

# MAKING SENSE OF EDUCATION FOR DIVERSITIES: CRITICALITY, REFLEXIVITY AND LANGUAGE

FRED DERVIN

## Introduction

“To try a concept on an object is to ask of the object what we have to do with it, what it can do for us. To label an object with a concept is to tell in precise terms the kind of action or attitude the object is to suggest to us. All knowledge properly so-called is, therefore, turned in a certain direction or taken from a certain point of view”.

Henri Bergson (1938: 199)

Many adjectives are used in global research worlds to talk about education for what I shall call *diversity* for now: crosscultural, metacultural, polycultural, multicultural and intercultural – but also global and international (Dervin, Gajardo & Lavanchy, 2011; Grant & Portera, 2011). These “labels” can appear interchangeably – without always being defined or distinguished. *The multicultural* and *the intercultural* represent the most widely used notions, which have been discussed extensively in education scholarship and practice. Many researchers and practitioners have attempted to define their specific characteristics by establishing borders and boundaries, through which they have often tended to be opposed, namely in geographical terms (the US vs. Europe, Northern vs. Southern Europe, etc., Palaiologou & Dietz, 2012). Some European researchers have even demonized the ‘multicultural’, asserting that multicultural education celebrates only cultural differences (see the example of “multicultural fairs”, Kromidas, 2011) and ignores similarities, individuality, and the importance of relations, interaction and contexts – as the ‘intercultural’ is said to operate. But even if multicultural education and intercultural education have different origins (Abdallah-Preteuille, 1986) – the former is related to Civil Rights Movements while the latter to mass immigration in Europe, amongst others – Holm and Zilliacus (2009) argue that today multicultural and intercultural education can both mean

different things: “it is impossible to treat and draw conclusions about intercultural and multicultural education as if there was only one kind of each since there are several different kinds of both multicultural and intercultural education” (ibid.: 23). With the birth and spread of critical and more “political” approaches to education for diversity worldwide, does this mean that the dichotomy has lost much of its relevance? Have the enduring rivalries between the two notions been finally put to rest? What is then left of them? How can that be used and integrated in what I would like to refer to as education for diversities?

The inspiration for this article comes from the fact that I was appointed professor of multicultural education in a Finnish department of Teacher Education in 2012. Having always worked within the field of language and intercultural education before that, this appointment made me reflect on the dichotomy mentioned earlier. Many of my colleagues wrote to me saying that they had been confused by my new title – some of them even accused me of being a “traitor”! What I quickly realized was that even though there is a wide array of labels, many and varied intersections between authors claiming to belong to different trends were noticeable. Politically they differ but when one looks at research and practice, they are so complex that it is impossible to define one approach in precise terms. When I set up my research group at my new department I decided to call it *Education for Diversities* (E4D) in order to avoid having to position the group within one label or another. For me multicultural and intercultural mean the same as long as they are used in a critical manner, especially in relation to the concepts of culture and identity, in relation to questions of power and justice but also, as will be my main claim in this chapter, in relation to criticality, reflexivity and language.

Edward Said’s words (1978) reassured me: “Fields, of course, are made. They acquire coherence and integrity in time because scholars devote themselves in different ways to what seems to be a commonly agreed-upon subject matter. Yet it goes without saying that a field of study is rarely as simply defined as even its most committed partisans – usually scholars, professors, experts, and the like – claim it is. Besides a field can change so entirely, in even the most traditional disciplines like philosophy, history, or theology, as to make an all-purpose definition of subject matter almost impossible”. My goal was thus to take the “best” of the intercultural and the multicultural and to blend them to propose a field that would reflect the way we should deal with education for diversities today.

In this article I will use the term education for diversities to refer to authors who belong to any strand of research working on “othernesses” in education. Though also a very much contested and political term, diversity in the plural indicates a move from a mere emphasis on people from the outside (migrants, “Others”) to taking into account the *diverse diversities* from within, in other words anyone who is considered or who constructs themselves to be different (Dervin, 2011, 2012). This allows me to put an end to a certain hierarchy which tends to be established between “othernesses” in research and practice and to question ‘imagined’ oppositions between us and them. In Finland for example, the use of the labels *migrant* and *diverse* are problematic in this sense as they tend to be used in daily doxic discourses but also in research to determine “certain” children who were born in Finland of migrant parents, thus excluding them from the label “Finns”. My interest in this chapter rests upon critical points that we need to reflect on, consider and use in both practice (e.g., in school) and research. Three aspects are discussed in what follows: criticality, reflexivity and the importance of language.

### **Entry Point: Criticality**

“Imagine an infant removed immediately from its place of birth and set down in a different environment. Then compare the various “identities” the child might acquire in its new context, the battles it would now have to fight and those it would be spared. Needless to say, the child would have no recollection of his original religion, or of his country or language. And might he not one day find himself fighting to the death against those who ought to have been his nearest and dearest?”

Maalouf (2001: 24-25)

When we use such notions as the ‘multicultural’ or the ‘intercultural’, we have to deal with the tired old notion of culture. For Debray (2007: 27) “in the fauna of vague things, culture ranks amongst the most dangerous as it can lead to infinite misunderstandings” (my translation). The problem with the word culture is that it is a very imprecise and loose concept, which can be used for different purposes: making sense of us vs. them, providing one’s interlocutors with easy explanations see excuses, manipulating our way out of a situation, etc. (Breidenbach & Nyíri, 2009). For Ingrid Piller (2011: 172), “Culture is sometimes nothing more than a convenient and lazy explanation”. Brubaker (2004: 9) argues that the tendency to use “multichrone mosaic of monochrome” cultural blocs is problematic and

yet a common phenomenon in our societies. I would add that it is also frequent in research and educational practices.

The anthropologist Alban Bensa (2010: 56) maintains that the monochrome and often meaningless use of the concept of culture often evacuates continuums, social hybridation, and *mélange* (mixing), which constitute any group of people. Postmodern and some constructivist approaches have clearly demonstrated that the contemporary individual, depending on the possibilities and liberties offered by his/her gender, socioeconomic position, etc., is before all a “cultural programmer” rather than a “member of a culture” (Lull, 2000: 268). Martine Abdallah-Preteuille (2003: 15) contends that “each person has the possibility to express and act by using (...) cultural reference codes which they have freely chosen” (my translation).

In order to be useful, the concept of culture and what we do with it as practitioners and researchers, should thus reflect these elements but also allow us to work from a more dynamic and ‘liquid’ perspective (Bauman, 2004), which takes into account both differences and similarities across individuals and groups. As such Arendt (1958: 155) reminds us that “If people were not different, they would have nothing to say to each other. And if they were not the same, they would not understand each other”.

For Hoskins and Sallah (2011: 214), our use of the concept of culture should thus include for instance the “knowledge of the political systems and how historically they have been created (at global, European, national and local levels) including how these structures have developed in relationship to the key concepts”. Relying on cultural facts and ‘recipes’ appears increasingly as a very contested approach, especially as when defining a culture, no one can claim that the retained elements characterise all those who are included in this entity. Anne Cheng (2010: n.p.) explains that ‘doing’ culture corresponds in a way to “walking” or “dancing”: “we are permanently unbalanced and only movement can allow us not to fall and to move on” (my translation). She also questions the approach that consists in systematically comparing cultures (and thus ignoring the real thing: people) because this implies solidifying something that is always in movement, always changing (ibid.). As a specialist of China, Cheng notes that even though the country has never ceased to change, we still tend to consider it and the Chinese as “pieces in a museum” (ibid.). For her comparison can be used if it is an exit point and not an entry point.

The comparison of cultures to trigger intercultural or multicultural awareness and encounters has been a strong tool in education (Abdallah-Preteuille, 2011). According to Holliday (2010), cultural comparison is always accompanied by ideology and easily leads to ethnocentrism, and (implicit and explicit) xenophobic but also xenophilic comments. Anne Philips, a professor of political and gender theory, rightly claims (2010: 20) that “cultural difference is more often read as cultural hierarchy than cultural variation. There are said to be ‘better’ and ‘worse’, ‘more advanced’ and ‘more backward’ cultures”. Like all social categories, we need to bear in mind that culture is “perspectival, historical, disrupted by the movement of people and re-constitutive of the phenomena (it) seek(s) to describe” (Gillespie et al., 2012: 391). For Anne Cheng (2010, n.p.), if we ignore these aspects, “we look at each other as inanimate objects and dialogue ends” (my translation).

The idea of culturalism has been used in anthropology and then in other fields to refer to the use of static cultural differences to explain intercultural encounters. Culturalism is the reduction of the self and the other to cultural “alibis” (often national culture) (Bauböck, 2008; Abdallah-Preteuille, 1986). Ethically and epistemologically culturalism is presented increasingly as unacceptable in research and practice as it shows a lack of awareness of interdisciplinary discussions around the concept of culture. Furthermore it reveals limited reflexivity and criticality from the actors who use it in these fields.

I believe that this is the first point of entry of making sense of education for diversities. Rejecting entirely culturalism is essential, i.e. the use of a static understanding of the concept of culture, which overlooks contextualised and intersubjective interaction between complex persons and leads to “plural monoculturalism” (Sen, 2001) rather than dialogue. In their book *Seeing Culture Everywhere*, Breidenbach and Nyíri (2009: 281) give the following example which I qualify as culturalist. This is taking place in a lecture hall in Australia. A lecturer addresses a Japanese student:

*One day, the lecturer asked him to demonstrate how Japanese people greet each other. Atsushi lifted his hand, wiggled his fingers, and said « hello ». Not satisfied, the lecturer insisted: « No, I mean how do you greet people in a formal situation? » Atsushi shrugged and repeated that this was how he greeted people. Getting annoyed, the lecturer—who was of course expecting Atsushi to perform a bow—said « Okay then, how would*

*you greet the Emperor? » Atsushi, feeling harassed, responded that he would prefer not to meet the emperor. Finally, the lecturer was obliged to perform the bow herself, but Atsushi felt stereotyped and kept complaining about the incident for weeks.*

It is easy to see the danger of the culturalist approach in working on education for diversities. In this excerpt the lecturer is trying to meet a cultural aspect (greetings in Japan) rather than an individual who has to negotiate these elements in different micro- and macro-contexts and in relation to diverse interlocutors.

In a recent article, Hoskins and Sallah (2011: 114) explain clearly how the focus on culture “hides unequal power relations, including poverty, violence, structural inequalities such as racism and the possibilities of multiple identities”. In the excerpt the lecturer uses her “power” to impose her own representation of the Japanese on the class – which leaves Atsushi “feeling harassed” and “culturalised”. Hoskins and Sallah add that this is a way of putting aside important discussions “of the wider structural forces of capitalism, racism, colonialism, and sexism” (*ibid.*: 114).

### **Paying Attention to Ideology: Reflexivity**

“The reductionism of high theory can make a major contribution, often inadvertently to the violence of low politics.”

(Sen, 2001: xvi)

The second point I wish to make is that, whenever we discuss diversities and/or multiculturalism-interculturalism, we are very much influenced by ideologies and that an awareness of this is essential to act upon in a critical, reflexive and ethical way. Shi-xu (2001: 283) defines ideology as “symbolic power whereby one group becomes dominated, excluded, prejudiced against by another—‘symbolic violence’—and which is smoothed over or turned ‘natural’ or ‘universal’ through ‘commonsensical’ ways of thinking and speaking”. If we refer to our previous discussion on the word culture, it is easy to see from this definition how researchers and practitioners can easily impose their views and categories of their own self and the other in their research participants.

Reflexivity is thus important in order to avoid contributing to the “violence of low politics” as A. Sen puts it in the opening quote to this section.

Martine Abdallah-Preteuille (2006: 480) makes a first important point related to ideology when she asserts that “No fact is intercultural at the outset, nor is the quality of intercultural an attribute of an object, it is only intercultural analysis that can give it this character”. As such as a practitioner or a researcher, we might decide that such or such a situation is intercultural or multicultural without even consulting the people who are taking part in the situation – and who may not consider it as such but just an act of interaction between friends, lovers, etc. The labels that we use always tend to be viewpoints and beliefs that we need to question. In his book on the intellectual, Edward Saïd (1996: xi) reminds us that our role is to “break down the stereotypes and the reductive categories that are so limiting to human thought and communication”.

Hoskins and Sallah (2011), whom I mentioned earlier, call for a more political approach to these issues. They ask us to interrogate systematically such phenomena as discrimination and inequality in our own work (forms of sexism, racism and colonialism; *ibid.*: 123) and to question the power relations and their consequences for representation in what we present in e.g. our research results (*ibid.*). For example, this means, in the case of an interview, to examine our own discourses and potential influence on what our research participants are saying and not present them as being solely responsible for his/her words. It is not enough to say that research participants felt at ease and that there was no boundary between them and us. The use of digital recorders, even if agreed upon with the participants, can represent “symbolic violence” that we cannot just ignore or justify by saying “after a while, the participants forgot that they were being recorded”. Is such a claim valid? How do we know? This all implies thus taking seriously into account the proposal of moving away from researching *on* informants to researching *with* research participants (Midgley et al., 2012). This would, I believe, trigger more justice in the way we do research and work with diversities in education.

In his book *Intercultural communication and Ideology*, Adrian Holliday (2010: 18) notes that “Many (people) might consider that a lot of intercultural communication has nothing to do with prejudice or issues with the Centre-West, but with ‘innocent’ unfamiliar cultural events, practices, behaviour and values such as different management styles, family relations, dress codes, forms of address, attitudes to privacy, and modes of getting things done”. He also criticizes the lack of political discussions amongst practitioners and researchers about issues of

inequality, hegemonies, poverty, etc. (Ibid.). For him ideology in research and practice also derives from the overemphasis on culture (see previous section) and the ignorance of the intersection between identity markers such as social class, age, gender, emotions, etc. (ibid.: 187). For the anthropologist Amselle (2010: 79), this means that we should “hear” our participants rather than “listen to” them. For example it is not up to us (the dominants) to decide on their ‘culture’ or even ‘language’ to characterise them (Amselle, Ibid.).

Another important point that Holliday (2010: 187) makes is that the Other also constructs “discourses of culture”, so instead of trying to answer the questions “what is their culture?” and “how does their culture allow them to communicate with others?” we should explore such questions as “how do they present and co-construct the culture they are claiming to be representative of?” and “how and why do they put its characteristics into scene when interacting with others?” (“in my culture we do”; “you’re not from my culture so you can’t understand”).

Often the way research participants speak to researchers or practitioners tend to mimic how the latter speak to them. The formulation of questions and comments, the concepts that we use often lead them to reinvest these elements. As such, with Brubaker (1994: 10), we could say that research participants “have a performative character” (in reference to P. Bourdieu). In all forms of interaction “people not simply ‘understand(ing)’ each other; rather, they are acting with and upon each other” (Shi-xu, 2001: 285). This means that what a participant does or says is “jointly negotiated and constructed” (Ibid.) with a researcher or a practitioner. It is important to note that this phenomenon applies to any kind of data or genre such as narratives, interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, etc. We also need to be critical of the idea that e.g. “narratives” are more subjective and reveal more than interviews. Any act of interaction is intersubjective and even a questionnaire involves at least two people interaction (the person who asks questions and the one who answers).

### **Language is Central in Working with Diversities**

The aspect of language is often absent from discussions of diversities in education though it is central, as education has often been described as being ideologically biased towards languages (Risager, 2007). Most of the time intercultural interactions and the collection of data take place through the use of a language/different languages, “mother tongues”, foreign or

second/third... languages and lingua francas. This is why we need to problematize consistently and in a coherent way the following aspects.

Just like culture, the notion of language needs to be revised and complexified in order to make sense of education for diversities. For many individuals in the world, their daily lives revolve around the use of many languages not just one. Answering a question such as “what is your mother tongue?” may be difficult for them and require positioning, i.e. decide on only one language to identify oneself. There is here a danger of leading to simplistic boxing. In our daily lives we also all use different forms of the same language depending on contexts, interlocutors, power relations, etc. This means that it is not because we share a first language (often called “mother tongue”) with an individual that we systematically understand each other. Marc Augé (2010: 17) explains that “a volatile, fluid and invisible boundary can separate those who appear to be similar and subtly unite those whose language and culture appear to place a distance between them”.

Like culture language can sometimes be too easy an explanation for misunderstandings or non-understandings: “you can’t understand, you don’t speak my language” or “it is impossible to translate into your language or in an other language”. The “natural” and “biological” links that are often made between language and culture are somewhat deterministic and problematic as they seem to imprison individuals in cultural and linguistic cells. The example of the word *sisu* in Finnish and the usual argument that is impossible to translate it into other languages will serve as an illustration. An important element of (imagined) Finnishness, the word was “invented” at the end of the Winter War in 1940 to describe the Finns’ perseverance during the war against the Russians. Used today to create a strong sense of national identity, the Sisu argument is often used to construct *us vs. them*. In fact there are many equivalents in other languages, for example in English it can translate as *strength of will, determination, and/or perseverance*. Laypeople, scholars and educational practitioners alike use the *sisu* argument to describe and determine Finns (Brueggeman, 2008), often failing to note the ideology behind it as it places problematic boundaries between people from different countries (Finns are more perseverant or stronger than others). Who can decide on such elements? Who has the right to claim superiority? Pullum’s great attack on what he calls *the great Eskimo vocabulary hoax* or the fact that in order to explain the link between culture and language we often use the example of the word snow in Eskimo (1991), could aptly

apply to the word in Finnish. The problem with these arguments is that they tend to biologize culture through language and allow people who use them to place artificial and hierarchical boundaries between “cultures”. As researchers and practitioners, we need to question these elements not to allow exclusion, hierarchization and potential symbolic and physical violence to emerge.

Another aspect that we need to bear in mind is that language is always political and power-ridden. For Lakoff (1990: 17), a specialist of the question, “our every interaction is political, whether we intent it to be or not; everything we do in the course of a day communicates our relative power, our desire for a particular sort of connection, our identification of the other as one who needs something from us, or vice versa. Often, perhaps usually, we are unaware of these choices; we don’t realize that we are playing for high stakes even in the smallest of small talk”. For the researcher and practitioner this means consciously and explicitly taking this fact into account when working on diversities. Interaction is always between two individuals *a minima* and “we cannot give an undistorted account of ‘a person’ without giving an account of his relation with others. (...) No one acts or experiences in a vacuum” (Laing, 1961: 81-82). The researcher is as much responsible of what is shared as the participant.

Linguistically power can be attached to different identity markers (social class, gender, generation, etc). In terms of interaction with diversities, the power relations between e.g. the researcher and the researched, especially in relation to the “native” and “non-native” statuses of the actors involved, should also be taken into account. The so-called native usually has more power than the non-native speaker (Dervin & Badrinathan, 2011). Chen (2011) has examined this aspect in the context of ethnographic interviews and showed how languages spoken in this context can affect interviews and power dynamics. I do not agree fully with her claim though that power relations are less prominent if the interviewer is a non-native speaker of the language used during the interview. Again, as has been stated a few times in this chapter, it is a combination, an intersection of different aspects that play a role in power relations (language + social status + gender, etc.) – not just one.

This leads me to the question of translation. Too often in research on diversities in education, the act of translating is hardly problematized. When we translate data from one language/different languages to another, we make certain choices, using certain tools, as to how we express and

construct words, phrases and ideas. These choices can be extremely difficult or subjective. The example of certain pronouns in some languages is telling. As such in the French language, the ‘cameleon’ pronoun “on” (which can translate in English as a generic you, one, but also as we or I, depending on the context), can serve a specific purpose in relation to identification and any translation in English or any other language needs to be explicitly positioned (Boutet, 1996). Another example is that of code-switching and code-mixing, i.e. the use of different languages in one utterance, which should be indicated clearly in our translations as they often allow speakers to construct identity – they are not just innocent “moments” in a text (Alam, 2011).

Bradby (2002) but also Temple and Edwards (2002), amongst others, have looked into issues of translation and interpreting in relation to diversities in education and call for a transparent, honest and problematizing discussion on researching multilingually. Maria Birbini (2000) has also reflected on the challenges involved in collecting data in one or different languages and presenting the results in another. She also calls for transparency in terms of translation-related decisions that “have a direct impact on the validity of the research and its report” (ibid.).

Furthermore Birbini (2000) mentions the following aspects as being problematic: “gaining conceptual equivalence” (especially in relation to ‘emotional connotations’ that a word might not have in another language), “comparability of grammatical forms” (see the French pronoun “on” above), and “making participants’ words accessible and understandable”. The scholar offers certain solutions for dealing with these essential issues from which we could learn (ibid.). A first technique is to use back translation (translating an excerpt back into the original language) and to discuss the choices made with others (translators, other scholars but also people who know the context).

In a similar vein, González y González & Lincoln (2006: np) also propose to include the data in the original language too in our articles for the sake of transparency. The authors (2006: np) suggest answering in writing the following questions: “What is the first language of the researcher? Can the research be carried out adequately in the researcher’s language or would it be more appropriate to use the language of the research participants? Are the researcher and translator the same person? If not, what position is the researcher taking toward the research? How does that differ from that of the translator?”.

The next point about the centrality of language is that of transcription, an analytical tool we use to work with naturally occurring talk. Transcribing data is always a political act in the sense that it consists in “re-”presenting a social phenomenon in words only and is “only ever partial representations of the talk (they) record” (Liddicoat, 2011: 27). If one asked different researchers to transcribe e.g. the same interview, they might all come up with different transcriptions (even individual researchers) and thus with different results and different views on the participants. Transparency is thus vital here.

In general, for a transcription to be fair, one needs to mention and discuss the context where the interview took place (time, place, actors, etc.). Standard practices in transcribing data when working with diversities is to use orthographic transcription. For Liddicoat (2011: 32) this type of transcription is not “a neutral representation of the language but rather it contains a partial theory of the sounds and units of the language (...) and is based on a particular variety of the language”. This is why when we transcribe we make certain decisions that need to be explained and clarified.

For Chauvier (2010: 18) the semantic aspect of language (i.e. its meaning, the transmission of a piece of information) is not the only aspect to be taken into account. Other aspects contributing to the relation between the interlocutors (researchers-practitioners and participants) are also contained in the words they use, express and co-construct. Liddicoat thus maintains that we also need to make allowance for spoken language characteristics found in the speech such as stress, intonation, volume and length of words (2011: 33) to make our analyses even more valid. The scholar (2011: 39) also stresses the importance of including speech sounds in our transcriptions (breathing, laughter, ‘smile voice’ –a smile accompanying a sound-, etc.) as they play a meaningful role in the interaction we are considering and thus in the meaning that is being co-created and negotiated. Other elements such as pauses and silences are also important in meaning-making and should be included when analysing naturally occurring talk (ibid.). We need to make these explicit and use them throughout our analyses of data.

My last point about language is related to the still widespread idea that the researcher should not be heard in her/his research work, that the work should not be “visceral”. Though sometimes denounced as “navel-gazing”

(Jarvie, 1988), reflexivity and voicing are essential to reimagine both participants and researchers, to turn research into a real “political” experience rather than a structural exercise (Bensa, 2010: 21). Too often, researchers who try to be reflexive, intersubjective and critical satisfy themselves with mentioning either at the beginning, in the methodological section of their work or in the review of the results, the necessity to take into account the fact that the results are based on the co-construction of discourses and actions between the researched and the researcher but they fail to integrate it throughout the work. According to the anthropologist Eric Chauvier (2010: 156), the processes behind producing and constructing a study should be considered as an object of the study to be examined to make research “fairer”.

### **Conclusion: Towards Actors’ Diversities Competences?**

To end this chapter, I would like to summarize the three central points that I have proposed to make sense of education for diversities (but also multicultural and intercultural education). These three aspects need to be consistently and coherently be taken into consideration by all the actors involved in such education: teachers, principals, teacher assistants, student teachers and researchers.

***Criticality*** was presented as being the first component of what I wish to call diversities competences, especially in relation to contested and polysemic concepts that we use on the street, in practice and in research. Being critical towards our own ‘boxing’ of our students through the use of these terms is but the basis of working on education for diversities. This also implies being aware and paying attention to potential (implicit) discrimination, injustice and inequalities on structural and individual levels (Hoskins and Sallah, 2011: 114).

***Reflexivity*** relates to the constant attention that should be paid to ideologies ‘lurking’ behind how we conceptualise and do research, or work with diversities in education. For Hoskins and Sallah (2011: 114) this also means “Critical thinking towards your own beliefs and actions and towards others”. This entails analyzing one’s own discourses and the co-construction of discourses with research participants that we analyse in our work or actions. The notion of power difference between us researchers/practitioners and our participants is also essential here and must be taken seriously into account.

Finally, *language*, without which the two previous elements are impossible, must also be systematically discussed: do we encounter when problems when dealing with diversities linguistically? How do we translate from different languages and how can we make this process more transparent? What transcription systems are we using and are they complex enough to help us to include as many elements of the interactions as possible?

Making sense of education for diversities from a renewed perspective involves the competences mentioned above. Though they are not really so new (anthropologists have already dealt with these issues for several decades), it is the combination of these aspects which can make education for diversities a fairer, less hierarchizing and complex place where diversities can flourish.

## References

- Abdallah-Preteuille, M. (1986). *Vers une pédagogie interculturelle*. Paris, Anthropos.
- Abdallah-Preteuille, M. (2006). Interculturalism as a paradigm for thinking about diversity. *Intercultural Education* 17 (5): 475-483.
- Abdallah-Preteuille, M. (2011). Postface. In A. Lavanchy, A. Gajardo, & F. Dervin (Eds), *Anthropologies de l'interculturalité*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Alam, S. (2011). Integration of Various Approaches towards the Functions of Code-Switching between Punjabi, Urdu and English. *International Journal of Linguistics* 3 (1): 1-18.
- Amselle, J.-L. 2010. *Rétrovolutions*. Paris, Stock.
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and Culture: Global Flows and Local Complexity*. Clevedon, Multicultural Matters.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Augé, M. (2010). *La communauté illusoire*. Paris, Payot.
- Bauböck, R. (2008). *Beyond Culturalism and Statism. Liberal Responses to Diversity*. Eurosphere working paper series, No. 6.
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Bensa, A. (2010). *Après Lévi-Strauss*. Paris, Textuels.
- Bergson, H. (1938). *La Pensée et le Mouvant*. Paris, PUF.
- Birbili, M. (2000). Translating from one language to another. *Social*

- Research Update*, 31 (University of Surrey), <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU31.html> (visited on 1.10.2012)
- Boutet, J. (1994). *Construire le sens*. Bern, Peter Lang.
- Bradby, H. (2002). Translating culture and language: a research note on multilingual settings. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 24 (6): 842-855.
- Brueggeman, M. A. (2008). An outsider's view of beginning literacy in Finland: Assumptions, lessons learned, and sisu. *Literacy Research and Instruction* 47 (1): 1-8.
- Briedenbach, J. & P. Nyíri (2009). *Seeing Culture Everywhere*. Washington, University of Washington Press.
- Brubaker, R. (2004). *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard.
- Chauvier, É. (2011). *Anthropologie de l'ordinaire. Une conversion du regard*. Toulouse, Anacharsis.
- Chen, S.-H. (2011). Power relations between the researcher and the researched: an analysis of native and non-native ethnographic interviews. *Field Methods* 23 (2): 119-135.
- Cheng, A. (2010). Le ressac de l'histoire. Réflexions sur les amnésies chinoises. *Vacarme*, 52. Retrieved on 15.8.2012 from <http://www.vacarme.org/article1917.html>
- Debray, R. 2007. *Un mythe contemporain: le dialogue des civilisations*. Paris, CNRS.
- Dervin, F. & V. Badrinathan (2011). *L'enseignant non natif : identités et légitimité dans l'enseignement-apprentissage des langues étrangères*. Paris, E.M.E. Éditions.
- Dervin, Fred (2011). A Plea for Change in Research on Intercultural Discourses: A 'Liquid' Approach to the Study of the Acculturation of Chinese Students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 6 (1): 37-52.
- Dervin, F. (2012). *Impostures Interculturelles*. Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Dervin, F., Gajardo, A. & A. Lavanchy (Eds) (2011). *Politics of Interculturality*. Newcastle: CSP.
- Gillespie, A., Howarth, C. S. & F. Cornish (2012). Four problems for researchers using social categories. *Culture & Psychology* 18 (3): 391-402.
- González y González, E. M. & Y. S. Lincoln (2006). Decolonizing qualitative research: non-traditional reporting forms in the Academy [41 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 7(4), Article 1.
- Grant, C. A. & Portera, A. (2011). *Intercultural and Multicultural Education: Enhancing Global Interconnectedness*. London, Routledge.
- Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural Communication and Ideology*. London,

- Sage.
- Holm, G. & H. Zilliacus (2009). Multicultural Education and Intercultural Education: Is There a Difference. In M. Talib, J. Loima, H. Paavola & S. Patrikainen (Eds), *Dialogues on Diversity and Global Education* (pp. 11-28). Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Hoskins, B. & M. Sallah (2011). Developing intercultural competence in Europe: the challenges. *Language and Intercultural Communication 11* (2): 113-125.
- Jarvie, I. (1988). Comments. *Current Anthropology 29*: 427-429.
- Kromidas, M. (2011). Troubling Tolerance and Essentialism: The Critical Cosmopolitanism of New York City Schoolchildren. In F. Dervin, A. Gajardo & A. Lavanchy (Eds), *Politics of Interculturality* (pp. 89-114). London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Laing, R. D. (1961). *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking Power*. NY, Basic Books.
- Liddicoat, A. (2011). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London, Continuum.
- Lull, J. (2000). *Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Maalouf, A. (2001). *In the Name of Identity*. London, Penguin.
- Midgley, W., Danaher, P. A. & M. Baguley (Eds). *Reimagining Participants in Education Research*. London, Routledge.
- Palaiologou, N. & Diez, G. (2012). *Mapping the Broad Field of Multicultural and Intercultural Education Worldwide: Towards the Development of a New Citizen*. Newcastle, CSP.
- Philips, A. (2010). *Gender and Culture*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural Communication: A Critical Approach*. Edinburgh, EUP.
- Pullum, G. K. (1991). *The Great Eskimo Vocabulary Hoax and Other Irreverent Essays on the Study of Language*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London, Penguin.
- Said, E. (1996). *Representations of the Intellectual*. London, Vintage.
- Sen, A. (2001). *Violence and Identity*. London, Penguin.
- Shi-xu (2001). Critical Pedagogy and Intercultural Communication: Creating discourses of diversity, equality, common goals and rational-moral motivation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies 22* (3): 279-93.
- Temple, B. & R. Edwards (2002). Interpreters/translators and cross-language research: reflexivity and border crossings. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods 1* (2): 1-12.