

## Preparing for a Future of Diversity - A Conceptual Framework for Planning and Evaluating Multicultural Education at Colleges

Rita Sever

ritasever9@gmail.com

**Abstract:** Higher Education institutions in the Western world need to prepare for a future in which cultural diversity is not a transient phase but a constant reality. They should, therefore, consider introducing Multicultural Education (*ME*) into their institution, and further develop it. As *ME* is a widely used yet hazy concept that covers a vast variety of approaches, strategies and programmes, the paper attempts to unveil the complexity of *ME*'s broad conceptual basis. It addresses the ambiguity of the term "multiculturalism", differentiates between five diversity-managing strategies, analyses a variety of definitions and goals attributed to *ME* and presents an integrated typology of *ME* programs. On this basis, it offers colleges a three-tier tool for benchmarking, introducing and designing *ME*. The tool consists of a diagnostic questionnaire, a table of design choices and an organisational guide for introducing and developing *ME* as first and second order changes in the college. With the multilayer conceptual framework constructed in it, the paper aims to achieve two purposes. The first is to supply a backbone for informed decisions that colleges have to make while designing their educational policy and practice in culturally diverse contexts. The second purpose is to offer a new research platform for future evaluations of *ME* as a complex system.

**Keywords:** multicultural education, higher education, diversity management, evaluation.

### Introduction

Collaboration between culturally different societies is often addressed as necessary for "constant renewal, dialogue and freedom of expression and, therefore, as the prerequisite for a truly democratic concept of community life" (Chombart de Lauwe, 1987, p.144). At the same time, little attention has been given to the continual waste of potential benefits that might be gained

by multicultural collaboration *within* culturally diverse societies and organisations (Sever, 2000).

Cultural diversity in immigrant-receiving countries is not just a transient phase but a constant reality (Sever, 2004). This is especially true for countries like the US, Australia, Canada and Israel, which contain not only "new cultural minorities" (i.e. immigrants and their descendants), but also "old cultural minorities" (i.e. black and/or indigenous populations) (Medda-Windischer, 2015). Nowadays, they may also contain "transnational minorities" (Glick Schiller, Basch and Szanton Blanc, 1995; Levitt, 2001; Sever, 2014).

There is a growing awareness of the multiethnic nature of most contemporary nation-states and of the need to account for this aspect of pluralism in public policy.

A *Multiculturalism Policy Index*, developed by the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) in Washington D.C. for international comparisons, is based on eight indicators: an official affirmation of multiculturalism; multiculturalism in the school curriculum; inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in public media and in licensing; exemptions from dress codes in public laws; acceptance of dual citizenship; funding of ethnic organisations to support cultural activities; funding of bilingual and mother-tongue instruction and affirmative action for immigrant groups.

Australia, Canada and Sweden have officially adopted multiculturalism as their model for managing cultural diversity and have undertaken detailed policies and programs. Becoming aware of the need for greater knowledge and understanding of cultural differences and responding to this need, these countries developed a range of public and privately provided cross-cultural training programs. Language and related educational policies have been a major focus of their implementation of multiculturalism (Inglis, 1996).

In Australia, an important feature of the government support for minority language initiatives is recognising their importance, not solely as a means for cultural maintenance but also as a way of incorporating individuals equitably into the society. This rationale is manifested in the operation of the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS) and the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) in Australia. The 24/7 Translating and Interpreting Service provides a nation-wide telephone service which assists non-English speakers to receive emergency help as well as non-emergency access to an interpreter. SBS provides regular multilingual radio programmes, which serve as important sources of information about community and mainstream activities and services. In addition, the SBS national television channel broadcasts international news and features in a number of languages, and provides a

series of English language news and other programmes addressing issues pertinent to Australian cultural diversity (Inglis, 1996).

Multicultural policies focusing on *ethno-cultural* diversity basically address the existence of heterogeneity of races, religions, languages, and/or nationalities (sf. the MPI index). However, some of the multicultural policies stemming from a social justice approach expand their scope to impede social exclusion based on gender, social class, sexual inclination, physical and mental disabilities etc. (Widestedt, 2008). The latter versions of multicultural policies usually emphasise equity for individuals and not for cultural groups. They can, therefore, coexist with policies of cultural assimilation - namely, with striving for *cultural* uniformity. This makes them less controversial in the eyes of the mainstream whose cultural superiority they do not challenge.

Canada, with its policy of 'multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' and its recognition of Aboriginal ("First Nations") rights to self-government, has officially recognised and endorsed both polyethnicity and multinationality. In its vision, people retain their heritage languages and their cultural identifications while enjoying the full benefits of a citizenship founded on shared rights, freedoms and obligations (Ungerleider, 2007).

Except for Antarctica, contemporary literature addresses multicultural education in all the continents. A book edited by Grant and Lei (2001), for example, includes chapters on *ME* in North America, South America, Europe, Asia and Africa; and, of course, there is much reference to multiculturalism in Australia (e.g. Inglis, 1996). There are also reports on a variety of policy responses to specific cultural diversity, such as policies for Native American and First Nations peoples ((Ungerleider, 2007), race-based policies in the UK (Sarup, 1996), policies for immigrants and language policies in Israel (Sever, 2004). In the US, the multicultural education policy has been focused from the beginning on addressing the problems of racial conflict and intolerance (Johnson and Joshee, 2007).

### **In Higher Education**

One of the responses to a reality of socio-cultural diversity is Multicultural Education (*ME*). Many higher education institutions in Western countries are already aware of the need to cater to culturally diverse student populations, and many of them are engaged - to a certain extent - in some kind of Multicultural Education (*ME*). The San Francisco University (SFU) and the University of Minnesota in the US are but two of many example.

San Francisco University declares in its official site that "Diversity is at the heart of who we are" and "seeks to promote a campus climate and culture that values diversity in all its forms through inclusive dialogues, interpersonal

experiences, and Intercultural appreciation; in support of a thriving campus climate and inclusive excellence".

The University of Minnesota, being aware of the discrepancy between the demographic characteristics of the teachers in the state and of the participants of teacher preparation programme (mostly middle-class white women) and the increasing diversity of children in schools, developed a large project to redesign the entire teacher education programme to ensure that their teacher candidates have more sophisticated understanding of the cultural processes, the needs of immigrant learners, as well as effective partnership with parents and local communities (Demerath and Mattheis, 2012).

The Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) has been addressing multicultural curricular issues in the United States for more than two decades; its 1995 research report, for example, was entitled "American Pluralism and the College Curriculum - Higher Education in a Diverse Democracy".

Nonetheless, many colleges in the Western world are still far behind in this field. Education colleges and university teacher training departments in Israel, for example, do not emphasise the need to prepare and equip future teachers for dealing with the country's cultural diversity. In institutions where some kind of multicultural education does exist, it is based on voluntary activity of lecturers, while the national *ME* teacher-training policy does not provide any guidance on the issues. Lecturers do not have a clear approach to equipping teacher trainees with the relevant skills and abilities required from tomorrow's teachers working in a demographically multicultural society (Lev Ari and Laron, 2014).

With the growing globalisation on the one hand and the influx of refugees from the Middle East and Africa storming into the EU on the other hand, pressures on education systems to accommodate their growingly diverse student body must be expected. Though the changes will be needed at first mainly in elementary schools, colleges would be well advised to anticipate and prepare for these pressures in the long run. In other words, they need to prepare for a future in which cultural diversity is not a transient phase but a constant reality. They should consider introducing Multicultural Education (*ME*) into their institution and further develop it.

*ME* is a widely used yet hazy concept that covers a vast variety of approaches, strategies and programmes. This paper aims to assist navigation in this abundance by unveiling the complexity of the broad contextual bases underlying *ME*. The following sections present a conceptual framework that should serve colleges as a backbone for culturally informed educational policy and practice.

## Conceptual bases and frameworks

The term “multicultural” can be and is being used at a number of angles and carries a number of meanings. Rarely do its users define explicitly what they mean when they say “multicultural”. Such an explication used to be so rare that Australia had been praised at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century on a back cover of a book, for the very fact that it attempted to explicate the meaning of the term (Watts and Smolicz, 1997).

Even nowadays the meaning of "multicultural" is not unequivocal. For some it is a *demographic* term, for others the meaning is *philosophical /ideological*, yet others use it in a *structura/political* meaning (Sever, 2003; Reingold, 2005, 2007). In its *demographic* use, "multicultural" refers to a culturally diverse society/group and geographical proximity of people from different cultural backgrounds.

The *structural/political* meaning of multiculturalism refers to power sharing and equity for culturally diverse groups: striving to ensure equal opportunities and social equality to members of all cultural groups in the society. From this point of view, a multicultural society is one that applies ample mechanisms to abolish discrimination against people from non-dominant cultural backgrounds, a society that ensures equal life-opportunities for individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds.

From the *philosophical/ideological* point of view, a multicultural society perceives cultural diversity not as a threat to its solidarity but as an asset and a potential resource for internal enrichment (Stone Hanley, 2015). On the individual level, this means believing in people’s right to value, maintain and develop the ethnic-specific components of their identity. On the national level, this means maintaining and nurturing the diverse composition of cultural communities.

Whether an organisation perceives cultural diversity as a liability or as a potential asset greatly affects the way/s it attempts to deal with it. This issue will be elaborated in the next section.

### *Typology of Diversity-Management Strategies*

This typology differentiates among five types of diversity-management strategies. Lacking the basic multicultural assumption that all cultures are equal (Sarup, 1986), the first three strategies (A1-A3) are variations of the general approach known as "assimilation". The last two (B1-2) rest on the *philosophical* meaning of multiculturalism, namely on equal valuing of different cultures and on conceiving diversity in terms of potentials rather than problems (Sever, 2003).

## ***A) Assimilation***

This approach strongly objects to separation of people from culturally different groups and puts an emphasis on mixing ("integrating") them. Assimilation declares that all individuals are equal and should have equal opportunities. However, while individuals are seen as equal, cultures are not. Therefore, all individuals should have equal opportunities provided that they all adopt the dominant culture. But, unless all cultures are equally valued, the result is the subordination of marginalised groups' cultures to the culture of the dominant group. This does entail the apparent drawing together of groups into a whole, but the whole is *hierarchically* configured. Subsequently, the culture, the language and the value system of marginalised groups are always at a disadvantage in comparison to the dominant group.

"[...assimilation] has to *deny the existence of a viable culture* in those to be assimilated. ... to assimilate, for whites, means to stay the same; to assimilate, for blacks, is to discard their identity and all that culturally defines their existence" (Sarup, 1986, p.16, emphases added).

### ***A1. The "melting-pot" strategy (Overt Assimilation)***

This strategy "implies the complete and unconditional surrender of one's own culture and the adoption of the mainstream culture, resulting in the elimination of cultural differences" (Lemmer and Squelch, 1993, p.43). It requires that the micro-cultures of a country "rid themselves of their basic cultural integrities and adopt the cultural value system of the dominant culture" (Mitchell & Salsbury, 1996, p.347). Sometimes this approach is accompanied by *colour blindness* (Holoien and Shelton, 2011) which entails *down-playing the salience and importance of racial/cultural differences by focusing on the commonalities people share*.

While this strategy *openly* aims at assimilation, A2 and A3 are actually types of concealed assimilation *disguised* as pluralism or multiculturalism (Smolicz, 1981, 1997; Sarup, 1986); their growing popularity may be rooted in the spreading resistance to overt assimilation and the demand for "political correctness" (Loury, 1994).

### ***A2. The "crutches" strategy (Transitional Pluralism)***

Anchored in the traditional image of an "uprooted immigrant" (Diminescu, 2008), this approach allows immigrants to hold on to their culture of origin and mother-tongue only as temporary crutches that sustain them during the first period of acculturation; with time, they are expected to give up these crutches and adopt the new culture and language (Smolicz, 1981).

Bilingualism, for instance, is seen as a liability rather than an asset. The continued use of mother tongue is considered useful if it helps faster and/or better acquisition of the dominant language, but is expected to be gradually forsaken once this is accomplished.



This approach rejects transnational identities as a potential risk of "divided loyalties" (Sever, 2014: 3). It ignores the gradual replacement of the "uprooted immigrant" image by an image of a "connected migrant" (Diminescu, 2008) and the growing phenomenon of immigrants creating communities that span borders (Levitt, 2001), by continuing to participate in the political, social, and economic lives of their countries of origin even as they put down roots in their new country (Glick Schiller, Basch and Szanton Blanc, 1995).

### ***A3. The "token" strategy (Residual Multiculturalism)***

This strategy is another disguise of assimilation. It encourages the maintenance of *exotic, peripheral* components of minority cultures such as folk music, ethnic food, garments, hair style, etc., in some cases even adopting some of them within the mainstream. The "culinary multiculturalism" in Australia (Arnold, 1997), the folkloristic "three S's: Saris, Steel band and Samosas" (Massey, 1991), the partial recognition of folklore elements of Ethiopian immigrant culture in Israel (Baratz, Reingold and Abuhatzira (2011), or Eduard Said's (1977) "Orientalism", are but a few examples. This strategy is actually a kind of *tokenism* (Lemmer and Squelch, 1993), since it rejects the central components of the non-dominant culture, such as the language and core values. A minority's culture of origin is lowered to a level of a second-rate culture, one that has lost its core, has no vitality and stops to develop. A culture in this state has no appeal for members of other cultures and its own members are often left in a state of inferiority, bitterness and social unrest (Smolicz, 1981).

### ***B) Sustaining Diversity***

This approach reflects the *philosophical* meaning of the term 'multiculturalism', namely valuing different cultures as equal and conceiving diversity in terms of potentials rather than problems (Sever, 2003).

### ***B1. The "mosaic" strategy (Federative Pluralism)***

This type opts for the side-by-side co-existence of a mosaic of culturally non-similar components, such as "the enclave solution in Switzerland and Ghana" (Deutscher, 2002, p.87). There is no hierarchical ordering of the components, all are equal in status and rights, and all are able to maintain and develop their own unique culture. However, each component remains internally mono-cultural since they are not expected to be influenced by each other.

The *mosaic* strategy is sometimes mistakenly taken to be identical to *segregation*. The latter (e.g. Apartheid) entails the "hierarchical separation of groups where a more powerful group keeps other group(s) separate and marginalised" (Heugh, 1997, p.244; emphases added). The reason for this

mistake is that cultural groups are to be separate according to both strategies. However, the two contradict each other in their basic approach to different cultures: while *segregation* keeps the cultural groups separate in order to keep one of them marginalised, the *mosaic* strategy opts for symmetry and equality of the separate cultural groups. In this aspect the *mosaic* strategy differs also from all types of *Assimilation*, which allegedly opt for equality for individuals but maintain a hierarchical ordering of different groups' cultures, thus actually of the different groups themselves.

### ***B2. The "chulent" strategy (Interactive Multiculturalism)***

"Chulent" is a traditional Jewish meal mainly made of a mix of beef, marrow, beans and barley cooked together slowly, so that each preserves its unique characteristics within the common sauce of the complex dish.

This strategy implies that the relative advantage of a society, like that of the "chulent", rests in the diversity of its ingredients."Each of the ingredients offers something special to the total flavour while still retaining its individual identity" (Mitchell and Salsbury, 1996, p.347). This requires metamorphic changes. In curricula, for example, such a change would involve "the selection, structuring and delivery of knowledge which is balanced, accurate and appropriate; reflective of the achievements and contributions of cultural groups beyond the dominant one" (Parker-Jenkins, 1995, p.126). In the UK, with its numerous Moslem immigrant population, this would involve appropriate recognition of Islamic contribution to science and mathematics, a sensitive approach to teaching history topics like "The Crusades" and promotion of positive role models (op.cit).

Such changes would require the full participation of cultural groups in a society's public life. Interactive multiculturalism aims at a balance of shared and core values, with an overarching set of shared or supra-ethnic values, the most basic one being the value of multiculturalism itself. Creating this balance is an ongoing process in a society that values diversity, a society in which several cultures are in a state of vitality and are developing in central areas such as language, family, religion, etc. These cultures are bound together via ongoing processes of interaction and dialogue, through which they enrich each other and contribute to the core of shared values. (Smolicz 1981, 1983). It is a two-way process whereby aspects of cultures are shared and a culture becomes modified through contacts with another culture. Each culture, however, maintains its essential aspects (Lemmer and Squelch, 1993, p.127).

This is where the "chulent" differs from the "mosaic", the latter aiming at the detached development of each cultural group, sometimes actively keeping each group from being influenced by another even in the long run.



There are cases where the gap between the core-cultures of different groups is so profound that expecting mutual influence is hopeless (Tamir, 1998). In such cases the "mosaic" may be a more realistic alternative for symmetrical co-existence of such groups within the same society.

Furthermore, cultural minorities and/or immigrant groups sometimes prefer the "mosaic" strategy as a means of rejecting assimilative pressures from the dominant cultural group. Any strategy aiming at cultural influence, even one that aims at mutual influence, may seem to them as threatening their ability to maintain their own cultural uniqueness in the future.

Having clarified these conceptual bases, we move on to addresses the variety of definitions and goals attributed to ME and to ME programmes in the next section.

### **Multicultural Education (ME)**

ME is a widely used yet a very vague term serving as an umbrella for a loose collection of approaches, empirical models and programmes.

It is widely addressed in a number of dedicated journals (e.g. *Journal of Multicultural Education*, *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, etc.), and is sporadically addressed in journals having different focuses (such as the *Education and Urban Society Journal*).

A quick glance at the contents of vol. 17 (2) 2015 of the *International Journal of Multicultural Education* may be a nut shell illustration of the vast variety of subjects that take cover under the umbrella of multicultural education. The papers in this volume touch upon elementary as well as higher education and address a wide range of educational target populations (e.g. Faculty, immigrant scholars, teacher education participants, graduate students, Junior High students, immigrant parents, and religious minority pupils) and a collection of different issues. It includes one paper on a reverse of power structure, i.e. the adjustment challenges of majority members (white faculty) to a minority status in Black (old minority) colleges (Louis, 2015); two papers on *old minorities*: one about Taiwan Aboriginal Junior High students (Chen & Lee 2015), the other about Indigenous Graduate Students Engaged in Language Reclamation through graduate degree programmes (Chew, Hicks Greendeer and Keliiaa, 2015); two papers on *new minorities*: one about Somali parents' perception of the Swedish school (Månsson, 2015), the other about Black Immigrant Scholars in the United States (Hernandez and Murray-Johnson, 2015); one paper on addressing religious diversity through children literature. (Hayik, 2015); one on resistance to critical multicultural education in a teacher education graduate course (Marshal, 2015), and one about

education professionals who learned about African cultures in a workshop experience through making African masks using authentic symbolism (Rule et al., 2015).

### *The Elephant*

"It is rare that any two classroom teachers or education scholars will have the same definition for multicultural education. In any dialogue on education, individuals tend to form concepts to fit their particular focus" (Wahab, 2007, p.1).

Like the elephant that met seven blind people in the famous Indian parable, the notion of multicultural education has accumulated a number of different descriptions and definitions (sf. Burnett, 1994; Banks and McGee Banks, 2001; Wahab, 2007; Demerath and Mattheis, 2012). This is not surprising given that "since its earliest conceptualisations in the 1960s, multicultural education has been transformed, refocused, reconceptualised, and in a constant state of evolution both in theory and in practice" (Wahab, 2007, p.1).

*ME* is often perceived as a corrective to the long-standing *de facto* policy of assimilating minority groups into the "melting pot" of the dominant culture.

"...African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and within contemporary society immigrants from diverse backgrounds have been historically marginalised and excluded from receiving equitable access and opportunities within public education. Thus, multicultural education as an educational alternative, attempts to critically analyse inequalities within the American public school system, and suggest strategies for further inclusion of marginalised groups" (Mwonga, 2005, p.2).

Others describe it as an idea, an educational reform, and a process which by definition facilitates respectful inter-group and intercultural dialogues, openness to 'others' and self-awareness (Banks and McGee Banks 2001); or as an approach to teaching and learning based upon democratic values and beliefs that affirms cultural pluralism within diverse societies and an interdependent world (Wahab, 2007).

"...the concept that cultural differences enrich, rather than diminish our society is increasingly acknowledged. It is the suppression of cultures that weakens the society. The ongoing discourse and practice of multicultural education is an effort to mine the possibilities of plurality through education" (Stone Hanley, 2015).

According to the American National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME)'s recent definition (2010), *ME* is a philosophical concept built on the ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity and human dignity. It challenges

all forms of discrimination in schools and society through the promotion of democratic principles of social justice. It affirms the need to prepare students for their responsibilities in an interdependent world; recognises the role schools can play in developing the attitudes and values necessary for a democratic society; values cultural differences and affirms the pluralism that students, their communities and teachers reflect.

### *The Umbrella*

The variety of *ME* definitions produces a variety of aims and goals.

" Multicultural Education is an idea, an educational reform and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students and students who are members of diverse racial, ethnic, language and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school" (Banks, 2001: 3).

*ME* may, for example, aim to "change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students and students who are members of diverse racial, ethnic, language and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school" (Banks, 2001, p 3); to ground students with multicultural knowledge; to teach from a multicultural perspective; to adopt educational equity and cultural pluralism as philosophies (Wahab, 2007); to achieve equity for the students of excluded groups; to ensure that all students have equal opportunities to access appropriately the education programs and services, without any significant barriers (Stone Hanley, 2015); to empower students and promote student social action (Wahab, 2007), to cultivate them as change agents (Stone Hanley, 2015), to prepare all students to life in a culturally diverse society, to enrich society's human capital and/or to improve productivity (Inglis, 1996).

The declared goals of *ME* may include the creative development of cultural diversity, promoting social justice and cultural diversity and/or the maintenance of social cohesion (Wahab, 2007); or the transformation of schooling to include the needs and perspectives of many cultures in shaping the ways in which children are educated and thus transforming the society (Stone Hanley, 2015).

The roots of these different goals can be traced to the different meanings of the notion of multiculturalism *per se* and to the different strategies used to manage diversity. Each of these goals implies assumptions concerning those who need *ME* and those who would benefit from it.

Much of the discourse on *ME*, especially in the US, revolves around the notions of social justice and the lack of equal opportunities for members of

certain groups. The implicit assumption here is that members of excluded groups are those who need *ME* and benefit from it, while the privileged groups are actually doing them favours. One can take it from here to argue that society at large benefits from *ME* because injustice yields conflicts, even violence, which threaten the well-being of privileged groups as well, and/or because giving up and wasting the human capital that lies uncovered within excluded populations reduces the productivity of the society at large. All this conveys a hidden assumption that diversity is a liability, and since it cannot be abolished (as the failure of assimilation policies has shown) we need to carry the burden the best we can and even think of ways to reduce its damage.

An alternative assumption would be that diversity in itself is an asset for society and should be maintained and nurtured since it is a potential resource for enrichment and innovation. The belief that *ME* can contribute to the country's productivity may stem from two different notions: first, that equity would raise the economic contributions of members of excluded groups as they assimilate; second, that the existence of diversity enriches, pushes forward innovations and opens more international markets (Inglis 1996). This leads to the conclusion that higher education institutions at large, including their privileged members, all benefit from diversity in the long run. Therefore, *ME* that educates for appreciation of cultural diversity is necessary for all, both privileged and excluded.

### **Multicultural Education Programmes**

In view of the multiple definitions of the *ME* concept and the diversity of aims and goals attributed to it, no wonder that in practice we find a great variety of models, programmes and strategies, with various, sometimes contradicting, goals under this conceptual umbrella.

Various attempts to introduce some order into the wealth of *ME* programmes have yielded several independent but partly overlapping typologies. Among them are: the distinction between "content-oriented", "student-oriented" and "socially-oriented" programmes (Burnett, 2014); curricular models that are hierarchical/additional/interactive or transformative (Reingold, 2005); and a typology of *ME* approaches: "teaching the culturally different"/"human relations"/"single-group studies"/"multicultural approaches" and "social reconstructionist approaches" (Wahab, 2007; Stone Hanley, 2015).

Considering them together, we can construct an integrated typology that consists of five categories: (a) content-oriented programmes and curricular models; (b) student-oriented programmes, or "teaching the culturally-different"; (c) programmes that focus on human relation, (d) single-group

studies and (e) socially-oriented programmes which include diversity-oriented programmes (e1) and social-reconstruction programmes (e2).

### **(a) Content-Oriented Programmes and Curricular Models**

These programmes include culturally specific contents in the curriculum and educational materials in order to increase students' knowledge about excluded groups. In its simplest form, this type of programme adds a multicultural patina to a standard curriculum. It inserts fragmented pieces, or lessons on cultural activities, into an existing ethnocentric curriculum, perhaps incorporating a few short readings or a few in-class celebrations of cultural heroes and holidays within the school year (Banks, 1989). More thorough versions add numerous multicultural materials and themes to the curriculum (Burnett, 2014).

Reingold (2005) described four different curricular models: (a) hierarchical: Western culture as basis and non-Western cultures as enrichment; (b) additive: adding great works of women and non-Western cultures to a Western core; (c) interactive: a common American culture based on the interaction among the various American ethnic cultures and (d) transformative : based on critical pedagogy. The latter model actively transforms the curriculum, aiming to develop multicultural content throughout the disciplines, to incorporate a variety of different viewpoints and perspectives in the curriculum and to transform the canon, ultimately developing a new paradigm for the curriculum. Content-oriented programmes often take the form of "single-group studies" (see below). Children from the majority culture are often excluded from participating in the appended curricula, and the main curriculum fails to emphasise common elements in the minority and majority curricula (Burnett, 2014).

### **(b) Student-Oriented Programmes, or "Teaching the Culturally-Different"**

While curricular programmes attempt to increase the body of knowledge about different ethnic, cultural and gender groups, student-oriented programmes are intended to increase the academic achievement of these groups, even when they do not involve extensive changes in the content of the curriculum. They attempt to raise the academic achievement of minority students through culturally relevant instruction and to assimilate them into the cultural mainstream as it currently exists, using transitional bridges in the regular school programmes. These efforts may take the form of organisational or instructional changes intended to match students' learning styles and existing skills. Many of these programmes are designed not to transform the curriculum or the social context of education, but to help culturally or linguistically different students make the transition into the educational

mainstream. To do this, these programmes often draw upon the varied linguistic and cultural backgrounds of their student bodies (Burnett, 2014; Wahab, 2007; Stone Hanley, 2015).

"...the work done in the name of multicultural education can exoticise and marginalise some groups through its own kind of mythmaking, underscoring the need to look at policies in connection with existing discourses and relations of power" (Johnson and Joshee, 2007, p.9).

Many student-oriented programmes are actually compensatory in nature and often not multicultural in their emphasis. They include: (a) programmes that use research into culturally-based learning styles in an attempt to determine which teaching styles should be used with a particular group of students; (b) bilingual or bicultural programmes; (c) language programmes built upon the language and culture of minority students and (d) special math and science programmes for minority or female students (Burnett, 2014).

### **(c) Programmes that focus on Human Relation**

Here the emphasis is on helping students of differing backgrounds understand and accept each other. Students are taught about commonalities of all people through understanding their social and cultural differences, but not their differences in institutional and economic power. These attempts take many forms and often are as informal as teachers assigning a "friend" to a new student in class or assigning work or play groups to facilitate understanding and acceptance. This category may include programmes designed to increase all kinds of contact among members of different cultural groups, such as programmes to encourage minority teachers, anti-bias programmes, cooperative learning programmes, as well as formal procedures for conflict mediation (Wahab, 2007; Stone Hanley, 2015).

### **(d) Single-group studies**

These programmes are about the histories and contemporary issues of oppression suffered by people of excluded groups. They attempt to encourage cultural pluralism by concentrating on appreciation of the contributions of individuals and groups and emphasising the importance of emulating the lives of outstanding people in various cultures. The intent is for young people to study the history of oppression, to feel proud of their heritage and to recognise that human accomplishment transcends racial and cultural barriers. Common examples in this category include black, ethnic and women's studies programmes. In some cases, single-group studies programmes can play a major role in the transformation of entire schools, as, for instance, in the development of independent Afrocentric schools. (Wahab, 2007; Stone Hanley, 2015). Some schools have also created single-gender classrooms designed specifically to meet the educational needs of girls away from the distractions of a mixed-gender situation. Such schools and



classrooms combine elements from *content-oriented* programmes with aspects of *student-oriented* programmes.

#### **(e) Socially-Oriented programmes**

This type of *ME* includes a broad spectrum of programmes with social and social activism goals. They are much less common and may be much more controversial than the categories discussed above, since they emphasise pluralism and cultural equity in society as a whole, not simply within an educational institution (Burnett, 2014).

Many of these programmes apply critical thinking skills to a critique of racism, sexism and other repressive aspects of society. Some emphasise multilingualism, while others attempt to examine issues from a large number of viewpoints that are different from that of the predominant culture; yet others can utilise cooperative learning approaches and decision-making skills in order to prepare students to become socially active citizens.

These programmes seek to reform both schooling and the cultural and political contexts of schooling, aiming neither to simply enhance academic achievement nor to increase the body of multicultural knowledge, but to have a much broader impact (Wahab, 2007; Stone Hanley, 2015). This category includes two sub-categories: diversity-oriented programmes (e1) and social-reconstruction oriented approaches (e2).

##### *(e1) Diversity-oriented programmes*

These programmes promote the transformation of the educational process to reflect the ideals of democracy in a pluralistic society. Students are taught content using instructional methods that value cultural knowledge and differences. Pluralism is promoted by reforming the entire educational programmes altering curricula, integrating staffs and affirming family languages; they recognise, accept, and affirm human differences and similarities related to gender, race, disability, class, and sexual preferences. In doing so, they embrace "productive confusion" (Frawley, Dang and Kittiphanh, 2014), encourage students to consider different viewpoints drawing on content developed through single group studies and challenge western-privileged theories of education. Instructors also involve students into active analysis of real-life situations, attempting to make curriculum relevant to students' experiences and backgrounds.

The importance of cultural diversity in the staff and student body is illustrated by a recent study in Belgium which found that ethnic minority teachers reported higher levels of multicultural content integration than native-white teachers, and that teachers working at schools with a higher share of ethnic minorities and public (state) schools incorporated more multicultural education than teachers working in elite-white schools and Catholic schools (Agirdag, Merry and Van Houtte, 2014).

## *(e2) Social reconstruction programmes*

These programmes teach students about oppression and discrimination and promote active challenge of social inequality. Students learn about their roles as social change agents so that they may participate in the generation of a more equitable society. Teachers who want to achieve these goals use students' life experiences as opportunities to discuss inequities in society. They encourage students to think critically about information in textbooks, newspapers and other media to consider alternative points of view and to think about ways in which they might work constructively to achieve social justice for all people (Wahab, 2007; Stone Hanley, 2015).

The different types of *ME* programmes and approaches are nested in the broad conceptual frameworks presented in previous sections of this paper. Here are a few examples: the *political* aspect of "multiculturalism" is reflected in the strong emphasis on social justice in many of the *ME* programmes; the roots of the *diversity-oriented* programmes can be found in the *philosophical* meaning of "multiculturalism", namely in valuing diversity as a potential asset; *single-group studies* and some of the *content-oriented* programmes echo the "mosaic" strategy; *teaching the different* approach is nested in the "crutches" strategy, since it attempts to raise the academic achievement of minority students through culturally relevant instruction in order to assimilate them into the cultural mainstream as it currently exists, using transitional bridges in the regular school programmes; and the *particularistic* approach addressed in the next section reflects the *mosaic* model of managing cultural diversity

## *The Ocean*

Due to space limitations, this paper is only able to briefly mention - but not enter deeply into - the ocean of debates and controversies storming around multicultural policies in general and *ME* in particular.

The salient images of social cohesion in popular discourse and political rhetoric assume the necessity of a high degree of likeliness among co-citizens in order to facilitate their close interaction. Common understanding of civil society or social capital, both of which emphasise values such as trust, civic responsibility and co-operation, often assumes that minorities' cultural backgrounds preclude such value structures (Vertovec, 1997). Recent calls for rethinking multiculturalism are evoked by global events and economic pressures and by concerns about the long-term effects for certain community members (such as women and children), for inter-group relations, for social cohesion and for national unity. An outstanding dilemma in this context focuses on the question: how can a demographically plural and systemically complex democratic society promote political unity and at the same time

celebrate the social diversity that challenges that unity? (Vertovec, 1997; Wahab, 2007).

One of the forceful debates affecting *ME* practices is the debate between the *particularistic* and the *pluralistic* schools of thought (Reingold, 2007). The former requires providing a unique space for each disadvantaged group where its members are acquainted with their own legacy and become empowered before they enter the competitive encounter with other more self-confident group members. (e.g. Kalnizke, Melat and Cohen, 2015). The latter approach maintains that the multicultural encounters should start in a mixed group and that the enhancement of the dialogue will result from a cultivation of tolerance and appreciation of the uniqueness of other groups (e.g. Lev-Ari and Laron, 2012). Advocates of the multicultural particularistic approach are often branded as ethnocentric and racist and perceived as endangering the fabric of national unity by allegedly promoting *segregation* in the sense described above. Their response to such accusations is that in calling for creation of separate ethnic educational systems they do not encourage the separation of any ethnic group from the general society. They argue that the need for an educational process aimed at helping students acquire knowledge about their own ethnic and cultural legacy is a prerequisite for creation of a true pluralistic dialogue. The restoration of ethnic culture is meant to enable students of these groups to gain knowledge about their culture and pride in their legacy, to develop positive self-esteem and enter the inter-group dialogue as equal and proud citizens (Reingold, 2007).

### **Preparing for the future**

Higher education institutions that wish to prepare for the future are hereinafter offered a three-tier tool for benchmarking, introducing and designing *ME*. It consists of a diagnostic questionnaire, a table of design choices and a generic organisational guide for introducing and developing *ME* as first and second order changes in the college

#### **(a) Benchmarking**

To begin its journey towards becoming a truly multicultural campus, a college needs to assess where it stands at present, in terms of coping with the task of catering to a diverse student body, by responding to the following questions (Sever, 1999):

- A. What is the college's basic perception of cultural diversity in general and of its own culturally diverse student body in particular - is diversity perceived (1) as a liability, or (2) as a potential asset?
- B. Where does the task of catering to a diverse student body stand in the college's list of priorities - is it (1) a central task, or (2) a negligible one?

- C. How does the college perceive the impact of internally growingly cultural diversification - (1) as a first-order, additive change, or (2) as a second-order, metamorphic/ transformative change?
- D. What kind of diversity management strategy (DMS) does the college apply - (1) *Assimilation* (overt or disguised), (2) *Mosaic*, or (3) *Chulent*?

The answers to these questions should produce a profile that reflects the college's pattern of addressing its cultural diversity at present.

Bearing in mind the conceptual framework presented above, the college should be able to recognise, for instance, that a profile like A1-B1-C1-D1 is hardly conducive to *ME*. This profile implies that diversity is seen as a liability; the task of catering to a diverse student body is of low, even negligible priority; internal cultural diversification is perceived as an additive change, and assimilation (sometimes disguised) is the strategy applied to managing it. This profile used to be typical of the Israeli (Sever, 1999) and the UK (Sarup, 1986.) education systems until late in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

A profile that serves as a much better starting point for introducing *ME* should be as close as possible to A2-B2-C2-D3/2, implying that the college sees diversity as a potential asset and applies a strategy of *Chulent* (with/or *Mosaic*) to manage it, catering to a diverse student body is a priority task; and internal growth of cultural diversity is perceived as a metamorphic/ transformative change.

### **(b) Designing its own Multicultural Education**

After assessing the starting-point, the college needs to make culturally informed decisions during the process of designing its own unique form of *ME*.

The planning needs to address three basic questions: **Why? Who? What?** (W.W.W)

1. **Why?** -What would be the major goal/s of introducing *ME* into this college?
2. **Who?** - Who needs *ME* and who would be affected (positively or negatively) by it?
3. **What?** What type/s of programmes would the college base its *ME* on?

Table 1 presents optional answers, based on the conceptual framework presented in previous sections (pp. 10-16). That framework should also contribute to the college's awareness of the implications of the choices it is making while answering each of these questions.

**Table 1: W.W.W design choices**

Why	Who	What
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to improve students' academic achievements</li> <li>• to achieve equity for students of excluded groups;</li> <li>• to fight social injustice</li> <li>• to prevent conflicts and violence</li> <li>• to promote social cohesion</li> <li>• to teach from a multicultural perspective</li> <li>• to ground students with multicultural knowledge</li> <li>• to adopt educational equity and cultural pluralism as philosophies</li> <li>• to prepare students for their responsibilities in an interdependent world</li> <li>• to develop the attitudes and values necessary for a democratic society</li> <li>• to prepare the graduates for successful participation in a culturally diverse world</li> <li>• to empower students</li> <li>• to promote student social action</li> <li>• to cultivate students as change agents</li> <li>• to promote social diversity</li> <li>• to reduce waste of hidden human capital, to promote productivity</li> <li>• enhance innovations</li> <li>• other goals :....</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• students               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underprivileged</li> <li>• ethno-cultural minorities</li> <li>• any excluded group</li> <li>• privileged</li> <li>• all students</li> </ul> </li> <li>• staff               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• majority</li> <li>• minority</li> <li>• whole staff</li> </ul> </li> <li>• all members of the college</li> <li>• others: ...</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Content oriented"               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ hierarchical</li> <li>○ additive</li> <li>○ interactive</li> <li>○ transformative</li> </ul> </li> <li>• "Student oriented"</li> <li>• Teaching the culturally different"</li> <li>• "Single-group studies"</li> <li>• "Human relations"</li> <li>• "Socially oriented"               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ "Diversity-oriented"</li> <li>○ "Social reconstructive"</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other:....</li> </ul>

### (c) Developing into a Truly Multicultural Campus

In order to implement *ME* successfully, "it is necessary to conceptualise the school as a social system" (Banks, 2001: 3) and to change the way in which the organisation and its staff operate (Inglis, 1996). The college needs to implement first and second order changes not only at the individual and group levels but also on organisational levels that are necessary for coping with the task. In other words, the college needs to develop into what Pope, Reynolds and Mueller (2014) call "a multicultural campus". First order change at the individual level, they claim, is characterised by the development of multicultural awareness, and second order change is characterised by a paradigm shift in how an individual perceives diversity. At the group level,

first order change is characterised by changes ingroup membership and second order change consists of the restructuring of groups. At the institutional level, first order change is programmatic (e.g., the addition of new multicultural programmes) while second order change is systemic and involves structural changes across institution, division, or department levels. They offer a paradigmatic guide for such changes and present examples of empirical implementations of their model in higher education, among them at the University of Texas at Austin (op.cit: 120-124).

Following one of these examples, table 2 presents a possible generic adaptation:

**Table 2: A generic framework for developing into a truly multicultural campus**

<b>PRINCIPLE</b>	<b>RATIONAL</b>	<b>EXAMPLES OF ACTION</b>
<i>1.Start at the top with leadership and advocacy</i>	For a successful diversity plan to exist, leaders must model and champion behaviours they expect employees to demonstrate and advocate for the diversity initiatives within the organisation	Make sure all employees are familiar with the diversity plan Establish short- and long-term goals annually Set expectations for the college Seek additional diversity training to support mission efforts Support training of staff Recognise efforts of those who go above and beyond expectations Review assessment results and implement changes
<i>2.Create a comprehensive definition of organisational diversity and multiculturalism.</i>	Managing organizational diversity requires a common definition for organisational diversity. The college's definition might state that organisational diversity is "an organisational environment in which everyone can contribute to their fullest to achieve organisational goals".	Make sure the diversity statement addresses cultural and religious groups, ethnicities, genders, socioeconomic levels, religions, abilities, and sexual orientation Educate staff on multiculturalism and include multiculturalism terms in publications, interviews, training
<i>3.Create and publicise mission statement and diversity plan</i>	The mission statement and diversity plan provide direction for how the diversity plans will be implemented throughout the organisation. It promotes greater involvement and trust that the programme is working and keeps members of the organisation aware of the diversity initiative.	Post diversity plans and goals  Publicise organisational newsletters  Highlight diversity accomplishments



4. <i>Recruit, hire and retain diverse staff.</i>	Recruiting, hiring and retaining a diverse staff is critical to the diversity goals. The college must constantly work to improve its commitment to diversity and encourage all staff members to provide feedback on how it can improve	Ensure hiring committees/teams are diverse Ensure diverse hiring pools Review recruitment practices, strategies and advertising sources Include multicultural awareness, competence, knowledge and skills as an integral part of the job description and evaluate candidates using these criteria. Encourage exit interviews and ongoing supervision to explore retention-related issues
5. <i>Review policies, activities, forms and services.</i>	Developing practical policies for an entire college can be a daunting task, but such policies inspire staff to support the organisation's diversity programme	Create a hate-incident guide/policy and educate staff on content Establish clear minimum diversity training requirements for all staff and publicise them Conduct a full review of departmental policies, procedures, forms to assess their impact on diverse populations and make appropriate changes where needed.
6. <i>Develop multicultural expectations and evaluations</i>	To ensure that each employee understands what is required of him/her and to provide a means to establish accountability. Employees are expected to be agents of organisational diversity. This includes using their position and influence to confront exclusion, teach and learn about issues of diversity.	Clearly outline diversity training expectations; include in annual evaluation, and explain how unachieved expectations will be addressed Provide effective multicultural supervision for all professional and student staff Require diversity goals for each staff area and encourage each individual to establish at least one diversity goal each year Publicise and support employee participation in local, state and national conferences or workshops that address multicultural diversity issues.
7. <i>Implement and maintain a diversity/multicultural training programme</i>	The college understands the importance of inclusion. Believes that diversity awareness and appreciation improves the effectiveness of its daily operations.	Create opportunities for staff to attend training programmes Ensure that diversity programmes are multicultural in content and values Explain how diversity and multicultural training benefit the work environment and individual employee
8. <i>Schedule and publicise scholarly activities, outreach and celebrations</i>	The college has the resources and activities to educate, collaborate and celebrate the multicultural entities of its people	Share diversity and multicultural information through flyers, books and articles. Present workshops on multicultural topics at local, state, regional and national conferences, and at employee team days, Collaborate with other departments and organisations to reach a broader audience and to share current efforts and successes Write diversity articles for departmental newsletters and other publications. Subscribe to a wide range of cultural publications.
9. <i>Perform physical environment</i>	Socially inclusive spaces encourage a sense of	Review individual offices and public spaces to make sure they are void of offensive or

<i>reviews</i>	comfort, belonging and common purpose. They are accessible to everyone and represent the diversity of the people who use them	insensitive language and materials Ensure that offices, programmes and activities are welcoming to all students Include accessibility for students (and staff) with disabilities Display culturally inclusive and diverse artwork, music and publications in public spaces. Provide education to staff on how to respond to insensitive or offensive verbal and non-verbal conduct and remarks.
10. <i>Survey and assess programmes, initiatives and services</i>	Measuring the effectiveness of the organisational diversity programme is crucial to its continued success.	Evaluate programmes, workshops and activities for effectiveness. Assess employee and student satisfaction with services and with the level of multicultural competence demonstrated by peers and supervisors. Gather demographic information on those who attend diversity programmes and those who use diversity-related services. Set goals to increase participation numbers , overall satisfaction level and cultural representation in workshops and classes

### **Suggestions for future evaluation-research**

In discussions of complexity theory we find that education reforms have been regarded as complex systems (e.g. Snyder, 2013) and so have also been individuals, schools, teacher education programmes and courses, professional learning contexts, etc. (Cochran-Smith et. al., 2014). The present paper suggests that *ME* system should be added to this list.

Banks (2001) approaches *ME* as a *complicated* system, one that comprises multiple components: content integration, a knowledge construction process, prejudice reduction, equity pedagogy and an empowering school structure. He emphasises that reforming any one of the components is necessary but not sufficient (Banks, 2001, p.22) and offers schools a 14-question "multicultural education evaluation checklist" that reflects these components (Banks, 1994, pp. 113-115).

Researchers manage to use traditional methodologies to evaluate *ME* as a complicated system (e.g. Lev Ari and Laron, 2012). However, some systems are not only *complicated* but also *complex* (Glouberman and Zimmerman, 2002). Both complicated and complex systems have multiple parts and interactions, and both are difficult to understand at first glance. In complicated systems, however, the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, and the functions and their outcomes can be fully understood by separately considering the parts and the processes of the system. In contrast, complexity in complex systems results from the interactions and nonlinear relationships of the component parts and from intricate feedback loops within the system.

In a complex system, the whole is much more than the sum of its parts. Taking complex systems apart results in losing key aspects of how they work and what makes them work in the first place, since it is interactions of the parts that may lead to unexpected consequences. This means that outcomes are emergent and unpredictable, although not random and not inexplicable (Cochran-Smith et. al., 2014). Evaluating complex systems requires coping with new challenges and using novel, often untraditional methodologies (Rogers, 2008; Sever, 2012).

If *ME* systems were just *complicated*, the nature and the outcomes of their functioning could be fully understood by addressing each of the components and processes separately.

*But this would resemble the situation of the seven blind men in the Indian fable who were unable to understand what an elephant is as long as they addressed each of its parts separately. Once ME systems are acknowledged as complex, their evaluators will require new creative methodologies (Sever, 2012). The multilayer conceptual framework constructed in this paper may serve as a comprehensive research platform for implementing such methodologies.*

## **Conclusion**

Higher education systems in the Western world need to introduce multicultural education into their systems to prepare for a future in which cultural diversity is not a transient phase but a constant reality.

A multicultural education policy is one of the possible responses to socio-cultural diversity. It can be rooted in a need to respond to dangers, such as violence and conflict produced by discrimination and social injustice; it can also be rooted in the belief that cultural diversity in itself is an asset which should be nurtured and retained because of its potential contribution to renewal, innovation and productivity. In this case, it would be perceived as a permanent feature of society's education system.

In any case, *ME* remains nested in the broad conceptual bases which this paper unveils by addressing the ambiguity of the term “multiculturalism” and differentiating between five diversity-managing strategies, analysing a variety of definitions and goals attributed to *ME* and presenting an integrated typology of *ME* programmes. On this basis, the paper offers colleges a three-tier tool for benchmarking, introducing and designing *ME*. The tool consists of a diagnostic questionnaire, a table of design choices and an organisational guide for introducing and developing *ME* as first and second order changes at the college.

The multilayer conceptual and practical framework presented in this paper has been constructed for two purposes. Firstly, to supply a backbone for

informed decisions that colleges have to make while designing their educational policy and practice in culturally diverse contexts. Secondly, to draw researchers' attention to the complex and challenging nature of ME systems, and to offer them a new research platform for future evaluations of ME systems as complex ones.

## References

- Agirdag, O., Merry, M. S. & Van Houtte, M. (2 June 2014). Teachers' Understanding of Multicultural Education and the Correlates of Multicultural Content Integration in Flanders. *Education and Urban Society Journal*.
- Arnold, L. (1997). Breaking the Tyranny of Monoculturalism and Monolingualism – The Australian Experience, pp. 185-211 in: Richard J. Watts & Jerzy J. Smolicz (Eds.), *Cultural Democracy and Ethnic Pluralism – Multicultural and Multilingual policies in education*. Bern, Peter Lang / *Cross Cultural Communication, Vol. 5, Ch. 10*.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon 7<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Multicultural Education: Characteristics and Goals. In: Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (Eds.). (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 3-32). Boston: Allyn and Bacon 7<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Banks, J.A. (1994). *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Baratz, L., Reingold, R. and H. Abuhatzira (Nov. 2011). A Bi-lingual newspaper as an expression of a Fake multicultural educational policy in Israel. *International Education Studies, 4*(4).
- Burnett, G. (1994). Varieties of Multicultural Education: An Introduction. *ERIC Digest 98*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education New York NY.
- Chen, Shwu-Meei & Y. A. Lee (2015). Dancing with Ethnic Identities: How a Taiwan Aboriginal Dance Club Influenced Junior High Students, *The International Journal of Multicultural Education, Vol17* (2) 2015.
- Chew, K. A. B., Hicks Greendeer N. & C. Keliiaa (2015). Claiming Space: An Autoethnographic Study of Indigenous Graduate Students Engaged in Language Reclamation, *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 17*(2).
- Cochran-Smith, M., Ell, F., Ludlow, L., Grudnoff, L. & G. Aitken (2014). The Challenge and Promise of Complexity Theory for Teacher Education Research. *Teachers College Record, 116* (5), 1-38.
- Demerath, P. & A. Mattheis (2012). Toward Common Ground: The Uses of Educational Anthropology in Multicultural Education. *International journal of multicultural education, 14*(3), <http://ijme-journal.org/index.php/ijme/issue/view/24>
- Deutscher, I. (2002). *Accommodating Diversity – National Politics that prevent Ethnic Conflict*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Diminescu, D. (2008). The connected migrant: an epistemological manifesto. *Social Science Information, 47*(4), 565-579.

- Frawley, J., Dang, K. A. and D. Kittiphanh (2014). Productive Confusion: Advancing Intercultural Perspectives Through A Multicultural Professional Development Program For Educational Leaders. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education*, 9(1).
- Glick Schiller, N. Basch, L. and C. Szanton Blanc (Jan., 1995). From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1), 48-63.
- Glouberman, S., and Zimmerman, B. (2004). "Complicated and complex systems: What would successful reform of Medicare look like?", *Romanow Papers: Changing Healthcare in Canada*, Vol. 2, Forest, P.-G., G. P. Marchildon, and T. McIntosh (eds.), University of Toronto Press.
- Grant, C.A. and J. L. Lei, eds. (2001). *Global Constructions of Multicultural Education: Theories and Realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hernandez, K-A. C. Kayon K. Murray-Johnson (2015). Towards a Different Construction of Blackness: Black Immigrant Scholars on Racial Identity Development in the United States, *The International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(2).
- Holoien, D. S., and Shelton, J. N. (October 2011). You deplete me: The cognitive costs of colorblindness on ethnic minorities. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.010. Available from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251472737\\_You\\_Deplete\\_Me\\_The\\_Cognitive\\_Costs\\_of\\_Colorblindness\\_on\\_Ethnic\\_Minorities](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251472737_You_Deplete_Me_The_Cognitive_Costs_of_Colorblindness_on_Ethnic_Minorities) [accessed Nov. 27, 2015].
- Inglis, C. (1996). Multiculturalism: New policy responses to diversity. *Management of Social Transformations (MOST) - UNESCO*, policy paper no. 4. [www.unesco.org/most](http://www.unesco.org/most)
- Johnson, L. and R. Joshee (2007). Introduction: Cross-Border Dialogue and Multicultural Policy Webs. pp 3-13 in: Joshee, R. and L. Johnson, editors. (2007) *Multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States*. UBC Press.
- Kalnizki, E., Melat, Sh. and N. Cohen (2015). *Voyages of Hope: Ethiopian Immigrants in Tracks of Education, Schooling and Success*. Tel-Aviv: MOFET. (Hebrew).
- Lemmer, E. M., and Squelch, J. (1993). *Multicultural education: A teachers' manual*. Southern Book Publishers.
- Lev Ari, L. & D. Laron,(2012). Ethiopian Students at an Academic College of Education: Integration of Segregation? *Hagira*, 1: 128-154 (Hebrew).
- Lev Ari, L. & D. Laron,( 2014). Intercultural learning in graduate studies at an Israeli college of education: Attitudes toward multiculturalism among Jewish and Arab students. *High Education*, 68, 243-262.
- Levitt, P. (2001). *The Transnational Villagers*. University of California press.
- Louis, D. A. (2015). Cross-cultural peer mentoring: One approach to enhancing White faculty adjustment at Black colleges. *The International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(2).
- Loury, G. C. (1994). Self-Censorship in Public Discourse - A Theory of "Political Correctness" and Related Phenomena. *Rationality and Society*, 6(4), 428-461.
- Månsson N. (2015). "I go to teacher conferences, but I do not understand what the teacher is saying" - Reflections on Somali parent's perception of the Swedish school, *The International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(2).
- Medda-Windischer, R. (2015). Migration and Diversity Management in Traditionally Divided Society: The Case of the Autonomous Province of Bolzano/Bozen. *Hagira4*: 112-129. (Hebrew).

- Mitchell, B.M. & R.B. Salsbury (1996). *Multicultural Education – An International Guide to Research, Policies, and Programs*, Greenwood Press, London.
- MPI – Migration Policy Institute, Washington D.: Multiculturalism Policy Index. [www.migrationpolicy.org/article/debate-over-multiculturalism-philosophy-politics-and-policy](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/debate-over-multiculturalism-philosophy-politics-and-policy)
- Mwonga, C. (2005). *Multicultural Education: New Path Toward Democracy Re-envisioning Education and Democracy*. December 15, 2005. [www.macalester.edu/educationreform/publicintellealessay/CarolineM.pdf](http://www.macalester.edu/educationreform/publicintellealessay/CarolineM.pdf)
- Parker-Jenkins, M. (1995). *Children of Islam – a teacher's guide to meeting the needs of Muslim pupils*. Chester: Trentham Books.
- Pope, A, Reynolds, A. L & J.A. Mueller (2014). *Creating Multicultural Change on Campus*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Pope, A, Reynolds, A. L. Mueller J. A. & H. E. Cheatham (2004). *Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs* (2004), Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Reingold, R. (2007). Promoting a True Pluralistic Dialogue – a Particularistic Multicultural Teacher Accreditation Program for Israeli Bedouins. *International Journal of Multicultural Education* , 9 (1), 1-14. Online: <http://journals.sfu.ca/ijme/index.php/ijme/article/view/6>
- Reingold, R. (2005). Curricular models of multicultural pluralistic education – four event investigations from the USA Academy. *Dapim*, 40, 108-131 (Hebrew).
- Rogers, P. J. (Jan. 2008). Using Programme Theory to Evaluate Complicated and Complex Aspects of Interventions. *Evaluation*, 14(1), 129-48.
- Said, E. W. (1977). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Sarup, M. (1986). *The Politics of Multicultural Education*. London: Routledge Education Books, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sever, R. (2014). ICT, Migrant Networks and Transnational Identity. In: Corbu, N., Popescu-Jourdy, D. & V. Tudor (eds.). *Identity and Intercultural communication* (pp. 652-657). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishing.
- Sever, R. (2012). Challenges of Evaluating Complicated and Complex 'Glocalised' Interventions. Paper presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> Conference of the European Evaluation Society (EES) in Helsinki, Finland. October 1-5, 2012.
- Sever, R. (2004). A transient task or a constant reality? – an alternative for immigrant integration policy. *HedHa'UlpanHe'Hadash* 87: 18-41 (Hebrew).
- Sever, R. (2003). A Conceptual Framework for Examining Multicultural Issues. In P. Kirmayer & S.T. Michaelson (Eds) : *Adult Education in Israel*, Vol. 7: 55-67.
- Sever, R. (1999). Patterns of Coping with the Task at Schools. Pp. 178-189 in: Horowitz, T. (Ed): *Children of Perestroika in Israel*, University Press of America, Inc., Lanham, New York, Oxford.
- Snyder, S. (2013). The Simple, the Complicated, and the Complex: Educational Reform Through the Lens of Complexity Theory. OECD Education Working Papers, No. 96, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3txnpt1lnren>
- Smolicz, J.J. (1981). The Three Types of Multiculturalism. In: Garner, M. (ed): *Community Languages – Their Role in Education* (pp.1-12). Melbourne & Sydney, River Seine Pub.
- Smolicz, J.J. (1997). In Search of a Multicultural Nation – The Case of Australia from an International Perspective. In: Watts, Richard J. & Jerzy J. Smolicz (Eds.) 1997 : *Cultural Democracy and Ethnic Pluralism – Multicultural and Multilingual policies in education* (pp. 51-76). Cross Cultural Communication Vol. 5, Bern, Peter Lang.



- Stone Hanley, M. (2015). *The Scope of Multicultural Education*. School of Education at Johns Hopkins University. retrieved 19 September 2015 from <http://education.jhu.edu/PD/newhorizons/strategies/opics/multicultural-education/the-scope-of-multicultural-education/>
- Tamir, Y. (1998). Two concepts of multi-culturalism. Pp. 92-79 in Mautner, M., Sagie E. & R. Shamir (eds). *Multiculturalism in a Jewish Democratic State*. Tel Aviv: Ramot - Tel Aviv University. [Hebrew]
- Ungerleider, Ch. (2007). Foreword. Pp IX-XIV in: Reva Joshee and Lauri Johnson, editors. (2007). *Multicultural education policies in Canada and the United States* / UBC Press.
- University of San Francisco. *Diversity Engagement & Community Outreach*. <http://www.usfca.edu/diversity/> . [accessed Nov. 24, 2015].
- Baratz, L., Reingold, R. & Abuhatzira, H. (2011). Bi-lingual newspaper as an expression of a Fake multicultural educational policy in Israel. *International Education Studies* Vol. 4(4).
- Wahab, R. (2007). *Multicultural Education: Its Implication For General Education And Gifted Education In Indonesia*. Paper presented at the International Conference: Said Nursi on Multicultural Education - for Renewal of Faith and Civilization in the Contemporary World, on May 28, 2007, at STAIN Kediri, East Java Province, Indonesia.
- Watts, R. J. & J. J. Smolicz (1997). *Cultural Democracy and Ethnic Pluralism: Multicultural and Multilingual Policies in Education*. Peter Lang pub.
- Widestedt, K. (2008). Issues of Gender Equality and Diversity in Broadcast News Policy. *Nordicom Review*, 29 (1), 45-62.