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About Coexistence International

Based at Brandeis University since 2005, Coexistence International (CI) is an initiative committed to strengthening the resources available to policymakers, practitioners, and funders promoting coexistence at local, national, and international levels. CI advocates a complementary approach to coexistence work through facilitating connections, learning, reflection, and strategic thinking between those in the coexistence field and those in related areas. CI is funded by the Alan B. Slifka Foundation.
Introduction

Understanding that education can be a key change agent and one of the main instruments through which a diverse society can address inter-group relations, Coexistence International (CI) commissioned this survey research to examine the role of education policy in promoting coexistence. This research initiative is consistent with CI’s other activities, all of which are designed to contribute to a meta-level analysis of coexistence and an appreciation for a complementary approach to building coexistence (i.e. societies where diversity is embraced, equality is actively pursued, and interdependence between different groups is recognized). All of CI’s initiatives strive to be as practical and applicable as possible, and to this end, a list of further resources and contacts can be found at the conclusion of this report.

Educational institutions are often the heart of a community and are central agents of socialization. Schools can be an important channel through which to promote social cohesion and address community issues of inter-cultural, inter-religious, or inter-ethnic relations. The education system is also a public institution, and as such, can create open and participatory processes through which the community can exert influence. If education policy is not sensitive to the issue of social cohesion and does not incorporate the perspectives of key stakeholders, it can be divisive and alienating, contributing to injustice and violence.

The main questions addressed in this research are: (1) whether and how a country’s education policy can help to promote coexistence rather than reinforce divides, (2) how education policies of different countries grapple with questions of diversity and citizenship, and (3) how divisive moments in a country’s history are presented in its education curriculum.

Using these guiding questions, the research examines critical factors related to primary and secondary education. In addition to a section on cross-cutting themes, ten case studies are presented. The ten countries were chosen because of their multicultural or multi-ethnic populations. This research seeks to understand how the ethnic, racial, and cultural needs of a country’s student population are considered when creating education policy, and how constructive policy can be effective in contributing to positive and peaceful intergroup relations. CI does not endorse any particular education model or policy described in this research, but has rather presented examples of the relationship between national-level education policy and the promotion of coexistence.

CI recognizes the limited scope of this initial review, but believes that it provides valuable insight into what is currently happening at the level of education policy in a sampling of countries around the world. The report does not pretend to fully assess the actual implementation of these policies but rather provides an overview of how policymakers in countries with diverse populations address questions of citizenship, unity, and identity, among others.
Methodology

Secondary research for this paper was carried out between May 2007 and March 2008. The scope of the research was intentionally broad and was designed to identify key questions and cross-cutting themes related to coexistence and education policy. Survey research on general themes and in the country case studies section points to important considerations and trends, but it is not able to flesh out the complexities and subtleties of the situations on the ground.

The countries studied were chosen because of their multicultural or multi-ethnic populations and their geographic range. The intention in each of these brief country studies is to provide an overview and some examples of education policies that either have helped to build coexistence or may have contributed to divides.

Organizations that are doing notable work in these arenas are listed in the conclusion of this report.

Glossary of Terms

The literature uses many different terms to frame the discussion about education and coexistence. In some cases, coexistence is not even the term being used; instead, policies refer to diversity or multiculturalism, or the related issue of citizenship. Coexistence International uses the term coexistence to mean that there are peaceful and positive relationships between groups that are different from one another. Coexistence is strong when different ethnic, racial, religious, and social groups feel safe, equal, at home, and respected in the communities and countries where they reside. The use of weapons to address conflicts is increasingly obsolete.

Sleeter and Grant (1987) identify five main phases in the development of multicultural education: 1) teaching the culturally different, 2) human relations, 3) single group studies, 4) multicultural approach, and 5) multicultural and social reconstructionism.

Other terms used to describe this type of work include pluralism, consocialism, integration, and a social reconstructionist approach. Pluralism is a condition in which minority groups participate fully in the dominant society, yet maintain their cultural differences. Experts say this encourages positive diversity. Integration means the whole population is treated in a uniform manner; however, in order to ensure that minorities are not disadvantaged, certain measures may be necessary to allow them to compete on equal footing with the rest of the community. A social reconstructionist approach aims to transform a society to reduce social inequities.

Michael Wardlow, Chief Executive Officer of the Northern Ireland Council for Integrated Education, points out that many ministries of education claim to be promoting a culture

of tolerance, multiculturalism, cultural pluralism, or shared society and diversity with their education reform. Multicultural education includes the usual aims of education, plus a respect for cultural diversity and antiracist educational goals. In England the term social inclusion is often used to describe the goal of a multicultural education policy. The terms democratic citizenship and citizenship education are used in Canada and parts of Europe. James Banks, of the Center for Multicultural Education, says that "Citizenship education should help students acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to function in their nation-states as well as in a diverse world society that is experiencing rapid globalization and quests by ethnic, cultural, language, and religious groups for recognition and inclusion."\(^2\)

The term mosaic or patchwork is used in the United States to describe a scenario in which the distinct group identities are maintained. Melting pot refers to a society in which difference between groups is minimized. The term nationalism is often used when immigrant populations are encouraged to care about and show loyalty to their host nation; sometimes this may be described as social insertion. In the United Kingdom, terms such as intercultural education, multi-ethnic education, antiracist education, and multiracial education have been used to describe educational reform when it relates to non-native people. Inter-governmental organizations such as the World Bank and the Council of Europe freely use the term social cohesion to describe any work promoting the social unity and well being of all of a country’s various populations.

Cross-cutting Themes

The following are cross-cutting themes that emerged from this secondary research on education and coexistence: (1) the balance between diversity and unity; (2) the role that a country’s history plays in current education policy; and (3) the importance of teacher training and preparation.

DIVERSITY VS. UNITY

Many countries are struggling to find the best model to promote the concept of "citizenship education," which encourages national unity and cultural understanding while acknowledging and celebrating ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity in its students.

There is a delicate balance between promoting diversity and encouraging unity among groups through national education policy. Through its education policy, the state can provide opportunities for different groups to maintain aspects of their culture while building a nation in which these groups are structurally included and to which they feel some degree of loyalty and belonging. What some countries are learning is that it is important for citizens in a diverse democratic society to maintain attachments to their cultural communities as well as to participate effectively in the shared national culture. Unity without recognition of existing diversity results in cultural repression and hegemony by dominant groups. One important policy consideration in multi-ethnic societies concerns the teaching of minority language, which can be a sensitive political and social issue.

IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY

A key question is how a country’s history—which in many cases includes violent conflict, repression, genocide, exploitation or other dark moments—can be shared, relayed, and taught in order to address past injustices and learn from them moving forward, without fanning the flame of animosity.

How can history be taught so that all groups see themselves reflected in the teachings? In other words, how do schools teach a country's history in a manner that respectfully and justly represents the different ethnic, religious, or cultural groups in a particular country? Experts have identified the importance of presenting the different narratives, where the focus is on the “perspective” rather than on the “events” themselves. This is a particularly relevant question in societies that have emerged from violent conflict, such as Rwanda or South Africa. It is important to consider the historical background of a given country in an effort to clearly understand why the country needs an education policy to promote national coexistence. What is the legacy of the country's multicultural history and how does it play out in modern-day education policy? How does the political history affect the formation of education policy?

The inclusion of different ethnic, religious, or cultural groups in a country’s education policy needs to be addressed. To date, there is limited evidence that representatives from minority or marginalized groups have been included in the creation or conception of most nations' education policies.\footnote{Osler, Audrey, and Starkey, Hugh. "Citizenship Education and National Identities in France and England: inclusive or exclusive?" Oxford Review of Education 27.2 (2001)}

TRAINING IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Most governments provide inadequate training for teachers and school administrators to assist them in understanding the importance of promoting coexistence in the school system or classroom. As a consequence, some teachers are not equipped to deal with diversity within the classroom, nor do they have a syllabus to teach a nation's history effectively. Lack of training often stems from a more general problem, which is that most governments struggle to provide the funding for schools to address the educational needs of different ethnic, religious, or cultural groups in an equitable way.

Training needs to be provided not just to teachers and school administrators, but also to those who are pushing for change in education policies at the national level. Opposition to education policy that promotes coexistence often emerges from those who criticize multiculturalism for jeopardizing educational standards and undermining national pride. Such critics often dismiss multicultural education as divisive and anti-nationalist, or as self-serving political correctness. Thus, advocates for coexistence training in the education system need to be taught how to deal in an effective manner with negative backlash to their policies.

In cases where governments do provide training, an important question to ask is: Do the trained teachers and school administrators reflect the diversity of the population of students they serve? A lack of diversity at the leadership level in an education system may affect the impact of coexistence education.

Case Studies

In its other program areas, Coexistence International gives strategic priority to research and publications that can serve to highlight positive models of coexistence. This survey research applies the coexistence lens to education policy in ten countries, seeking to understand both the potential and the challenges for integrating coexistence and education in those places.

The ten countries profiled, Brazil, Canada, England, Israel, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, South Africa, and the United States of America, were chosen because they have diverse populations, often have legacies of conflict or repression, and are geographically wide-ranging. Some of these countries have made substantial efforts to address the issues of coexistence through their education policy; others have not.

Each case study explores the country’s ethnic, religious, or cultural background and basic population demographics; key issues of diversity and coexistence within the country; the overarching coexistence policy within the education system; and specifics such as how schools are organized, curriculum design, approaches to language instruction, teacher-training opportunities; and funding for education as it pertains to coexistence policies.
Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brazil has always celebrated its fluid racial groupings and ethnic mixing. Though originally settled by Amerindian tribes and then by the Portuguese, Brazil has also experienced waves of immigration from other European nationalities, as well as a significant number of Japanese and Middle Eastern immigrants. During the colonial period, a large number of African slaves were imported to work on the sugar plantations. Over the years, intermarriage was common between all of Brazil’s ethnic groups, leading to an increasingly difficult to classify racial mix. Often, lines are implicitly drawn between those who are lighter in complexion and those who are darker.

Wealth is distributed highly unevenly in Brazilian society, and to a large extent the inequality is drawn along racial lines. The Brazilian education system faces many severe challenges, so the formation of coexistence education policy has not been given any priority. Brazil has a poorly developed school system and a low literacy rate, as well as several underdeveloped and rural regions. Its education system is plagued by many structural deficiencies and racial and regional disparities. Although most funding and education strategies are directed by the central government, implementation of an education policy is ultimately a state and local responsibility. One issue that Brazil has not had to struggle with is language: Portuguese is understood by the majority of the population, and is the primary language taught in schools. In addition, the Federal Constitution, in the 2nd paragraph of article 21, reads that "Fundamental regular teaching will be administered in the Portuguese language, with the assurance to the indigenous communities of the use of their mother tongues and their own learning processes" (emphasis added).

The fundamental foundation of the education system is unequal. Most students coming from poor backgrounds do not get the same quality education as their wealthier peers, who can afford private schools. Illiteracy among white students over 15 is 8%; among black students it is 20%. Among black students there is a high rate of grade repetition, age-grade distortions, and dropping-out. Since the individual states within Brazil oversee their own education systems, poorer states lack adequate funding for public schools whereas schools in richer states tend to be better funded.

In recent years, Brazil has made some policy reforms that address the equitability of education provided by the state, including the National Fund for Primary Education Development and for Enhancing the Value of the Teaching Profession (FUNDEF)

---

established by the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law and the constitutional amendment n.14. This fund, established in 1998, ensures that municipalities and states direct earmarked funds toward the public education system. By implementing certain tracking and accountability methods, the fund guarantees that money will be spent on education and not used for other purposes. This amendment to the Brazilian constitution also stipulated that at least 60% of the education budget must be used toward teacher salaries. In addition, the fund also nationalized a dollar amount of spending per student per year. If a state is below that amount, the federal administration provides the appropriate funds to bring the state up to the national standard.\(^7\)

Lacking adequate funds to improve education, Brazil sought help from the World Bank, an institution that gives low-interest loans (with spending guidelines and recommendations) to developing countries to improve infrastructure, education, health, and communications. In 2003, the World Bank issued a loan to Brazil for US$1 billion to aid the education, energy, and financial sectors.\(^8\) Most of the funding has gone to the actual building of school infrastructure, and not to training of teachers or curriculum design. The former Brazilian Minister of Education commented that teacher salaries are extremely low, ranging from US$140 to $150 per month, which deters the highly educated from teaching.\(^9\) According to Brazilian experts, the World Bank’s model for aid does not sufficiently take into consideration the particular needs of Brazilian students. Brazil’s primary and secondary education system is one of the most privatized in the world because of lack of government funding for and investment in the public schools. Private schools educate over half of the population.\(^10\) Moreover, private schools, attended by the wealthy and middle class of Brazil, are sometimes based on ethnic origin. For example, there are private schools exclusively for Germans and Americans. The public higher-education system, on the other hand, is both well funded and high quality. After attending high-caliber private schools, many of the wealthy students attend public universities. But poorer students educated in public schools rarely matriculate to the university level.

In 2001, after attending the World Conference on Racism hosted in South Africa, the Brazilian government increased its efforts to make access to higher education and government jobs more equitable. The policy is one of affirmative action, implemented in the form of racial quotas, and has been controversial among the Brazilian population. After the policy was first in force in Rio de Janeiro, over 300 lawsuits were filed against the state university, some from white students whose applications were denied in favor of a less qualified minority.\(^11\) Critics debate whether this policy will create a new institutionalized racism in Brazil that is similar to that of the United States.


\(^8\) World Bank. worldbank.org

\(^9\) "Dealing With Hearts, Minds, and Pockets of Brazilian Teachers" from portal.unesco.org/education


As in the US, slavery was once legal in Brazil. The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization has created a program called *Breaking the Silence: The Transatlantic Slave Trade Education Project* aimed at educating children in Europe, the Caribbean, Africa, and the Americas, including Brazil, about the truths of the slave trade. *Breaking the Silence* uses history to break stereotypes and promote multiculturalism and tolerance.\(^{12}\)

Presently, the lack of sufficient teacher training is one of the main problems facing Brazil's overall education system, and it has not been a high priority of the government of Brazil. The institutions to train teachers in even basic education techniques are limited, so there is little evidence that teachers are being trained to promote coexistence.

\(^{12}\) "Breaking the Silence: the Transatlantic Slave Education Project," UNESCO. www.unesco.org
Canada is a nation that has extensively integrated the ideals of multiculturalism and pluralism into its national and provincial government policy and into its education institutions. Canada’s diverse population continues to expand as the country welcomes more than 200,000 immigrants each year from around the world.\(^\text{14}\) The country was established as a bilingual and bicultural country by settlers from the British Isles and France. In an effort to safeguard their distinct cultural and linguistic rights, these two “founding groups” remained largely unresponsive from the time of their settlement in the 1600s to the cultural rights and needs of the indigenous population as well as other immigrant groups. This led to policies which stressed the need for the assimilation of “others” for the purpose of nation-building; policies that were eventually challenged by the increasing numbers of immigrants from Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and by indigenous or First Nations peoples.

In 1946, the Canadian Citizenship Act was passed and Canadians soon obtained full citizenship distinct from the British Commonwealth. In 1965, Canada ceremoniously lowered the Union Jack and raised its own flag. These events symbolized the changing reality of the Canadian nation and opened up possibilities for new and more inclusive social policies. It was against this backdrop that an early attempt at making education institutions more inclusive came to be, as part of a 1971 policy which called for “multiculturalism within a bilingual framework.” The policy officially declared Canada to be a multicultural "mosaic" society where minority members could participate in government-funded heritage language programs to maintain their ethnic identity while still maintaining an overarching Canadian identity and equal rights. While the policy aimed to break down discriminatory attitudes and promote national unity, immigrant-rights activists contended that policy goals set within a “bilingual framework” by default limited the scope of the education reforms needed. This is especially true today when a number of Canadian urban schools are serving ethnically diverse student populations.

All subsequent multicultural policies at the federal and provincial levels, such as the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988, typically conveyed a commitment to a middle ground between total assimilation and the creation of cultural “ghettos.” Multicultural education policies and school programs were designed to prepare citizens for


participation in Canadian democratic society and to instill shared values which underpin the national identity, while accepting the cultural and linguistic differences which serve to enrich the society. Because public education in Canada falls under provincial jurisdiction, the thirteen provincial governments and territories have over the years developed their own policies and approaches to multicultural education. Researchers point out several distinct approaches such as “ethnocultural support-service orientation” as it is pursued in Ontario and Nova Scotia and the linguistic-oriented focus of multicultural education as practiced in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba.

As an example, the Province of Manitoba’s multicultural education policy¹⁵ is founded on the following pillars:

- **Education for Full Participation in Society** which allows all students, regardless of race, color, gender, language, cultural heritage, religion, ethnicity, physical capabilities, or intellectual potential, to pursue equal and meaningful roles in Canadian society. The education curriculum is designed to enable all students to develop competencies which promote effective social participation and equal status for themselves and their ethnocultural groups. Students whose mother tongue is neither English nor French are assisted in the development of linguistic proficiency in either of the official languages. Attention is given to effective language programs, cultural awareness programs, identification of community-liaison personnel, and other initiatives that address the cultural differences and unique needs of minority language students.

- **Education for Cultural and Linguistic Development** attests to the positive force of cultural pluralism and assists students from different cultural backgrounds in developing self-esteem and a strong sense of personal identity as Canadians and as members of their ethnocultural group through awareness of their own cultural, linguistic, and historical heritage. Besides English and French instruction, opportunities for heritage language study are provided.

- **Education for Intercultural Understanding** assists students in developing self-esteem and a strong sense of personal identity through the positive portrayals of their own cultural and historical heritage. Education programs are focused on developing students’ understanding of and respect for the cultural and historical heritage of others and on equipping students with skills to deal with incidents of stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, and racism.

The Canadian government’s policy of “official languages” in education programs has been revised and adapted several times since the 1970s. The federal government’s commitment to bilingualism serves as an important incentive for continued financial support for bilingual education and French immersion programs in public schools throughout Canada. French immersion programs in the English-speaking provinces use French-language curriculum with English-speaking children as young as kindergarteners. The country’s mainstream programs, while taught mostly in English, introduce French language, literature, and cultural studies in elementary classes. Some provinces offer

---

“Extended French” programs that provide additional courses in French, beginning in seventh grade. Similarly, in the largely French-speaking province of Quebec, English-language education is available to students who meet the requirements set by the bilingual education provisions, namely, that the student’s parents were educated in English within Canada. The children of non-Canadian immigrants residing in Quebec, even those from other English-speaking countries, must attend French-language schools. The access to French-language and English-language education is an important factor for integrating newly arriving immigrants from Anglophone and Francophone countries in Africa, the Caribbean, and some former colonies in South and East Asia.

The diversity in many urban Canadian schools has greatly increased over the last few decades and the current focus of most multicultural education programs is on teaching students about national and global issues and on raising awareness of different, non-Western worldviews and cultures, including the previously disregarded history and perspectives of Canada’s First Nations or indigenous peoples. Education departments at the federal and provincial levels have been involved in the development and distribution of educational materials in the area of multicultural and citizenship education and in teacher training programs. While funding and curriculum support for English and French language programs has been steadily committed over the years, minority-rights advocates continue to demand increased attention and more culturally responsive policies to address the cultural and educational rights of the indigenous population of Canada and of non-Anglophone and non-Francophone immigrants.
As the heart of what was once the British Empire, England continues to absorb immigrants from Commonwealth countries and other parts of the globe. Over the last several decades, there have been a number of major shifts in the direction and focus of the national education policy, which has variously incorporated assimilationist, integrationist, and multicultural aspects. These differing approaches to educating a diverse student population have had long-lasting effects on the social debates and race relations in the country. The series of race riots which took place across several towns in England in 2001 highlighted the deepening social divides between white and South Asian Muslim communities. Several studies commissioned by the government demonstrate that institutional racism in secondary and higher education and in the labor market damages the prospects of people of Afro-Caribbean and South Asian descent.

In the early 1960s, England’s Department of Education and Sciences (DES) was largely guided by policies that stressed the importance of absorbing and assimilating children of immigrants into the established English education system. The early policy circulars reveal a level of concern with the slow rate of assimilation of immigrant students but do not address the distinct cultural needs of minority students. Following a decrease in education funds and a resulting surge in social, political, and economic tensions, the push for integrationist approaches in the education sphere entered the social policy debates in the late 1960s. According to Richard Race, a scholar of education policy, the aim of integrationist policies was “to bring immigrant children into the life of the school with minimal and conditional cultural diversity in schools.” Integration, as opposed to assimilation, required a minimum accommodation of cultural differences and mutual tolerance, rather than simply absorbing minorities into the population and requiring them to adopt the majority’s language, customs, and values. A number of British education researchers and experts have argued, however, that neither assimilationist nor integrationist education policies addressed the structural causes of low achievement rates among minority students. Instead, argued Race, writing specifically about children of African or Afro-Caribbean descent, they “directed the problems away from the education

---

15 Population
- White 91.3%
- South Asian 4.4%
- Black 2.2%
- Mixed race 1.4%
- Chinese 0.4%
- Other 0.4%

18 Ibid, 4.
system and toward the black child which meant greater alienation in the classroom and in society in general.”

Since the 1970s, national education policies have moved away from assimilation and integration towards multiculturalism, which embraced the concept of cultural diversity and sought to deal with the detrimental effects of institutional racism. With the introduction of the “Education for All” policy document on ethnic minorities, the education system was held to a higher standard in preparing all children for life in a culturally diverse society. A multicultural curriculum was seen as central to achieving this goal. A new national curriculum was introduced in the 1988 Education Reform Act, which stressed the need to improve the academic achievement of low-income and minority students. Funding for academic support for bilingual immigrant children was at first provided through the UK Home Office and later was devolved to local education authorities and schools. The majority of the funds go towards teaching the English language; only limited state funding is available to support native-language development.

In 1997, a policy taskforce was established to outline a working definition of citizenship education and make recommendations for its application in schools. Its recommendations led to another important shift in education policy and, for the first time, introduced “citizenship” as a compulsory component of the school curriculum in England. Further work on curriculum development, teacher training, and curriculum integration was undertaken in order to reinforce the importance of building the civic and democratic skills of all English pupils. Overall, since 1997 the national education policy has placed a greater emphasis on schools as an important mechanism for promoting social inclusion.

A recently developed academic segment on “Identity and Diversity: Living together in the UK” will soon be integrated into the existing citizenship education curriculum. This new element emphasizes critical thinking about ethnicity, religion, and race, provides a framework for the discussion of political issues and values, and uses contemporary history in teachers’ pedagogy to illuminate thinking about issues relating to citizenship.

The content of the lessons will include contextualized understanding of the United Kingdom as a “multinational” state and as a member of the European Union as well as lessons on immigration, the history of the Commonwealth, the legacy of the British Empire, slavery, universal suffrage, and equal opportunities legislation. Policymakers and educators hope that the new curriculum will help address the disenchantment of English youth, especially among second-generation immigrants.

The Department of Children, Schools and Families, which is responsible for setting the national education policy, recently produced a “Guidance on the duty to promote community cohesion,” which reinforces the existing laws requiring schools to uphold their duty to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of

20 Ibid, 5.
opportunity and good relations between people of different groups. Community cohesion is understood as the process of “working towards a society in which there is a common vision and sense of belonging by all communities; a society in which the diversity of people’s backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and valued; a society in which similar life opportunities are available to all; and a society in which strong and positive relationships exist and continue to be developed in the workplace, in schools and in the wider community.”

Concurrently, there is an on-going debate about the provision of state funds for faith-based schools in England. The British Parliament has considered and debated several proposals that would turn part of the state education system over to religious groups. The debate has been largely polarized, and critics have argued that any concentration of students in religious schools will lead to communal segregation and decreased community cohesion. The argument that faith-based schools are divisive is countered by many advocates who highlight the benefits of religious communities educating their children with respect to their distinct customs and religious beliefs. The debate spans faith-based education establishments administered by Christian, Jewish, Islamic, and Sikh religious bodies.

One of the persistent challenges to successful implementation of multicultural education and citizenship education remains the insufficient resources and professional training provided to teachers, who often struggle to see the link between their subject area and the overarching goals of education for diversity. Beyond these programmatic challenges, experts and advocates continue to argue that the legacy and effects of institutional racism are not being addressed at the policy level and require more attention and resources. They believe that long-term systemic change is essential in order to guarantee equitable educational opportunities for all children in England.

---

23 Department of Children, Schools and Families. “Guidance on the duty to promote community cohesion.”
http://www.multiverse.ac.uk/viewArticle2.aspx?contentId=13123
Ethnic identity is an issue that cuts across all sectors of Israeli society. The long-standing tensions between Jewish Israelis and Palestinian Arabs, in addition to the unequal opportunities available to other minorities such as the Druze or the Bedouin, make socially inclusive education an important factor in creating positive coexistence in Israel. Israeli national education policy reflects its state's declaration that "it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture" and promote "equality of social and political rights for all of its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race and sex." However, there is a sense both historically and continuing today that in practice, the Israeli education system treats some groups, especially the large Arab minority, unfairly, thereby possibly contributing to divides within society.

In the 1950s, soon after its founding, Israel shifted the perspective of its education policy from a “melting pot” ideology to a cultural pluralism one. Rather than combining all children into one uniform school system, the Israel State Education Law of 1953 created a system that divided schools into four groups, which are still present today—secular, religious, private, and Arab and Druze. Not all citizens of Israel were satisfied with this system; non-orthodox Jewish parents asked the Education Ministry to combine secular education with Jewish teachings. However, the state primarily ignored this plea and instead opted to give more funding to orthodox education. The main conflict area in Israeli national education lies between the Jewish and Arab schools. The current education system allows students to attend the school that best meets their cultural and religious needs. Jewish traditional and orthodox schools are taught in Hebrew and emphasize the Jewish religion and history. The Arab schools consist of Arab Israelis and Arab immigrants and provide courses in Arabic and on Arab history and traditions. Thus, the teaching of these one-sided historical narratives in both Hebrew and Arabic schools has become an accepted policy of the Ministry of Education. However, all teacher

---

26 Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel.
training—even for Arab teachers who teach in Arab schools—is conducted in Israeli Jewish colleges, which emphasize Jewish culture (Zionist history, Jewish studies, and festivals).\(^{30}\) Moreover, teachers are only allowed to use materials in the classroom that have been previously approved by the Ministry of Education, which effectively limits what is taught in Arab schools.

Language is a controversial issue in Israel, where Hebrew and Arabic are the two official languages. In Jewish secular and religious schools, Arabic is sometimes offered from junior high school on, but it is not a compulsory subject in the final school exams.\(^{31}\) In January of 2008, the Ministry of Education completely dropped Arabic from the core curriculum of secular, religious, and orthodox schools.\(^{32}\) But in Arab schools, by contrast, Hebrew is taught as a second language from the third grade and is obligatory for the matriculation exams. This situation threatens to widen the cultural, political, and social divide by hindering effective communication and devaluing the importance of the Arabic language.\(^{33}\)

Moreover, Arab students have lower matriculation rates and less access to school resources than Jewish students. (This is particularly true of the Bedouin minority, whose villages are often unrecognized by the government, and therefore passed over by the Ministry of Education when building local schools.) Arab schools generally have less funding and fewer resources to meet the demands of the growing Arab immigrant population, and a lower number of adequately trained teachers. One study showed that most Jewish elementary schools receive 40% more resources than Arab schools; in secondary schools, the gap can reach 50%.\(^{34}\) At the university level, the Jewish and Arab students merge into a single system, which operates mostly in Hebrew and in English.

Numerous independent organizations are working to address this issue by promoting equality within Israel's education system. One of these is the Abraham Fund’s Mirkam initiative, which utilizes education to promote inter-dependence and collaboration among communities of Arabs and Jews throughout Israel.\(^{35}\) Mirkam organizes educational forums and discussions for students involving Arab and Jewish religious, political, or business leaders as a way to build interfaith understanding on a community-wide scale. One example is the Galilee Forum for Interfaith Understanding, where Islamic, Christian, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders lead lectures and discussions for high school students on topics that promote tolerance and understanding of the various religions practiced in Israel. Mirkam also sponsors the Language as a Cultural Bridge program, which seeks to make Arab culture and language studies mandatory in Jewish elementary


\(^{33}\) "Bilingual Education in the State of Israel," Jaffa Convention (December 27 2007).


\(^{35}\) "Strategy & Initiatives: Mirkam." Abraham Fund. [www.abrahamfund.org](http://www.abrahamfund.org)
public schools. In addition, Mirkam is sponsoring a school-pairing program that organizes activities between Arab and Jewish schools.

Another organization, Hand in Hand,36 builds elementary schools throughout Israel, with permission from the Ministry of Education, which is attended by both Arab and Jewish students. Each school is led by an Arab and a Jewish principal who work side by side. All classes are taught in both Arabic and Hebrew and emphasize diversity and tolerance. Through an integrated school system, the program hopes to not only increase collaboration and tolerance among the children but also to have those ideals reach school employees, parents, and the surrounding community. Hand in Hand is also working with the Ministry to develop a new multicultural and bilingual curriculum.

PRIME (Peace Research Institute in the Middle East)37 is a team of Israeli and Palestinian teachers and researchers who are designing a program called "Learning Each Other's Historical Narratives." Since there is much tension surrounding the differing perspectives on the history of the Middle East, PRIME historians are creating two distinct historical narratives, one written from the perspective of the Jewish Israelis and the other from Palestinian Arabs. Both narratives will be translated into Hebrew and Arabic and with the idea to eventually teach them side by side in the classroom. PRIME believes that exposing students to multiple perspectives of the same historical events will enhance understanding and tolerance between the feuding groups. Although the program has not yet been integrated into the Israeli education system, some European countries have translated and used the narratives to better understand local Islamic Arabic communities.

Another organization, the Israel-Palestine Center for Research and Information (IPCRI), analyzed the history textbooks in both Israeli and Palestinian classrooms and concluded that each lacks adequate references to the other.38 IPCRI believes that exposing children to other cultures and history is an important step toward a more peaceful political and national existence in Israel. As part of their work to address this gap, they create opportunities for dialogue between Arab and Jewish educators regarding education reform and the development of lesson plans and textbooks on “learning about the other.”39 Working more directly with the Ministry of Education, the Merchavim organization has created education programs and teacher training that promote shared citizenship, equality, and tolerance of cultural and ethnic diversity among all Israeli citizens. Merchavim's education programs run from kindergarten through high school and are tailored to each branch of the Israeli education system.40

The Israeli Ministry of Education established the Department of Education for Democracy and Coexistence in 1986, and has implemented many programs where Israeli and Arab students work together on joint projects in an effort to learn more about each
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other, their heritage and culture. The “Children Teaching Children” project, for instance, brings together Jewish and Arab elementary and junior high students and teachers, so they can become acquainted and engage in shared study of a subject. This program takes place during regular school hours over the school year.\footnote{http://www.teachkidspeace.org/doc212.php} The Department also runs programs where Arab and Jewish students work together on archaeology projects, language study, or drama performance.
Malaysia’s diverse population is composed of its largest ethnic group, the Malays, as well as the long-established Chinese and Indian communities, and several indigenous groups. Under colonial British rule, primary and secondary school education was almost entirely ethnically segregated, with Malay students attending Malay schools, Chinese students attending Chinese schools run by their own community, and Indian students attending Tamil schools set up by the British (who brought in laborers from India). One notable exception was the Christian missionary-run secondary schools, which were open to students from all three backgrounds. However, the location of the missionary schools in urban areas meant that they were more accessible to the Chinese community, who dominated trade, and less to the Malays and Indians, the majority of whom lived in poorer rural areas and on rubber estates.

In the decades following Malaysia’s independence from Britain the government focused on nation-building and developing a national system of education – replacing the divisive system of pre-independence years. In these years the New Economic Policy was introduced, addressing eradication of poverty and making efforts to provide opportunities for the Malays (who were mostly living in rural areas) to participate in economic activities. These were important measures designed to include more Malays in economic activity and create equal access to economic and educational opportunities.

The issues concerning education and coexistence were first addressed by the National Education Policy based on the recommendations of the 1956 Education Committee (also known as the Razak report) which stated the following goals: 1) “A national system of education acceptable to the people of the federation as a whole which will satisfy their needs and promote their cultural, social, economic and political development as a nation”; 2) “Having regard to the intention to make Malay as the national language of the country whilst preserving and sustaining the growth and culture of other communities in Malaysia”; and 3) “The ultimate objective of education policy in this country must be to bring together the children of all races under a national system of education in which the national language is the main medium of instruction.”

At the primary and secondary school level, the government-funded education system is centralized and the Ministry of Education establishes the national curriculum to be used
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in all state schools. Primary education is free and compulsory for children from all ethnic and language groups. There are four types of schools in Malaysia: 1) “National,” where the medium of instruction is the national language, Malay, and which are open to students from all language groups (as are all the schools); 2) “National-type,” where Chinese-language instruction is used in Chinese primary schools and Tamil-language instruction is used in Tamil primary schools; 3) “General Secondary” schools, including technical and vocational schools, as well as Islamic religious schools which teach Muslim students from any language groups subjects related to Islam (these schools are only available at the secondary level); and 4) Several types of private schools which are run by independent governing boards with some funded through community sources. Parents may choose which type of school they’d like their child to attend. In 2003, the Ministry of Education mandated the use of English for teaching all math and science subjects in order to prepare its student population for competition in an increasingly globalized market.

While Islam is the official religion of Malaysia, non-Muslims are free to practice their own religious beliefs. In National schools, while Muslim students attend Islamic religious instruction, the non-Muslims attend “Moral Education” classes, the contents of which are drawn from the religious texts of the other religious groups in the country. In addition to the religious subjects taught in government-funded schools, starting at the age of ten classes on “civics and citizenship” are introduced in all schools for all students. Citizenship education aims to instill patriotic feeling for the Malaysian nation, raise the students’ civic consciousness, and teach students to live together in a plural and democratic society.

The indigenous groups living in remote rural areas across the Malaysian Peninsula are granted the same access and rights to universal and free education as the other ethnic groups. However, the remoteness of some of the settlements and the traditional lifestyles of the indigenous groups such as the Orang Asli still affect the school attendance and graduation rates among those communities. The government of Malaysia is working together with UNICEF to improve access to education and proper healthcare in the most remote and under-developed areas inhabited by the Orang Asli people. In regards to the language policy, Semai, which is the predominant language among the Orang Asli group, is taught in schools attended by the indigenous students. Similarly, in the state of Sarawak, the language of the Iban ethnic group is taught until Form 5, and in the state of Sabah, the language of the Kadazan ethnic group is taught until Form 3. Some of the indigenous languages are offered in the national public examinations.

While Malay remains the language of instruction at the majority of primary schools, the Ministry of Education has begun to introduce Chinese and Tamil languages as elective courses in some National schools. This decision came in response to the increasing trend of Chinese- and Tamil-speaking students overwhelmingly choosing to attend National-type and private schools, where they are taught in their native language. This trend has sparked a number of debates in the media and in education-policy circles, with concerns being voiced that separate schooling results in greater polarization in the society later on. The Ministry of Education has also recently established several “vision schools” across
the country. These schools combine an existing National school (using Malay as the medium of instruction) with a National-type Chinese school (with Mandarin as the medium of instruction) and a National-type Tamil school (using Tamil as the medium of instruction) on the same campus. While the classes take place within each respective small school community, all students share common facilities, such as the school canteen and the sports grounds. The schools are currently under a separate administration but are being observed with great interest by many educators and politicians, some of whom have expressed hopes that the close proximity of students of different ethnic groups and the organized activities between the schools will encourage greater interaction between students and will foster national unity.
In recent years, the Netherlands has faced many of the benefits and the tensions that come with a growing multicultural society. Starting in 1961, the government began recruiting guest workers, mainly from Turkey and Morocco, to meet the need for additional labor in the growing Dutch economy. At this time it was believed that these immigrants would be temporary residents, and therefore the Dutch government encouraged them to continue to speak in their own native languages. The second generation of these immigrants was at a severe disadvantage and faced marginalization due to their inability to speak Dutch. The urban areas in which they were able to afford housing became breeding grounds for ethnic tension.

Over the past few decades, improving equal access to education for both minority and majority students has been a consistent goal. But over that same period, policies have shifted dramatically as the thinking on how best to meet that goal has evolved. As stated, in the 1960s and 70s, when most new immigrants were not expected to settle permanently in the country, maintaining group identity was the main policy toward the immigrant population. For this reason, programs were established that taught mother-tongue languages and tried to combat the educational disadvantages faced by immigrant workers’ children.

In the 1980s, policies were aimed at reducing the socioeconomic disadvantages of the immigrant groups, as it was by then clear that they intended to settle in the Netherlands. This phase focused on individual integration. Part of this was increased attention to the integration of immigrant pre-school children, including the introduction of a Dutch-language program in an effort to prevent language deficiency upon entering school.

In the 1990s, policies focused on enhancing participation in school and the labor market, with less of an emphasis on individual ethnic minority groups. More recently, there has
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been a focus on “proportional participation in education” (promoting school demographics which reflect the makeup of the larger population).

In 1998, the Laws on the Citizenship of Newcomers (LCN) came into effect, which are still in force today. The objective of this policy is to create equal education opportunities, giving ethnic minorities greater access to education while increasing their employment potential and their general citizenship knowledge. Dutch language training is compulsory, and is seen as a way to combat the historical educational disadvantages faced by immigrant groups. The intent is to prepare immigrants to be effective members of Dutch society through language immersion while being respectful of their cultural needs.

In a 2006 report, teachers from all grade levels indicated that more training is required on how to teach classes with immigrant students. As mentioned, past education policy heavily supported immigrant children learning their mother tongue, but now more weight is put on learning Dutch and the Netherlands’ culture. In other words, Dutch education policy has shifted from one of moderate integration to one of assimilation over the last thirty years—“a swing from diversity to ’civilization.” The process of learning the Dutch language is seen as a dual opportunity to create a national identity and build social cohesion.

In terms of the curriculum, inter-cultural education is now compulsory for all students. The education policy of the new millennium is now completely oriented to promoting the full participation of all children in the Dutch education system. But there are still identifiable challenges: citizenship education is not a special subject in the curriculum, and even in some schools where there is a high minority population, few programs exist that discuss racism and discrimination.
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**Population according to religious affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>宗教信仰</th>
<th>百分比</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>罗马天主教</td>
<td>43.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新教</td>
<td>53.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>其他</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>无信仰</td>
<td>2.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

在北爱尔兰长期被英国和苏格兰居民的压迫和冲突的背景下，1969年爆发了血腥的内战，并持续了30年，直到1998年的《和平星期五协议》。教育计划旨在解决这些分歧，自1980年代起，政府和非政府组织开始与教育部门合作，以提高教育体系的教育能力，增进两个社区的宽容与理解。

历史上，自1921年北爱尔兰作为联合王国的一个行政区域成立以来，学校系统是分开的，天主教徒和新教徒在不同的学校中接受教育。两个教育系统有不同的课程设置，特别是在历史和宗教教科书上。天主教系统在宗教和艺术教学上投入了更多的时间，而新教学校则更注重科学和科技教学。这种安排使得新教徒在劳动力市场和公务员考试中占有优势。当天主教学校的课程改革和考试制度调整后，成功就业的机会被平等化。

All Children Together (ACT) 于1974年由一群关注父母所成立，倡导天主教和新教儿童应该共同接受教育。1981年，该组织成立了第一所整合学校。1989年，北爱尔兰教育部通过《教育改革令》（1989），允许现有分隔学校通过家长投票选择整合。这显著增加了整合学校数量，目前有61所活跃的整合学校，为5%的小学和中学学生提供位置。

近年来，整合学校的重点在于“转型”，即现有分隔学校寻求获得整合许可，将其原则建立在整合教育的基础上，并获得政府教育部的认可，带来相应的财政利益。所有这些条件上的要求如下：
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schools for a proportional Protestant-Catholic “balance” are less stringent than on a newly developed integrated school, and many schools are pursuing such lesser integration because of falling rolls due to the declining birth rate in Northern Ireland.

By the late 1980s, agreement was reached by education policymakers and a group of educationalists drawn from both sides of the community divide that in order for tolerance education work to be successful, it had to encompass the vast majority of children and youth—not just the few who were educated in integrated schools. Their conclusion was that the existing education system, despite its segregated nature, should be used to facilitate understanding and respect between children and youth from divided communities. They agreed upon the following programs that, since 1993, have been implemented in all schools, whether Catholic, Protestant, or integrated:

- **Education for Mutual Understanding (EMU) and Cultural Heritage programs** are designed to ensure that pupils learn about each other's traditions, history, and culture. These programs are now an obligatory part of all schooling in Northern Ireland. The EMU program addresses the need for children to feel confident in their own identities, while the Cultural Heritage program helps them learn about the religious and political beliefs of the other communities in Northern Ireland. These programs include information about the increasing number of ethnic minority groups who are settling in Northern Ireland, along with information about the main traditional groups.

- **Contact Programs**: With school and parental permission, contact programs may be established between Catholic, Protestant, and state (mainly Protestant) schools. (Government grants are available to fund any expenses incurred in developing the programs.) Some examples include joint visits to historical sites and museums, allied with discussions and projects on differing identities. Some segregated schools now try to share study facilities to ensure contact for their pupils, particularly in their later years at school. Others have ongoing arrangements for visits to each other’s schools, for debates, joint sporting activities, and the like. To facilitate such contact the government has provided for the development of purpose-built venues, often based near existing cultural and historical centers to enable schools to develop contact programs.

- **Revised Curricula**: By the late 1980s, an agreed history curriculum for all schools in Northern Ireland had been devised. Previously, Catholic schools had taught a version of Irish history that often dwelt heavily on the negative role of the British in Ireland, and included very little about the perspective of the Protestant community. State schools and Protestant schools concentrated almost solely on British history, and generally ignored the history of the island of Ireland. The agreed history curriculum has become an important factor in removing one-sided histories from the classroom.

Following the development and implementation of the agreed history curriculum, the churches, faced with harsh criticism that the segregated system of education was a major cause of the continuing division in Northern Ireland, eventually agreed to devise a
common core curriculum for the teaching of the Christian religion, and in 1993 a common religious curriculum was introduced.

A significant amount of teacher training is still carried out in a segregated manner, with Catholic and state (mainly Protestant) teacher-training colleges refusing to amalgamate their training, despite initiatives to reduce the teacher training that takes place within religious institutions. However, increasingly sensitive to criticism that they should be training their teachers to be more proactive in addressing issues of sectarianism, the teacher-training colleges have been developing examples of shared education such as the joint colleges Masters in Education program.\textsuperscript{57} In addition, training which equips new teachers to deal with controversial issues that may come up in a classroom is being done at the University of Ulster Coleraine's School of Education.

\textsuperscript{57} Department of Education UK. "A Shared Future," \textit{Policy and Strategic Framework for Good Relations in Northern Ireland} (March 2005)
Rwanda’s education system has been blamed for contributing to ethnic conflict and the 1994 genocide of nearly one million Tutsi and moderate Hutus. Practices such as identifying students by ethnicity, biased access to national examinations, violent forms of punishment targeted toward a particular group, and biased content in the history and civics curriculum were common before the genocide and were seen as exacerbating divisions between groups. Even though sharp divisions have historically been drawn between Tutsi, Hutu, and Twa, schools in Rwanda have never been segregated. This means that students interact with other ethnic groups on a daily basis.

Post-colonial Rwanda was filled with bloody wars. The Tutsi massacre that occurred in 1959-1961 and the second republic 1973 to 1994 reinforced a quota system and ethnic preferences, particularly in the school system. The quota system was defined for the different regions, ethnic groups, and gender. This policy is said to have involved arbitrary criteria, since the objectivity of the statistics available for the different regions and ethnic groups was questionable.

Since the genocide and the rebuilding of the Rwandan government, the education system has been seen as one of the important venues working toward creating trust and understanding between different groups. The main goal of the post-war education policy has been to “promote national unity and reconciliation, prioritizing equity of provision and access and encouraging a humanitarian culture of inclusion and mutual respect.”

The outright discrimination that was encouraged before the 1994 war was made illegal, as was the classification of students and teachers according to their ethnicity. The new examination board introduced an unbiased method of marking examinations, identifying by number rather than by name, which could reveal people’s ethnicity. Furthermore, activities such as community sports or peace education programs were put in place to promote the development of harmonious relations between students.

In 1998 a semi-autonomous unit called the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) was created to focus on the design of a new curriculum and on the training of teachers. Some of the curriculum principles outlined in the new education policy are directly linked to efforts to strengthen social cohesion and national unity, including the promotion of life skills such as peaceful problem resolution, respect for linguistic differences, and respect for human rights. Stakeholders including parents, teachers, NGOs, churches, and donors are often consulted for their input on the development of
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new education and curriculum policies that build social cohesion. However, an agreed upon curriculum teaching the history of Rwanda has yet to be identified. History classes are taught that highlight the defects of the genocidal regime as well as the “democratic” elements of the current government.60

The NCDC has published a guide called "Participatory Teaching Methods to Strengthen the Culture of Peace in Schools" as a way to train teachers on how to work with students traumatized by the genocide, either because their families were victims or perpetrators of the violence.61

However, sources of division in the education system in post-conflict Rwanda remain, including language. Most classes are taught in French or in English. Schools that are taught primarily in French teach English as a second language, and vice versa. The Hutu speak primarily French, and the Tutsi refugees (specifically those that took refuge in Uganda) speak English. English is taught in the classroom partly to take into account the diverse learning experience of the returning refugee children. Although Kinyarwanda is the mother tongue for most children, traditionally it has hardly been taught in schools. But that is starting to change. A new education policy established in 2004 attempts to acknowledge the diversity in native tongue languages,62 and Kinyarwanda and English are now used to teach mathematics and science in most schools.

A challenge to the school system in Rwanda is the severe lack of qualified teachers and the resulting high ratio of students to teachers. Many teachers were killed in the genocide, or emigrated from the country because of it. Some of the remaining teachers were personally implicated in the violence or lack sufficient experience and training.63

Many social issues are competing for funding in post-conflict Rwanda. The government, though, has made education a priority. The majority of the education funding comes from large international donors such as the UK Department for International Development (DFID), UNESCO, and the World Bank. The Ministry of Education has focused on addressing the basic education needs for all, rather than the advanced education needs of the few.

As of yet, there’s little data on how Rwanda’s reformed education system is doing in terms of its quest to build social cohesion. But those organizations funding the schools will likely keep a close eye on the issue in the years ahead. The reason for lack of data is that data on ethnicity is not encouraged or used in the country post-genocide

On a general level, the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission (NURC) runs Ingando, or peace solidarity camps, as a widely used tool to build coexistence in the

62 Obura, 88.
63 Ibid, 87.
community, with a particular focus on teachers. Instruction is given to promote unity and non-discrimination, and to help analyze the Rwandan political situation and the state of national reconciliation. It has brought together students at all levels, as well as community leaders, refugees, demobilized soldiers, informal traders, survivors, prisoners, teachers, and persons with disabilities.

64 www.nurc.gov.rw
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South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black African 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White 9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colored 8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian 2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects of the apartheid regime are still felt in every institution in South Africa; the education system is no exception. Racial bias—the institutionalization of discriminatory practices and inequality between groups—has led to extreme disparities in the delivery of education.

In 1948, when the apartheid government of South Africa was formed, Afrikaans and English were declared the official languages of instruction in schools. In 1953 the Bantu Education Act increased the existing gap in education provided for white and black South Africans by creating separate departments of education. Black schools were allocated less funding, decreasing the educational opportunities for their students. The act also eliminated financial aid to religious high schools and forced many to close down. There are also generations of blacks who received virtually no formal schooling. There was measured improvement to black education in 1984 when the National Policy for General Affairs Act gave the minister of national education more power, but the system remained segregated.

In the post-apartheid era, all government-run primary and secondary schools were officially integrated. Policies such as compulsory schooling for all those aged 7-16 attempted to be racially neutral, but the lack of resources to provide adequate schools and teachers was a constant challenge. The 1996 the new South African constitution identified schooling as a provincial competency; in other words, the governance and administration of schooling is now the responsibility of the nine provinces.

There are three major aspects of the education reform that took place in 1996 which speak to advancing coexistence: 1) the National Education Policy Act (NEPA), which enables open enrollment, so parents can choose where their children go to school; 2) the South Africa Schools Act (SASA), which created nationwide standards and procedures for the new public system; and 3) the Employment of Educators Act (EEA), which is aimed at providing equal personnel (teaching and non-teaching staff) and resources to all provinces. The Department of Education also developed a national policy to direct public funding to schools in a way that “promoted equity and redress, and contributed to


raising the overall quality of education provision.”  

In 2007 a revised education policy was endorsed, but little has been published regarding the changes and effects.

Language has always been a contentious issue in South Africa. There are eleven official languages. Nine are indigenous African languages and two are of European origin (English and Afrikaans). In 1997, the Language in Education Policy (LiEP) was started, making a place for African languages in the schools. English and Afrikaans remain the primary media of learning. The African languages are offered from first through fourth grade in predominantly black schools, after which English takes over as the instructional medium. Some experts claim this deprives students of the benefits of learning in their native tongue and does not acknowledge their linguistic history.

There are many social issues that compete for attention and funding in South Africa, making education about diversity and coexistence a low government priority. (By contrast, HIV/AIDS prevention training and education is a key piece of government policy, since HIV/AIDS is a prevalent social issue.)

One of the present day challenges is that even though the constitution and education policy profess equal access to education, the reality is that many rural and township schools are in conditions similar to those of apartheid days. The lack of participation by marginalized communities in South Africa’s education system is a growing challenge. Some organizations are pushing for a community-based, inclusive approach to improve the education system, in which teachers and parents would collaborate to improve a child’s education.
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The United States of America is one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world owing to a long history of immigration from many countries. Since the early colonization by European settlers in the 1500s, the country’s physical, socio-economic, and cultural landscape has been greatly impacted by immigrant groups. The diversity of the country’s population is not entirely a result of voluntary immigration by groups seeking religious and political freedom and economic opportunities. American colonial history includes the devastating chapter of the transatlantic slave trade, which brought millions of Africans to the new American colonies for slavery that lasted several centuries. Concurrently, the indigenous population was greatly reduced in numbers by disease, confrontations with early settlers, and disastrous resettlement policies by the U.S. government during the 1800s. This historical context offers an important opportunity and a challenge to the task of educating generations of young Americans in an education system that still carries a legacy of the past. America’s identity as a land of immigrants has greatly influenced the narratives presented in social studies and civics classes whose contents continue to be revised with contemporary stories of social struggles that continue to this day.

The legacy of slavery and subsequent racial discrimination has profoundly influenced both public and private school systems and national education policies. Decades after the abolition of slavery, education remained racially segregated or restricted with special quotas set for certain minorities and immigrant groups. The civil rights struggle of the 1960s and 70s challenged the inequities that remained in America’s education system even after Brown vs Board of Education struck down “separate but equal” education. The struggle for equal access to quality public school education involved mass protests, violent confrontations, and subsequent court rulings ordering desegregation. The policy known as “busing” was instituted in an attempt to integrate schools in population centers with racially segregated neighborhoods. The practice of busing has been declining since the 1980s due to changes in housing patterns, demographic shifts, and concerns about the safety of busing young children to distant neighborhoods.

Many education advocates point out that busing did not result in integrated classrooms, as many urban cities such as Boston have seen an exodus of white middle class families to the suburbs. Inner city schools today are diverse due to large numbers of immigrants, but they are attended mostly by black and Hispanic students. In the case of Boston, the 2000 census places Boston's white (non-Hispanic) population at 54.48% and Boston's black
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and Hispanic populations together at 39.77%. But in the Boston public schools, the student population is 41% black, 35% Hispanic, 14% white, and 9% Asian. According to official estimates, of the 77,000 school-age children living in Boston, 20,400 (or 27%) do not attend Boston public schools. This subset of students, who are 45% black, 40% white, 11% Hispanic, and 3% Asian, choose to enroll in private and parochial schools or in charter schools. About 3,000 other students are bused into suburban schools through the METCO initiative—a voluntary program intended to expand educational opportunities, increase diversity, and reduce racial isolation by permitting students in certain cities to attend public schools in suburban communities that have agreed to participate.

At the curriculum level in states throughout the country, a process of revision and development of curriculum materials and education resources to include the histories, cultural perspectives, and voices representing diverse racial, ethnic, social, and cultural groups was funded by state and private sources in the late 1970s. Generally called “multicultural education,” the central premise behind these efforts was that “by exposing students to knowledge about ethnic diversity and the contributions of various groups to [the] developing American civilization, educators in the social studies may change negative ethnic group stereotypes, reduce intolerance, and enhance cooperation for the common good.” Many history textbooks and curricula have been revised and expanded to include modules on the treatment of Native Americans, slavery, women’s movements, the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, and immigrant experiences. These modules use groups’ experiences as narratives that invite dialogue and pave the way for positive relations between groups and for reconciliation in the long term. Much of the work of studying and reforming the U.S. curriculum was conducted by university research centers and federal and state education agencies; in addition, a number of not-for-profit advocacy groups produced alternative curriculum resources on equity, social justice, and the realities of the “American melting pot.”

Over the years, several prominent approaches to multicultural education have been developed and the following are just a selection from the currently available curricula. Many secondary school educators choose to use more than one approach in their classroom.

- Advocates of the Teaching the Culturally Different approach attempt to raise the academic achievement of students of color through culturally relevant instruction.
- In the Human Relations approach students are taught about commonalities of all people through understanding their social and cultural differences but not their differences in institutional and economic power.
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• The *Single Group Studies* approach is about the histories and contemporary issues of oppression of people of color, women, low socioeconomic groups, and gays and lesbians.

• The *Multicultural Education* approach promotes the transformation of the education process to reflect the ideals of democracy in a pluralistic society. Students are taught content using instructional methods that value cultural knowledge and differences.

• Educators who use the *Social Reconstructionist* approach to multicultural education go a step further to teach students about oppression and discrimination. Students learn about their roles as social change agents so that they may participate in the generation of a more equitable society.

Many schools and districts celebrate diversity by recognizing African-American history month, Chinese New Year, and other holidays, traditions, and accomplishments of different groups, and may add social studies units featuring the contributions of minorities. These are seen as steps towards becoming more inclusive of cultural diversity in a country where students of color now make up 40 percent of the population in the nation’s public schools.78 However, a number of advocates have argued that these efforts can be tokenistic and do not sufficiently alter the content, concepts, paradigms, and stereotypes embedded in the established core academic curriculum. Coming up with a comprehensive assessment of multicultural education in public schools and its impact on reducing prejudice and improving inter-group relations continues to be a challenge. Each state retains a level of autonomy in developing curriculum and selecting textbooks, but the recurrent budget deficits that have plagued many school systems greatly reduce the ability of districts to expend resources on additional social studies curriculum segments.

In the past two decades, federal- and state-level education reforms have focused on the overall improvement of public school education and on raising student achievement levels. There is an on-going struggle to address the growing number of public school children who drop out before graduation or graduate with very poor literacy and math skills. Statistics clearly point to a disproportionate number of students of color among those who are failing academically. The 2001 federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) holds all fifty states and their constituent districts accountable for the academic achievement of all public school students. One of the stated goals of the NCLB is to narrow the achievement gap between white students and students of color. Each state is required to administer standardized tests and disaggregate students’ academic achievement data by income level, race, ethnicity, disability, and Limited English Proficiency categories. Education advocates have voiced concerns that an exaggerated emphasis on standardized testing ignores the fundamental obstacles to school improvement, mainly the persisting unequal distribution of resources that results in poor quality public schooling.

School districts with a high concentration of immigrants are using a number of different approaches to educating English language learners. In many states, transitional bilingual

---

and English as a Second Language programs have not produced the expected positive outcomes, and these results were used to pass laws that greatly limit bilingual education programs. Currently, the emphasis for helping immigrant children succeed in U.S. schools is on developing effective instruction methods that move English language learners into regular or mainstream classrooms more quickly. One notable development is the increase in two-way bilingual or “dual immersion” programs where, for example, native English speakers and native Spanish speakers learn alongside each other in both languages.

Public school education in the United States, by virtue of its role in transmitting cultural and social values, has been at the center of multifaceted research, advocacy, and policy efforts aimed at transforming race relations at the societal level. It is widely recognized that schools have made significant progress towards validating the culture of minority students, recognizing how diversity enriches the education process, and promoting unity. Nevertheless, the achievement gap continues to challenge educators and policymakers and requires a steadfast commitment to equitable and quality education opportunities for all children.
Conclusion

This research highlighted ten case studies focusing on education policy as it relates to questions of diversity, and focused on three cross-cutting themes, 1) addressing the balance between diversity and national unity, 2) the role of history, and 3) training (teachers, administrators, and policy influencers). Canada remains one of the few nations where multicultural ideals are entrenched in national government policy and, in that way, could be seen as a model for coexistence policy. England has also embraced the concept of multiculturalism, and its recent change in curriculum could be promising, but the proof of its success is still to be seen.

Often there is a lack of clearly defined goals for education reform or policy, whether from its inception or during its implementation. These factors make it very difficult to evaluate individual education policies, and particularly to do any significant comparison between countries. Ministries of Education should serve as allies for promoting coexistence through education policy. According to Hébert and Sears at the University of Calvary, "Citizenship education remains a relatively low priority in education systems around the world." This is especially true of those education systems that rely heavily on high-stakes examinations for promotion to the next stage.

Questions not addressed by this research, but important to consider in making the case for education policy that serves to build positive coexistence:

- What sort of mechanism can serve to bridge the gap between government policy and local grass-roots efforts for a representative education policy?
- How can a case be made for promoting coexistence through education policy in the face of arguments by some that this only serves to dilute a country’s heritage?
- How can the issue of equal access to education resources be best addressed?
- How do we create a respectable evaluation mechanism to assess education reform and policy? What benchmarks are important to consider?
Key Organizations

These organizations are highlighted because they provide funding and/or technical assistance to governments for education purposes. Some may also provide technical assistance to schools and teachers for an improved curriculum. This list is not exhaustive.

1. Abraham Fund
   www.abrahamfund.org
2. Center for Multicultural Education
   www.edchange.org/multicultural
3. Citizenship Education Research Network
   http://canada.metropolis.net/research-policy/cern-pub/overview.html
4. Council of Europe: Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) and Human Rights
   http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/
5. European Centre for Higher Education (UNESCO-CEPES) in Romania
   http://www.cepes.ro/
6. Facing History and Ourselves
   www.facinghistory.org
7. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA)
   www.iea.nl
8. International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2006-10
   www.iea.nl/icces
9. International UNESCO Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC)
   www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve
10. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
    www.oecd.org
11. UNESCO
    www.unesco.org
12. World Bank
    www.worldbank.org
13. World Council for Curriculum Instruction
    www.wcci-international.org
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