

# We are IntechOpen, the world's leading publisher of Open Access books Built by scientists, for scientists

6,500

Open access books available

176,000

International authors and editors

190M

Downloads

Our authors are among the

154

Countries delivered to

TOP 1%

most cited scientists

12.2%

Contributors from top 500 universities



WEB OF SCIENCE™

Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index  
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us?  
Contact [book.department@intechopen.com](mailto:book.department@intechopen.com)

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.  
For more information visit [www.intechopen.com](http://www.intechopen.com)



## Chapter

# Educational Models for Managing Diversity: What's Next?

*Evanthia Tsaliki*

*To those who fight against the odds.*

## Abstract

Different educational models have been designed and implemented through the passage of time in order to manage diversity in the classroom. These educational models have been categorised as the monocultural educational models, such as the assimilation and integration models, which aim at assimilation and integration, respectively, of minority groups. The multicultural educational models aiming at the promotion of coexistence, tolerance of diversity and interaction of different cultural groups of either minority groups of the majority are also discussed and criticised along with recent educational dimensions of managing diversity such as the critical multicultural and the critical intercultural model.

**Keywords:** multicultural, intercultural, education, critical, diversity

## 1. Introduction

In this chapter of the book, a number of educational models that have been designed to address the phenomenon of the coeducation of native and foreign pupils in various countries are presented and discussed. Their presentation follows the approximate chronological order of their appearance. However, it would be misleading to think that they were developed consecutively. They are also presented in such a way as to reveal the evolution of the views and principles regarding the coeducation of pupils belonging to minority and majority groups ranging from the assimilation and integration educational model to multicultural, critical multicultural, anti-racist, bilingual and intercultural education.

More specifically, the theoretical underpinnings of each educational model and their impact on practice are presented and discussed. A critique of the aforementioned educational models and a discussion on the role of the implementation of critical interculturalism—in relation to critical pedagogy in educational practice follows.

The exploration of the meaning of intercultural education—which is the most recent and completed educational model suggested—through and with the reference to the relative preceding educational models constitutes the first step for moving on to its implementation. The term ‘intercultural education’ is ambiguous. There is not a universally agreed definition of the term [1]. It seems that in some cases the terms

‘multicultural’ and ‘intercultural’ do not have discrete limits in terms of meaning [2]. Dealing with this topic in the present chapter will facilitate professional search for the main principles underpinning intercultural education. Intercultural education is a complicated term and the aim of this chapter is not to oversimplify it. Making clear what it means and elucidating its complexities is of great importance because it informs the design of the appropriate teaching strategies for implementing intercultural education. As so, the fact that there has been little in-depth research [3] conducted on the subject has also been taken into account as a factor contributing to the decision to focus on this subject.

### **1.1 Assimilation model**

The assimilation model of education was the very first model presented to solve the problems related to immigrants’ education in the host country and it dominated education until the mid-sixties [4]. According to it, all immigrant pupils irrespective of their national and cultural identity need to acquire the knowledge and skills, which will permit them to participate in the society of the host country. Therefore, they have to learn the language of the host country and acquire its culture, too [5, 6].

School will help them learn the national language and culture, which will lead to their assimilation and which in turn will help them to participate equally in the society. The assimilation may vary from cultural, behavioural and social to marital (mixed marriages) and civic [7] through the passage of time. If pupils do not manage to acquire the ethos of the educational system of the host country, they are responsible for their educational inequality and they are excluded so as not to disturb the balance of it [8]. If immigrants want their children to learn the language and the culture of the *country of origin*, this is a personal issue and not an issue for state schools.

The supporters of assimilation believe that the notion of nation and modernisation of the society, and the existence of cultural diversity, are quite opposite. Therefore, the only way to preserve ‘nation’ is to assimilate the various cultural groups, which will be achieved by them learning the *dominant language* [2].

In terms of school practices foreign pupils are totally immersed in the language and the culture of the host country from the very beginning of their school life. The medium of instruction is the second language and they participate in all aspects of school life related to the culture of the host country, such as national and religious celebrations. They have to acquire the language and the culture of the host country in order to participate in the common national culture.

### **1.2 The integration model**

Towards the end of the 1960s, there was a shift from the assimilation model to the integration model in education due to the disadvantages of the first [2, 8]. Some people support the view that the term ‘assimilation’ evolved into the term ‘integration’ [9].

According to the integration model, the cultural elements of immigrants are accepted and respected to the extent they do not threaten the cultural principles of the dominant group [4]. The supporters of the integration model believe that the introduction of immigrants’ cultural elements facilitates their integration into the host country. Some cultural elements of immigrants may be taken into account in school programmes. However, they are evaluated according to the cultural norms of

the dominant group [4, 5]. Therefore, nothing is implied about equality of cultures [6]. Foreign pupils may have the chance to be taught their first language and elements of their culture, such as music, customs and celebrations, may be introduced into the curriculum. However, the emphasis is still on the integration of the immigrants into the culture of the host country.

### **1.3 The multicultural model**

The model of multicultural education was actually the first educational model, which focused on cultural pluralism compared to the aforementioned models, which placed an emphasis on an ethnocentric approach in education [10, 11]. According to Watkins [11], multicultural education is a product of social, political, economic and intellectual interests. It first appeared in 1970 in the USA, Europe and Australia [4] in an attempt to describe the multicultural profile of society [12] and to propose how people could respond to it.

According to the literature on multicultural education, the main aim of it is the cultivation of tolerance and respect between people of different cultures leading to their harmonious coexistence [4–6, 13–16]. The advocates of multicultural education believe that all people are unique parts of a whole community irrespective of their cultural background [13]. Therefore, they should develop positive self-concepts [13, 17] and experience equality in schooling [14, 15, 18], which will lead them to academic achievement. Besides, research has shown that the recognition of pupils' cultures improves their school performance [2] and that multiculturally educated persons have more respect for people from other cultures [7] and are not prejudiced towards them [15].

In terms of schooling, there are some suggestions made for the achievement of the main aims of multicultural education. Researchers support the view that pupils should be introduced to other cultures, all pupils' linguistic and cultural experiences should be taken into account [5, 14, 19–22] and their differences should be celebrated. In this sense, cultural differences will be recognised and understood (Lynch, 1989) and pupils' cultural identities will be maintained and reinforced.

Kendall [13] also supports the view that through the application of multicultural education, all pupils will positively experience the similarities and differences of their cultures. However, this exploration of similarities and differences between cultures constitutes more of a principle of intercultural education [2, 4] as will be indicated below, and can be achieved when pupils are engaged in discussions in which they analyse and evaluate different cultures. However, the literature on multicultural education devotes little space to the analysis and evaluation of different cultures [23]. It is obvious that this type of educational model refers both to the education of the minority and majority of pupils [8]. Govaris [24], Lawton and Gordon [25] believe that multicultural education could be applied even when there are no foreign pupils in the school. However, I would like to express my doubts on this point. I am sceptical as to how firmly and deeply the main aims of multicultural education could be achieved in the absence of pupils from diverse cultures.

Various researchers attribute different meanings and dimensions to multicultural education. Some of them adopt a simple form of multicultural education, which focuses on the incorporation of material from other cultures such as music, clothes, foods and festivals [26–28]. This dimension is known as content integration [18].

Other researchers adopt a deeper approach. They believe that pupils should acquire an internal understanding of the differences in cultures by exploring how the

formation of cultural identities is influenced by social, economic and political factors. This dimension is known as knowledge construction [18] and it seems to share some of the main principles of critical *multiculturalism*, as will be analysed below.

Finally, there are a number of researchers who believe in a more radical approach to multicultural education. According to them, the application of multicultural education should aim to develop pupils with more positive antiracial and democratic attitudes by challenging the structures of education and of wider society so that equality could be achieved. This approach is known as prejudice reduction [18, 28] and it seems to be influenced by the principles underpinning the antiracist model in education.

According to Hessari and Hill [27], there are four types of multicultural education in relation to antiracist education. The first type refers to multicultural education, which ignores antiracist education. In the second one, antiracist education is included in multicultural education and in the third one antiracist education incorporates multicultural education. Finally, the fourth type refers to antiracist education, which criticises multicultural education.

The four-fold typology above regarding the relationship between multicultural education and antiracist education reveals the conceptual confusion regarding the meaning and the application of this educational model. Therefore, researchers made an attempt to go beyond it by proposing another educational model known as the critical multicultural model, which makes an attempt to cover the conceptual deficiencies of this model. The critical multicultural model is analysed below.

At this point, it has to be mentioned that there is another type of education called multiethnic education. This type of education focuses more on ethnic minority studies [7] compared to multicultural education, which puts an emphasis on all cultures.

#### **1.4 Antiracist model**

The antiracist educational model was developed principally in the eighties in England and the USA [4, 5]. The idea of antiracism was developed as an attempt to combat racism in school and in the wider society. The advocates of the antiracist model support the view that racism exists in the structures of the society and it extends into other fields such as education. The antiracist model emphasises the changing of the structures of the society by applying stronger laws. This changing of structures should also be applied in education [6].

Another idea, which is strongly connected with antiracist education, is institutional racism. Institutional racism is applied when society's institutions operate to the advantage of the majority [8, 28, 29]. Therefore, two more of the main aims of antiracist education are not only equality for all children in education but also justice for all through equal opportunities of life, development and participation in the society as well as liberation from racist models [2, 4]. The whole educational system and school curricula should change in such a way so that they can guarantee that all pupils have equal chances to participate in the school process and succeed academically irrespective of their colour and their social class.

It is also mentioned that antiracist education was a radical departure from multicultural education [28]. Multicultural education emphasises the social and cultural aspects, which may promote racism by concentrating on pluralism and cultural diversity. However, the issue of racism is also influenced by structural, economic, class and political factors [27], which have to be combated according to the principles of antiracist education.

Therefore, there was another educational approach suggested in order to tackle racism by controlling social, cultural and structural, class, economic and political factors. The multicultural antiracist model was suggested because it was thought that each one of the approaches alone, that is multicultural education and antiracist education, was inadequate and that their combination could lead to better educational results [27, 28]. According to Grinter (1985), as cited in Palaiologou and Evaggelou [15], antiracist multicultural education was conceived as a solution to bridge the gap between multicultural and antiracist education.

### **1.5 Critical multicultural model**

The critical multicultural model is not a widely accepted educational model of multiculturalism, but it has been referenced as 'critical multiculturalism' in the research literature.

In critical multiculturalism, culture has to be placed in the wider sociopolitical context in order to be understood. Critical multiculturalism accepts that the concept of culture is dynamic and fluid. Thus identities are constructed and reconstructed through the passage of time. It also accepts that there are different types of diversity except the ethno-cultural diversity. Therefore, all pupils need to engage critically with cultural identities in order to explore how they were constructed and reconstructed; how they are interconnected across the historical, political and social contexts; and how factors such as race, class and gender intersect and shape one's identity [30–33]. According to critical multiculturalism, issues of racism, disadvantage and inequality have to be addressed so that everyone can understand how power is exercised over some people and guides or modifies their behaviour, and thus, how power relations are established [30, 32].

One of the principles of critical multicultural education is that both teachers and pupils are able to produce knowledge by examining and questioning the different cultural identities through dialogue instead of simply getting to know the different cultures without using their critical thinking [34]. Both teachers and pupils are able to challenge the existing construction of school knowledge by daring to deal with issues they may not feel comfortable with and by recognising the contribution of minorities, women, working people and other groups of people considered to be subordinate in the formation and evolvment of one's cultural identity and of knowledge in general [34, 35]. Critical multiculturalists believe that the knowledge we consider official and valid has not been produced in a neutral manner and that there are other forms of knowledge which have not been included in the official curriculum for some reasons. For example, in a critical multicultural curriculum in mathematics teachers and students could explore how different cultural groups define 'logic'. In this context, teachers and students need to consider and analyse what they know and how it is constructed, what they do not know and why [30]. However, nothing specific is mentioned regarding the practical implications of this model in school.

### **1.6 Intercultural model**

The educational models discussed so far all have limitations. I am now going to discuss the intercultural model, which is closer to my research position for a number of reasons.

First of all, the intercultural model takes theory forward, because it suggests that the coexistence of different cultural groups is not enough to achieve mutual

understanding and communication. More importantly, interaction is needed to achieve this. Secondly, intercultural education demonstrates that the cultural identity is not static but always changeable [36]. This is true if we consider that we live in a multicultural society whose members belong to different ethnic, religious and cultural groups, which may interact and be mutually affected. It also deserves to be mentioned that according to intercultural education, people of diverse cultural groups may have differences, but they also have similarities. They may also share the same experiences, which deserve to be explored so that people can understand that they are not so different from others. These are some of the main principles underpinning intercultural education with which I identify myself.

Intercultural education appeared in the 1960s in the official educational policy of the USA and a few years later in Canada. In Europe, it appeared in the mid-1970s [5, 37] and it has evolved since then [38]. This educational model stemmed from the actual necessity of providing education to a large number of minority groups [37, 39]. According to Kotsionis [40], Katsikas and Politou [8], intercultural education developed from the deficiency of the previous educational models to integrate immigrants effectively. More recently, intercultural education has harmonised with the ideology of those people who through international organisations such as UNESCO aim at increasing the collaboration and respect between people in a broad field [41].

A number of researchers have expressed their views regarding the meaning and the aims of intercultural education. Some of them converge, whereas others are more extensive. In this subchapter, an attempt will be made for all views to be presented. The first component of the word 'intercultural' means 'between'. The term 'intercultural' implies a dynamic and active process of interaction between cultures, which involves learning from each other across cultural boundaries [42–44].

Intercultural education refers both to native and foreign pupils [45], it takes into account all pupils' experiences, it views them as of equal value [46] and its influence is positive for all children [2]. It has implications in all aspects of both schools attended by children from a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds and of 'monocultural' schools [46, 47] since these children need to be prepared to live in a multicultural society and it also applies in the wider society such as media, local communities and organisations [41, 48–51].

The implementation of intercultural education aims at cultivating tolerance, acceptance and appreciation between people from different cultures; understanding of each other's problems regardless of their cultural background; and empathy and respect<sup>1</sup> through being open to other cultures [55–58].

It prepares individuals to participate in a democratic, multicultural society. It prepares them to be able to deal effectively with their intergroup relations [38, 59] and to be sensitive to and resolve issues emerging from intergroup relations [60], as interpersonal relationships constitute a priority for living in a peaceful environment. It also encourages them to develop their critical thinking regarding the ideological use of culture [47, 51, 60]. Interpersonal relationships are a priority for living in a peaceful multicultural society [61].

Intercultural education is an educational model, which constitutes a way to achieve the aforementioned aims [50]. Therefore, there are a number of principles underpinning this model. First of all, intercultural education is based on the principle that all

---

<sup>1</sup> There are cases in which intercultural education deals with issues which other fields of education refer to [52]. For instance, respect is an essential concept common in peace education [53] as well as in human rights education [54].

cultures are equal [62–65]. There are people who tend to favour some cultures because they adjust to theirs and disregard others because they maintain traditions different from their own [66]. According to intercultural education, there are no 'good cultures' and 'bad cultures'. Individuals should develop the skills to respond to people from different cultures in a non-judgemental and evaluative way and try to explore under which circumstances each culture was constructed and by which factors it was affected across time. Consequently, as all cultures are equal, all pupils' cultural capital is equal and all pupils have the right to experience educational equity [7, 47, 67]. Therefore, teachers are responsible for creating opportunities in the classroom for all pupils to communicate by using elements of their cultural background [47].

At this point, it should be mentioned that on the basis of the equality of cultures, intercultural education denies the superiority of European civilisation [39]. European culture is constructed by criteria belonging to the European tradition [66] and is not universally accepted criteria. Therefore, it leads to eurocentrism and prevents the implementation of intercultural education, which is based on the premise that all cultures are equal. According to Kaldi [41], European education has to adopt a more intercultural approach, which will lend it to more humanistic, global and pedagogical aspects [8, 40].

Another principle underpinning intercultural education is the dynamics of culture. Culture is not static but it constantly evolves and changes [57]. Individuals come in contact with other people who have different cultural identities and they also receive incentives from mass media on a daily basis. It is natural to deny some of these incentives and to accept others of those to incorporate them into their cultural identity. In this sense, there is no cultural identity which is static across time. On the contrary, the dynamics of each cultural identity is a natural consequence of individuals' continuous contact and communication and it also helps the evolution of the society [62]. In Damanakis's [63] and Kotsionis's [40] opinion, intercultural education also accepts the so-called '*intermediate culture*', which is developed on the basis of pupils' cultural heritage (*enculturation*) and the influences they accept from the cultural environment of the host country (*acculturation*). Intermediate culture constitutes part of the process of the evolution of a cultural identity. Besides, intercultural education cannot be implemented in real terms unless learners' societal context is taken into account, understood and appraised [68–70].

Nikolaou [4], Georgogiannis [5], Pantazi [71], Papas [6], Androussou [37] and Damanakis [63] suggest that intercultural education assumes the overcoming of the idea of the 'nation-state' and the elimination of stereotypes and prejudice towards people coming from different cultural backgrounds. More specifically, it demands the changing of teachers' personal attitudes towards foreign pupils (Taba 1945 as cited by [60]). According to Vinsonneau [72], stereotypes can change when people are keen to change their established opinions, their emotional predispositions towards certain groups of people and the conditions of the reception of the new information. How is this going to be achieved?

The advocates of intercultural education suggest a number of ways through which this can be achieved in school. School must be the place where all pupils' cultures are going to meet each other and be negotiated [42, 71, 73]. The key elements of this meeting and negotiation are the exploration of similarities and differences between cultures [51, 74], and the exchange of ideas and symbols of other cultural systems [75, 76], so that pupils can understand that cultures may be different at some points but at the same time they can be similar at other points. Robinson [77] shares the same view by saying that people perceive different people more similarly when they



focus on the similarities beneath the differences. They realise that they have some common principles, which unite them without having to lose their cultural identity [6]. As Perroti [78] claimed it is possible for pupils to become experts on one or more cultures when they study them at school, but that does not guarantee that they will develop understanding and empathy towards culturally different people. This may be achieved only when they explore their similarities and differences. Karhonen and Helenius [44] and Kontogianni [48] add that a culture is better understood when one has been exposed to another culture.

This dynamic interaction between cultures [79] has to be continuous to lead to cultural interchange and enrichment, as the Council of Europe addresses [73], as well as to interdependence, which is positive towards successful cooperation [72]. Besides, when a person is in contact with other cultures, he or she learns to appreciate them, creates friendly relationships with different people, and becomes a cooperative and creative member of the society [80]. As Fennes and Hapgood [79] indicate, through intercultural learning, people will achieve greater openness to and appreciation of other cultures. They will also develop intercultural/cross-cultural communication skills by developing greater empathy and flexibility towards other persons [81].

Every child and the recognition of her/his cultural identity are at the centre of intercultural education [51]. Intercultural education starts with the knowledge and the skills pupils already have [47] and supports their cultural and linguistic incorporation [63]. More specifically, there are some researchers who demand the legal introduction of foreign people's language and culture in the host country [63] and in the school, as a consequence, within the framework of intercultural education, so as to ensure that all children will be empowered at school, as Cummins [82] denotes. When the differentiation (national, religious and linguistic) of pupils is accepted, recognised, utilised and not perceived as deficiency, then power and status relations between minority and majority groups will disappear and coercive relations between pupils will change to collaborative relations [82].

There are various approaches with reference to intercultural education in Greece according to Damanakis [83] as cited in Spiridakis [84]. In synopsis, the main approaches are four. The first one, the well-disposed-naïve approach, focuses on the defence of people belonging to other groups. This approach reminds us of the antiracist model and it may be dangerous as no one can raise the problems better than the people who experience them. The *a priori* and preservable difference constitute the second approach according to which different types of education should be offered to different groups of people in order to preserve their differences. However, this kind of education may lead to ghettoisation. It also supports the maintenance of differences without emphasising the necessity of cultural exchange. This point of view reminds us of the multicultural model.

As for the third approach, the ego- and ethnocentric difference, its advocates analyse and understand peoples' differences without retreating from their personal and ethnocentric criteria. This way of thinking resembles the principles underpinning the integration model. Finally, the approach of relative difference claims that principles are relative and suggests that discussion should occur in order to explore the relativism of principles. I would say that this last approach relates more to intercultural pedagogy.

Further to that, in relation to school practices, multicultural education seems to have adopted a more tokenistic point of view compared to intercultural education. For example, in intercultural schools, labels are written in the first languages of all

pupils in the school directing to the exit, the toilets or the dining room of the school would have a practical function, whereas in multicultural schools the same labels or a frame with photographs of all pupils in the school might not serve any practical purpose.

At this point, it should be added that a new dimension—extension I would call it—of interculturalism, that of critical interculturalism, has been proposed and discussed in various research papers [31, 85]. According to this approach, the exploration of similarities and differences among different cultural groups or/and different cultural identities is not enough. Critical thinking facilitates us realising that these cultural differences constitute a different ‘reality’ and shape different kinds of ‘knowledge’ for each group and/or person. Thus, the one and only reality and knowledge should not be taken for granted in each society as different experiences, histories and customs construct multiple realities and multiple knowledge. Furthermore, according to critical multiculturalism, otherness is used to reveal the power relations, which are established and lead to the categorisation of people into dominant and subordinate groups [85].

In this sense, it seems that critical intercultural education relates to critical education and critical pedagogy in general as the exploration of similarities and differences, which constitutes one of the main techniques for the implementation of intercultural education [86], may be used as a means to evolve pupils’ and students’ thoughts. More specifically, through the exploration of similarities and differences, students may problematize why differences between different cultures or even individuals exist and whether those differences relate to power relations that have been established, which in turn the latter perpetuate the former for specific interests and reasons. For example, the exploration of similarities and differences in preservation and violation of human rights between different cultures or individuals within the framework of the implementation of intercultural education could motivate students to think critically about why this happens and reveals existing power relations which cause this situation. According to this example, intercultural education shifts to critical intercultural education, which in turn facilitates the implementation of critical education. I am not claiming that critical interculturalism relates directly to critical pedagogy but they share some principles, such as democracy and the idea of a fairer and better world. These may be achieved by initially realising and accepting diversity, then questioning its roots and finally utilising it for democracy and the idea of a fairer and better world [85, 87].

### **1.7 Bilingual education**

Bilingual education is a separate type of education, which refers to pupils that are educated with the use of two languages. Therefore, their education is also bicultural, since there is a symbiotic relationship between language and culture. On the one hand, language makes us see things from a cultural point of view as it reflects culture. On the other hand culture influences the language one uses [48].

Baker [88] suggests that there are ten types of bilingual education which are separated into two main categories according to the educational aim. The first category concerns the weak types of bilingual education, which aim at helping pupils to develop the official language or their second language through the use of their first language, which is helping them to become monolinguals. More specifically, after foreign pupils have acquired the second language to a certain extent, teaching of their first language stops. In this case, the ultimate goal is the linguistic, cultural

and social assimilation of the members of the minority<sup>2</sup>. On the contrary; the second category refers to the strong types of bilingual education, which aim at helping pupils to develop effective language skills in both languages. The ultimate goal is pupils' maintenance of their first language and the empowerment of their cultural identity with the parallel development of the second language. This section will deal with the strong types of bilingual education.<sup>3</sup>

The implementation of bilingual education is based on the principle that pupils benefit academically when they are educated both in their *first language* (L1) and their *second language* (L2) [89]. The use of their first language in the school implies that their cultural capital is accepted and respected. In turn, they feel that they are acceptable as cultural entities in the new society and they do not have experiences which are too negative from the host country [90, 91].

The learning level that they have acquired in their first language will help them to progress and it is going to be used, preserved and developed in their further education even in the host country. On the other hand, the pupils who use the majority language will have, as a model, the pupils who will start using two languages and this will be an incentive for them in order to learn a second language (*additive bilingualism*) [92]. Besides that, pupils feel more secure when they start school by using the language they know best [93]. At this point, it should be added that the use of the two languages is not enough to ensure success at school. The recognition and use of symbols and customs related to children's cultures will make them feel that they are not perceived as being different [37].

According to the literature, there are a number of advantages for balanced bilinguals. Balanced bilinguals have better performance in *cognitive functioning*, *divergent thinking*, *metalinguistic awareness* [88] and *communicative sensitivity*. They also have

---

<sup>2</sup> According to Baker [88], there are six different types of educational programmes which belong to the weak types of bilingual education, which are as follows:

- a. Submersion: Foreign pupils communicate and are taught in the school exclusively in the second language.
- b. Submersion with withdrawal classes: The pupils are withdrawn from the mainstream classes and attend classes in order to reinforce the second language.
- c. Segregationist education: Pupils are taught through their mother language and not through the official language of the country they live in.
- d. Transitional bilingual education: Pupils keep contact with their first language for some time of teaching, which gradually decreases.
- e. Mainstream education with foreign language teaching: Pupils of the majority attend their classes in their first language and attend classes in a second language for some hours per week.
- f. separatist bilingual education: It promotes monolingualism in the first language through education in this language.

<sup>3</sup> According to Baker [88], there are four different types of educational programmes that belong to the strong types of bilingual education, which are as follows:

- a. Immersion bilingual education: This educational programme is based on the intensive use of the first language in the school with the parallel use of the second language.
- b. Maintenance and heritage language education: The main principle of this programme is the parallel teaching of the first language aiming at complete bilingualism.
- c. Two-Way/Dual language education: In this programme both languages are used as a medium of instruction aiming at balanced bilingualism and at learning to read and write in both languages.
- d. Mainstream bilingual education: In this programme the pupils are taught the dialect of the country in which they live in as well as the the official language/s of the country as in Luxemburg or in some regions in Asia or in Africa.

better *mental flexibility* [48]. Bilingual education has positive consequences for the host country, too. Foreign people can contribute to the society of the host country by bringing a large number of languages and cultural qualities with them [91].

Bilingual education often includes aspects of multicultural education in the curriculum and the infrastructure of the school [7]. Nevertheless, there are some opposing views regarding the benefits of bilingual education. The opponents of it believe that bilingualism is harmful and that it leads to learning and psychological difficulties. It was also suggested that bilingualism causes mental confusion and sentimental instability, although Hoffmann [94] does not agree with this point of view. It also supported the view that bilingual pupils should only be taught and educated in their second language, the language of the majority, so that pupils can have equal chances in the society and that minority pupils will not be marginalised. Finally, it has been suggested in the extreme view that some cultural groups are biologically inferior to some others. Therefore, they should be adjusted to the linguistic code of a biologically superior cultural group [95].

However, it has been proved that there is no problem of mental confusion when the two languages are developed at the same time and continuously. The view regarding the supposed deficiencies that bilingual pupils can develop constitutes a myth (Myth of Bilingual Handicap), according to Cummins [95]. In Cummins' [96] view, there is enough space in one's brain for learning more than two languages and the space that each language occupies is not separate. Cummins [96] supported the view that people have a common underlying proficiency, which is responsible for the function of two or more languages.

The educational aim of weak and strong types of bilingual education seems to have an indirect relevance with the 'Hypothesis of Deficiency' introduced by Bernstein [97] and the 'Hypothesis of Difference' suggested by Labov [98], respectively. According to Bernstein [97], pupils coming from low socioeconomic layers develop a restricted linguistic code<sup>4</sup>, which is characterised as a deficit and which condemns them to social immobility and underdevelopment because this linguistic code restricts their educational perspectives. Whereas pupils coming from upper socioeconomic layers develop an elaborated linguistic code<sup>5</sup>, which favours their educational perspectives, and thus, contributes positively to their social mobility and development. However, Labov [98] questioned the 'Hypothesis of Deficiency' by introducing the 'Hypothesis of Difference' according to which the restricted code of pupils coming from low socioeconomic layers is not subordinate to the elaborated code as Bernstein [97] suggested in the so-called 'Hypothesis of deficiency'. It just expresses another, different relationship with the language. Labov supported the view that every linguistic code is equally effective, that is, every code can express any idea and it is just expressed in a different way [99]. He accepts that there is a linguistic differentiation between the two codes but that does not mean that the restricted code leads to linguistic deprivation. Therefore, later on, Bernstein [97] had to retreat from this position and accept that the restricted code is not necessarily linked to social class and that both codes are used by all members of a society at different times.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the restricted code the syntactical structure is predictable, linguistic expression is accompanied by gestures and facial expressions, there is no great cohesion in meanings and the speakers find it difficult to develop abstract thinking [99].

<sup>5</sup> Abstract thinking, slow and stable rhythm of speech, clear meanings and great cohesion in meanings are some of the main characteristics of the elaborated code [100].

Assuming that in the weak types of bilingual education, the foreign pupils' first language is perceived as a deficit, which does not help them to progress academically, then we could suggest that the theory underpinning this type of bilingual education is related to the 'Hypothesis of Deficiency' in some way. Similarly, if we assume that in the strong types of bilingual education, foreign pupils' first language is of equal value to the language of the host country and that it does not hinder their progress in school, then we could say that the theory underpinning the strong types of bilingual education in some way is related to the 'Hypothesis of Difference' [101]. Nonetheless, there is not a direct relationship between the first and the second language and the restricted and the elaborated code since Bernstein and Labov talked about different codes of the same language/linguistic system, whereas bilingual education refers to different languages, which are not linked to social class. The relation is made on the level of how differently the first language of the pupils is perceived by each type of bilingual education, that is, as a deficit in the weak types and as a difference, but not necessarily of subordinate value and of no useful utilisation, in the strong types.

## **2. Critique and discussion**

After having analysed the main principles underpinning each one of the aforementioned educational models for managing diversity we will move to a critical discussion about them.

The assimilation model constitutes a monolingual and monocultural educational solution to the issue of immigrant pupils' education. It is absolutely ethnocentric and it does not leave any room for them to develop their own culture in the school or in the wider society. Pupils are obliged to abandon their first culture [5, 6].

The application of the assimilation model in education has also negative consequences for the pupils belonging to the dominant group. As suggested by Parekh [102] and Massey [28], they do not develop curiosity or respect for other cultures and they tend to judge the other cultural groups according to their own cultural norms. They do not bother knowing how and why other cultural groups think, behave or judge as they do and, as a consequence, they do not develop critical thinking. Being negative towards other cultures promotes racism.

As regards, the integration model constitutes a positive evolution of the assimilation model. It is more tolerant, as it accepts and respects part of the cultural identity of immigrant pupils in the school. Moreover, the pupils of the host country have the chance to know more about other cultures [8], which may raise their curiosity for more knowledge of these cultures.

As has already been mentioned, the negative points of the integration model are twofold. Firstly, the immigrants' cultural identity is accepted to the extent that it does not threaten the culture of the dominant group. That means that the main goal of the integration model is still the integration of immigrants into the society of the host country so that a culturally homogeneous society is created. The acceptance of the cultural elements constitutes simply the means of achieving this integration. They are not further utilised or celebrated. Secondly, the cultural elements of immigrants introduced in the schools are evaluated according to the cultural standards of the dominant groups [4, 5], which is subjective and unfair. This also implies that there is not equality of cultures [6], since true equality is applied only when each issue is judged according to its own standards.

The first educational model to be taken into account, recognising all pupils' cultural identity and pursuing educational equality, was the multicultural model. However, there are a number of negative points indicated by the researchers regarding its implementation. To begin with, in multicultural education cultural factors are overemphasised and little attention is drawn to the other types of factors (social, economic, psychological and structural), which may have led to intolerance, no respect and inequality towards people from other cultures [4, 5, 27]. Zografou [58] supports the view that this type of education is harmful to the educational system because it makes it conform to the demands of ethnic minorities. Multicultural education also does not accept that cultural identity evolves and that it is not static [4, 24]. It may also lead to discrimination by the classification of people into different categories according to their cultural characteristics [4, 14].

Some researchers have also expressed their doubts about the usefulness of the co-existence of different cultural groups, which constitutes one of the main aims of multicultural education. Papas [6], Damanakis [102] and Taboada Leonetti [103] argue that the harmonious co-existence of different cultural groups is a wish. Nevertheless, co-existence does not imply anything about mutual acceptance, mutual understanding and interaction between the groups.

Katsikas and Politou [8] indicate that multicultural education is opposed to the main aim of education, which is to socialise all in a common culture. This may be true to a certain extent. Pupils need to meet specific requirements for achieving academically, which means knowing the 'school culture', which is common for all pupils. They also need to know the formal culture of the country in which they live in order to find a job or if they require specific state services. There is not enough space in this thesis to analyse whether or not the existence of a formal cultural position in a field should exist. However, I strongly believe that all pupils have the right to use their own cultural elements in school, to get acquainted with this 'school culture' or the formal culture of the country they live in and maintain and evolve their personal cultural identity at the same time.

The analysis of multicultural education above has shown that different researchers attribute different meanings to it [104]. This may be due to the fact that the notion of multicultural education is formulated each time by the history of the different cultural groups living in a territory [24]. However, it is accepted that multicultural education is a field with major problems and ambiguity of meaning.

It seems that the term is broad and ambiguous and that there are also fundamental gaps between theory and practice [27, 105]. In particular, Sleeter and Grant [104] note that there needs to be research on the impact of the implementation of multicultural education in the classroom. Readers need to be aware of these different meanings that researchers attribute to multicultural education, which range from teaching the culturally different pupils and developing human relationships between pupils of different cultural backgrounds on the one hand to challenging social structural inequality [104] on the other.

As far as the model of antiracist education is concerned, according to Verma [38], it constitutes an educational model that provides equality of opportunity. It goes deeper compared with multicultural education because it challenges the institutions of the society which promote racism, such as mass media, the state and the police [2, 58]. She supports the view that some multicultural education models may include racism as a topic, whereas antiracist programmes analyse and explain the issue of racism further and more deeply [7].

However, doubts have also been expressed regarding the application of this model. Verma [38], Gillborn and Gipps [106] believe that antiracism has been applied loosely in

education and that it has only affected teachers working in schools with minority populations. Some researchers have expressed their fear regarding antiracist education. It is mentioned that antiracist education lends a political profile to education and, therefore, there is the danger that it will become a field of competition between political parties [2].

Finally, although in the beginning, some researchers such as Grinter supported the attempts for the bridging of the gap between antiracist and multicultural education, in his later writing he argued that the gap is 'unbridgeable' and that 'the philosophies do not meet' (Grinter, 1990 as cited by Grant and Ladson-Billings, [107]). However, as Tsakiropoulou [108] denotes, the fulfilment of the aims of antiracist education, which is the abolition of distinctions and of racism, constitutes the presuppositions of the aims of intercultural education.

May [109] and Nieto [33] made an attempt to go beyond multicultural education by introducing critical multicultural education. Critical multicultural education is understood as what follows multicultural education [34]. It goes further than multicultural education as it suggests that getting to know the other cultures and celebrating differences is not sufficient [32]. A deeper understanding of cultures demands the use of critical thinking by teachers and pupils so that they will be able to understand how cultural identities are constantly constructed and reconstructed under the influence of social, historical and political factors across time.

Critical multicultural education shares the principle of the dynamics of cultures with intercultural education. It also belongs to the category of educational models that are interested in introducing and exploring the notion of the evolvement of cultural identities to both foreign and native pupils. Moreover, it encourages teachers and students to explore subjugated knowledge in an attempt to understand that there are different ways of seeing the world. This type of multiculturalism also shares the principle of combating racism and discrimination in society with antiracist education. Its advocates believe that power relations have been established in society, which have to be explored in order to be eliminated [30, 32]. Generally speaking, it seems that critical multiculturalists want to engage teachers and students in an analysis of what and why something is learned and exists as valid and official, so as not to become passive citizens.

As far as intercultural education is concerned, its meaning and aims vary from one author or one country to the other [37]. It lacks a universally accepted definition. Therefore, there are a number of different interpretations of it [1, 8, 110]. There are times that the terms 'multicultural education' and 'intercultural education' are used interchangeably due to the confusion between the terms 'multiculturalism' and '*interculturalism*' [41]. Some researchers recognise the dynamic process of intercultural education, while others do not. There are also some researchers who do not accept the term and others who use the term without accepting its basic principles [15]. Some researchers use the term '*interculturalism*' to describe the multicultural situation and to talk about the aims of intercultural education. Other researchers distinguish between the terms 'multiculturalism' and '*interculturalism*'. They use the first term to describe the existing situation and the latter term to denote what 'it should be' [41, 63, 111].

Intercultural education approaches also vary from national directives established as part of national education programmes to approaches concerning communication and cooperation between authorities at a national, regional and school levels [110]. Intercultural education approaches may also take a variety of forms in terms of their focus of study. Some forms pay more attention to the history and culture of the countries from which immigration has taken place, others to developing students' awareness of their racial attitudes and some others to transmitting a sense of the relativity of all cultures [112].

I believe that intercultural education constitutes the evolution of multicultural education [4]. It was critical multiculturalism which pinpointed the negative points of multicultural education and triggered the notion of intercultural education. It is a more active process [41], as it provides pupils with the opportunities to discuss and exchange ideas and get to know other cultures more deeply [113]. Besides, the very same term 'intercultural' denotes this communication and interaction among different cultures [37]. According to Freedman Lustig [114], the first component of the word 'inter' is preferable to 'multi' because it denotes an active process rather than a collection of separate cultures.

I fall in with the view that multicultural education just aims at the peaceful co-existence of different cultural groups, which is not enough. Co-existence of different cultural groups does not guarantee that people coming from different cultural groups appreciate, understand and communicate with each other effectively. This can be fulfilled through the implementation of intercultural education, which encourages dialogue [4, 15, 103] and the exploration of similarities and differences between people of different cultural groups.

However, I believe that there are commonalities between multicultural education, critical multiculturalism and intercultural education. They all make an attempt to recognise and accept the differences emerging between the different cultural identities. Their differences lie in the extent to which each belief tries to understand and resolve the differences. **Table 1** summarises the main characteristics of multicultural education and intercultural education.

The intercultural dimension in education is also different from the European dimension in education because it does not focus on European cultures, but it takes account of all cultures [102]. It also stresses cultural understanding and communication between people of different groups more compared with the European dimension in education, whereas the European dimension in education also aims at preparing European citizens with enough qualifications in the marketplace. The promotion of equality of opportunities is a common point of both dimensions of education [15].

Multicultural education	Intercultural education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-existence of different cultural groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interaction of different cultural groups</li> <li>• It is a dynamic process</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dominant culture is unchallenged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All cultures are explored and understood (similarities and differences)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different cultures are presented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All cultures are equal and in turn, all cultural capitals are equal</li> <li>• Each cultural identity is not static, it constantly evolves</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In some schools, the implementation of multicultural education takes the form of celebrations and presentation of folklore elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hybridity is the norm (race, ethnicity, nationality, religion constitute different elements of each cultural identity)</li> <li>• It is based on pupils' cultural experiences; it is based on their own lives</li> <li>• Alternative languages are recognised as part of the curriculum in an intercultural school</li> </ul>

**Table 1.**  
*Characteristics of multicultural education and intercultural education.*



Nevertheless, intercultural education has been criticised because it has dominated more as a term and an attempt, and less as an effective educational action [115]. Some researchers claim that it has mostly appeared as a field of academic analysis [8] and not as an applied educational model. It has also been criticised because it does not take into account that school constitutes a mechanism of the society and, therefore, intercultural education should not be implemented only in the school but in the wider society, too ([8, 57]). *Interculturalism* cannot be very effective if it is not implemented in all aspects of life.

Furthermore, Gill [116], Damanakis [73] and The Council of Europe [65] note that intercultural education ignores all these social, political and economic factors, which could contribute to its implementation. Bliss [117] stresses the importance of political will in this regard. However, I do believe that intercultural education could bring all these factors to light as well as the available material to teachers and pupils [60] who might analyse them and take them into account in the design of intercultural programmes. Finally, intercultural education has been criticised for not attacking racism directly [39].

There are some more obstacles concerning the implementation of intercultural education. Alkan [68] pointed out that intercultural education has failed to set clear, precise and definite aims and goals. Therefore, there is a confusion regarding its theoretical background and its practical dimension, in turn. In various countries, intercultural education still relies on the efforts of individual educators [78] who are not properly trained to this end [60].

Research conducted in Greece showed that intercultural education met the resistance of both parents and teachers and this constitutes an obstacle towards its implementation [83]. As has already been mentioned, the implementation of intercultural education needs to surpass the ethnocentric conception of culture, which may be the cause of some communities' resistance towards it [39]. Further to that, when there is a gap between the culture of foreign pupils on the one hand and teachers and parents on the other hand, prejudice should be eliminated. More systematic, coordinated and consistent efforts would be more fruitful instead of making brief attempts like studying particular books, attending seminars or designing and implementing various intercultural programmes in schools, which only last for a certain period of time [60].

Two more points deserve to be mentioned regarding how intercultural education can cope with reality. The first one relates to how intercultural education could achieve compatibility between the basic values of an existing cultural system and the existing legislation and the values and practices of other cultural systems present in a country or a territory [62]. The second one concerns a new discourse that has to be proposed within the framework of intercultural education in order to manage an already hybrid identity, which is an identity that derives from already hybrid identities.

Despite the above criticism, I do believe that intercultural education takes theory forward [73]. It is acceptable that there is no consensus in any democratic society as to how to best educate all children in a culturally diverse environment [38] and that the implementation of any educational policy regarding diversity depends on the extent of political interest and of interest on the part of higher education [8, 78] and a number of other obstacles, which have to be overcome.

However, what makes intercultural education important irrespective of its negative points is that the previous educational systems have failed to deal with issues of diversity. Intercultural education is the most recent and complete educational system suggested in this direction [70]. It is a model to which attention should be

paid so it can be refined, it can become more specific in its meaning and goals, and more specific suggestions should be made and more research should be undertaken regarding its implementation. The present chapter moves in this direction. Besides, as has already been obvious from the analysis above, all educational systems have both positive and negative aspects.

Bilingual education refers to bilingual persons aiming at preserving, developing and expanding their bicultural identity<sup>6</sup>, whereas multicultural education and intercultural education refer to groups of people and aim at cultivating mutual tolerance, recognition and understanding between the various cultural groups. That is, bilingual education refers to a micro level, whereas multicultural education and intercultural education refer to a macro level [63].

Bilingual education shares the same principle with intercultural education, which declares that foreign pupils' cultural identity should be taken into account and that it plays an important role in their further education. However, as Kontogianni [48] claims, strong types of bilingual education do not seem to have an intercultural approach due to social and financial reasons.

In my view, bilingual education should also include multicultural elements because if not, there is the danger that pupils will be exposed to only two cultures and will not develop tolerance, respect and recognition of other cultures. As Byram [118] notes, "It is possible that biculturals are 'ethnocentric in two cultures' as monoculturals can be ethnocentric in one (p. 65)." Further to that, I believe that multicultural and intercultural education should incorporate bilingual education for pupils who come from diverse cultures as research has shown that knowledge is better acquired and pupils can better progress academically when they are taught both in their first and second language (additive bilingualism).

Regarding the polemics of bilingual education, it principally emerges from the ideology of nationalism, which is based on the notion of the development of a language of a country as an integral part of one's national identity. Even nowadays, the negative views towards bilingual education are attributed to hostility towards foreigners, who are considered as putting in danger the unity and the homogeneity of the nation-state [101]. In any case, it seems that strong types of bilingual education are more beneficial compared to educational programmes, which aim at developing monolingualism.

### **3. Conclusions**

It seems that each one of the aforementioned educational models improves the preceding and adds other perspectives that have not been covered or thought of. Each one is used to describe and make an attempt to combat the complicated reality [8] of the time of its conception both in the domain of education and in the wider society. However, the aforementioned educational models were not supported by dominant social powers, which ensured their real application.

One more point that deserves to be mentioned is that the analysis and the critique of the educational models above were based on the explicit curricula presented in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, that does not mean that a pupil's cultural identity is viewed as fixed, static and shaped by only two cultural systems. It is constantly reshaped and influenced by various cultural systems due to advanced technology and ease of movement between countries.

relevant literature. It should not be forgotten that the hidden curriculum<sup>7</sup> plays an important role and forms the type of education offered in each school. According to Apple [121], the hidden curriculum refers to norms, behaviours and values, which are implicitly taught in schools and are not included in the official curriculum. Dreeben [122] argues that these norms, behaviours and values are learned by students unconsciously in classroom and school life and shape the ongoing social, economic and political order. Jackson [123], as cited in Gordon [120], shares the same view by saying that the hidden curriculum is more effective than a school's official curriculum and that it contributes to the maintenance of the existing structure of the society.

The hidden curriculum seems to relate to the concept of symbolic power, which was first introduced by Bourdieu [124] and explained later on by Bourdieu and Passeron [125, 126]. They suggested that symbolic power accounts for the unconscious modes which dominate in the cultural and social environment, including school life, and which determine and perpetuate the existing social, economic and political situation. Similarly, the hidden curriculum constitutes a way of exercising symbolic power by penetrating different domains in the school, such as in the structure of the school (hierarchy, school council), in preparation for teaching, in the language that teachers use and the type of assessment they select, thus, determining the type of education offered and contributing to the imposition of certain meanings and ideas as legitimate.

Before closing this chapter I would like to draw readers' attention to the new dimensions mentioned before, that is critical multiculturalism and critical interculturalism. It seems that these two approaches relate to critical education and critical pedagogy [85]. In this sense, it is imperative to make an attempt to explore the theoretical underpinnings of critical multiculturalism and critical interculturalism, thus, realising whether the terms are identical or similar, to what extent and at which points they differ if any. These would be very helpful steps for educators in terms of their everyday teaching design and practice, as the exact definition of the theoretical underpinnings of an educational approach always guides and secures more firmly everyday teaching practice.

In turn, it would be of great theoretical and practical interest to pronounce how those approaches relate to critical education; their complementarity and convergence with critical pedagogy. Finally, we should be sceptical on whether intercultural education is the most recent and completed educational model for managing diversity or if another more advanced type of education should be implemented in order to meet the requirements of constantly diverse populations, cultural groups and cultural identities by taking into account the socio-political circumstances in which they are constructed and act.

## **Disclaimer**

Some parts of this chapter constitute parts of the literature review chapter of my PhD thesis titled 'Intercultural Education in Greece: the case of thirteen primary schools' submitted and accepted by the Institute of Education, University of London in 2012.

---

<sup>7</sup> According to Martin [119], as cited in Gordon [120], the hidden curriculum includes all norms, behaviours and values that are intended or unintended on the teachers' or school's behalf but are not acknowledged to the pupils.

IntechOpen

IntechOpen

### **Author details**


Evanthia Tsaliki

International Centre for Intercultural Studies, UCL Institute of Education, University of London, UK

\*Address all correspondence to: [inka140@hotmail.com](mailto:inka140@hotmail.com)

### **IntechOpen**

---

© 2023 The Author(s). Licensee IntechOpen. This chapter is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. 

## References

- [1] Surrian A. Promoting a European dimension of intercultural education. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 1998;9(3):307-315
- [2] Markou G. Introduction to Intercultural Education: Greek and International Experience. Athens: Electronikes Technes; 1997
- [3] Sarantakos S. Social Research. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.; 1998
- [4] Nikolaou G. Incorporation and Education of Foreign Pupils in Primary School. From “homogeneity” to multiculturalism. Athens: Ellinika Grammata; 2000
- [5] Georgogiannis P. Immigrant children’s and minority populations; Educational models. In: Georgogiannis P, editor. *Issues of Intercultural Education*. Athens: Gutenberg; 1999. pp. 45-56
- [6] Papas A. *Intercultural Pedagogy and Didactics*, volume A. Athens: published by himself; 1998
- [7] Baker C, Jones SP. *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 1998
- [8] Katsikas C, Politou E. *Gypsy, Minority, Repatriate and Foreign Pupils in Greek Education: Is “Different” out of the Classroom?* 2nd ed. Athens: Gutenberg; 2005
- [9] Nikolaou G. *Multicultural Education in Greek Schools. Pedagogical and Teaching Approach of Teachers’ Action Aiming at the Smooth Integration of Pupils with Cultural Differences*. Athens: University of Athens; 1999
- [10] Miligou E. Teachers’ training and the intercultural reorganisation of school education: The issue of the curriculum. In: Markou G, editor. *Intercultural Education—Teachers’ Training: an Alternative Suggestion*. Athens: Center of Intercultural Education, University of Athens; 1997. pp. 138-171
- [11] Watkins W. Multicultural education: Towards a historical and political inquiry. *Educational Theory*. 1994;44(1):99-117
- [12] Markou G. *Approaches of Multiculturalism and Intercultural Education—Teachers’ Training*. Athens: National Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs and General Secretariat of Laic Training; 1996
- [13] Kendall F. *Diversity in the Classroom: New Approaches to the Education of Young Children*. 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press; 1996
- [14] Olneck M. The recurring dream: Symbolism and ideology in intercultural and multicultural education. *American Journal of Education*. 1990;98(2):147-174
- [15] Palaiologou N, Evaggelou O. *Intercultural Education: Educational, Teaching and Psychological Approaches*. Athens: Atrapos; 2003
- [16] Quetgles-Pons T. Losing cultural diversity in Europe? *International Education Journal*. 2001;2(5):126-137
- [17] Blake D, Hanley V. *The Dictionary of Educational Terms*. Aldershot: Arena; 1995
- [18] Banks J. Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions and practice. In: Banks J, McGee Banks C, editors. *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing USA; 1995. pp. 3-24

- [19] Gollnick D, Chinn P. *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society*. 4th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company; 1994
- [20] Mathews G. *Global Culture/Individual Identity*. London: Routledge; 2000
- [21] Mathews MA. Encouraging student voices: Conversations about race and interracial relationships. *Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education*. 2001;3(2):1-5
- [22] Schrodt K, Gilliam J, Hast M. Exploring culturally relevant texts with kindergartners and their families. *The Reading Teacher*. 2015;68(8):589-598
- [23] Grant S, Sleeter C. The literature on multicultural education: Review and analysis. *Educational Review*. 1985;37(2):97-118
- [24] Govaris C. *Introduction to Intercultural Education*. Athens: Atrapos; 2001
- [25] Lawton D, Gordon P. *Dictionary of Education*. Seven Oaks, Trent: Hodder and Stoughton; 1993
- [26] Gardner P. *Teaching and Learning in Multicultural Classrooms*. London: David Fulton Publishers; 2001
- [27] Hessari R, Hill D. *Practical Ideas for Multicultural Learning and Teaching in the Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge; 1989
- [28] Massey I. *More than Skin Deep: Developing Antiracist Multicultural Education in Schools*. Weshpool, Powys: Litho Link Limited; 1991
- [29] Mason DC. *Race and Ethnicity in Modern Britain*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2000
- [30] Kincheloe JL, Steinberg S. *Changing Multiculturalism?* Buckingham: Open University Press; 1997
- [31] Maniatis P. Critical intercultural education; Necessities and prerequisites for its development in Greece. *Journal for Critical Education*. 2012;10(1):156-167
- [32] May S. Critical multiculturalism. In: Peters M, Lankshear C, Kincheloe J, editors. *Critical Theory and the Human Condition*. New York: Peter Lang; 2003
- [33] Nieto S. Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In: May S, editor. *Critical Multiculturalism. Rethinking Multiculturalism and Antiracist Education*. UK: Falmer Press; 1999. pp. 191-215
- [34] McCarthy C. Multicultural discourses and curriculum reform: A critical perspective. *Educational Theory*. 1994;44(1). Available from: <http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/journal.asp?ref=0013-2004&site=1>
- [35] Giroux HA. Democracy, education and the politics of critical pedagogy. In: McLaren P, Kincheloe JL, editors. *Critical Pedagogy: Where Are We Now?* New York: Peter Lang; 2007. pp. 1-5
- [36] UNESCO. *Guidelines on Intercultural Education* [no date]. 2008. Available from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001478/147878e.pdf> [Accessed: July 12, 2008]
- [37] Androussou A. An intercultural dimension in educational practice (English trans.: T. Moser). In: Tsarnas E, editor. *The Multicoloured School: An Experience of Intercultural Education through Art*. Athens: "Schedia" Center of Artistic and Cultural Training; 1996. pp. 11-23
- [38] Verma G. Inequality and intercultural education. In: Woodrow D, Verma GK, Rocha-Triadale GC, Bagley C, editors. *Intercultural Education: Theories, Policies and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 1997. pp. 55-64

- [39] Frangoudaki A, Dragonas T. Intercultural education in the European Union from a 'Southern' Viewpoint. In: Gundura J, Jacobs S, editors. *Intercultural Europe: Diversity and Social Policy*. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.; 2000. pp. 167-187
- [40] Kotsionis P. The dimensions of intercultural education in Greek Primary Schools. *Contemporary School*. 1995;25-30(27):120-126
- [41] Kaldi S. *Projects about the European Union in the Primary Classroom Environment: Cross-Cultural and Educational Case Studies*. Sussex: University of Sussex; 1999
- [42] Gotovos A. *Education and Difference: Issues of Intercultural Education*. Athens: Metexmio; 2002
- [43] Gupta AS. Changing the focus: A discussion of the dynamics of the intercultural experience. In: Alred G, Byram M, Fleming M, editors. *Intercultural Experience and Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 2003. pp. 155-173
- [44] Korhonen R, Helenius A. Becoming a cultural personality through the early years. In: Papoulia-Tzelepi P, Hegstrup S, Ross A, editors. *Emerging Identities among Young Children: European Issues*. London: Trentham Books; 2005. pp. 45-53
- [45] Miliou O. *Intercultural Skill and Classroom: Primary School Teachers' Views on the Educational Management of Cultural Diversity*. Department of Philosophy and Pedagogy. Thessaloniki: Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki; 2011
- [46] Batelaan P. Intercultural education. In: Commission for Racial Equality, editor. *The Practice of Intercultural Education*. London: Commission for Racial Equality; 1983. pp. 13-18
- [47] Batelaan P, Hoof V. Cooperative learning in intercultural education. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 1996;7(3):5-16
- [48] Kontogianni D. *Bicultural-Bilingual Education in Greece: the Case of "Greek Repatriates' Schools"*. Crete: University of Crete; 2002
- [49] Grant N. Multicultural education in Scotland. *Comparative Education*. 1983;19(2):133-153
- [50] Besalu Costa X. Intercultural education and teacher training. In: Woodrow D, Verma GK, Rocha-Triadale GC, Bagley C, editors. *Intercultural Education: Theories, Policies and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 1997. pp. 183-201
- [51] Monasta A. Intercultural education: The reality in Italy. In: Woodrow D, Verma GK, Rocha-Triadale CG, Bagley C, editors. *Intercultural Education: Theories, Policies and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 1997. pp. 157-164
- [52] International Amnesty. *First Steps. Manual for the Basic Education in Human Rights* (translation Giannogona A, Papachristos C, Silligardaki S). Athens: Pataki Publications; 2007
- [53] Salomon G, Nevo B. *Peace Education: the Concept, Principles and Practices around the World*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2002
- [54] Ray D, Bernstein Tarrow N. Human rights and education: An overview. In: Bernstein Tarrow N, editor. *Human Rights and Education*. Vol. 3. Oxford: Pergamon Press; 1987. pp. 3-16
- [55] Batelaan P, Gundara I. Intercultural education, cooperative learning and the changing society. *Intercultural Education*. 2000;11(supplement):31-34

- [56] Cordeiro A. Intercultural education in Portugal. In: Woodrow D, Verma GK, Rocha-Triadale GC, Bagley C, editors. *Intercultural Education: Theories, Policies and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 1997. pp. 167-181
- [57] Zografou A. The Educational Situation of Greek Immigrants' Children and the Necessity of Intercultural Education in Greece. Patra: Technological Institute of Patra; 1997
- [58] Zografou A. *Intercultural Education in Europe and Greece*. Athens: Tipothito; 2003
- [59] Belesi D. Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Learning in School: A Suggestion of Intercultural Didactics in High Schools. Aegan: University of the Aegean; 2009
- [60] Sanders MK. Revisiting intercultural education: Goals, methods, and obstacles. *The Journal of Intergroup Relations*. 1999;26(3):62-69
- [61] Council of Europe: The Concept of Intercultural Dialogue. 2008. Available from: [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/concept\\_EN.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/concept_EN.asp) [Accessed: July 12, 2008]
- [62] Camilleri C. From multicultural to intercultural: How to move from one to the other. In: Lynch J, Modgil C, Modgil S, editors. *Education for Cultural Diversity; Convergence and Divergence*, volume one. London: Falmer Press; 1992. pp. 141-151
- [63] Damanakis M. Multicultural—Intercultural education. *The Starting Point, Aims Perspectives, Educational Issues*. 1989;14-16(18):75-87
- [64] Kanakidou E, Papagianni B. *Intercultural Education*. 3rd ed. Athens: Ellinika Grammata; 1998
- [65] *Education and Culture: Training Teachers in Intercultural Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe; 1986
- [66] Norberg K. Intercultural education and teacher education in Sweden. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2000;16:511-519
- [67] Mallick K. Language diversity and intercultural education. In: Woodrow D, Verma GK, Rocha-Triadale CG, Bagley C, editors. *Intercultural Education: Theories, Policies and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 1997. pp. 99-110
- [68] Alkan M. Aspects of intercultural education and curriculum decision-making. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 1990;13(1):113-121
- [69] Campani G, Gundara J. Overview of intercultural policies within the European Union. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 1994;5(1):3-8
- [70] Gundara JS. *Interculturalism, Education and Inclusion*. London: SAGE Publications; 2000
- [71] Pantazi V. Basic principles of intercultural education. *Educational Issues*. 1998;46-52(49-50):156-159
- [72] Vinsonneau G. Conflict between social groups: Cognitive psychology and the reduction of conflict between groups. In: Woodrow D, Verma GK, Rocha-Triadale GC, Bagley C, editors. *Intercultural Education: Theories, Policies and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate; 1997. pp. 299-316
- [73] Damanakis M. Internal and external difficulties in the production of an intercultural oriented teaching material. *Educational Issues*. 1997;41-45(43):66-73
- [74] Luchtenberg S. Language varieties and intercultural education. *Journal*



of Multilingual and Multicultural Development. 1988;**9**(182):141-149

[75] Contini RM, Pica-Smith C. Problematizing the conceptual framework of interculturalism and its pedagogical extension of intercultural education: Theoretical perspectives and their implications. 2017;**9**(3):236-255. DOI: 10.14658/pupjijse-2017-3-10

[76] Bereris M. Forms of Intercultural Education and Social Integration of Immigrants' Children in Greece. PhD Thesis, University of Athens; 1999

[77] Robinson. Cross-cultural Understanding. Oxford: Prentice Hall; 1988

[78] Perroti A. The Case for Intercultural Education. Netherlands: Council of Europe Press; 1994

[79] Fennes H, Hapgood K. Intercultural Learning in Classrooms. Crossing Borders. London: Cassell; 1997

[80] Katevas G. The education of children with cultural and social deficiency. Applications of Intercultural Education in School, Educational Issues. 1998;**46-52**(47-48):114-121

[81] Brislin R, Yoshida T. Intercultural Communication Training: an Introduction. London: Sage Publications; 1994

[82] Cummins J. Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Educational Review. 1986;**56**(1):18-36

[83] Damanakis M. European and intercultural dimension in Greek education. European Educational Research Journal. 2005;**4**(1):79-88

[84] Spyridakis J. The Correspondence Between the Intercultural Pedagogical

Theory and the Educational Practice in the Intercultural Schools founded by the law 2413/1996. The Case of the Intercultural Primary School in Sapes Rodopi. Crete: University of Crete; 2002

[85] Papageorgiou I. For an education that makes the most out of globalization; A critical intercultural approach. Current Sociology. 2000;**58**(4):642-660

[86] Tsaliki E. Teachers' views on implementing intercultural education in Greece; the case of thirteen primary schools. International Journal of Comparative Education and Development. 2017;**19**(2):50-64. DOI: 10.1108/IJCED-07-2017-0013

[87] Bajaj M, Canlas M, Argenal M. Human rights education and critical pedagogy for marginalised youth. In: Palaiologou N, Zembylas M, editors. Human Rights and Citizenship Education and Intercultural Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing; 2018. pp. 12-28

[88] Baker C. Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 1993

[89] Corson D. Realities of Teaching in a Multiethnic School. International Review of Education. 1991;**37**(1):7-31

[90] Boteram N. Immigration and the identity of Ego. Pedagogical Review. 1989;**8-10**(10):39-68

[91] Tingbjorn G. Active Bilingualism. The Swedish Goal for Immigrant Children's Instruction. In: Skutnabb-Kangas T, Cummins J, editors. Minority Education from Shame to Struggle. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 1988. pp. 103-126

[92] Dean J. Improving Children's Learning: Effective Teaching in the

- Primary School. London and New York: Routledge; 2000
- [93] Scarcella R, Crookall D. Simulation/gaming and language acquisition. In: Crookall D, Oxford RL, editors. *Simulation, Gaming and Language Learning*. New Jersey: Newbury House Publishers; 1990. pp. 223-230
- [94] Hoffman C. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Longman; 1991
- [95] Cummins J. *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society*. Ontario: California Association for Bilingual Education; 1996
- [96] Cummins J. *Bilingualism and Minority Language Children*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, OISE Press; 1981
- [97] Bernstein B. *Class, Codes and Control Volume I Theoretical Studies towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge; 1971
- [98] Labov W. The logic of non-standard English. In: Alacis JE, editor. *Report of the Twentieth Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; 1969, 1970. pp. 1-29
- [99] Pirgiotakis J. *Socialization and Educational Inequalities*. Athens: Grigoris Publications; 1996
- [100] Rosen H. *Language and Class: a Critical Look at the Theories of Basil Bernstein*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press; 1972
- [101] Tsaliki E. Types of bilingual education and their relationship with the 'Hypothesis of Deficiency' and the 'Hypothesis of Difference'. A theoretical intercultural approach. In: Georgogiannis P, editor. *Intercultural Education—Greek as a Second or Foreign Language—Eighth International Conference—Volume 1*. Patra: University of Patra, Department of Primary Education, Centre of Intercultural Education; 2005. pp. 359-371
- [102] Damanakis M. *The Education of Repatriate and Foreign Pupils in Greece: Intercultural Approach*. Athens: Gutenberg; 1998
- [103] Taboada Leonetti I. From multicultural to intercultural: Is it necessary to move from one to the other? In: Lynch J, Modgil C, Modgil S, editors. *Education for Cultural Diversity; Convergence and Divergence*, volume one. London: Falmer Press; 1992. pp. 153-162
- [104] Sleeter C, Grant C. An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. *Harvard Educational Review*. 1987;57(4):421-444
- [105] Hoffman D. Culture and self in multicultural education: Reflections on discourse, text and practice. *American Educational Research Journal*. 1996;33(3):545-569
- [106] Gillborn D, Gipps C. *Recent Research on the Achievement of Ethnic Minority Pupils*. London: HMSO; 1996
- [107] Grant CA, Ladson-Billings, editors. *Dictionary of Multicultural Education*. Arizona: The Onyx Press; 1997
- [108] Tsakiropoulou I. *Intercultural Education: the Official Approach of the Institute of the Education of Greeks Abroad and of Intercultural Education and the Orientation of the Departments of Primary Education of the Country*. Thessaloniki: Department of Primary Education, Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki; 2008
- [109] May S. *Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding*

- essentialism. In: May S, editor. *Critical Multiculturalism. Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education*. Lewes: Falmer Press; 1999. pp. 11-41
- [110] Onestini C. Intercultural education within European education programmes. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 1996;**6**:49-54
- [111] McGee Banks. *Intercultural and Intergroup Education, 1929-1959: Schools and Communities*. In: Banks JA, Banks CAMG, editors. *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2004. pp. 753-769
- [112] Council of Europe. *Education and Culture: Training Teachers in Intercultural Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe; 1986
- [113] Hatzinikolaou-Marasli V. Intercultural education: Origin, socio-philosophical position, function. *Aim Educational Issues*. 1999;**37-40**(39-40):8-14
- [114] Freedman Lustig D. of Kwanzaa, Cinco de Mayo, and Whispering: The Need for Intercultural Education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*. 1997;**28**(4):574-592
- [115] Paparizos C. Language planning, intercultural education and language teaching. *New Education*. 2000;**93-96**(94):59-65
- [116] Gill S. Overseas' students intercultural education as intercultural learning: A transformative framework. *Compare*. 2007;**37**(2):167-183
- [117] Bliss I. Intercultural education and the professional knowledge of teachers. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. 1990;**13**(1):141-151
- [118] Byram M. On being 'Bicultural' and 'Intercultural'. In: Alred G, Byram M, Flemming M, editors. *Intercultural Experience and Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 2003. pp. 50-66
- [119] Martin J. What should we do with a hidden curriculum when we find one? *Curriculum Inquiry*. 1976;**6**(2):131-151
- [120] Gordon D. The concept of the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 1982;**16**(2):187-198
- [121] Apple MW. *Ideology and Curriculum*. 3rd ed. New York and London: Routledge Falmer; 2004
- [122] Dreeben R. *On What is Learned in Schools*. Reading and Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley; 1969
- [123] Jackson PW. *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 1968
- [124] Bourdieu P. The forms of capital. In: Richardson G, editor. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press; 1986. pp. 241-258
- [125] Bourdieu P, Passeron J. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications; 1990
- [126] Parekh B. The meaning of multicultural education. In: Modgil S, Verma G, Mallick K, Modgil C, editors (Zoniou-Sideri A, Charamis P, trans). *Multicultural Education: Problems—Perspectives*. 2nd ed. Greek Letters: Athens; 1997. pp. 44-64