THE EDUCATION OF IMMIGRANT STUDENTS IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Policy Debates in Comparative Perspective

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of humankind, population movements have been at the heart of the creation and evolution of civilizations and cultures. More recently, at least from a historical perspective, a whole continent, North America, was radically transformed by an influx of colonizers, slaves, and voluntary migrants. The magnitude of this influx in relation to the receiving native population has never been equaled. Moreover, since the nineteenth century, with the spread of the nation-state model in the Western world, newcomers have generally been received in immigration societies with a mix of openness and rejection, as well as with the expectations and fears echoed in today's debates concerning the so-called "new" immigration (Morelli 1992; Palmer 1984; C. Suárez-Orozco & M. Suárez-Orozco 2001).

As a scholar working on integration issues from a historical and comparative perspective, especially as they relate to education, I find the whole concept of globalization quite elusive. I am nevertheless fully aware of the pitfalls of the other perspective—that is, the "nothing under the sun has changed since people have always migrated" paradigm. One of the central tasks that informed and socially responsible academics have to perform for an amnesic or short-term-minded policy community and public opinion is to ascertain the extent to which the challenges we face today

are unique and whether we can be enlightened by the lessons of past experiences, positive or negative.

My aim in this chapter is thus to critically examine three policy debates regarding the education of immigrant students: the role of common schooling versus that of ethnocultural institutions in the integration of newcomers; the place that majority versus immigrant minority languages should have in the curriculum; and the extent to which public schools should adapt their norms and regulations to religious and cultural diversity. These issues share two common features. They have generated heated debates and a relatively impressive body of research in most Western immigration countries, and they have been recurrent, though intermittent, preoccupations for over a century. So they serve the aim of this paper well, which is, on one hand, to ascertain to what extent globalization influences the current framing of these old debates and affects the policy options available to us and, on the other, to identify, based on a comparative analysis of policy-relevant research, the minimum consensus about how best to successfully integrate immigrant students. At the end of each of the following sections, I also identify research topics that should be pursued in light of the current transformations taking place in the world.

COMMON SCHOOLING VERSUS ETHNOSPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS

Without doubt, the establishment of common compulsory schooling, which occurred in Europe and North America from the nineteenth century onward, has been a powerful instrument of nation building and homogenization of diverse populations (Holmes 1981; Lê Than K. 1981). Moreover, although the degree of educational autonomy granted to regional subcomponents or national minorities varied greatly according to history and geography, the normative consensus regarding the desirability for immigrant students to attend schools, reflecting the ethos of the receiving society, has always been strong. The arguments expressed as early as 1830 by Horace Mann in the United States and by Jules Ferry in 1885 in France were not radically different from those voiced today by the opponents of community-controlled education or by ordinary citizens concerned with the current fragmentation of the educational market (Gautherin 2000; Parsons & Bales 1955). Common schools were seen as playing a double role in the integration of newcomers: on one hand,

they propagated an explicit curriculum, which consisted of shared values and the minimal knowledge needed to be a productive member of society; on the other, they were vehicles for intergroup contact and friendships among children at an early age when identities and attitudes are developed.

Nevertheless, two centrifugal tendencies limited the political impact of common schooling. On the ground, common but de facto majority-dominated institutions were not always receptive to newcomers. In the most lenient cases, resistance to their presence amounted to benign neglect and relegation to "the back of the classroom." In other circumstances, state or local authorities practiced active segregation, creating de facto immigrant schools (Glenn & De Jong 1996; Laferrière 1983). Immigrant parents also often resisted common schooling and established their own schools, as supplementary or parallel institutions, to ensure the retention of their language, their culture, and especially their religion when the last was different from that of the majority community (Anderson & Boyer 1970; Swann 1985). These institutions were rarely supported by public money, even in societies that did not offer the alternative of a genuine secular school system. In some instances, they were seen as political threats; in the United States, for example, Irish Catholic schools and German-language schools after World War I were actively opposed. But most of the time they were simply ignored, since immigrant groups, unlike national minorities, generally do not manifest strong autonomous tendencies.

Research on academic and social outcomes for those attending ethnospecific institutions was also almost nonexistent. But this absence of interest was generalized to all immigrant students, who were not defined as social, and thus research, problems, until the democratization of education in the second half of the twentieth century, when equality of access and of results for different groups became normative ideals (Ballantyne 1989; Samuda, Berry, & Laferrière 1983). The availability of state support for ethnocultural institutions—still a hotly debated issue—became part of the public agenda during roughly the same period. Given the emerging consensus (still strong today) that "public schools were failing minorities," partisans of ethnospecific institutions began to champion them not so much for the sake of cultural maintenance but as alternative vehicles of educational and social mobility for immigrant students (Homan 1992; Smith 1981).

To what extent has the current policy debate on the relevance of common schools versus ethnospecific institutions been reshaped by twenty-first-century globalization? Many previous trends certainly endure, as revealed by international research (McAndrew 1996a; McAndrew

& Ledoux 1998; Orfield & Eaton 1996; Payet 1999). First, it is clear, as it was formerly, that school segregation is as much the product of various forms of exclusion as it is a voluntary alternative actively pursued by parents and communities. In many European countries, as well as in Canada and the United States, de facto concentration of immigrants in specific public schools is on the rise, under the combined effects of the flight of affluent majority and minority groups to private schools, and the concentration of poorer immigrants in some neighborhoods. Some have also equated the specialization of public schools, which serve different interests and lifestyles, to de facto privatization. Globalization—which has weakened the nation-state, heightened the importance of individual choice, and encouraged a tendency to look at education as a global market commodity —has certainly played a role in school segregation (Ball 1993; Van Haecht 1998). But it would be simplistic to contrast the Golden Age of common schooling, which never existed, to the era of fragmented schooling in which we now live.

Second, there is no evidence that voluntary segregation, that is, attending a community-controlled institution, would be more popular today than before among immigrant groups. Although this may be the case in some countries or among specific groups, it is far from a general trend. Numerous contradictory factors, some of which are the product of globalization, probably balance each other out in this regard. On one hand, the generalization of pluralistic, child-centered, and human rights ideologies has certainly made public schools, if not neutral and bias-free, at least more receptive to the needs of immigrant students (Banks & McGee-Banks 1995; Glenn & De Jong 1996). Moreover, contrary to patently racist discourses that stress the greater cultural incompatibility of the "new" immigrants with the receiving society,[1] globalization, especially but not exclusively in countries with a selective immigration policy, has likely helped to close the gap in this regard. More and more immigrants share, for better or worse, the individualistic materialism characteristic of Western society, as well as a belief in shared citizenship and equality. These values make immigrants who uphold them more inclined to fight for the transformation of public schools than for the establishment of parallel institutions (C. Suárez-Orozco & Todorova 2003; Waugh, Abu-Laban, & Burckhardt Qureshi 1991). On the other hand, the intensification of supranational loyalties is a reality, both for religious militant groups and for more discreet immigrant groups that can benefit in this regard from the assets of globalized communications (Shahid & Van Koningsveld 1996; Walford 1996). Thus, choosing an ethnospecific school no longer means

attending a second-rate institution or being cut off from various opportunities for social mobility. In fact, the reverse may be true, given the international funding some of these institutions receive.

Finally, as in the past, arguments on both sides are based mostly on normative models of what constitutes "genuine" integration and of the schooling most likely to achieve it, not on research findings that would weight various claims (McAndrew 2001, 2003b). The socialization benefits that the partisans of common schooling stress have rarely been ascertained, much less compared with the identity profile and cultural attitudes prevalent among students attending ethnospecific institutions. The opposite claim (Halstead 1986), that subsequent social integration can occur when a positive group identity has been cultivated during youth, has not been substantiated, nor have the results of ethnospecific institutions in this regard been monitored consistently. Even in the area of academic results, which has generated a bit more research,[2] results are either inconclusive, though slightly in favor of public schools, or limited to a few self-evident truths, such as the fact that institutions controlled by socioeconomically advantaged groups fare better than those attended by poorer immigrants (Driessen & Bezemer 1999; Schwartz 1996).

Research on the impact of immigrant concentration in public schools is not very enlightening, either. In the European context and, in the case of poorer groups, in the United States, such concentration is usually considered and sometimes proven to be negatively correlated with school success (Mahieu 1999; Payet 1999; C. Suárez-Orozco, M. Suárez-Orozco, & Doucet 2003). In other North American cases, especially in Canada, selection produces a more class-balanced immigration. Schools with a high concentration of immigrant students have often been found to outperform others in academic results, especially when their socioeconomic composition is taken into account (Anisef et al. 2004). Although these conclusions seem contradictory at first sight, they point in the same direction: the dominance of social class over ethnic factors in explaining school performance and mobility, even if class does not account for all discrepancies between majority and minority students.[3]

So where does this leave us in terms of desirable strategies? I would dare put forth three minimal tendencies in this regard.

First, it is obvious that multiple fragmented school spaces are here to stay and that, in the current globalized context, they may even hold some benefits—for example, allowing easier mobility for students enrolled in schools belonging to an international network, whether religious or elit-

ist. Nevertheless, if we believe, based perhaps more on common sense than on research, that a lack of common schooling of future citizens at an early age will undermine social cohesion, some of the action taken in various countries regarding voluntary segregation can be inspiring (Commission for Racial Equality 1990; McAndrew 2002; U.S. Department of Education 1999). Such action is basically of two kinds: one, at the level of explicit curriculum, ensures that minimal knowledge and values are transmitted to all students, especially but not exclusively when parallel institutions receive some kind of public funding; the other compensates for the lack of informal socialization by providing other meaningful venues—such as twinning programs, sports, or other extracurricular activities—in which youth attending various school networks can meet.

Second, whenever explicit or implicit school norms regarding student recruitment or placement in schools are at the root of involuntary segregation, it would seem a rather obvious requirement in any democratic society that school authorities actively support immigrant parents who want their children to attend public common schools because they believe such institutions are better vehicles for social mobility and increased contact with the host society. In this area, comparative research (Katz 1992; Leman 1999) points in two directions. For one, we should not strive toward a statistically perfect distribution of the immigrant clientele in the school system. It is more realistic and educationally sound to aim at preserving "medium density" schools, which combine the twin advantages of a sizable presence of the host society's students with a critical mass of immigrant students. For the other direction, although the fight against institutional discrimination in the recruitment and placement of immigrant students should mostly adopt soft, voluntary sensitization mechanisms, a more proactive or explicitly normative legal or administrative framework, such as the Anti-Discrimination School Pact devised by the Flemish government, can be an advantage.

Finally, whenever involuntary segregation is mostly the creation of socioeconomic factors and residential segregation, the literature (Astor Stave 1995; Orfield & Eaton 1996; Willis & Alves 1996) clearly points toward the inefficiency of major "social engineering" endeavors aimed at a better distribution of school clienteles. Small-scale voluntary programs can have a certain impact. But above all, we must ensure that if immigrant students are concentrated in high-density schools, they do not receive a second-class education, especially if ethnic concentration coincides with socioeconomic deprivation. Such instances call for both compensatory and

intercultural programs.[4] The former tackles students' various educational deficits, while the latter ensures that school personnel and norms are sensitive to their needs and experiences.

In this area, one research priority is clearly revealed: a systematic assessment of the consequences for social cohesion of the currently accelerating fragmentation of the educational market. Without falling into the pessimistic or alarmist traps identified above, we should better understand how and to what extent identity formation, among immigrant or host society students, is influenced by the potential lack of common socialization associated with such a trend. If instead of normative statements, we gather reliable comparative data in this regard, we can discuss policy options, especially regarding attendance and funding of ethnospecific institutions, in a much more informed manner.

THE PLACE OF IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES

Since most Western states adopted one or more official languages in the nineteenth century,[5] a broad consensus has existed regarding the necessity for school systems to ensure mastery of that language or those languages by all students. Language mastery represents both an essential vehicle of educational and social mobility for immigrant students and a necessary tool for intergroup exchanges and common citizenship. The debate has thus focused not on the role of official or majority languages (which was questioned only by some national minorities), but rather on the legitimacy of making immigrant or "heritage" languages[6] part of the curriculum (Berque 1985; Krashen 1996; McAndrew & Cicéri 1998).

In addition to teaching in or of targeted languages conducted by ethnospecific institutions, we know that bilingual programs—or more often, some teaching of immigrant languages—were implemented in some public schools in Canada and the United States as early as the late nineteenth century (Anderson & Boyer 1970; Samuda et al., 1983). Although the European situation is slightly less documented, there is, at least some evidence of similar trends in this regard. When they were known to the general public, these initiatives generated far from universal support. The concerns voiced at that time are largely the same echoed today: the dangers of a "babelization" of society, the "refusal" to integrate that language retention revealed, the power that "ethnic elites" were, thus, preserving (Crawford 1999; Galindo 1997).

Nevertheless, since the mid-twentieth century, the framing of the immigrant language controversy in public schools has undergone major

shifts. The first, which has little to do with globalization, concerns the relationship between mastering the host language and learning heritage languages. Before the 1960s, many decision makers and educators in Europe and North America shared a belief in the "subtractive bilingualism" hypothesis developed by psychologists and linguists at the beginning of the twentieth century (Grosjean 1982; Hakuta 1986). According to this hypothesis, within the brain, learning one language was usually done at the expense of the other. Some experts even argued that bilinguals must be less intelligent than monolinguals.[7] Such beliefs were obviously not shared by people who engaged in multilingual activities, but they certainly prevented them from "selling" such initiatives to the majority community as assets for furthering linguistic integration. This situation changed radically when a new hypothesis, "additive bilingualism," was introduced in the 1960s and soon became the dominant view. It asserts that metalinguistic and metacognitive abilities developed in the first language are transferred to the second and that if basic concepts and skills are not strengthened in the mother tongue, full mastery of other languages will be impeded (resulting in semilingualism) (Cummins 1979; Mackey 1970). Since then, proponents and opponents of a greater role for immigrant languages in public schools have focused their arguments on the impact of various formulas on host-language acquisition.

This debate has been especially heated in the United States, but it has also touched other societies.[8] Research regarding the issue is inconclusive. Fundamental psycholinguistic studies targeting individual learners, as well as the bulk of research on "immersion programs" aimed at national minorities, support the additive bilingualism hypothesis (Artigal 1991; Cummins, 1989; Painchaud, d'Anglejan, Armand, & Jesak 1993). But evaluation studies of actual bilingual programs that target immigrant students have yielded more mixed results, partially due to the methodological complexity of proving that, other things being equal, it is better for immigrant students to continue mastering their heritage languages while learning host languages[9] (Greene 1998; Dolson & Mayer 1992). Thus, while specialists and opinion makers continue to quarrel, school authorities in most countries make decisions based on a mix of personal assumptions, community pressures, and short-term costs-benefit analyses. This is why monolingual mainstream education for immigrant students, complemented by some teaching of heritage languages offered mostly after school hours, largely continues as the norm, even though innovative breakthroughs in multilingual education are reported everywhere (Glenn & De Jong 1996).

The second shift, which can certainly be linked to globalization, is the new importance placed on the potential benefits for majority students of a greater recognition of immigrant languages in public schools. Gradually over the past fifty years, teaching in or of heritage languages has been advocated less as an ethnospecific program aimed at cultural maintenance than as a mainstream initiative that fosters multilingualism and cultural awareness among the full student body (Fishman 1976; McAndrew & Cicéri 1998; Paulston 1980). Primarily in North America and Canada, majority parents have started lobbying to have their children admitted to heritage language or bilingual programs, with a preference for languages considered important on the world scene over obscure ones.[10]

The eruption of the global linguistic market has sometimes created tension between the two competing objectives of heritage language teaching: linguistic maintenance, which is better achieved within a linguistically homogenous group, and linguistic and cultural enrichment, which by its nature requires the presence of nonspeakers of the target language. It has also generated a pecking order regarding the value of various languages, which is incompatible with the conception of bilingual education and heritage language teaching as tools to help immigrant students of any mother tongue master the host language. However, immigrant parents themselves often make linguistic choices based on instrumental motivations when they prefer enrolling their children in prestigious world languages (such as Chinese for Cambodians, or Spanish for Haitians) to having them learn their own mother tongue.

Up to now, research on this new recognition of immigrant languages in the promotion of multilingualism has been limited in magnitude and, even more, in its impact. This neglect is in line with the general lack of interest among researchers studying heritage language teaching in topics other than its impact on mastery of the host language. Indeed, we know very little about the extent to which minority speakers enrolled in such programs master the target language or use it later as an asset for international business or exchange. Everywhere, lip service is paid to the benefits of multilingualism in a globalized world, but the link between this emerging normative ideal and the actual presence of speakers of multiple languages among the immigrant population has not been fully exploited.

Let us now weigh various policy options. I first take a normative position not necessarily shared by everyone. In the current debate about the place of immigrant languages in the curriculum, our main point of reference should be the impact of our choices on immigrant students. If these choices also benefit the multilingual skills of majority students, the

maintenance of multilingualism and ethnic communities in the entire society, or the economic competitiveness of the country in the global market, so be it—let's rejoice. But whenever these objectives come into conflict, we must go back to our most immediate responsibilities to the most vulnerable.

The basic needs of immigrant students are pretty obvious, as is the order of priority of those needs. First and foremost, they must master the host language(s) without losing their sense of self-worth or accumulating academic deficits that would hinder their educational mobility. Depending on the age at which students enter the new school system, their academic profiles, and their migration histories, host-language mastery may or may not imply intensive instruction in their mother tongue or access to full bilingual programs. But as the National Research Council found in its meta-analysis of thirty years of American research on the most effective means of teaching English to newcomers (1997), for many students, especially younger ones, the openness of schools to linguistic diversity, along with a minimal presence of their mother tongue in teaching materials and activities (such as the popular European "Language Awareness Program"), is sufficient to generate the sense of security necessary for learning a new language.[11] Given the complex logistics of bilingual programs in countries whose migration influx is not as homogeneous as that in the United States, and considering the generalized lack of resources everywhere, these conclusions give a little more room for maneuvering to policy makers than the usual militant stance of "No salvation without full multilingual programs."

Should we, however, assume that good instruction in the host language in linguistically open settings will answer all immigrant students' needs, especially in a globalized world? Certainly not, but in this regard, they are not fundamentally different from other students (all should master more than one language), except for the special advantage they enjoy of already knowing another one. Thus, the main challenge lies in helping immigrant students fully exploit their multilingual potential and, if possible, to transform it into an opportunity for majority students. Various initiatives have been implemented in different countries with greater or less success; for example, the accreditation of heritage language classes offered by community organizations; the opening of school-based heritage language or bilingual programs to majority students; the inclusion of a wider variety of immigrant languages among the international languages taught in high school; and the opportunity for immigrant students to choose their mother tongue when they take second- or third-language

exams, even if the latter is not part of the formal curriculum (McAndrew 2001). Research on the strengths and weaknesses of these programs is needed to foster the exchange of best practices while respecting the specificity of each context.

In a wider perspective, further studies are also needed to better assess the impact of globalization on the need for multilingualism. This need is likely not as obvious and univocal as some oft-voiced amiable banalities would have us believe. It is quite possible that globalization will actually contribute, in the middle run, to a decrease in the need for multilingualism, or at least in a narrowing of the spectrum of useful languages. In this scenario, immigration countries with English as their main language would preserve more room for the learning of immigrant languages, whereas in countries with another official language, immigrant students might choose English as a second language rather than their mother tongue. It is a reality we have to better understand and face if we are to maximize the potential benefits to all of the presence of a multilingual immigrant population, without forcing those immigrants into cultural and linguistic maintenance they may not desire.

CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY

Of all the debates discussed here, cultural and religious diversity has been the most controversial and heated over the past ten years in many European and North American contexts. Moreover, even though cultural and religious conflicts in schools or over schooling were not unknown in the past (Holmes 1981; Samuda, Berry, & Laferrière 1983), they have become much more obvious and also more complex. Meanwhile, the normative models that decision makers, principals, teachers, parents, and even students can invoke to legitimize different stands have multiplied. For example, the conception of citizenship that schools traditionally preferred and that immigrant parents or students accepted, or at least did not contest, followed either the republican model popular in France and in many Southern European countries (Gautherin 2000; Kepel 1989), or the liberal model dominant in the United States and in most Northern European countries (Galston 1991; Rawls 1993). Although the two models differ in the degree to which they view schooling as promoting a substantive versus a procedural set of values (thick versus thin culture), they both favor the neutrality of the public space and relegation of diversity to the private sphere. This stance largely inhibited recognition of cultural and religious differences in school norms and practices, even if ad

hoc accommodations were not unknown. Also, the dominant epistemo-
logical paradigm was realism, which contends that objective, neutral, and
universal knowledge exists and that it is possible to define a school cur-
riculum whose mastery would generate consensus among all social
groups (Nagel 1994). Finally, in matters of ethical positions regarding plu-
ralism, the field was largely dominated by assimilationists who argued that
the historical majority should keep its capacity to control the agenda of
curricular change and its right to protect identity-linked elements that it
wanted to remain unchanged. Immigrant parents and students were thus
much less likely to get involved in contestations regarding the school cur-
riculum and its cultural components (Samuda, Berry, & Laferrière 1983;
Glazer 1997).

Today, under the influence of decolonization, which undermined the
power base of many of these positions, and of globalization, which has
heightened the normative value of a common culture of human rights,
other competing paradigms have emerged (Kymlicka 1995; Taylor 1992;
Touraine 1994). Both communatarians and renewed liberals, whether they
are philosophers, policy makers, or ordinary schoolteachers or parents,
have come into the arena defending the recognition of diversity in the pub-
lic sphere as a condition of equity and an asset for a better integration
of immigrant students. They disagree, nevertheless, about the respective
weight to be granted the individual or her or his community of origin in
the final say regarding cultural and religious conformity, and they take
different ethical positions on value conflicts. Communatarians tend to
advocate cultural relativism, that is, total respect for those elements per-
ceived as requirements of immigrant cultures or religions, while renewed
liberals point to democratic values and laws as necessary limits to insti-
tutional adaptation.[12] Curricular issues have also become much more
contested, especially under the assault of antiracist educators who, high-
lighting the social construction of knowledge and of its selection for school
purposes, have advocated that the current Eurocentrism be replaced by
a multiplicity of perspectives and voices (Dei 1996; Gillborn 1995; Grin-
ter 1992).

At a time when globalized religious movements are on the rise, faith-
based claims of immigrant parents and students have proved especially
difficult to accommodate on a consensual basis (Bernatchez & Bourgeault
1999; McAndrew 2003a, 2005; McDonnell 1992). On one hand, the
requirement of state neutrality in this regard is, with a few historical excep-
tions, generally more absolute. And compared to cultural tradition, the
absolutism of religious belief is far less amenable to either the necessarily

critical review of facts associated with schooling or to the practical need to sometimes limit expression of diversity in schools. On the other hand, international conventions and several national constitutions and bills of rights attach more weight to religious freedom than to the mere right to further one's cultural life. This complex set of counteracting factors can lead only to deeper conflicts of legitimacy between educational institutions attempting to produce common practices and identities, and parents or students defending their right to develop their faith. The perfect formula to balance rights, especially religious freedom with gender equity, has not yet been found, as shown, for example, by the wave of criticism that both tolerance and interdiction of the wearing of Islamic veils has generated in many European countries and in some Canadian provinces (Cicéri 1999; McAndrew 2005; Renaerts 1999; Stasi 2003).

Nevertheless, the high visibility of some controversies regarding diversity in schools should not be the tree that hides the forest from view. A comparative analysis of various policies, programs, and evaluative studies of their implementation indicates that many harmonious adaptations happen ad hoc, or at least generate little resistance from the school staff or majority parents (First Amendment Center 1999a, 1999b; Lorcerie 1996; McAndrew, Cicèri, & Jacquet 1997). These findings reflect the coexistence of various ideological positions among principals, teachers, and parents of immigrant and nonimmigrant backgrounds in the same country,[13] even though, at the political level, decision makers favor a more coherent and univocal paradigm. Practice on the ground does seem to be more multiform and to consist of a greater blend of approaches than do official discourses. This hybridization of daily routine is also influenced by the intensive aspects of schooling and the personal nature of relationships it breeds, which often inhibits, for better or worse, a consistent institutional response toward diversity.

Nevertheless, it is possible to distinguish five groups of practices on a continuum from least to most actively committed to diversity and to establish some links in this regard to various models of citizenship, epistemological paradigms, and ethical positions (Banks 1988; Gillborn 1995; McAndrew, Cicèri, & Jacquet 1997; OECD 1987; Pagé 1993).

- Selective incorporation of elements pertaining to immigrant cultures and religions in school activities in order to foster the integration of immigrant students.[14] This type of practice is found everywhere at various degrees and gives rise to little debate, even in countries that prefer a republican model of citizenship.

- Implementation of activities specially tailored to the needs and characteristics of immigrant minorities from an equalization-of-opportunity perspective.[15] These practices are also widespread. However, in countries with a strong republican tradition, they are most often implemented based on socioeconomic disadvantage (e.g., priority education zones in France and French-speaking Belgium), rather than justified explicitly by the presence of immigrant groups (Van Zanten 1997).

- Integration of specific immigrant-oriented content or perspective into the regular school curriculum so that differences and even conflicts over interpretation are acknowledged.[16] These practices are more common in national communities with long-standing divisions or in those dealing with specific conflicting cultural and religious issues concerning some immigrant groups. Although they sometimes appear under the pressure of the discipline itself in countries with a republican ideology (Lantheaume 2002), they are more popular in societies that embrace the communatarian or the renewed liberal models of citizenship and where espousal of a constructivist vision of knowledge is more prevalent.

- In response to religious claims made by certain immigrant groups, adaptation of norms and regulations governing school life.[17] As pointed out earlier, numerous adaptations are made every day, even in systems in which secularism is a fundamental principle. However, such demands meet with far greater resistance when they appear to encroach on mandates that lie at the heart of educational activity. Namely, the critical transmission of knowledge, the promotion of fundamental democratic values (e.g., gender equality), and the preservation of a public space where common identity outweighs differences.

- Tailoring or transforming various elements of the curriculum in response to the demands of the "organized" community.[18] Although they meet with various forms of resistance, these non-consensual and sometimes questionable practices do exist and have on occasion received normative support from public authorities in contexts where the communatarian ideology is popular.

If one takes a dispassionate distance from both normative controversies and specific practices, is it possible to identify optimal policy options

regarding the extent to which schools should adapt to cultural diversity? Probably not, if we try to find a "one model fits all" solution or rely exclusively on direct research evidence to do so. Indeed, on one hand, the mere idea of an efficient strategy that runs against the deeply felt ideological beliefs of school decision makers or personnel is an oxymoron. Normative models, whether enunciated by the state or experienced by social actors (or both), must be taken into account when defining the right balance between common norms and respect for diversity (Holmes 1981; Lê Thanh 1981).[19] Moreover, until recently, comparative research on the outcomes of systems more or less open to adaptation to diversity has been limited (Lorcerie & McAndrew 1993; McAndrew 2001). But it would, in any case, also be extremely complex. "All things being equal" is almost an impossible goal in such circumstances. What one might attribute to national choices or specific practices in matters of religious or cultural recognition (or nonrecognition) might well be actually linked to numerous other variables.[20]

However, if we cannot rigorously prescribe "what to do," we certainly can identify consensual guidelines on "what not to do," based on fundamental research in social psychology regarding identity development (Camilleri et al. 1990; De Vos & Suárez-Orozco 1990; Phinney 1990) and on legal guidelines (Guttman 1987; McLaughlin 1992; Thornberry & Gibbons 1997) concerning the state's obligation to all its citizens in a democratic country. Although these safeguards have been developed in much more depth in other publications (Bourgeault, Gagnon, McAndrew, & Pagé 2002; Hohl & Normand 1996; McAndrew 2003a, 2005), I present them here under two general ideas.

First, whenever family and school hold different norms, values, or codes of conduct, which is unavoidable in the context of migration, the aim should not necessarily be harmonization but respect for or at least avoidance of detrimental judgments about the other party. Children are extraordinarily flexible human beings: they can live in two different worlds as long as they are not forced to choose one over the other or made to feel that some cultural or religious characteristics are linked to socially devalued individuals (especially if the latter are their parents). Teenagers will eventually have to devise their own "cultural formula." Here again, at a minimum, schools should avoid pressuring them to take a stand and instead support the development of complex identity strategies more suitable both to the reality of the second generation and to a globalized world. Whether this can be done under any model of diversity recognition (or nonrecognition) is open to debate. It would seem, nevertheless, that both an

extreme republican rigidity, which would keep the expression of any differences outside the school space, and an uncritical communatarian approach, which would not recognize the moral independence of students vis-à-vis their community, would not appear conducive.

Second, although religious and cultural accommodation in school is often framed as a socialization issue, weighing our choices in this regard according to their consequences on equal educational opportunities provided to immigrant students might be useful. Or to put it in a negative, less daring manner, one clear limit to adaptation is the obligation not to engage in any practice detrimental to the equality of students or subgroups of students (such as boys and girls). This duty points to the inadequacy of some communatarian practices. But given that democratic societies also have a commitment to ensure equality of results (i.e., equity), not merely formal equality of treatment, many accommodations to immigrant cultures and religions may prove to be long-term assets for the realization of these goals, even though, in the short term, we might not spontaneously consider them desirable. This is especially true of any practice that enhances parent-school communication and collaboration, given the overwhelming research evidence regarding its positive impact on school success (McMillan 2001). But this relationship between the recognition of pluralism and equality could also be an argument in favor of curricular adaptation, although we do not know with the same degree of certainty what difference a culturally and socially relevant curriculum makes in the educational performance and mobility of immigrant students.[21] So any "school as a fortress" model that would refuse any link with the community would also be inadvisable.

In terms of research, what is lacking is neither conceptual work on citizenship and pluralism nor ethnographic studies of ad hoc adaptations, both of which have thrived recently. We really need to understand why so little of the current sophisticated academic knowledge regarding the accommodation of diversity in schools is actually reflected in public debate and professional practices. In both instances, assimilation, often disguised by the now more acceptable term *integration*, and multiculturalism, often associated with the ghetto and undemocratic practices, are usually considered the only two competing alternatives. Moreover, even in countries where intercultural training is compulsory, numerous studies show that it is rarely invoked by teachers when they describe or reflect on their teaching practices. In some instances, this weakness can be linked to the lack of implementation of official commitments in grassroots programs. In other cases, the approach put forward may be either

too theoretical or too remote from classroom preoccupations to really produce an impact. Thus, more action-research aimed at fostering a more critical and deeper appropriation by media analysts, school professionals, and even ordinary citizens, who are often also parents, of some of the theoretical work or research data on the accommodation of diversity in schools is greatly needed, as well as some comparative work on best practices.

NOTES

1. Both Eugene Roosens's and Unni Wikan's chapters in this volume offer vivid examples of these increasing trends in Europe, to which North America, although less affected, is not immune.

2. This is notwithstanding the mountain of research on the impact of integrated versus community-controlled education for African Americans, which I do not discuss here, since they do not constitute a voluntary migrant group (Gibson & Ogbu 1991).

3. This is exemplified by the PISA data presented in Rita Süssmuth's chapter in this volume. Maurice Crul's enlightening chapter also points to the impact of the general structural features of the school system in this regard, a dimension not covered in my discussion here.

4. Rita Süssmuth's chapter (this volume) proposes a global and balanced strategy in this regard.

5. With the noteworthy exception of the United States, which, given the overwhelming status of English, probably did not feel the need to make it the official language until recently, when some states enacted legislation to that effect.

6. *Heritage languages* is the term used to refer to children born in the new country, as their maternal language cannot be considered something foreign.

7. The fact that this school of thought was developed almost exclusively in regard to immigrant or colonial languages, while elite bilingualism in classical or foreign languages continued unchallenged, is clear testimony, if any is necessary, of the socially constructed nature of "scientific" knowledge.

8. See Eugene Roosens's chapter in this volume for a deeper and fascinating analysis of the Flemish case in this regard.

9. For example, are we comparing equivalent groups of students when contrasting formulas? What educational practices lie behind the label *bilingual education*? Are all "bilingual programs" alike? Should we expect all academic problems of immigrant students to be solved by adopting one language formula, especially when they belong to socioeconomically deprived groups?

10. This tendency has been less pronounced in Europe for a variety of reasons. First, the socioeconomic status of immigrants is generally lower, as is the desire of majority parents to see their children mingling with immigrant students. Second, the popularity of multilingualism is heavily influenced by the process of

the construction of Europe, and a clear hierarchy exists there between community (i.e., members of the European community) and extracommunity languages.

11. Research (Johnson & Acera 1999; Sammons, Hillman, & Mortimore 1995) also shows that other conditions are needed, such as a high-quality program, dedication of teachers, and their belief in the capacity of students to succeed, as well as effective leadership from the school principal. But these factors are not related to the presence or absence of immigrant languages in the curriculum.

12. A good example of the contrast between these two positions in reference to a specific issue such as honor killing is found in Unni Wikan's chapter in this volume.

13. As for the issue of common schooling, it is also likely that the impact of globalization on the lesser or greater cultural gap between native-born and immigrant parents is ambiguous, as shown, for example, by the fact that across different countries, opponents and proponents of tolerance for the Muslim veil in public schools includes parents of all origins and religious backgrounds (McAndrew 2005).

14. For instance, persons of all origins or various cultural events found in learning material and in school; presence of individuals of various origins among the teaching staff; intercultural or interreligious aspects of the events celebrated and special activities conducted throughout the year. Mentor programs, as described in Maurice Crul's chapter in this volume, would also fall into this category.

15. For example, multilingual or culturally adapted information documents on the school system; implementation of special school outreach activities directed towards the community; intercultural training of teachers so as to provide them with a better understanding of student characteristics or enable them to vary their teaching strategies.

16. Generally in the social sciences, history, geography, and civic and moral education, in which case, these disciplines abandon their claim to universality and neutrality.

17. For example, adaptation of school cafeteria menus; tolerance of certain nonrecurring absences during major religious holidays; adaptation of the school uniform.

18. For instance, nonpresentation of elements deemed offensive in sexual education; setting up segregated male and female classes for physical education or for the teaching of all subject matters; warning teachers about any value judgment on matters deemed racist or sexist within the minority culture.

19. Actually, globalization might well enhance the necessity to do so, as comparative studies (McAndrew 1996b) have shown that, as borders become more porous, decision makers and public opinion seem to cling more than ever to their specificity regarding the preferred model of immigrant integration.

20. Such as those explored in Maurice Crul's chapter in this book between community (i.e., members of the European community) and extracommunity languages.

21. Although it certainly makes schooling a more enjoyable and a less alienating experience, as contributors to this volume all witnessed when we visited Tensta Gymnasium.

REFERENCES

Anderson, T., and M. Boyer, (1970). *Bilingual schooling in the United States.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Anisef, P., J.-G. Blais, M. McAndrew, C. Ungerleider, and R. Sweet (2004). *Academic performance and educational mobility of youth of immigrant origin in Canada: What can we learn from provincial data banks?* Rapport de recherche. Ottawa: CIC (Citizenship and Immigration Canada).

Artigal, J. P. (1991). *The Catalan Immersion Program: A European point of view.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Astor Stave, S. (1995). *Achieving racial balance: Case studies of contemporary school desegregation.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Ball, S. (1993). Education market choice and social class: The market as a class strategy in the UK and the US. *British Journal of Sociologic Education* 14(1): 3–17.

Ballantyne, J. H. (1989). *The sociology of education: A systematic analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banks, J. A. (1988). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice.* 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. A., and C. A. McGee-Banks (1995). *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* New York: Macmillan.

Bernatchez, S., and G. Bourgeault (1999). La prise en compte de la diversité culturelle et religieuse à l'école publique et l'obligation d'accommodement—Aperçu des législations et des jurisprudences au Canada, aux États-Unis, en France et en Grande-Bretagne. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada* 31(1): 159–171.

Berque, J. (1985). *L'immigration à l'école de la République.* Rapport d'un groupe de réflexion remis au ministre de l'Éducation Nationale, Centre national de documentation pédagogique. Paris: La Documentation française.

Bourgeault, G., F. Gagnon, M. McAndrew, and M. Pagé (2002). Recognition of cultural and religious diversity in the educational systems of liberal democracies. In *Citizenship in transformation.* Y. Hébert, ed. Pp. 81–92. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Camilleri, C., J. Kastersztein, E. M. Lipansky, H. Malewska-Peyre, I. Taboada-Leonetti, and A. Vasquez (1990). *Stratégies identitaires.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Cicéri, C. (1999). *Le foulard islamique à l'école publique: Analyse comparée du débat dans la presse française et québécoise francophone (1994–1995).* Working paper. Montréal: Immigration et métropoles.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice.* Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.

Commission for Racial Equality (1990). *Schools of faith: Religious schools in a multicultural society.* London: CRE.

Cummins, J. (1979). The language and culture issue on the education of minority language children. *Interchange* 10(4): 72–88.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students.* Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Dei, G. (1996). *Antiracist education: Theory and practice.* Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.

De Vos, G., and M. Suárez-Orozco (1990). *Status inequality: The self in culture.* Cross-cultural research and methodology series, no. 15. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Driessen, G. W. J. M., and J. J. Bezemer (1999). Background and achievement levels of Islamic schools in the Netherlands: Are the reservations justified? *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 2(2): 235–256.

Dolson, D. P., and J. Mayer (1992). Longitudinal study of three program models for language minority students: A critical examination of reported findings. *Bilingual Research Journal* 16(1–2): 105–157.

First Amendment Center (1999a). *Teacher guide to religion in the public school.* Washington, DC.

First Amendment Center (1999b). *Public school and religious communities.* Washington, DC.

Fishman, J. (1976). *Bilingual education: An international sociological perspective.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Galindo, R. (1997). Language wars: The ideological dimensions of the debates on bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal* 21(2–3) (Spring–Summer): 103–141.

Galston, W. (1991). *Liberal purposes.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gautherin, J. (2000). Au nom de la laïcité, Pénélope et Jules Ferry. In *L'école dans plusieurs mondes.* J.-L. Derouet, ed. Bruxelles: De Boecke.

Gibson, M., and J. Ogbu (1991). *Minority status and schooling: A comparative study of immigrants and involuntary minorities.* New York: Garland.

Gillborn, D. (1995). *Racism and antiracism in real schools: Theory, policy, practices.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Glazer, N. (1997). *We are all multiculturalists now.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glenn, J. U., and E. De Jong (1996). *Educating immigrant children: Schools and language minorities in twelve nations.* New York: Garland.

Greene, J. (1998). *A Meta-analysis of the effectiveness of bilingual education.* Claremont, CA: Thomas Rivera Policy Center.

Grinter, R. (1992). Multicultural or antiracist education? The need to choose. In *Cultural diversity and the schools, Volume one: Education for cultural diversity: Convergence and divergence.* J. Lynch, C. Modgil, and S. Modgil eds. London: Falmer Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guttman, A. (1987). *Democratic education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language. The debate on bilingualism.* New York: Basic Books.

Halstead, J. M. (1986). *The case for Muslim voluntary aided schools: Some philosophical reflections.* London: Islamic Academy.

Hohl, J., and M. Normand (1996). La prise en compte de la diversité culturelle et religieuse dans les normes et pratiques de gestion des établissements scolaires:

balises psychopédagogiques. *Revue française de pédagogie* (October-December): 39–52.

Holmes, B. (1981). *Comparative education: Some considerations of method.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Homan, R. (1992). Separate schools. In *Cultural diversity and the schools, Volume one: Education for cultural diversity: convergence and divergence* J. Lynch, C. Modgil, and S. Modgil, eds. Pp. 59–72. London: Falmer Press.

Johnson, J., and R. Acera (1999). *Hope for urban education: A study of nine high performing, high poverty urban elementary schools.* Report on method to the U.S. Department of Education Planning and Evaluation Services. Houston: Charles A. Donna Center, University of Texas.

Katz, J. Y. (1992). Educational interventions for prejudice reduction and integration in elementary schools. In *Cultural diversity and the schools, volume two: Prejudice, polemics, or progress?* J. Lynch, C. Modgil, and S. Modgil, eds. Pp. 257–271. London: Falmer Press.

Kepel, G. (1989). L'intégration suppose que soit brisée la logique communautaire. In *École et intégration des immigrés.* Problèmes politiques et sociaux, no. 693. C. Wihtol de Wenden and A. M. Chartier, eds. Paris: La Documentation française.

Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education.* Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Laferrière, M. (1983). L'éducation des enfants des groupes minoritaires au Québec: De la définition des problèmes par les groupes eux-mêmes à l'intervention de l'État. *Sociologie et société* 15(2): 117–132.

Lantheaume, F. (2002) *L'enseignement de l'histoire de la colonisation et de la decolonisation de l'Algérie depuis les années trente: État-nation, identité nationale, critique et valeurs. Essai de sociologie du curriculum.* Paris: EHESS, INRP.

Lê Thanh K. (1981). *L'éducation comparée.* Paris: Armand Colin.

Leman, J. (1999). School as a structuring force in interethnic hybridism. *International Journal of Educational Research* 31: chapter 8, 341–353.

Lorcerie, F. (1996). À propos de la crise de la laïcité en France: dissonnance normative. In *Pluralisme, citoyenneté et éducation,* F. Gagnon, M. McAndrew, and M. Pagé, eds. Pp. 121–136. Montréal: L'Harmattan.

Lorcerie, F., and M. McAndrew (1993) Modèles, transferts et échanges d'expériences en éducation: le cas de l'éducation interculturelle en France et au Québec. In *Modèles, transferts et échanges d'expériences en éducation: Nécessité d'une analyse conceptuelle et d'une réflexion méthodologique.* R. Toussaint and O. Galatanu, eds. Pp. 203–219. Actes du 21e colloque annuel de l'Association Francophone d'Éducation Comparée, 1995. Trois-Rivières: Publications de l'Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières.

Mackey, W. (1970). A typology of bilingual education. In *Bilingual schooling in the United States.* T. Anderson and M. Boyer, eds. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Mahieu, P. (1999). Minorities, policies and strategies in Europe: A Belgian (Flemish) view. In *Cultural identities and ethnic minorities in Europe.* D. Turton and J. Gonzalez, eds. Pp. 35–42. Bilbao, Spain: University of Deusto.

McAndrew, M. (1996a). "Diversité culturelle et religieuse: divergences des rhétoriques, convergences des pratiques?" In *Pluralisme, citoyenneté et éducation*. F. Gagnon, M. McAndrew, and M. Pagé, eds. Pp. 287–317. Montréal: Éditions l'Harmattan.

McAndrew, M. (1996b). Model of common schooling and interethnic relations: A comparative analysis of policies and practices in the United States, Israel, and Northern Ireland. *Compare* 26(3): 333–345.

McAndrew, M. (2001). *Immigration et diversité à l'école. Le débat québécois dans une perspective comparative*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

McAndrew, M. (2002). Ethnic relations and education in divided societies: Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities* 1: 5–19.

McAndrew, M. (2003a). School spaces and the construction of ethnic relations: Conceptual and policy debates. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada* 35(2): 14–29.

McAndrew, M. (2003b). Should national minorities/majorities share common institutions or control their own schools? A comparison of policies and debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland, and Catalonia. In *The social construction of diversity: Recasting the master narrative of industrial nations*. D. Juteau and C. Harzig, eds. Pp. 369–424. New York: Berghahn Press.

McAndrew, M. (2005). The hijab controversies in Western public schools: Contrasting conceptions of ethnicity and ethnic relations. In *The making of the Islamic diaspora*. S. Rahnema and H. Moghissi, eds. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

McAndrew, M., and C. Cicéri (1998). Immigration, diversity, and multilingual education: The Canadian example. *Zeitschrift für internationale erziehungs- und socialwissenschaftliche Forschung* 15(2): 295–322.

McAndrew, M., and M. Ledoux (1998). Identification et evaluation de l'impact relative des facteurs influençant la dynamique de concentration ethnique dans les écoles de langue française de l'île de Montréal. *Revue canadienne des sciences régionales* 20(1–2): 195–216.

McAndrew, M., C. Cicéri, and M. Jacquet (1997). La prise en compte de la diversité culturelle et religieuse dans les normes et pratiques de gestion des établissements scolaires: Une étude exploratoire dans cinq provinces canadiennes. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation* 23(1): 209–232.

McDonnell, M. W. (1992). Accommodation of religions: An update and a response to the critics. *George Washington Review* 60: 685–687.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education* 21(3): 235–250.

McMillan, Robert. (2001). Competition, parental involvement, and public school performance. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Tax Association* (93rd, Santa Fe, NM, November 9–11, 2000). Washington, DC: National Tax Association.

Morelli, A. (ed.) (1992). *Histoire des étrangers et de l'immigration en Belgique de la préhistoire à nos jours*. Bruxelles: Éditions EVO et CBAI, collection EVO-Histoire.

Nagel, T. (1994). *Égalité et partialité*. C. Beauvillard, trans. Paris: PUF.

Nash, G. B. (1996). Multiculturalism and history: Historical perspectives and present prospects. In *Public education in a multicultural society. Policy, theory, critique*. R. K. Fullinwider, ed. Pp. 183–202. New York: Cambridge University Press.

National Research Council (1997). *Improving schooling for language minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Committee on Developing a Research Agenda on the Education of Limited English Proficiency and Bilingual Students.

OECD. See Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1987). *L'éducation multiculturelle*. Paris: Centre pour l'innovation et la recherche en éducation.

Orfield, G., and S. E. Eaton (1996). *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of* Brown vs. Board of Education. Harvard Project on School Desegregation. New York: New Press.

Pagé, M. (in collaboration with J. Provencher and D. Ramirez) (1993). *Courants d'idées actuels en éducation des clientèles scolaires multiethniques*. Québec: CSE.

Painchaud, G., A. d'Anglejan, F. Armand, and M. Jesak (1993). Diversité culturelle et littératie. In Pluralisme et éducation: Perspectives québécoises. M. McAndrew, ed. Special issue, *Repères, Essais en éducation* 15: 77–94.

Palmer, H. (1984). Reluctant host: Anglo-Canadian views of multiculturalism in the 20th century. In *Cultural diversity and Canadian education*. J. Mallea and C. J. Young, eds. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Parsons, T., and R. Bales, eds. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. New York: Free Press.

Paulston, C. (1980). *Bilingual education: Theories and issues*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Payet, J. P. (1999). L'école et la question de l'immigration en France. Une mise à l'épreuve. In *Les politiques d'immigration et d'intégration au Canada et en France: Analyses comparées et perspectives de recherche*. M. McAndrew, A. C. Découfflé, and C. Cicéri, eds. Pp. 353–369. Paris: Ministère de l'Emploi et de la Solidarité sociale; Ottawa: CRSH.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research, *Psychological Bulletin* 108(3): 499–514.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Renaerts, M. (1999). Processes of homogenization in the Muslim educational world in Brussels. *International Journal of Educational Research* 31: chapter 3, 283–294.

Sammons, P., J. Hillman, and P. Mortimore (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. London: University of London Institute of Education.

Samuda, R., J. W. Berry, and M. Laferrière, eds. (1983). *Multiculturalism in Canada: Social and educational perspectives*. Toronto: Allyn & Bacon.

Schwartz, W. (1996). How well are charter schools serving urban and minority students? *ERIC/CUE Digest* (219).

Shahid, W., and P. Van Koningsveld (1996). Politics and Islam in Western Europe: An introduction. In *Muslims in the margin: Political responses to the presence*

of Islam in Western Europe. W. Shahid and P. Van Koningsveld, eds. Pp. 1–14. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos.

Smith, A. (1981). *The ethnic revival.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., and M. Suárez-Orozco (2001). *Children of immigration.* The Developing Child series. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C., and I. L. G. Todorova (2003). Understanding the social world of immigrant youth. In *New directions for youth development: Theory, practice, and research.* G. Noam and S. Barry, eds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suárez-Orozco, C., M. Suárez-Orozco, and F. Doucet (2003). The academic engagement and achievement of Latino youth. In *Handbook of research on multicultural education.* 2nd ed. J. A. Banks and C. A. McGee Banks, eds. Pp. 420–437. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stasi, B. (2003). *Rapport au président de la République.* Rapport de la Commission de réflexion sur l'application du principe de laïcité dans la République. December 11. Paris.

Swann, L. (1985). *Education for All.* Final report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority. CMND 9453. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thornberry, P., and D. Gibbons (1997). Education and minority rights: A short survey of international standards. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 4(2), 115–152.

Touraine, A (1994). *Qu'est-ce que la démocratie?* Paris: Fayard.

U.S. Department of Education (1999). *The state of charter schools.* Third Year Report. National Study of Charter Schools. May. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement; National Institute on Student Achievement Curriculum and Assessment. www.head.gov/pubs/chartertrdyear/title.html.

Van Haecht, A. (1998). Les politiques éducatives: figures exemplaires des politiques publiques. *Éducation et Sociétés, numéro spécial L'éducation, l'État et le Local,* 1. Revue internationale de sociologie de l'éducation. Paris: INRP; Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Van Zanten, A. (1997). Territerriolisation et recomposition des politiques, des modes de fonctionnement et des pratiques de scolarisation dans les milieux difficiles. In *La scolarisation dans les milieux difficiles: politique, processus et pratiques.* A. Van Zanten, ed. Paris: Institut national de recherches pédagogiques, Centre Alain Savary.

Walford, G. (1996). Diversity and choice in school education: An alternative view. *Oxford Review of Education* 22(2): 143–154.

Waugh, E. H., S. McIrvin Abu-Laban, and R. Burckhardt Qureshi, eds. (1991). *Muslim families in North America.* Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Willis, C. W., and M. Alves (1996). *Controlled choice: A new approach to desegregated education and school improvement.* Providence, RI: Education Alliance Press; New England Desegregation Assistance Center, Brown University.