz, as the current General Secretary of IAIE has fully supported this effort as co-editor of this book.

This volume also marks the start of academic exchange at global level which can help to build bridges amongst very diverse groups and develop collaboration amongst educators in all the continents. We hope that this development will begin to address some of our common and shared values as citizens in democratic states.

Professor Jagdish S. Gundara
President of the IAIE
Emeritus Professor in Intercultural Education, Institute of Education, University of London
UNESCO Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Studies and Teacher Education

PROLOGUE

"If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost"
—Aristotle, Ancient Greek Philosopher, Scientist and Physician, 384 -322 BC

We are living in an era which, more than ever before, is characterized by complexities and multiplicities in all sectors of life. Most countries around the globe share concerns about social cohesion and stability. Violence, social tensions, migration, and the current global economic recession have brought to the forefront a crisis in various social domains and the need to find ways to secure the stability and viability of modern multicultural nations.

In the history of humanity, communities and their residents have been characterized by their variability: Majorities, immigrants, minorities, disenfranchised groups, stateless persons without citizenship or nationality, people who speak different languages, with various religious beliefs and cultures, attitudes in their lives etc, are all living together on this planet. In other words, people have always been characterized by differences, either because of their skin color and appearance, their gender, sexual orientation, social class, or their language, geographical origin etc, leading to both histories of harmony and conflict.

In academic terms, this diversity, as an intrinsic characteristic of all societies,[1] is reflected in the terms of *multiculturalism* and *interculturalism*. According to a prevailing trend in the literature, "multiculturalism describes the variety in modern nation states" (Gundara 2000, Gundara 2008a) and "implies that members of such groups should have equal rights in all spheres of society, without being expected to give up their diversity" (Castles, p. 24, in: Banks 2004). Scholars from around the globe have argued about the definition of terms like "Multicultural" and "Intercultural" Education, core terms in this volume.

[1] Societal Diversity can be created through migration or domestic developments, aspirations and conflicts. In this volume, the focus is on diversity issues related to migration.

The idea for this volume arose during the joint International Conference of the International Association of Intercultural Education with the former Hellenic Migration Policy Institute, in 2009 in Athens, Greece. The conference was a significant educational event and at the same time a social gathering with participants from around the globe. During the Conference, it became clear that people from different countries, irrespective of their educational, social approaches or disciplines, shared similar concerns about their societies and were trying to express their ideas in a common international language, English in our case. Another issue that was raised during the Conference was that various aspects associated with multiculturalism and interculturalism could refer to different situations. This is because these terms are conceived, conceptualized and given credence in accordance to specific contexts (educational, societal, anthropological, etc.) Different countries and communities give priority to different dimensions of these terms.

For example, in very general terms, the term "multicultural" is used more frequently in the USA, whereas in Europe the term "intercultural" is deemed more preferable.

Especially during the last decade, the concepts of "multicultural" and "intercultural", as adjectives, and "multiculturalism" and "interculturalism" as nouns have been food for debate. Here, we will mention a few key contributions to this debate.

To start with, Bhadha (1998) points to the "tendency for multiculturalism to be appropriated to as a *'portmanteau term'*, one that encapsulates a variety of sometimes contested meanings" (p.31).

Along these lines, Meer and Modood argue that (2012):

> "Multiculturalism as a concept is like very many others 'polysemic' such that multiculturalist authors cannot be held entirely responsible for the variety of ways in which the term is interpreted." They also mention that "one illustration is the manner in which multiculturalism is simultaneously used as a label to describe the fact of pluralism or diversity in any given society, and a moral stance that cultural diversity is a desirable feature of a given society (as well as the different types of ways in which the state could recognize and support it). Moreover, in both theoretical and policy discourses, multiculturalism means different things in different places" (p.179).

Meer and Modood place emphasis on the interpretation of the content associated with the term "multiculturalism", which can mean very different things in different places and has different connotations, depending on the context.

Also, they state that "Multiculturalism surpasses interculturalism as a political orientation that is able to recognize that social life consists of individuals and groups, and that both need to be provided for in the formal and informal distribution of powers, as well as reflected in an ethical conception of citizenship, and not just an instrumental one" (p. 192).

Meer and Modood raise the question whether interculturalism is all that different from multiculturalism. Others have also reflected on this issue.

For example, Werbner (2012) contends that "multiculturalism in Britain, as applied to immigrant minorities rather than territorial ones, is a politically and bureaucratically negotiated order, often at the local level, responsive to ethnic grassroots pressure, budgetary constraints and demands for redistributive justice. It is bottom-up rather than top-down; a politics of citizenship, like other group politics (Werbner 2005, cited in Werbner 2012. p. 200). He continues by stating that the "failure of multiculturalism' discourse has taken root in Britain, promoted by politicians, the media and academics, and is a central aspect of the debate between Muslim leaders and British politicians" (p. 201). Werbner highlights "the central role that multiculturalism from above can play, at least in Britain, in facilitating intercultural or inter-faith openness and dialogue", and concludes that "it is extremely counterproductive that politicians tend to use multiculturalism as a euphemism for immigration or extremism" (p. 207).

In this way, Werbner emphasizes the political character of multiculturalism, referring to a bottom-up struggle as well as a policy-making tool. There is reference to 'multiculturalism in history' and not only to multiculturalism as day-to-day tolerance.

Kymlicka (2012) reminds us in the White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue, issued by the Council of Europe in 2008, and signed by ministers from the 47 member states, that "there was a clear political consensus that we need a post-multicultural alternative, to be called 'interculturalism'" (p. 213). He comments on Meer's and Modood's above-mentioned work, pointing out that:

> "And so we may want to ask, not whether 'interculturalism as a remedy for failed multiculturalism' is a sound scientific analysis (it isn't), but whether it offers a compelling political narrative that can potentially sustain a flagging commitment to diversity. I'm far from convinced it can, but then again it's far from clear what the alternative strategy is for addressing popular discontent with diversity. In any event, this seems to me to be the real question to ask of the interculturalism vs. multiculturalism trope. It's important to be aware of the misinterpretations and conceptual ambiguities

> pointed out by Meer and Modood, but recognising the mythical quality of the trope is, from my perspective, just the start of the analysis.We now need to ask what work this myth can do, for whom, in which contexts, and how this compares with alternative strategies for addressing popular discontents. And in so far as we think there is a potentially enabling political myth here, at least in countries where multiculturalism has been demonised beyond rehabilitation, progressive intellectuals may decide to invest their energies, not in deflating the myth, but rather in making it work" (p. 215).

Levey (2012), from Australia, refers to the importance of context in his own reflections on the terms "multiculturalism" and "interculturalism". He comments that, "a decade or so ago, interculturalism as used in Continental Europe tended to focus on the relations among citizens and groups in civil society rather than on the state's relation to its cultural minorities, arguably, the predominant concern of multiculturalism"[2]. He further develops a rationale suggesting that "there is, perhaps, something narrowly political at stake in the interculturalists' campaign to supplant multiculturalism". He believes it is important to "distinguish between 'hard' and 'soft' claims underpinning the alleged contrast in the use of the two terms" (p. 217), and that nowadays the European debate has been "Canadianised" (p. 218). In an earlier work, Levey (2009) had suggested that 'interculturalism' is just as semantically problematic as multiculturalism, since both terms conjure images of culturalism ruling the roost (in: Levey 2012, p. 223).

Wieviorka (2012) alleges that:

> "the the main limit to a potential concept of interculturalism is due to the fact that it proposes to connect cultures with each other while multiculturalism is concerned with setting up a legal and institutional framework enabling each culture which it considers to find a place in a society while, at the same time, being recognised at the level of public authorities and the State". He concludes that "multiculturalism is a concept that can and must be re-enchanted, while interculturalism functions at a much less sophisticated level, and a much less political one for us to be able to assert that it can act as a substitute. At the most, it may be possible to envisage it as complementary" (p. 230).

The suggestion by Wieviorka to see these two terms as "complementary", and according to Levey to analyze them by taking into consideration their geographical context and the claims underlined in their usage, could

[2] Levey notes that this situation is aptly captured by Will Kymlicka's working-title (2003), ''Multicultural States and Intercultural Citizens''.

provide a significant framework for a proper interpretation of the terms. This would help avoid misunderstandings regarding the debates and lines of argumentation raised either in the literature or at conferences.

In some of his earlier work, Wieviorka (1998) refers to comments by Benhabib[3], where she explains that 'the term "multiculturalism" has been used in recent discussions to refer to phenomena ranging from the integration of migrant workers and post-colonials into European nation states like France and Germany, to the right of the Francophone community in Quebec to assert its cultural, linguistic, and political autonomy, to debates about teaching the "canon" of the Western tradition in philosophy, literature and the arts. Because of its confusing deployment in all these instances, the term has practically lost meaning…" (Benhabib 1996, p. 17: in Wieviorka 1998, p. 908).'

Meer and Modood (2012), in their "Rejoinder", acknowledge that Wieviorka provides some needed critical reflection on the alleged 'Anglo-Saxon ethno-centrism' reflected in their aforementioned work. They reply that this is because their work is based on materials that are in the English language, and to a limited extent to writings by non-native English authors who express their views in English (p. 236), and they also tend to agree with him that both terms could be envisaged as "complimentary". They also find the distinction between 'hard' and 'soft' claims deployed by Levey in the interculturalist critique very useful. Whilst they are "in agreement over the status of 'hard' claims (i.e. of the arguments for rejecting multiculturalism in favour of interculturalism are not persuasive)", they believe that "Levey does see something of value in 'soft' interculturalism, especially its stress on communication" (p. 241)

The role of the citizen is a core issue in the debate about multiculturalism.

Especially in modern societies, the role of citizen has been a key focus for political philosophers of our times, such as Habermas (2012) and Rawls (1971), political theorists, such as Kymlicka, and social anthropologists such as Rosaldo. These authors, though from different disciplines, share common concerns about the role of citizens in modern democratic societies.

Kymlicka (1995) has developed the notion of "multicultural citizenship" and Rosaldo (1997) of "cultural citizenship". A citizen is an individual who lives in a nation-state and has certain rights and privileges, as well as duties to the state, according to Legassé (2001).

[3] Benhabib, S. (1996) Democracy and Difference. Contesting the Boundaries of the Political, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

In his classical citizenship typology, Marshall (1964) conceptualizes three elements of citizenship – the civil, the political and the social – which correspond to the historical development of citizenship in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. Since Marshall did not live during the most recent era of mass migration he could not foresee the next dimension in the development of citizenship, that of cultural rights.

This new dimension in citizenship -multicultural citizenship, as conceived by Kymlicka in his book *Multicultural Citizenship* (1995) focuses both on theory and the many problems confronting modern societies today, especially relating to multiculturalism and group rights. Kymlicka's novel approach is rooted in contemporary social analysis, in that it examines the ethnic and racial diversity of societies, and the increasing connection among these societies through modern forms of transportation and communication. These increased connections have brought issues of identity and rights to the forefront in social movements, individual experiences, and public policy. Kymlicka has developed an analysis that leads to policy implications and to implications for the way in which we look at ourselves and others, and how we as individuals, in groups and in society, relate to each other. In societies that will become increasingly diverse in terms of nationality and ethnicity - also in the next century- these are critical issues for scholars and researchers. The writings by the authors in this volume have been influenced and inspired by these developments.

Banks (2007) has also highlighted the importance of the concept of multicultural citizenship, especially when envisaging the impact of cultural diversities on modern states and the need to establish new rights that include all subordinate groups (chapter 1, in this volume; also in: Banks 2009, p. 305).

According to Werbner (2012) “Multicultural citizenship has similarly had its skeptical critics and defenders. Much of the multicultural debate at the turn of the century has focused on the politics of multicultural citizenship in plural or immigrant societies, and concerns language or religious rights rather than ‘culture’ per se”. She refers to Tempelman (1999) who distinguishes three forms of multiculturalism: ‘primordial’, associated with Taylor; ‘civic’, associated with Parekh; and ‘universalist’, associated with Kymlicka (p. 198-199).

Nye (2007) points to the importance of distinguishing between national identity (and citizenship) and residence (or denizenship)” (p.115-116), by

referring to the works of Hammar (1994) and Atikcan[4] (2006). He also refers to Samad[5] (1997) and concludes that "an important starting point for the discussion of multiculturalism is to distinguish three different primary understandings of the concept: multiculturalism as an ideology, multiculturalism as a social issue, and the academic study of multiculturalism" (p. 111).

The notion of citizenship can be understood as "belongingness" to a community (Gundara, chapter 2, in this volume; also, Gundara 2001: p. 51-52, in: Gundara & Jacobs 2001). "Positive secularism entails an understanding of all citizens of our shared "belongingness" in a complex society of shared rules and values. Secular collectivism moves towards the notion of "belongingness" of all groups in society" (Gundara 2001: p. 154). Gundara stresses the role of education. For him "the major issue is how the education system can legitimize this belongingness for diverse groups in society, particularly if dominant groups reject it" (cited, as above)

In the relevant literature, citizenship and citizenship education (i.e. school textbooks and curricula) are approached and interpreted either in a horizontal or vertical context. When citizenship is depicted as a function of nationality, then it is associated with commitment to officially recognized and shared rules, symbols and values (vertical approach). In cases where citizenship and citizenship education are not associated directly to nationality, the reference is to a horizontal approach.

There is an emphasis on rights and responsibilities in the educational programmes relating to citizenship in some countries, something which raises questions and implies that some groups either do not have the same or equal rights, and also that people acquire citizenship after an ongoing struggle. In addition, such an approach reflects the existence of an unequal society, with subordinate, disenfranchised groups, usually because of their social class and origin. These have the status of "second class" citizens or denizens.

---

[4] Atikcan, E. O. 2006. 'Citizenship or denizenship: the treatment of third country nationals in the European Union'. Sussex European Institute, SEI Working Paper no 85. Availablefrom www.sussex.ac.uk/sei/1-4-10-1.html; INTERNET. Hammar, T. 1994. Democracy and the national state: aliens, denizens and citizens in a world of international migration. Aldershot: Avebury.

[5] Samad, Y. (1997) The plural guises of multiculturalism: conceptualising a fragmented paradigm. In: *The politics of multiculturalism in the New Europe: racism, identity and community*, edited by T. Modood, and P. Werbner. London: Zed Books.

Citizenship education in the curricula and programmes of most countries is presented in a more folkloristic way, as a celebration and acceptance of diverse holidays and customs (see: Banks 2004).

The issues which are discussed in this volume address core matters with respect to modern diverse societies. The most important relate to the following: the societal needs of migrant populations and the educational needs of their children; the exclusivist policies which usually impact migrant groups; the need to enrich school texts and curricula with new intercultural and citizenship dimensions; the importance of integrating the notion of *Paideia* within the school ethos and educational programmes.

The 29 chapters in this volume are invitation only contributions. The majority of these are based on earlier presentations at the International Conference on Intercultural Education, organized by the International Association of Intercultural Education (IAIE), in cooperation with the former Migration Policy Institute in Greece, under the aegis of the UNESCO Division of Culture and Education, and with the support of international and national organizations, hosted in Athens from 22-26 June 2009. The Conference was entitled "Paideia, Polity and Demoi"[6], a title that was inspired by the President of IAIE, Professor Jagdish Gundara, during IAIE's official meeting in Sarajevo in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 2006.

The writings in this volume reflect the engagement of the authors with issues relating to modern multicultural cities and their citizens. During the IAIE's Athens Conference in 2009 we traced the path back to the ancient Greek Demoi, in order to make some connections to modern societies and draw some useful lessons from the ancient Greeks[7].

The 29 chapters that were finally accepted for publication in this volume were reviewed by prominent scholars in the fields of Intercultural, Multicultural, International and Comparative Education, coming from different continents, whose critical comments to the authors were valuable in order to ameliorate their work. When reading these texts, readers should keep in mind that the authors are speaking from their own particular contexts.

There is a great diversity of authors in terms of national background and scientific discipline (i.e. educational, sociological, anthropological etc.). Nevertheless, this volume highlights that authors share some common

[6] See also the Special Issue published by *Intercultural Education* Journal, invited contributions based on the IAIE's Athens 2009 Conference, entitled: *Intercultural Education: New century, new needs. Conceptual and Empirical Challenges*, vol. 24, no 4, August 2011.

[7] From "Demos", "Demoi" in plural number. About the notion of "Demos", see at the "Conclusions" chapter, section 6, in this volume.

ideas and tend to believe in the notion of Intercultural/Multicultural Education as a useful new dimension within the dynamics of many disciplines, as a new inter-disciplinary approach that is embedded within them and which characterizes modern societies.

For this reason, the title of this volume, "Mapping the field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education worldwide: Towards the development of a new citizen", has a dual aim. The first aim is to envisage the field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education from different disciplines at the international level, describing the new educational and social conditions that have been created by recent migration and identifying new trends in the field. In the title of this Volume, the term "Multicultural" has been placed first, since the editors agree that the term "multicultural" should be seen as an umbrella term that includes various forms of different 'cultures' and groups of people, while the term "Intercultural Education" places emphasis on the interaction and communication amongst socially diverse groups.

The second aim is to highlight the importance of Multicultural and Intercultural Education in the development of a new citizen, who moves around the world, interacting with different people, has a dynamic and flexible identity with polymorphic personal, social and cultural characteristics, a new *intercultural persona.* The role of 'Paideia'[8] to stimulate the development of individuals who are non-dogmatic, who respect the 'Other' and who have a vision for modern peaceful societies through their active participation as citizens, is catalytic. The issues presented in this volume highlight the importance of including Paideia in the aims and programmes of modern educational systems.

As one of the editors of this volume, I would like to thank the following five scholars and colleagues, who have been very active in the IAIE Board, for their volunteer work in reviewing the book chapters and for their support for this volume:
David Coulby, Leslie Bash, Paul Gorski, Michele Kahn, Sharon Duncan, and also Namrata Shamra. I am especially grateful to David Coulby for providing critical remarks and insightful feedback on my Prologue and Epilogue, which helped me to strengthen my frame of thoughts.

Of course, I would like to express my thanks to Gunther Dietz, Secretary General of the IAIE until June 2012, who supported the idea to

[8] The Greek notion of 'Paideia' (or Paedeia) refers to the process of educating people into their true form, the real and genuine human nature. Paideia, combined with *ethos* (habits), made a man good and made him capable as a citizen or a king (see: Aristotle, *Politics* 1288b).

co-edit this volume and launch it as a first volume in Cambridge Scholars Publishing forthcoming Intercultural Education series.

In addition, I would like to thank specifically two persons whose moral support has been precious to my efforts during the ten years I have been cooperating as scholar with the IAIE: Professor Jagdish Gundara, whose advice and ideas have always been an inspiration for me since I was a post-doctoral research fellow at the Institute of Education – University of London, and Barry van Driel, currently one of the IAIE Vice-Presidents and Editor in Chief of the Intercultural Education Journal, who has significantly supported the Conference and the publication of this volume, with whom we both cooperate closely at the Intercultural Education Journal. Also, I would like to thank Professor James Banks, who contributed significantly to the IAIE's Athens Conference in 2009, and added a significant contribution this volume. The fact that two pioneers in the field of Intercultural and Multicultural Education, Professor Jagdish Gundara on the European continent, and Professor James Banks on the American content, add some extra flavor to this volume. Moreover, from this position, I would like to thank all my colleagues – the Board of the IAIE, who are scholars with great expertise in the broader fields of Intercultural and Multicultural Education. Their collaboration and critical insights have greatly helped the field in the development of the IAIE.

Finally, I would like to thank Julia Mikic for our good cooperation in proofreading the whole volume under certain time constraints. I would also like to thank Amanda Pillar from Cambridge Scholars Publishing for the formatting and typesetting, Carol Koulikourdi from Cambridge Scholars Publishing for our cooperation on the publication of this volume and, of course, my family for their continuous moral support in my efforts.

Nektaria Palaiologou, May 2012

References

Banks, J. A. (2004) *Diversity and Citizenship Education. Global Perspectives.* San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons. Translated also in Greek, Pedio publishing company, 2012.

—. (2007) Educating citizens in a multicultural society (2nd ed.) New York: Teachers College Press.

—. (2009) *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education.* New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H., 1998. Culture's in between. In: D. Bennett, ed. Multicultural states – rethinking difference and identity, pp. 29-36. London: Routledge.

Castles, S. (2004) Migration, Citizenship, and Education. In: Banks, J. (2004) *Diversity and Citizenship Education. Global Perspectives*, pp. 17-48. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Grant, C.A., Portera, A. (2010). *Intercultural and Multicultural Education: Enhancing Global Interconnectedness.* Routledge Research in Education. Routledge.

Gundara, J., Jacobs, S. (2000) *Intercultural Europe. Diversity and Social Policy*. Ashgate/Arena. Translated also in Greek, Pedio publishing company, 2012.

Gundara, J. (2001) *Interculturalism, Education and Inclusion*. Sage Publications Ltd.

—. (2008a) Civilisational knowledge, interculturalism and citizenship education, *Intercultural Education Journal* 19, vol. 6, pp. 469-479.

Gundara, J., Portera, A. (2008b) Theoretical Reflections on intercultural education (editorial), *Intercultural Education Journal* 19, vol. 6, pp. 463-468.

Habermas, J. (2012). *The Crisis of the European Union*. In English: Polity Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). Multicultural citizenship. New York: Oxford University Press.

—. (2003). Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. Theory and research in education, vol. 1, pp. 147-169.

—. (2012): Comment on Meer and Modood, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 211-216Legassé, P. (ed.). 2000. *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (6th ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Levey, G. B. (2012): Interculturalism vs. Multiculturalism: A Distinction without a Difference?, Journal of Intercultural Studies, 33:2, 217-224

Meer, N., Modood, T. (2012): How does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism?, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 175-196.

Modood, T., Meer,N. (2012): Rejoinder: Assessing the Divergences on our Readings of Interculturalism and Multiculturalism, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 233-244.

Nye, M. (2007). The Challenges of Multiculturalism, *Culture and Religion. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 8, no 2, pp. 109-123.

Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice. Harvard University Press*. First Published edition 1999, Original Revised edition 2005.

Rosaldo (1997) Cultural citizenship, inequality, and multiculturalism. In: W. V. Flores & R. Benmayor (Eds.) *Latino cultural citizenship: Claiming identity, space, and rights* , pp. 27-38. Boston: Beacon

Werbner, P. (2012): Multiculturalism from Above and Below: Analysing a Political Discourse, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 197-209.

Wieviorka, M. (2012): Multiculturalism: A Concept to be Redefined and Certainly Not Replaced by the Extremely Vague Term of Interculturalism, *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 33, no 2, pp. 225-231.

—. (1998): Is multiculturalism the solution?, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 21, no 5, pp. 881-910.

INTRODUCTION

MULTICULTURAL AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION TODAY: FINDING A 'COMMON TOPOS' IN THE DISCOURSE AND PROMOTING THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN CONTINENTS AND DISCIPLINES

NEKTARIA PALAIOLOGOU
AND GUNTHER DIETZ

1. Multicultural and Intercultural Education today

Educational systems worldwide are still very strongly shaped by their roots in nation-states and national institutional arrangements. Despite international shifts towards common standards such as the ones promoted by the Council of Europe, the United Nations Organization for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO) or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), school structures, curricula, teacher training, classroom strategies and interactions, as well as evaluation cultures, are an integral part of the nation-states domain of educational policies. Educational systems differ at least in their degree of centralization-decentralization, in their emphasis on national-regional-municipal policy making, in their public-private mixture of stakeholders, in their inclusion or exclusion of confessional or faith-based organizations and in their social comprehensiveness vs. class differentiation. Diverse curricular, teaching and learning styles add to these national differences in school structures.

This "national bias" of schooling is particularly visible when we focus on the ways each educational system handles so-called minority pupils

and/or students. As in each educational system the national school culture is based on the presumption of "normality", of the "normal" child or adolescent; the "abnormal" and "exceptional" always tends to challenge educational norms, standards and procedures of school integration, of learning and of measuring failure or success. Accordingly, in the last half a century very different educational systems have been forced to react to the increasing presence and/or visibility of students who no longer represent the – often merely statistical or fictional – "normal citizenry" (Gogolin & Krüger-Potratz 2006).

In order to "accommodate" these diverse students to the still nationally or at least regionally homogeneous school cultures, a series of sub-branches have been developed in different countries and educational systems. So-called "special education" for pupils with non-standard mental and/or physical capabilities has been offered mostly apart from the "normal" school and classroom structures, but is increasingly being integrated into "normal" classroom learning through "inclusive" educational strategies. Rather similarly, students coming from non-standard mother tongue households are grouped in so-called "bilingual education" classes or schools; these strategies mostly start from either the premise of transitional bilingualism – learning to write and to read in their mother tongue in order to fully access the official *lingua franca* without further needing the mother tongue – or the opposite premise of maintaining their "heritage language" – in order to be able to return to their region or country of origin (Gogolin 2002b).

Linguistic diversity has been the major challenge for the supposed homogeneity of the nation-states' "normal" school system. However, religious diversification constitutes a similar challenge both for laicist, non-faith oriented school systems and for mono-religious, faith-based educational cultures (Jackson 1997). Accommodating new or newly perceived religious cultures inside schools has created tensions with policymakers, parents' associations and teachers alike. Again, as comparative research has shown, each educational system reacts according to its own path dependence, its own tradition of making difference visible or invisible, of including or excluding faith-related issues in the official curriculum (Weisse 2007).

These linguistic and religious challenges are only the "tip of the iceberg" of a broader need to step by step recognize cultural diversity as part of each educational institution's reservoir of teaching and learning resources. Although cultural diversity is still perceived by educational actors as a source of "problems", heterogeneity is slowly but persistently becoming a creative challenge, a relevant resource for developing new

educational responses. According to the particular nation-state's tradition of recognizing diversity, this still rather new approach is sometimes coined multicultural education, whereas in other contexts it is named intercultural education (Dietz 2009).

These terms, on the one hand, reflect divergent definitions of national identity: countries whose mainstream or dominant population stems from immigration, such as Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, tend to use *multicultural education* in order to reflect the official recognition of multiculturalism as a new ideology of their respective nation-states, whereas European nation-states originally based on autochthonous dominant ethnicities tend to concede *intercultural education*, predominantly defined as a reciprocal strategy of minority-majority integration or accommodation in increasingly post-national constellations (see: Gundara 2001).

However, on the other hand, these terminological distinctions are often blurred in their contemporary uses. In our impression, several national educational systems both in continental Europe and in Latin America, for instance, do not adopt the notion of multicultural education, simply because it connotes a certain "anglo" origin, not because of its particular emphasis on recognition instead of interaction. Therefore, in this volume we are including contributions and case studies from educational contexts which use either explicitly intercultural or explicitly multicultural strategies and programs.

What is more relevant for analytical as well as practical purposes is the distinction which is still maintained in different programs of intercultural/multicultural education, particularly with regard to the prevailing target group of the particular educational model, program or project:

- Both in historical immigration countries and in the postcolonial nation-states of Europe, intercultural/multicultural educational initiatives tend to target "new" immigrant communities and their children.
- In postcolonial Latin America, but also in other "southern" contexts and increasingly also in some European and Oceanian and North American contexts, intercultural/multicultural education explicitly targets native peoples, not immigrant communities. These peoples sometimes are minorities inside their nation-states, but often constitute genuine minorities inside their respective regions.
- And, finally, in different educational systems we perceive a shift from minority-oriented towards majority-oriented intercultural/ multicultural education, which starts either from the need to

prevent racism and other forms of discrimination, or which perceives the necessity to "interculturalize" the majority students' monolingual and monocultural habitus (Gogolin 1994).

These different target groups and their related educational strategies can only be assessed and critically analyzed through a genuinely global perspective, which is the one we are following in the course of the present book.

2. A global view on intercultural education

Throughout different countries, contexts and educational systems, multiculturalism as a normative program, as well as intercultural education as a diversity-driven pedagogical strategy, have become truly global throughout the last decades. In order to be able to critically engage in a fruitful, truly "intercultural" dialogue between multicultural theorists and activists on the one hand, and between academic and practitioners' knowledge on diversity on the other, we need a particularly, and constantly, self-reflexive and mutually comparative approach. In this way, we can avoid the traps and bridge the biases of the underlying, but omnipresent, self-fulfilling, and self-essentializing identity discourses in broader national society as a whole.

This need for critical reflexivity is even more urgent when comparing multiculturalism internationally (Gundara 2001). When multiculturalist discourses migrate from one society to another – and particularly from originally Anglo-Saxon to other diversity contexts – these different diversity contexts and their underlying identity domains (their structures of identifying "us" and "them" in each society) tend to be biased by supposedly neutral and technical arguments. These take the form of pedagogical debates on appropriate models and "solutions" for dealing with diversity, and they are imported and exported as such, without regard to differing societal contexts and identity constellations in the sending and the receiving societies.

Only in this way will it be possible to study critically both the discourses about multiculturalism, interculturality, and diversity, and the relationship that exists between these discourses and their associated practices as they contextually materialize in programs of so-called intercultural education. We must avoid the trap of "methodological nationalism", which is the false "assumption that the nation/state/society is the natural social and political form of the modern world" (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002: 302). This assumption is still strongly visible in social science research designs, and we must avoid it so that we do not