WORLD YEARBOOK
OF EDUCATION 1997

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

World
Yearbook
of
Education

Edited by David Coulby, Jagdish Gundara and Crispin Jones

Series Editors: David Coulby and Crispin Jones

WORLD YEARBOOK OF EDUCATION 1997

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

Edited by
David Coulby, Jagdish Gundara and Crispin Jones
Series editors: David Coulby and Crispin Jones

KOGAN PAGE
London • Stirling (USA)

First published in 1997

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers at the undermentioned address:

Kogan Page Limited
120 Pentonville Road
London N1 9JN
and
22883 Quicksilver Drive
Stirling, VA 20166, USA

© David Coulby, Jagdish Gundara and Crispin Jones, 1997

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0 7494 2114 2
ISSN 0084-2508

Typeset by Kogan Page
Printed in England by Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

WORLD YEARBOOK
OF EDUCATION 1997

World Yearbook of Education 1984
Women and Education
Edited by Sandra Acker, Jacquetta Megarry, Stanley Nisbet and Eric Hoyle

World Yearbook of Education 1985
Research, Policy and Practice
Edited by John Nisbet, Jacquetta Megarry and Stanley Nisbet

World Yearbook of Education 1986
The Management of Schools
Edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon

World Yearbook of Education 1987
Vocational Education
Edited by John Twining, Stanley Nisbet and Jacquetta Megarry

World Yearbook of Education 1988
Education for the New Technologies
Edited by Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1989
Health Education
Edited by Chris James, John Balding and Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1990
Assessment and Evaluation
Edited by Chris Bell and Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1991
International Schools and International Education
Edited by Patricia L Jonietz (Guest Editor) and Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1992
Urban Education
Edited by David Coulby, Crispin Jones and Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1993
Special Needs Education
Edited by Peter Mittler, Ron Brouilette and Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1994
The Gender Gap in Higher Education
Edited by Suzanne Stiver Lie, Lynda Malik and Duncan Harris (Series Editor)

World Yearbook of Education 1995
Youth, Education and Work
Edited by Leslie Bash and Andy Green

World Yearbook of Education 1996
The Evaluation of Higher Education Systems
Edited by Robert Cowen

试读结束：需要全本请在线购买： www.ertongbook.com

Notes on the Contributors

Sheila Aikman is a Lecturer in Education and International Development at the Institute of Education, London, UK.

Leslie Bash is a Principal Lecturer in Education at Anglia University, UK.

David Coulby is Professor of Education and Dean of the Faculty of Education and Human Sciences at Bath College of Higher Education, UK.

Robert Cowen is a Senior Lecturer in Comparative Education in the Culture, Communication and Societies Group in the University of London Institute of Education, UK.

Zubeida Desai is a lecturer in the Education Faculty at the University of the Western Cape, specializing in language education.

Jianhong Dong is Deputy Director, Division of Education, Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, Beijing, People's Republic of China.

Nigel Grant is Professor Emeritus of Education at the University of Glasgow, UK.

Jagdish Gundara is Reader in Education in the Culture, Communication and Societies Group and Head of the International Centre for Intercultural Studies, University of London Institute of Education, UK.

Olivier Hinton was educated in France and is currently preparing a PhD at the Institute of Education, University of London, UK.

Yasumasa Hirasawa is Professor in the Faculty of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Japan.

Crispin Jones is a Senior Lecturer in Education in the Culture, Communication and Societies Group and is a member of the International Centre for Intercultural Studies at the Institute of Education, London University, UK.

Tapas Majumdar is Emeritus Professor of Economics at the Jawaharal Nehru University, New Delhi, India.

John Mallea is Professor and Past President of Brandon University, Manitoba, Canada.

Kevin J Moran is Research Assistant Professor in the School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, USA.

Lisl Prendergast is Assistant Principal at Hasting Girls' High School, Hawkes Bay, New Zealand.

Euan Reid is a Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Education, attached to the Culture, Communication and Societies Academic Group, University of London, UK.

Nick Taylor is Director of the Joint Education Trust, a development agency in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Verena Taylor works in the Directorate for Education, Culture and Sports at the Council of Europe, Strasbourg, where she is responsible for the Network for School Links and Exchanges and the Council of Europe's In-service Training Programme for Teachers.

William B Thomas is Professor of Education at the University of Pittsburgh, USA.

Janusz Tomiak was a Senior Lecturer in Comparative and East European Education at the Institute of Education and School of Slavonic and East European Studies in the University of London, UK, until his retirement in 1988.

Jonathan Young is a Full Professor in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba, Canada, where he has just completed a term as Associate Dean.

Preface

The collapse of Soviet-style communism has meant that the focus of concern in relation to societal diversity has once again shifted to the state. The European Union, the Confederation of Independent States, the North American Free Trade Area and the emergent grouping of the Pacific Rim point towards a trend for larger economic groupings that, perhaps paradoxically, may reawaken the aspirations of peoples previously contained within individual states. Yet the number of recognized states is small, while that of nations or of peoples is large. For example, of the 6,000 or so languages in the world, a mere 100 account for some 95% of the world's population: in other words, 5% of the world's population speak the remaining 5,900. Language is a powerful signifier of identity but many language groups, like other minority groups, are constantly having to assert their right to exist in the face of apathy/hostility from the states in which they live. This is because there are only some 200 or so states in the United Nations, most of which claim some form of putative unitary identity, as opposed to many thousands of linguistic and other powerful group identities.

The issues that arise for education from this situation are complex. Each state has an educational policy in regard to interculturalism, implicit or explicit. Within most states there is also an oppositional discourse or discourses, frequently advocating some form of pluralistic educational policy in response to societal diversity, or, more worryingly, asserting a fictitious monist state singularity. International organizations like the United Nations and the Council of Europe also have policy statements, mostly of a normative nature, supporting interculturalism; however, such statements often have little immediate effect on individual state educational policies.

This *Yearbook* attempts two things in relation to this state of affairs. First, it examines this broader context and attempts to assess the current state of play in relation to debates about interculturalism, state education and societal solidarity. Second, it looks at the policy debates, decisions and practices within specific national and international contexts in order to demonstrate the range that is currently extant. In doing this, the book will be an important marker in a crucial educational debate.

The book, therefore, falls into three sections. The first consists of a series of framing essays that look at key issues in relation to intercultural education.

Such issues include linguistic diversity, religious diversity and secularism, responses to diversity within the state and education and refugees. The second section consists of a series of regional studies, demonstrating that interculturalism should not be solely examined in individual state contexts. The third section is a series of national case studies. In addition to examining some or all of the issues raised in the first two sections, the case studies demonstrate the wide variety of perceptions of and responses to the issues involved.

As a whole, the book reveals the complexities of the issues involved under the broad heading of intercultural education. No state education system discussed in this book has met the range of aspirations of the various groups that make up their society. That is the pessimistic conclusion. The optimistic one is that all systems appear to take intercultural education seriously and most would claim that progress is slowly and painfully being made.

The editors would like to thank all the contributors for their hard work in preparing material for this *Yearbook*. In particular, they would like to thank Gail Edwards for being the administrative linchpin of the project. Thanks also to Robert Cowen for invaluable assistance in establishing the initial contacts.

David Coulby, Jagdish Gundara and Crispin Jones

Contents

Notes on the Contributors vi
Preface vii

Section I: Issues in Intercultural Education
1. Nation, State and Diversity *Crispin Jones* 1
2. Educational Responses to Diversity Within the State *David Coulby* 7
3. Religion, Secularism and Values Education *Jagdish Gundara* 18
4. Education and Linguistic Diversity *Euan Reid* 27
5. Educational Contradictions: The Education of Stateless and State-denied Groups *Crispin Jones* 38

Section II: Regional Contexts
6. The Commonwealth of Independent States *Janusz Tomiak* 45
7. The Council of Europe and Intercultural Education *Verena Taylor* 56
8. Intercultural Education and the Pacific Rim *Robert Cowen* 68
9. Intercultural Education in Latin America *Sheila Aikman* 79

Section III: National Case Studies
10. Intercultural Education in Canada *John Mallea and Jonathan Young* 90
11. Intercultural Education in France *Olivier Hinton* 106
12. Intercultural Education in India *Tapas Majumdar* 112
13. Intercultural Education in Israel *Leslie Bash* 121
14. Intercultural Education in Japan *Yasumasa Hirasawa* 132
15. Geopolitics Language Education and Citizenship in the Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania *David Coulby* 142
16. Intercultural Education in New Zealand *Lisl Prendergast* 150
17. Minority Education in the People's Republic of China *Jianhong Dong* 162
18. Language and Education in South Africa *Zubeida Desai and Nick Taylor* 169
19. Intercultural Education in the UK *Nigel Grant* 178
20. Struggling for Continuity: Ethnic Identities and Language in the United States *William B Thomas and Kevin J Moran* 191

Section IV: Afterword
21. The Way Forward *Jagdish Gundara* 208

Index 213

Section I:
Issues in Intercultural Education

1. Nation, State and Diversity

Crispin Jones

States seldom go to war with one another as we reach the end of the century. It is a sort of progress, given the wars that filled the first half of the century. One reason is that so many modern states are involved in internal strife, even wars, that leave little energy for such external adventures. Thus, according to the Stockholm-based International Peace Research Institute, there were no inter-state wars but there were 30 internal civil wars in 1995 (Bellamy, 1996). In relation to individual state education systems, this means that curricula that are nationalist and ethnocentric, while still in full flourishing health, are now more concerned with the maintenance of some fictional state unity, best expressed in that modernist oxymoron, the 'nation state'. Of course, conscious or hidden demonizing of other states or a more general 'enemy without' (eg, 'capitalist running dogs', 'godless communism') is also a feature of most states' curricula but it is now matched by similar processes in connection with the 'enemy within'. At a simple level, words like 'foreigner', 'guest worker', 'immigrant' and even 'minority' and their non-English equivalents, can carry loaded and negative meanings in school classrooms as much as in the wider society outside the school.

As the need for the modernist state is put into question (Baumann, 1992; Hall *et al.*, 1992), the more its education system attempts to bolster its self-image of contented unity against the facts of demography and culture. A recent local and parochial example of this has been the debate in the English education system about the cultural responsibilities of schools, having as they do a culturally diverse student body. Dr Nicholas Tate, head of the British government's Schools Curriculum and Assessment Authority for England (SCAA), is arguing for a stronger sense of British identity to be inculcated by the schools. He wants a return to an Arnoldian 'best that is known and thought' high culture, where 'the curriculum needs to be firmly and proudly rooted in a cultural heritage with its roots in Greece and Rome, in Christianity and in

European civilisation' (Tate, 1996). Other traditions are recognized but not as 'British' and consequently are in a subordinate and unclear place within the curriculum of state schools in England. It is also revealing that Dr Tate tends to conflate British and English, much to the annoyance of Scots, Welsh and other British citizens who do not see themselves as English.

Tate's viewpoint or locally configured variations on it could well be accepted by certain powerful conservative or nationalistic educational groups in most state educational systems. In its European manifestations, the key elements are a belief in a common European heritage based on the Classics and Christianity. However, there is no objective agreement on where the boundaries of Europe are and who actually is a European (Coulby and Jones, 1995). In addition, such a view of a benevolent European civilization must bear in mind Ghandi's view of Western civilization, namely that it would be a good idea.

Confusion continues and is frequently compounded as 'Western', 'European' and 'civilization' are treated as synonyms in many school and college textbooks, as can be seen in Hollister's classic American college primer *Medieval Europe*, which shifts, in the space of one page, from 'Europe' to 'Western Europe' to 'Western Civilization', while describing the same area of scholarly concern (Hollister, 1964). As for the claims that European civilization has a unique cultivation and tolerance, a dispassionate view would be that other civilizations have an equal and perhaps equally spurious claim to the same attributes. In relation to Greece and Rome and Christianity, the so-called groundings of European civilization, Bernal has clearly demonstrated the problematic nature of the North European idealization of the Hellenic period (Bernal, 1987, 1991; Gundara, 1990). In relation to religion, Judaism has had a longer presence in Europe than its two related religions, Islam and Christianity. Christianity's domination of Europe has been the result of its repeated attempts to eliminate other religions through Crusades and pogroms, a process that continues to this day, as recent events in former Yugoslavia and the current wave of anti-Semitism across the European Union (EU) witness. Of course, Europe is not unique in terms of the educational struggles that have taken place in relation to the role of religion within the schooling system, an issue that is taken up in more detail in Chapter 3.

Mythologizing of their own antecedents is not confined to European education systems, despite the fact that many of the states they serve do have a longer history of group incorporation compared to other more recent states, such as settler states like Australia and the USA, the post-colonialist, cartographic states that are a feature of much of Africa and Asia, and the post-Soviet states. However, stressing state and national unity as coincident is a feature of most education systems and perhaps a necessary one. Thus, although all states discriminate against certain sections of their populations and this discrimination is frequently supported, tacitly or explicitly, by the education system, such discrimination is nearly always a dangerous balancing act. It can readily

试读结束：需要全本请在线购买： www.ertongbook.com

collapse, as has been recently seen in the CIS, Rwanda, Somalia, former Yugoslavia and Indonesia.

Yet the state's need for its education system to teach unity and loyalty to its idealized self is, on the surface, a sensible one, as it helps diminish potential inter-group conflict. As a consequence, the proponents of intercultural education are likely to be at variance with state education systems as the two may have conflicting aims. Stratton and Ang (1994) demonstrate this in their analysis of the critiques of multiculturalism in the USA and Australia from such liberal commentators as Schlesinger Jnr (1992). Recognition of the nature of this potential conflict is important for both sides. Intercultural education has to come to terms with the modern state; similarly, the modern state has to come to terms with its own diversity.

The dilemma is a real one for the modern state. The debate about subsidiarity apart, there are real dangers to peace if all groups, defining themselves and/or being defined by others, insist upon self-government. An illustration may help here. One symbol of group identity is language. If all language groups insisted on separate state status, there would be some 6,000 states, the vast majority very small but with one or two huge ones, such as the mainly Chinese-speaking state of the People's Republic of China (PRC). It is also salutary to remember that some of the national and/or linguistic minorities in the PRC are much larger than the total populations of many current UN states (Moseley and Asher, 1994). State constitutions and education systems have to compromise on this issue and, in doing so, are always open to criticism from one side of the debate or the other. Thus, as a typical example, the new, post-communist Bulgarian education system expounds the 'adoption of universal and national values, virtues and culture' in schools as well as supporting minority languages in an attempt to resolve some of these issues, but finds itself short of the actual resources to put such aspirations and policies into practice in an effective manner (Damianova-Ivanova, 1995).

Minorities, of course, can be of many types, not just linguistic, and to see them solely in terms of, say, an ethnic minority within a hostile state is too narrow a perspective. (Language issues are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.) Consequently, the point about who actually does the defining is important. We can define ourselves and the groups to which we belong, in terms of language, history, culture, religion and so forth, but others may define us in different ways. They may only see our religious affiliations or our skin colour and define us in terms that suit their prejudices and stereotypes rather than our sense of ourselves and our group. This latter point is all-important in education, as it is often a minority, the economically and politically powerful, who define the nature of the education, particularly the curriculum, that the state is to provide for its future citizens. The list below (developed from Coulby and Jones, 1995) gives an indication of some of the complexities of this issue, showing some of the ways in which education can be organized and the student population divided up or differentiated:

By *age* – compulsory, post-compulsory; adult and continuing education; education for the elderly, University of the Third Age.

By *attainment* – elite educational institutions, such as grammar schools, lycées and gymnasia; low-status adult and technical education as against high-status universities.

By *attendance* – boarding/residential or day institutions; part-time/shift or full-time; daytime or evening.

By *behaviour* – separate educational institutions or classes for students seen as disruptive or separate provision for those convicted of crime, such as educational provision in prison.

By *citizenship* – asylum seekers and other refugee groups may have separate education provided, to make reintegration more easy.

By *contact* – classroom or correspondence/radio/TV, distance learning.

By *curricula* – educational institutions with an agricultural, technical or other vocational specialism, as opposed to those with a strongly academic orientation.

By *disability/special educational need* – separate educational institutions for students with disabilities that make it inappropriate, in the view of the education system's organizers, for them to be within mainstream educational institutions.

By *gender* – separate schools or different curricula for boys and girls. (No educational system currently takes on issues of sexual orientation in terms of provision.)

By *language* – state educational institutions using one or more national languages; other educational institutions in the same system using another national language or other languages.

By *location* – there are frequently differences between educational institutions in prosperous and poor areas, even though both are funded by the state; educational institutions in rural or urban areas are frequently different in their resourcing and curricula. As important, groups who are settled are frequently treated differently in education to groups who travel, eg the Roma.

By *nationality* – although often seen in terms of religion and/or language, this category could apply to those educational institutions set up to educate minority or subordinated peoples within or apart from the mainstream state system; schools on 'reservations'.

By *'race'* – segregated educational institutions, both *de facto* and *de jure*.

By *religion* – religious educational institutions/secular educational institutions; also, different educational institutions for different religions within the one system.

By *state* – or precisely, by being stateless or state-denied, the fate of refugee and asylum seeking students who frequently have schools, of a sort, set up in their refugee camps. It also refers to a large group of schools and other educational institutions set up by one state to educate a group claiming

links with another, usually adjoining, state.
By *wealth* – private educational institutions for the wealthy.

警告

This list sketches the potential range of differentiation; it does not attempt to be exhaustive. The categories also overlap without clear boundaries. With these caveats in mind, three issues arise from it.

违反

The first is that, as has been stated earlier, the professional managers of all education systems feel the need to differentiate and that act, in itself, should not be seen as an axiomatic infringement of the educational aspirations, however defined, of the groups concerned. In addition, such differentiation has a curriculum element subject to a range of other pressures, a process that has been thought-provokingly examined by Denis Lawton in his book, *Education, Culture and the National Curriculum* (Lawton, 1989).

Another difficulty is the state's schooling system's dual role of instigating innovation and critical thinking, and passing on the culture or cultures of the state. The consequences of addressing these issues and attempting to resolve them in terms of curriculum practice in a manner that acknowledges such pluralism is still under-investigated. Certainly few state education systems currently address these issues in an open and systematic manner.

The second issue arises where the managers of an education system impose some form or forms of educational differentiation on a group without that group's permission or support. Educational and other inequalities are likely to result, sometimes leading to wider extra-educational protest. Decisions about languages and religions and their place in the educational system are an obvious example of this.

The other side of this particular argument, educational self-determination, has its difficulties as well. A minority group that insists on its children being given an education that contradicts official state policy, for example on religious matters or the responsibilities and loyalties the individual should have to the state, causes real dilemmas for a state education system, however well-intended it hopes to be. The reason is that if one of the purposes of a state's education system is to promote state unity and loyalty, as well as conformity to its laws, any group which refutes this view or wishes to provide an education system that does the opposite, for example, advocating some form of national independence, is likely to be seen as undesirable, at the very least. The dilemma is real for the providers of state education. Accept minority group separation in relation to education and the unity of the state may be threatened; enforce forms of differentiation that the same groups find alienating or destructive of their perceptions of identity and the unity of the state may also be threatened. There is no simple answer to this conundrum and the education system in each state usually attempts to resolve the issue in pragmatic ways which best secure the state's own stability, rather than the educational needs of the minorities concerned.

The third issue is that, although education and training systems often treat minorities as if they were a homogeneous group, minorities are themselves internally segmented, in education as in society generally. The questions of group versus individual human rights that arise from this are complex and difficult to resolve, as recent international conferences dealing with such issues well demonstrate. For educational systems and institutions, it can be difficult to locate an authentic voice for a community when various spokespersons make different and indeed conflicting demands.

The chapters in this volume attempt to identify progressive practice in intercultural education and factors within states which can encourage or impede it. They seek to theorize the need for intercultural education in states which are increasingly aware both of their diversity and of the effects of globalization. They draw on a wide range of contexts and cover the many issues involved in educational provision in multicultural states.

References

Baumann, Z (1992) *Intimations of Postmodernity*, London: Routledge.

Bellamy, C (1996) 'The end of war – and peace', *The Independent*, 14 June, p.1.

Bernal, M (1987) *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilisation, Volume I. The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785–1985*, London: Vintage.

Bernal, M (1991) *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilisation, Volume II. The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*, London: Free Association Press.

Bremner, C (1996) 'Nation state's day is over, Britain told [by Kohl]', *The Times*, 3 February, p.1.

Coulby, D and Jones, C (1995) *Postmodernity and European Education Systems: Cultural Diversity and Centralist Knowledge*, Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Damianova-Ivanova, A (1995) *Secondary Education in Bulgaria*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Press.

Gundara, J (1990) 'Societal diversity and the issue of "the other"', *Oxford Review of Education*, 16, 1, 97–109.

Hall, S *et al.* (eds) (1992) *Modernity and its Futures*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hollister, C (1964) *Medieval Europe*, New York: John Wiley.

Lawson, M (1996) 'Turning time up and over', *The Guardian*, 30 April, pp.22–3.

Lawton, D (1989) *Education, Culture and the National Curriculum*, Sevenoaks: Hodder & Stoughton.

Moseley, C and Asher, R (eds) (1994) *Atlas of the World's Languages*, London: Routledge.

Schlesinger Jr, A (1992) *The Disuniting of America*, New York: Norton.

Stratton, J and Ang, I (1994) 'Multicultural imagined communities: cultural difference and national identity in Australia and the USA', *Continuum: The Australian Journal of Media & Culture*, 8, 2.

Tate, N (1996) 'Culture is not anarchy', *The Times*, 8 February, p.18.

2. Educational Responses to Diversity Within the State

David Coulby

Segregation, stratification and naturalization

Education, along with immigration and citizenship legislation, is one of the main ways in which the state controls diversity and attempts to enforce homogeneity on its population. States differ in the extent to which the maintenance of homogeneity is an important policy objective – weak in South Africa and Hungary, stronger in China and France. Immigration, and increasingly asylum legislation, in many of the European Union states, for example, attempt to restrict the kinds of people who are allowed within their confines. Citizenship legislation, in states such as Germany as well as Latvia and Estonia (see Chapter 15), determines which components of a population are allowed to vote in the various levels of elections, who may carry what sort of a passport, and so on. Educational legislation and institutions segregate or integrate particular groups within a population (segregation), promote certain sections of them to academic and professional success (stratification) and instil within the population as a whole a myth concerning the history and identity of the state and of its citizens (naturalization).

This chapter examines these three processes of segregation, stratification and naturalization. While segregation and stratification are matters concerning the structure of educational systems and institutions, naturalization concerns the curricula of schools and universities.

Segregation

标准

There are a multitude of different criteria whereby educational institutions segregate pupils and students. These range from assessed educational performance to language or appearance (Coulby and Jones, 1995). The nature of segregated and differentiated provision is analysed in detail in Chapter 1. Examples include: the Magyar-speaking secondary schools of Transylvania, language classes for refugee children in the UK, the tripartite secondary system in Germany, and private universities in Bulgaria and Japan.

Segregation can lead to the separation of the school and/or university population, often for long periods of time. In a tripartite system where pupils are actually placed in different schools (as against France or the Netherlands where pupils can follow different curricula within the same institution) this separation can take on the illusion of being natural. Segregated special schools in the UK serve to enforce the difference and separation between their pupils and those in mainstream schools. By virtue (if that is the word) of being in a distinct institution, they come to view themselves as distinct kinds of people with different provision, aspirations and needs. In parallel, pupils in the mainstream or in the *gymnasium* do not have contact with other kinds of pupils and can, all the more easily, come to regard them as abnormal or intellectually inferior. Segregation is a process whereby educational institutions create and reinforce difference.

It is a sociological commonplace that this segregation frequently takes place along the lines of social class and that it functions overwhelmingly to reproduce it (Poulantzas, 1973; 1978a; 1978b). The lines of social class themselves are often very similar to those of language, religion or perceived ethnic identity. Thus disproportionate numbers of Afro-Caribbean children find themselves in segregated special education in the UK (Tomlinson, 1981) and very few Turkish children get through to the German gymnasium (Hoff, 1995a; 1995b). These segregated school placements obviously relate to the reproduction of the stratification of diversity discussed below. What is less commonly noted is that segregation may actually lead to the reinforcement of the sense of ethnic identity. The Romanian secondary school system with its Romanian, Magyar and (dwindling) German schools (each system in turn segregated according to perceived ability) functions to maintain and reproduce separation along the lines of language. Language classes and remedial provision may also serve to reinforce a sense of separateness, difference and possibly alienation among various groups. The state-language-speaking, non-remedial class groups are likely then to have their narrow parameters of state identity reinforced by not being educated alongside minority pupils and students and by being subjected to a curriculum in which the contribution of these groups is, in the main, remarkable by its absence. Segregation in school prepares for segregation in the workplace, the residential area and society.

To put this a different way: apparently non-racial, or more correctly apparently non-racist, segregations can have powerfully racist consequences. The example of Afro-Caribbean children in special schools in the UK is clear. Disproportionate numbers of these children are still referred to segregated Moderate Learning Difficulty or Emotionally or Behaviourally Disturbed schools. The consequences of this for the children concerned are examined in the following paragraphs, but there are many other sets of effects. Knowing this preponderance, are not teachers in mainstream schools more likely to expect unsatisfactory behaviour and/or performance from black children, and more likely to make a formal referral when they think they have found it and

试读结束：需要全本请在线购买： www.ertongbook.com