

**MULTICULTURAL PRACTICES OF CANADIAN IMMIGRANT YOUTH:
"A WORK IN PROGRESS"**

by

ROBERTA A. BISARO

B.Com., The University of British Columbia, 1989

B.Ed., The University of British Columbia, 1998

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of Individual Interdisciplinary Studies Graduate Program)

**We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
November 2003**

©Roberta A. Bisaro, 2003

Library Authorization

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

ROBERTA A. BISARO

Name of Author (*please print*)

19/12/2003

Date (dd/mm/yyyy)

Title of Thesis: MULTICULTURAL PRACTICES OF CANADIAN IMMIGRANT YOUTH: "A WORK IN PROGRESS"

Degree: Master of Arts

Year: 2004

Department of Individual Interdisciplinary Studies Graduate Program

The University of British Columbia

Vancouver, BC Canada

ABSTRACT

This ethnographic study is placed in a space between the principles and laws that come under the purview of multiculturalism and the way in which they are received and enacted in the everyday lives of student groups at a secondary school in Vancouver, BC. Using de Certeau's "logic of action," I view student multicultural practices as viewed as a set of "tactics" measured according to a principle of "usefulness" set against an official or ideological background of rights and privileges within a multiculturalism of mutual respect, integration, harmonious intergroup relations, social cohesion and a shared sense of Canadian identity. Student expressions of "distinctness," belonging and identity are examined using Charles Taylor's approach to a "Canadian multiculturalism." Student groups within a locale transform multiculturalism as policy into a *tactical* multiculturalism of "distinctness" in which *propriety* further suggests a multiculturalism based on recognition and individual rights.

Using the ideas of Charles Taylor and Will Kymlicka, a system of "strong" (cohesive) and "weak" (fragmenting) multiculturalism is identified in the practices of three institutionally composed groups of students – "ESL," "Regular," and "IB." This system is further nuanced by taking account of a richly textured "background" or context in which multiculturalism is practiced. I arrived at an idea of *multiculturality*, a *stylistic* spectrum that varies from a passive multiculturalism of "distinctness" with its emphasis stereotypical and bounded forms, to an active style that looks more to historical contingencies and dynamics of context consistent with a Taylorian multiculturalism of dialogue, a discussion of value moving towards a "fusion of horizons" (Gadamer). Based on the study, some suggestions are made regarding pedagogical directions with respect to *multiculturality*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Chapter I Introduction	1
Chapter II The Background of Canadian Multiculturalism	5
2.1 History and Politics of Canadian Multiculturalism	6
2.2 Critique of Canadian multiculturalism	8
2.3 Towards a Working Definition	12
2.4 Education and Citizenship	18
2.5 Multicultural Policy: Education and Nation	19
Chapter III Everyday Practice in a Vancouver Secondary School: A Field Study	25
3.1. Ethnography – a Practice	25
3.2. The School	28
3.3. Student Practices in the School	29
3.3.1. Practices of "Newcomers"	29
3.3.2. Practices of Regular Program Students	32
3.3.3. Practices of "IB" Program Students	38
3.4. Student Practices as "Propriety"	41
3.4.1. Language and Space in <i>The Practice of Everyday Life</i>	42
3.4.2. Habitable Space as "Neighbourhood"	46
Chapter IV Multicultural Practice as a Critique of Policy	53
4.1 Types of Multicultural Practices	57
4.2 Student Practices as Styles of Multiculturality	61
Chapter V Summary and Pedagogical Direction	65
5.1 Pedagogical Directions	68
Bibliography	75
Appendix I – Terminology	83
Appendix II – Transcription Conventions	86
Appendix III – Chronology of Canadian Multicultural Legislation	87
Appendix IV – Parliamentary Action	89
Appendix V – Parental Consent Form	90
Appendix VI – Canadian Multiculturalism Act	92
Appendix VII – Multicultural Practice by Student Groups	95
Appendix VIII – VSB Policy on <i>Non-Discrimination</i> (File AC)	96

List of Tables

Table 1 Characteristics of Weak and Strong Multiculturalism 24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to my committee who have helped me greatly in class assignments, personal discussions, and their own scholarly work. I am especially grateful for the guidance and mentoring of Dr. Dawn Currie through the long process from class student to MA thesis. Dr. David Ley's teaching, scholarship, and private discussions on immigration have helped me immensely. Dr. Kevin Mcneilly's willingness to provide an independent study course along with his regular teaching on critical theory were indispensable and formative to my access to basic ideas. Dr. John Willinsky guided me with his own scholarly example and critique. In the process of my research, I was assisted in the first place by every secondary school student who agreed to give their time to this study. Without their help there would have been no thesis. In addition, I would like to extend special appreciation to both the principal and several teachers and staff of the school where the study took place. Many other professors, instructors, students, and colleagues provided me with ideas, assistance, and support without which I could not have negotiated the intricate paths of Interdisciplinary Studies and the MA program.

Chapter I

Introduction

Canadian multiculturalism grows out of an ideologically liberal tradition germinated in the publicly articulated policies of Pierre Elliot Trudeau (Prime Minister of Canada, 1968-1984):

A policy of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework commends itself to the government as the most suitable means of assuring the cultural freedom of Canadians... National unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one's own identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions. (Trudeau 1971)

Since the time of Trudeau, we have seen a constant development of multiculturalism in such diverse ways as in the establishment of a federal *Department of Multiculturalism* in 1991, the restatement and adaptation of multicultural policies at the provincial and local levels, and even in a beer commercial—"I am Canadian." In fact, usually this rhetoric (persuasive symbols) comes to mind first when one thinks of Canadian multiculturalism. A frequent critique of multicultural legislation and policy is that it often appears merely symbolic because it is unaccompanied by funding; that is, it entails no action.¹ Carrying this dichotomy between what is said and what is practiced to a deeper level, the question arises of how these symbolic representations take form in daily lives and daily activities of ordinary people. The focus of my study is the interaction between these two levels, namely, *symbolic*, including especially policies and critical discussions of the content of multiculturalism, and *practical*, focusing on the doings of everyday life situations, in particular those of a defined group within the educational sphere.

The objective of my thesis is to interrogate and analyze the gap between multicultural policy and practices of multiculturalism. Specifically, I explore how youth in a Vancouver, British Columbia secondary school environment understand, negotiate and "use" the conventions of "multiculturalism." Multiculturalism in the schools, as explicit policy and implicit *background*, is congruent with national multicultural policy. The latter grows out of a tradition of liberalism as an ideal expression of Canadian society which in turn gives rise to a multiculturalism of individual rights, especially as a rhetorical vehicle for social justice, as seen in Trudeau's statement above. Formed again at the local level, these policies, diversely received and enacted, enter into the everyday lives of students. The everyday practices of students are

expressions of an understanding of multiculturalism and thus create a "rhetoric of practice" that stands alongside the multicultural rhetoric of policy.

The policies and rhetoric of multiculturalism come to life in response to specific historical factors, within a specific society, namely, Canadian society. In order to understand the implications of education multicultural policy, I begin with a discussion of the *background* through a historical, political and critical discussion of Canadian multiculturalism. By examining both the content and context of multiculturalism, I can identify two tendencies may be identified, one focusing on rights, both individual and group rights, and the other focussing on Canadian society. Both are contained in the Trudeau statement and reproduced in education policy, which forms the immediate context for the study of student practice.

The next chapter, an ethnography of a secondary school population, investigates the ways or styles of socially *marking* the gap opened up by various student practices (de Certeau 1984, 21). In this chapter, three distinct student groups emerge: one group having a strong feeling for individual rights; another group adopting practices which extend individual rights to geographically and linguistically coherent groups; a third group combining the two preceding multicultural practices while also critically discussing, challenging and sometimes self-consciously violating norms. All three groups make "use" of policy through everyday practices to create "habitable" spaces marked by behavioural rules or norms.

Student practices are then studied in the light of Michel de Certeau's "two logics of actions." De Certeau uses this scheme to develop an investigation into the identity of a culture or cultural group as maintained through reformulation of received "representations of another." His work grows out of studies of colonized groups *making use* of the representations articulated by the colonizers. Extending this work to the everyday practices of groups, de Certeau maintains that groups have the means to challenge the dominant power structure by using the existing (dominant) social order to deflect that power. Though groups do not have the means to directly challenge the structure, "they escape it without leaving it" (1984, xiii).

I then analyze this combination of policy and practices through the lens of various discussions of multiculturalism with particular attention to the work of Charles Taylor, whom I see as a prime figure in the articulation of mainstream "Canadian multiculturalism," as well as its critic. Taylor's discussion of cultural *survivance* and "distinct society" considers the extension of individual rights to the group and relations amongst groups and collective identities. I argue that Charles Taylor articulates a position of liberal multiculturalism that is closely shared with policy

makers and grows out of a *background* and public discourse common to both educators and policy makers.

My research interests arise out of my own background as an immigrant coming to Canada in my early school years and as a teacher in a school system that has reflected the rapid demographic changes occurring in Canada during the 1980's and 1990's. As a child studying and as an adult teaching in a high school, I have been sensitized to the practices of inclusion and exclusion, important for the notion of "identity," that occur among youth of differing cultural groups. These practices are not much discussed among teaching colleagues nor, I noticed, were students in my classrooms actively interested in engaging in a dialogue regarding these practices. On one occasion, not atypical, I was struck by the variety of ways in which multiculturalism could be understood and practiced when I questioned a practice of segregation in the classroom. Students responded that "multiculturalism" means they can maintain any practice they wished, whether it involves speaking their language of origin or associating with whom they wished. The challenge as a teacher was to provide a more integrative classroom environment in which students could go beyond practices of exclusion. While I observed that newcomers were more open to integrative practices, other students remained resistant, preferring to associate on the basis of language, geographic origin and observed similarities. Since students said they based their actions on "multiculturalism," I was prompted to query the notion of "multiculturalism" as a practice of inclusion and exclusion. As a study in the social field of education, a further objective is to determine a pedagogical direction that can be implemented as a result of a deeper and more systematic understanding of everyday student practices.

Policy makers have represented "Canadian multiculturalism" as a multiculturalism that includes ideas of mutual respect, integration, harmonious intergroup relations, social cohesion and a shared sense of Canadian identity – Trudeau's "national unity... founded on confidence in one's own identity." Charles Taylor, as a philosopher on the topic of "multiculturalism", added his voice in further defining a "liberal Canadian multiculturalism" to accord respect and recognition to all cultural *groups*. Against this background, both individuals and groups organize spaces; engage in multiple procedures and practices; enact and fail to enact; speak words or leave them unspoken; and make additional statements through behaviours prescribed, interdicted or ignored.

Charles Taylor views education as primary terrain on which multicultural recognition takes form and accordingly reflects the values of one or more cultural communities. De Certeau

not only states that education is a culturally certified model, he asserts that it is also a system based on rules insuring the "system's production, repetition, and verification" (24). In order to understand the variety of cultural interactions, this study takes place in a school with a large number of newcomers. Newcomers to Canada, for the most part, have a partial understanding of the background discourses of Canadian multiculturalism. Observing the "enculturation" of this group to Canadian multiculturalism is a first step in identifying the everyday practices of inclusion/exclusion as they "progress" through the education system. Currently, in schools newcomers who are not proficient in the English language are separated from other students and are gradually brought into the "Regular"² schooling as they become more proficient in English.

This study is a critical ethnography using a multimethod approach that follows the practices of students through observations, structured and semi-structured interviewing, and written class assignments. I attempt to identify the various expressions of multiculturalism as evidenced by student practices and such foregrounded practices are analyzed using Michel de Certeau's "cultural logic," applying his notions of *strategies*, *tactics* and *propriety*. Michel de Certeau³ recognized that "each individual is a locus in which an incoherent... plurality of [social] relational determinations interact" (1984, xi) and consequently a disjuncture between policy and practice will occur as individuals appropriate institutional policy for the purpose of making it "habitable" through their everyday practices. This study will explore that "space" (*espace*) where the everyday realities are constantly being produced by the practices of living. In examining expressions and practices of multiculturalism and looking at both education policies and student practices, I hope to bring out perspectives on Canadian multiculturalism that will enhance the understanding of Canadian multiculturalism as part of the social fabric of the country as conveyed through educational *strategies*. In the main, this study looks to the different expressions or practices of multiculturalism and whether there is congruity or disjuncture between policy and practice and to what degree, and for what stated or observed reasons.

Chapter II

The Background of Canadian Multiculturalism

Since the 1970's, the population of Canada has experienced a rapid change in its ethnic and racial composition from predominantly European to a more diverse population reflecting a global flow of peoples, goods and knowledge that Ong (1999) and Martin (1998, 121-150) refer to as "transnational." Increasing globalization and a general consensus on the "value" of immigration resulted in changes in Canadian immigration policies in 1967 that added to the diverse nature of this population. Along with these changes has come a federal policy of multiculturalism and a general trend or sense - or perhaps even ideology - that multiculturalism somehow expresses "Canadianness."

Public discussion became evident during the late 1980's and early 1990's when multicultural policies were a part of the national unity question, debated by the Reform Party, the Conservatives and the Citizen's Forum⁴. Peter S. Li observed that, "both public acceptance of the ideal of a multicultural Canada and political disagreements over the multiculturalism policy have helped to publicize and further legitimize the concept of multiculturalism in Canada." They have brought the term and the idea not only to the public arena, but into "the lives of ordinary citizens" (1999, 171).

In everyday practice, such debates often provoke mixed and sometimes contradictory responses. In my experience, colleagues often meet a discussion about "multiculturalism," with some reluctance. This reluctance is reminiscent of the experience of writers such as Neil Bissoondath whose "attempts to contribute to public discourse have been met with nervous silence..." (1994, 4-5). In another example, a local newspaper noted that its series of articles on immigration was condemned by the city council as "stirring up race relations..." (Editorial, *Richmond Review*, February 28, 1996).⁵ Clearly, the range of views in public discourse is very great but also lacking a consistent and determined dialogue and characterized by silences. Although it is very difficult to speak about reluctance and unspokenness, these boundaries are an important part of the expression of multiculturalism, both in policy and public discourse. Because the latter is a crucial issue in the various directions of a developing multiculturalism, and especially where boundaries are met (and sometimes transgressed) in the ethnography, I address these responses near the end of my study.

The process of uncovering this public discussion reveals a variety of views as to what constitutes "multiculturalism." I intend to pick out some of the main strands in this public discussion and to follow these as they take shape in education policy. Along with this, I also attempt a "working definition" of multiculturalism.

2.1 History and Politics of Canadian Multiculturalism

The politics of multiculturalism in Canada have been squarely located within liberal notions of nation and equality (Anderson 1999, 43-51; Kymlicka 1995; Taylor 1994). I note at the outset that multiculturalism as liberalism may be seen as a "conventional wisdom of order, rationality, and hierarchy brought by industrialization and globalization" (Li 1999, 168-70), legitimizing the unequal distribution of power that is reflective of colonialist and imperialist relations of power and domination. As a study in the social field of everyday student practices, my intention is to take a critical stance towards objectivity by relating to and situating my research in the local, and by providing a context, a history and a "standpoint" (Rogers 1998; Smith 1999; Hartsock 1983). With these cautions, I sketch the development of multiculturalism and consider some of its directions in Canada.

Multiculturalism in the Canadian context is a recent phenomenon arising as a result of a 20th century demographic reality. An Angus Reid Group opinion survey on "Canadian Respondents Indicating Who or What Multiculturalism Refers To"⁶ has shown that Canadians are somewhat unclear on the term "multiculturalism." Peter Li noted that when asked the above question responses varied widely. Of the group polled, 76% considered it to refer to "Canadians of every ancestry" while at the same time 49% agreed that it referred to "Non-white immigrants;" 73% indicated that it referred to "Immigrants, regardless of colour," while 67% indicated that it referred to "Cultural or racial minority groups." Of this group, 54% felt that multiculturalism referred to "Non-British, non-French Canadians." while 44% felt that multiculturalism referred to the "Relationship between Quebec and the rest of Canada" (1999, 160). Confusion is evident as a single respondent may indicate that Canadian multiculturalism refers to both "Canadians of every ancestry" and "Non-white immigrants." As a normative concept the term stands for a "Canadian pluralism" in opposition to the American assimilationist ideal of a "melting pot." Li observed that, although Canadians had difficulty in defining multiculturalism, most had something to say about it, "not so much over what version of multiculturalism to accept but what emphasis was to be attributed to multiculturalism" (1999, 247-8).

Despite having an official policy of multiculturalism and being historically and constitutionally comprised of both British and French, as well as First Nations, Canada has not been without internal difficulties. These difficulties have origins in what Weinfeld and Wilkinson (62-63) describe as the "Canadian mosaic." In the period up to 1961, European immigration accounted for 90.4% of the total population.⁷ By the period between 1991-1996, this trend had inverted dramatically with only 19% of Canadian immigration originating from Europe, while 57.1% was from Asia.⁸ Historically, immigration in Canada was based on a "nationality" preferential system (57) grounded on the idea that some ethnic groups were inferior to British and French cultures – "Eastern Europeans, Southern Europeans and in particular Asians" – while others were "stigmatized" as "dangerous foreigners" based on their political orientations. Dangerous foreigners included "Ukrainians, Finns and Jews" (57-58).

During the late 1960's, Pierre Trudeau's program of "nation-building" began as he faced a growing nationalism and an independence movement in Quebec that began with the formation of the Parti Quebecois in 1968 (Keating 1997, 177). Trudeau's vision of a "united Canada" accommodated Francophone-Anglophone differences by implementing a national policy of bilingualism enshrined in the *Official Languages Act* (1969) along with a policy of multiculturalism that ensured individual rights, particularly to Canada's ethnic minorities. Trudeau's announcement of a multicultural policy on October 8, 1971, was seen by many Francophones as reducing them to "just one of a multiplicity of ethnic groups rather than a co-founding people" (175; Li 1999, 157; Abu-Laban and Stasiulis 1992, 367-370). Thus, the announcement of this policy was viewed as a political stratagem in response to the growing nationalism and independence movement in Quebec.

Many critics of multicultural policy in Canada take the position that the policy is in the service of, subordinated to "nation building." Among them, Raymond Breton argues that Canada's multiculturalism policy, while redefining the symbolic order to incorporate those other than British or French origin in public institutions, was well suited to the Trudeau government's political agenda. The endorsement by that government of a "two nation" Canada undermined an independent Quebec (Breton 1988, 38-39). Hawkins (1988, 17) suggests that the Liberal Party of Canada adopted multiculturalism to win ethnic votes in anticipation of losing much of its traditional support from Quebec as it moved towards independence.⁹ In fact, the *Multiculturalism Act* of 1988, Bill C-23, 1988¹⁰ (hereafter referred to simply as the *Multiculturalism Act*) clearly states that it is "An Act for the preservation and enhancement of

multiculturalism in Canada" (refer to Appendix VI, Canadian Multiculturalism Act), hence is overtly "Canadian."

Under Trudeau, there had been an attempt to build a Canadian identity that included provincial equality and policies of bilingualism and multiculturalism that would satisfy the rights of Francophones and minority populations respectively (Keating 1997, 180). Constitutional reform that continued after the patriation of the Canadian Constitution in 1982 obscured the multicultural debate. Quebec had opted out of the constitutional process insisting on, among other changes, its recognition as a "distinct society." Subsequently, the failure of the Meech Lake Accord (1987) saw a rising demand by other groups, including First Nation peoples who sought "constitutional guarantees for their status" (181). Under continuing pressure by Quebec towards separation, a proposed Charlottetown Accord (1992) was to satisfy the demands of an increasing number of interests: Quebec as a "distinct society;" aboriginal people's "inherent right" to self-government; racial and gender equality; social advocates sought a nationwide health care system; education and social services and labour groups opposed internal free-trade (182). Ultimately, the Accord too failed to win endorsement.

In 1987, minority groups under the umbrella of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council¹¹ argued that the 1987 Constitutional Accord placed "linguistic duality" *above* "the multicultural aspect" of Canadian Society" (Canada, Senate and House of Commons 1987, 7, 42, as cited in Li 1999, 156). However, Pierre Trudeau's intent was made clear in his October 1971 speech in which he places multiculturalism policy "*within* a bilingual framework" (Trudeau 1971, 8545). Whether the rights of language and culture are seen either as hierarchical (institutional over individual) or equal (or even different), the policy-makers have clearly articulated two main categories of cultural identity—English and Francophone—two features that are seen in the practices studied below.

2.2 Critique of Canadian multiculturalism

In the midst of constitutional reform, the federal government had to balance recognition of Quebec as a "distinct" society with cultural protection of minority groups. To demonstrate federal commitment to multiculturalism, a new Department of Multiculturalism was formed in 1991. The creation of this department was to bring about the institutionalization of programs that emphasized cross-cultural understanding and social and economic integration through removal of discrimination barriers, institutional change and affirmative action in order to equalize opportunity. This change was more symbolic than substantive. Such symbolic

recognition explains why institutions are not provided the financial support to make the necessary changes to incorporate multiculturalism (Li 1999, 157; Henry and Tator 1999, 96; Wideen and Barnard 1998; Raymond Breton 1999). One such instance is Bill C-37, the *Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act*. The purpose of this Act was to establish an institute to implement national standards for teacher training and curriculum content for ethnic minority language classes in Canada. However, progression was never funded by government (refer to Appendix IV, Parliamentary Action). Curriculum models and policies have been put into place to promote "cultural understanding"; "cultural competence" and "cultural emancipation" in bilingual and bicultural education programs directed towards minority cultures and to promote multicultural education. However the funding to make these necessary changes never materialized (McCarthy 1995, 21-44).

The responses to symbolic changes cannot be described in simplistic terms nor merely described as "openness or resistance to change, tolerance or prejudice, or as informed or misinformed" (Breton 1999, 306).¹² The effects of such changes have more to do with a group's self-identity, including a group's perception of their own cultural group – who is included and excluded and upon what criteria; what "cultural paradigms" are used in the interpretation of sociocultural diversity; how status and recognition are allocated, and how cultural values and practices are evaluated (306). These features directly address student practices studied below.

Breton's views are captured by that quintessentially Canadian (at least since the 1960's) question, "What is a Canadian?" As an immigrant young adult in the 1960's and 1970's, I often described myself in the hyphenated form while distancing my "Canadianness" from "Americanness." It was rare to hear the discourse of multiculturalism during this time. In the late 1980's and 1990's, however, a discourse of respect, tolerance and diversity was to emerge in publicly expressed notions of Canadian identity and multiculturalism. In 1991 a Royal Commission under the direction of Keith Spicer toured Canada to obtain Canadian views on multiculturalism. The final report entitled the "Citizen's Forum on Canada's Future" indicated a consensus by the over 400,000 participants that multiculturalism was to emphasize what Canadians shared in common rather than repeat the stock reminder of different origins. As evidence of this consensus, the report quoted a Richmond, B.C. group as stating: "We are generally in favour of celebrating our cultural heritage... However, we must remain Canadian first ... We must have a strong core" (Spicer 1991, 85). Abu-Laban and Stasiulis are strongly critical of the report as a nation-building exercise (1992, 370). While they view multiculturalism

as providing and promoting its own norms and alternative ground rules, they see multiculturalism as a work in progress and "a *precondition*" to, for example, racial justice and economic equality.

Not all critics of Canadian multiculturalism regard it as simply a neutral force neither homogenizing nor pre-empting meeting at least some of the symbolic/cultural needs of groups (Abu-Laban and Stasiulis 1991, 368; Breton 1999, 306; Newfield and Gordon 1996, 76-115). According to Abu-Laban and Stasiulis (1992), Quebec's criticism of the policy has focused primarily on the perceived denial of Quebec "distinctness." Critique from outside of Quebec can be divided into three types that argue that the policy is: 1) assimilationist and maintaining the status quo; 2) a political move which distracts from the "real interests of Canada's minority ethnic groups;" and 3) a neutral force. Henry and Tator (1999) fall into the first category of criticism. They maintain that the Canadian government continues to reproduce inequities in spite of the attempts made to give recognition to the diversity of peoples within Canada through the enactment of the *Multiculturalism Act*, and the granting of equal rights, through the implementation of laws such as the *Employment Equity Act* and the *Charter of Rights* (refer to Appendix III Chronology of Canadian Multicultural Legislation). In particular, they claim that racial inequality is deeply embedded within the political discourses and practices of a political system resistant to change; arguing further that it reflects the colonialist and imperialist relations of power and domination.

The second category of criticism focuses on the tendency within "everyday" multiculturalism to prioritize cultural aspects like festivals and ethnic foods, taking away from the socio-economic inequalities, in particular educational and religious rights of minorities. Magsino et al. (2000) noted that religious minorities receive a mixed message where the imposition in the classroom of any religion has been confirmed as constitutionally impermissible, but entitlement to government support for religious schools intended to preserve religions has been denied. Magsino et al. foresee the inclusion of group rights into not only the management and administration of schools, but also the curriculum (Magsino et al. 2000, 99). Aihwa Ong (1996), on the one hand, rejects the "culturalism" of multiculturalism in favour of the social categories of class and "race." Others such as Susan Moller Okin (1999) and Susan Wolf (1994), view gender as being neglected by multiculturalism. In a final refinement to Kymlicka's (1995) view of intragroup rights, Okin states her version of multiculturalism as a striving

"toward... issues of gender and other intragroup inequalities... that effectively treats all persons as each other's moral equals" (Okin 1999, 131).

In public discourse Canadian multiculturalism is frequently debated on the basis of equality (or equal rights). The equal status of Quebec vis-à-vis the rest of Canada; the rights of indigenous groups vis-à-vis all other groups; the rights of ethnic/cultural groups vis-à-vis other ethnic/cultural groups; and, the rights of socially defined groups (based on religion, sexual orientation, gender and so on) vis-à-vis all others are such examples.

Equality together with a related appeal for rights has problematized the notion of "multiculturalism." Abu-Laban and Stasiulis (1991, 372) argue "a combined effect of partisan debates on issues of multiculturalism and immigration" has been to move discourses of multicultural policy towards individual rights and away from "group rights through the subsumption of the pluralist notion of multiculturalism under the individualist notion of citizenship." In surveying the statements of the various political policies (late 1980's and early 1990's), Abu-Laban and Stasiulis (372-376) reveal a consensus on the nature of multiculturalism consistent with national and local multicultural policies which in turn reflect a liberal ideology based on individual rights. Abu-Laban and Stasiulis bring out an interesting dissenting voice in Liberal Member of Parliament Nunziata's 1989 observations that "the present policy of multiculturalism is divisive... It is regressive and at times discriminatory... segregating and ghettoizing Canadians of origins other than French or English," and should be replaced by discourse "promoting what we all have in common," namely, "the fact that we are all Canadian" (376). In spite of its emphasis on "Canadianness," Nunziata's position acknowledges a group-based pluralism and thus builds on a liberalism of individual rights toward a valuation of the contributions of those groups to the common polity. However, Abu-Laban and Stasiulis show that this argument had little effect, serving rather to underline the political emphasis on citizenship and individual rights.

Critiques of multicultural policy have raised issues of official recognition. To what extent is multiculturalism on the same footing as national bilingualism? Is multiculturalism granted standing within a nation, or does the nation itself consist of multicultural groups? If the former is the case, is there a boundary between public and private practices of either groups or individuals and where is this line drawn? The dichotomy best developed in public debate is that between a multiculturalism of recognition and rights of specific *groups* and a multiculturalism

that flows from constitutional guarantees of *individual* rights and freedoms. Both sides are addressed *together* in the *Multiculturalism Act* and *Multiculturalism Policy of Canada*.

The Canadian philosophers Charles Taylor and Will Kymlicka extensively discuss the issue of officially sanctioned policy and procedures as part of the institutional and social fabric of the nation with respect to multiculturalism. They have taken on the challenge of examining "multiculturalism" and both argue for a new liberalism but differ in their approach. Taylor presents a liberalism founded upon an argument of the "survival of cultures" centered on the ideal of *social distinction*. Kymlicka's argument centers on a liberalism of individual freedom wherein identity (cultural identity) is an individual's right to their "societal culture." Taylor separates the cultural group (to which he grants "rights") from customs and "creations of different cultures," which he regards as a basis for ongoing discussion (1994, 68). Kymlicka identifies culture as a "societal culture," that is as a culture that forms the basis of a society.

These philosophical debates may seem remote from the immediate concerns of education. However, these issues are inevitably encountered in the process of education of teachers themselves, as well as education policy-makers. Indeed, the issues of multiculturalism versus national bilingualism, the rights of groups and those of the individual, and national or ethnic identity are precisely the issues reflected by students' characteristic questions and practices.

2.3 Towards a Working Definition

Multicultural policy is seen as endorsing the claims of tolerance and inclusiveness characteristic of "liberal democratic" traditions. A doctrine of "tolerance" as a liberal imperative may actually mean that social institutions remain unchanged, allowing the structural privileges of the "majority" culture, or any majority within any culture or cultural group, to remain in place. Further, liberal "multiculturalism" as ideology and a practice that promotes a cultural pluralism predicated on the doctrine of equal rights has been criticized as promoting separateness rather than integration. Discourses of "multiculturalism" intersect with further discourses of identity and nation in the context of recognition and "distinctness."

Walter Feinberg (2002) distinguishes pluralism from "multiculturalism", stating that although these two concepts come from the same source, they lead in different directions. Pluralism, on the one hand, allows individual expression of one's way of life within a separate cultural sphere, regardless of one's particular cultural orientation, where "freedom of association and equal opportunity are the dominant principles." Unlike the multicultural society, a pluralist

society does not have an "obligation" to maintain or support cultural structures, but rather provides the conditions for individual choice. Feinberg's example of a pluralistic society is one in which there is some assurance that education not only inform but allow for critical discussion, that "children are not brainwashed or indoctrinated and that they develop an awareness of various alternative forms of life and the skill required to assess them."¹³ "Multiculturalism," in contrast, as policy and practice, is "already cultural," actively fostering cultural identity as opposed to simply "permitting" it. A variety of viewpoints is actively sought in the expression of "the experiences of cultural groups," "collectivities that provide meaning" to the lives of their constituents. Feinberg asserts that group affiliation and cultural recognition are the principles that inform multiculturalism (http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/eps/pes-yearbook/96_docs/feinberg.html 10/24/02).

John Rex also separates plural and multicultural societies, suggesting that plural societies are separate from political institutions (1997, 208) and are held together because one group dominates others. A multicultural society is an idealization that takes into consideration an "abstract and impersonal society...[having a] more abstract form of law and morality...developed to govern large-scale political and economic organizations" as opposed to a much simpler "folk" society that relies on "morality and kinship structures" to govern a range of human activity. (210) As an ideal, Rex envisions a multicultural society separating the private (folk) domain, which permits diversity between groups, from the public domain, in which there "is a single culture based upon the notion of equality between individuals" (208-219). However, Rex does not envision this as a "static" society, but one that leaves room for minorities to conflict with and challenge the existing order. As challenges occur through dialogue between cultures, a new emergent multicultural social order will prevail.

Clearly Rex and Feinberg differ in their view of the nature of the public, one seeing it as a monocultural umbrella under which a private multiculturalism is practiced and the other seeing it as ideally an amalgam of officially fostered cultural expressions. Both raise issues of rights afforded to individuals in a liberal democracy versus recognition of cultural diversity and cultural groups as part and parcel of these rights. In addition, both see the multicultural society as one in which there is an ongoing public discussion reflecting a variety of viewpoints which is in dialogue with official policy.

I would like to make use of these issues to define a "multicultural" continuum ranging from "weak" to "strong," roughly parallel to the idea of the solidarity of the public to the extent

that the public acknowledges shared qualities, be it, for example, ideology or history or a commitment to the discussion of ideology or history. Since social pluralism, individual rights and freedoms, and cultural diversity are indeed part of Canadian society, I refocus the consideration of these elements on the degree to which they contribute to, or fail to contribute, or detract from a sense of that society.

A discussion of "weak" and "strong" multiculturalism requires further consideration of individual and group rights and the notion of transnationalism. Charles Taylor (1994) discusses the ideas of rights and recognition in the liberal tradition, showing their historical relationship through the medium of the Enlightenment idea of the *dignity* of the individual. Taylor identifies a variety of liberalism called "procedural liberalism" based on the principle of equal dignity and basic individual rights. In a "procedural liberalism" the state guarantees equal rights and the protection of individual freedoms (51). The assumption in this view is that human dignity consists largely in autonomy, conceived of as the ability of each person to determine for him/herself a view of the good life (57). Taylor finds this procedural variant of liberalism to be inhospitable to differences because of a pretension towards blindness (to differences) and neutrality (52). While the principle of equal respect or dignity requires that people are treated in a "difference-blind" fashion, it does not protect an individual against sameness or homogeneity (38). Furthermore, difference-blind principles are a reflection of a hegemonic culture, "a particularism masquerading as the universal" (44). Accordingly, Taylor argues that a "procedural liberalism" of equality does not take into consideration the cultural context or differing collective goals related to diversity or "distinctness." Consequently, he argues for a "non-procedural liberalism" in which he extends individual rights to the group ensuring the survival of a cultural group while at the same time guaranteeing the basic rights of all citizens – "distinctness" together with equality. He views the question of the rights and recognition of cultural groups along with the critical debate of traditional or cultural practices to be located primarily within the sphere of education rather than politics. As an example, Taylor argues for an extensive study and discussion of literature (presumably with its cultural context) as necessary in reaching an assessment of its place in the multicultural society. Taylor acknowledges that there may indeed be "equal worth" in all cultures but that this is only a beginning; that actual study of a culture must not be accomplished through the standards of one's own culture but rather through a Gadamerian "fusion of horizons" where we learn to "move in a broader horizon, within which what we have formerly taken for granted as the *background* to valuation can be situated as

one possibility alongside the *different background* of the formerly unfamiliar culture" (67, my emphasis).

Gadamer's notion of a "fusion of horizons"¹⁴ begins with the idea that understanding can only be negotiated dialogically, "between every speaker and his [sic] partner" (Gadamer 1996, 111, 121). In order to understand a text, we need a fusion between the horizon of our world and the world of the text. This is a creative or dialectic fusion that produces a new meaning. As a text passes through different cultural and historical contexts, meanings change from author to reader, *ad infinitum*. The past is understood in terms of the present as an interpreter's own thoughts bring into play possibilities of meaning. There is no knowing a text "as it is" (Eagleton 1996, 61-65; Alarcon 1996, 143; 147; Hekman 1995, 130-3; 143-4). Gadamer recognizes that an understanding of the "alien" is made possible only with the "support of familiar and common understanding" which not only broadens the horizons of the reader, but "enriches" a shared understanding and "experience of the world" (Gadamer 1996, 120).¹⁵ One seemingly unaddressed issue is how Taylor extends Gadamer's notion based on the individual to a cultural group.

Will Kymlicka (1995) acknowledges the normative use of multicultural policy within the Canadian context as supporting polyethnicity within the national institutions of the English, French and "Aboriginal" cultures. He separates potential self-governing groups within a nation, the French, English and First Nations, or "multinational" groups from immigrant or "polyethnic" groups comprised of ethnic minorities which have chosen to incorporate into another society. "[Polyethnic groups are] susceptible to cultural change, for they were not uprooted; they had uprooted themselves... There was a choice made to immigrate... These groups have no reason for secession, or for rejecting English as the public language" (13-17). "Multinational" groups on the other hand are potentially self-governing. A clear omission are the children of immigrants, who necessarily have not "made the choice" to immigrate. These groups will be encountered in the ethnography below.

Kymlicka's argument is based on the fact that Canada, with its policy of multiculturalism in a bilingual framework, already officially recognizes and endorses "polyethnic rights" (22; Birnbaum and Strong 1996, 33-45). Nevertheless, he argues for changes to the education curriculum to recognize the history and contribution of minorities, for exemptions to laws or regulations that may disadvantage these groups, and for first language rights (30-31). "If we reject the option of enabling immigrants to re-create their societal culture, then we must address

the issue of how to ensure that the mainstream culture is hospitable to immigrants, and to the expression of their ethnic differences" (96-97). This insurance requires modification of institutions of the dominant culture. He maintains that support of polyethnic cultures is needed if the nation is to succeed in a globalized world.

To summarize, Kymlicka's liberal "societal culture" that recognizes and protects group-differentiated rights will not only strengthen and promote a liberal ideology, but make a stronger and more secure nation. The liberal "societal culture" is multicultural as it recognizes and promotes cultural diversity in a variety of institutional spheres such as law and education. Kymlicka's multiculturalism is clearly a "strong" multiculturalism in that it is seen as a unifying force (conserving, in fact, individual rights and freedoms). Taylorian liberalism that insists on an ongoing discussion of the "value" of cultural artifacts and practices is, by virtue of this strong dialogism, also a "strong" multiculturalism. What Taylor sees as a logical and historical stage in the development of liberalism presents a picture of a liberal culture based on individual rights. To the extent that these rights are envisioned with respect to culturally diverse groups, without reference to a unifying tendency, but simply as in and of themselves, I would label this a "weak" multiculturalism.

The above discussions of multiculturalism share an underlying assumption of a relatively stable nation-state or even a "societal culture," constituted by the arrival of diverse groups into a common space. Given the mobility of people, capital and information (especially mass media) in the contemporary period, it seems relevant to consider the effect of this mobility on notions of multiculturalism. Aihwa Ong (1999: 111-112) sees the 1990's as a time when capital, displacements and hybridity explode the reigning notions of being, and when rapid social, economic and political changes have transformed the meaning of citizenship. In a conventional sense, citizenship is based on the rights and participation of citizens within a state. Ong expands the idea of citizenship to embrace the transnational movements of people who participate in global capitalism: "the multiple-passport holder; the multicultural manager with flexible capital; the astronaut, shuttling across borders on business; parachute kids, who can be dropped off in another country by parents on the trans-Pacific business commute" (19). A "flexible citizenship" incorporates those "flexible practices, strategies, and disciplines" that evolve in a globalized ("transnational") capitalism in which new forms of subjectivity are created.

The situation that Ong describes is clearly multicultural but seems to challenge one of the basic assumptions of the previous discussion, namely, the primacy of the nation state as location

of a specific multiculturalism. Ong notes an ambivalence toward the nation state, citing "the strategies and effects of mobile managers, technocrats, and professionals seeking to both circumvent *and* benefit from different nation-state regimes by selecting different sites for investments, work, and family relocation" (112, emphasis in original).

Ong's work on "Chinese transnational communities"(4) recounts the successes of Chinese "network capitalism." One of her respondents noted that a factor contributing to a successful entrepreneur was the acquisition of the English language and Western business practices, while promoting or reifying a "Chinese distinctness." "[T]he economic value of multiculturalism [is] derived from coexisting with and absorbing the good points of other cultures." As Ong noted, the implication behind the unchanging nature of being and remaining "Chinese" is maintaining culturally based practices of a species of multiculturalism (67-68).¹⁶

A "transnational" multiculturalism may hold some insights for a Canadian multiculturalism in general. It is clear that such multiculturalism maintains a strong sense of collective identity; a sense of what is "useful" to the group and particularly to transnational business networks. Multiculturalist policy may be seen as advantageous (if it is not redundant to say) to communities with the wherewithal and the structures and institutions to take advantage of it. The other side of this is that communities or groups without capital accumulations or strong representation do not seem to *benefit as much* from multiculturalist policy. This observation follows Breton's (along with Li) idea that multiculturalist policy is increasingly symbolic (1999, 291-310). If multiculturalism is to be seen as policy, practice and ideology, further work must take account of the historical context and actual practices broadly conceived as education, public discussion, media, government policy, immigration and the like in the accumulation and conversion of cultural capital. Furthermore, consideration be given to the role of social and economic class as well as gender in examining the operations and outcomes of multiculturalism.

Clearly, Kymlicka includes "ethnic multiculturalism" in his vision of multiculturalism and approves of the adaptation of distinct groups to the dominant culture. However, he does not seem to grant or extend his vision of multiculturalism to transnationalism because his focus is on the dominant culture as embodied in a liberal nation state. Thus transnationalism seems to provide us with a kind of "weak" multiculturalism, perhaps weakest of all to the extent that it transcends the nation state. One of the key tests of the weakness or strength of multiculturalism may be captured in his notion of citizenship discussed in the next section.

2.4 Education and Citizenship

Education plays a pivotal role in the issues raised above. On the one hand, through the strong tradition of public education in Canada, it is an essential part of and deeply integrated into official policies and procedures. On the other hand, education is seen as both an individual right (as well as an individual obligation) and as a group right; that is, no social group can be excluded, disadvantaged or promoted through the process of education. Here we see similarities in education to issues raised in the critique of multiculturalism. Schools provide an arena for the development of individuals and often take account of social groupings while at the same time producing informed and viable citizens. On the latter point, the *Multiculturalism Act* itself is subsumed under the *Citizenship Act*.

We can look for resonances of the discourse on citizenship in the arena of education policy. Education is a form of cultural production of the objects, discourses, and practices within a society constructing possibilities for and constraints on citizenship (Giroux and Shannon 1997, 4). In particular, public schools provide an institutional and cultural link between schooling and the reconstruction of public life wherein interrogation of the exclusion or inclusion, of production, distribution and circulation of knowledge occurs (5). The inclusion of "multiculturalism" into the curriculum has been an attempt to accommodate social diversity within a framework of national policy and ultimately addresses citizenship.

Recent discussions of citizenship speak to the liberal democratic ideal of individual rights and freedoms within a diverse multicultural society. The criteria of citizenship are clearly stated in the *Multiculturalism Act* of 1988.¹⁷ This Act grants "equal opportunity" to all individuals "consistent with the duties and obligations" of individuals as members of a society, thus appending citizenship to multiculturalism. Kymlicka and Norman (1994) argue that while an adequate conception of citizenship requires a balance of rights and responsibilities, it is also an identity, "an expression of one's membership in a political community" (359, 369). They describe the qualities of a citizen in the context of a "thick" conception of citizenship-as-activity. Citizenship is defined as an individual's

sense of identity and how they view potential competing forms of national, regional, ethnic, or religious identities; their ability to tolerate and work together with others who are different from themselves; their desire to participate in the political process in order to promote the public good and hold political authorities accountable; their willingness to show self-restraint and exercise personal responsibility in their economic demands and in personal choices which affect their health and the environment (352-353).

Prior to the mid-1940's, citizenship was concerned in the main with the guarantee of civil, political, and social rights. Kymlicka and Norman refer to this as a "passive" citizenship in which "every member of society feels like a full member of society, able to participate in and enjoy the common life of society." The absence of this kind of citizenship, they argue, violates and marginalizes individuals. Recognition that contemporary (Western) societies, in the post-war era, have become more pluralistic has seen a need for change in the meaning of citizenship to provide a common experience, identity and allegiance (355). Critiques of "passive" citizenship gave rise to arguments for a more "active exercise of citizenship responsibilities and virtues, including economic, self-reliance, political participation and even civility" or, at the very least, a revision of the current definition of citizenship "to accommodate the increasing social and cultural pluralism of modern societies" (355).

Kymlicka's formulation of multiculturalism, similar to multicultural policy, is entirely prescriptive in nature. Its normative character sets a clear standard by which to measure practice. Kymlicka's "active citizen" constantly revisits and revises the concept of citizenship. As a part of a public discourse, the activities of citizenship contribute to a sense of "strong" multiculturalism.

2.5 Multicultural Policy: Education and Nation

Multicultural policy begins with the *Constitution Act*, (1982) and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (1982) which provide a basis for national policy and, especially, education policy formulated at provincial and local levels. Provincially, the *BC Multicultural Act* (1993) repeats the official national policy of cross-cultural understanding, anti-racism and the elimination of barriers, while *The BC School Act*, 1996 (C-10), incorporated section 23 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and *Immigration Act* (Canada) in policy on the role of language and the status of "immigrant" within a school. Although the *School Act* does not mention multiculturalism per se, individual local school boards develop their own policies that reflect the growing cultural and linguistic diversity of the changing trends in immigration (Fleras and Elliot 1996; Halli and Driedger 1999).

During the latter part of the 1990's a revised immigration policy placed an emphasis on a new "Canadian approach" of *integration*.¹⁸ Incorporating *integration* into multicultural policy placed a stress upon the fostering of a society "that recognizes, respects and reflects a diversity of cultures such that people of all backgrounds feel a sense of belonging and attachment to

Canada.” (Canada, Department of Canadian Heritage April 1997 (as cited in Abu-Laban 1999, 202-203). In contrast to the themes of "assimilation and segregation" of past policies, this policy emphasized a "two-way process of accommodation" between newcomers and other Canadians. This two-way process retains an 'us' and 'them' binary and a monolithic Canadian/Canadian value/Canadian society with which 'others' (immigrants) are engaged. This view of integration is in contrast with the "separation" of cultures or "weak" form of multiculturalism and is more consistent with a "stronger" form of multiculturalism with the emphasis on inclusion (Abu Laban 1999, 202). The idea of a "two-way process" suggests a dialogue in which groups engage each other as much as they engage the "larger entity" which "contains" them. On this view, cultural groups *comprise* the nation. I return to this idea in my analysis of the ethnography.

In October 1996, following a federal review of multicultural policy, a renewed multiculturalism program emerged which acknowledged three new themes: "identity, civic participation' and social justice." These themes, along with themes of "inclusion", "cohesion" and "globalization" were expressed in many speeches by Hedy Fry, Member of Parliament and Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women). A speech given to the Canadian Islamic Conference, is an example:

It ensures that our society is *inclusive* and *cohesive*. To continue to achieve these important objectives, we will continue to focus on three fundamental goals of the Multiculturalism Policy: *identity, civic participation* and *social justice*... By working together, we can ensure that Canada's diversity becomes an element of national pride for everyone and that equality for all Canadians becomes a reality... to create in a new society: a society in which we could, in fact, enjoy freedom and democracy and live with others from around the world. We wanted to create here a global nation. I think that we as a country have shown that the roots run deep, that the roots of *tolerance* in this country run very deep (my emphasis) (2001).¹⁹

Historically the notion of "tolerance" is tied to the idea of a liberal philosophy of a commonality among human beings and the value of the individual, in keeping with a Taylorian "procedural liberalism."²⁰ Commencing her speech with "identity" and concluding her remarks with a return to the idea of "tolerance," Fry places the main direction of her policy making on the side of a liberalism of fundamental human rights. Bracketed within this approach is a recognition of a larger civic entity in which these groups participate. What seems to be absent is what would be called "recognition" and "valuing," according to a Taylorian non-procedural liberalism. The notion of tolerance as a response to the rooting out of "discrimination and prejudice", according to Kymlicka, gave rise to anti-racism policy as a part of multicultural policy in Canada (1995,

30). Ironically, the metaphor "roots run deep," clearly shows that "tolerance" is embedded within the status quo and belongs to a homogenizing tradition of liberalism.

Educational policy at the local level (Vancouver School Board) incorporates both the liberalism of fundamental human rights and a "weak" form of multiculturalism, dignity but not necessarily valuation. The Vancouver School Board Policy (VSB) directive (File ACA-E) entitled *Multiculturalism and Anti-racism Policy* (Revised June 1995) is an example.

"Multiculturalism" is defined as the "recognition of the diverse cultures of a plural society based on three principles: all individuals have an ethnic origin (equality); all cultures deserve respect (dignity); and cultural pluralism needs official support (community)" (my emphasis, 13). Significantly the School Board's list is headed by a reference to individual ethnic origin which is clearly intended in the same way as Hedy Fry's "identity." The linking of identity with "equality," "respect," and "dignity" falls neatly within the bounds of a "tolerant" liberalism that forms the basis of Fry's remarks. Furthermore, all of these imply Fry's social justice. If we can allow the Vancouver School Board's "community" to be the equivalent of Fry's "civic participation," the two statements of policy are virtually identical. This is a remarkable congruence between national and locally generated policy.

I would like to note at this point that such a consistency across the board in institutional policy clearly fits Michel de Certeau's (1984) notion of a *strategy* (discussed in detail below). *Strategy* according to de Certeau originates in ideology, in this case a liberalism of individual dignity and rights. This is precisely the sort of liberalism that is often criticized as maintaining class, gender and race biases while reasserting a "productivist emphasis on the 'economic worth' and 'self sufficiency' of immigrants" (Abu Laban 1999, 205) who are valued for their economic contribution but not for their cultural contribution.

Given the diversity of today's classrooms, such policies fail to take into consideration the social conditions and locations of the various "users" of education, be they teachers, students or administrators and community. De Certeau considers the *practice* of such policies, arguing that once articulated, policies are not re-stated or re-articulated but are "used" for one's own purposes or ends. If we further explore the definition of a "multicultural education" provided in the above directive, a teacher as a "user" quickly recognizes the verbs: "recognize," "understand," "respect," and "promote" as an imperative to action: "[a]n approach to education, including administrative policies and procedures, curriculum, and learning activities, that recognizes the

experiences and contributions of diverse cultural groups. Multicultural Education promotes understanding and respect for cultural diversity" (Vancouver School Board 1995, 13).

As noted above, Wideen and Barnard (1999) found that the Ministry of Education was silent on the issue of putting policy into practice. They found that policy existed without a planned course of action, with the linkage between the three levels of policy making the Ministry, the Vancouver School District and the individual schools functioning separately as a "loosely coupled system" (1999, 9). Their findings reinforce de Certeau's notion that "users," teachers, "construct their own meaning of policy... around the perceived needs of their students" (1984, 10).

To return to the idea of policy itself, the making of policy calling for actions but without an action plan and provision for its implementation seems like empty statements or "symbolism." A good example of this provincial support for the multicultural/anti-racist/anti-discrimination policy has taken the form of providing posters to school counselors. A sample of the "discourses of multiculturalism" as provided by the British Columbia Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism links notions of a "united Canada," "dignity," "a peaceful society," "community," "mutual respect," "good citizenship," and taking a "pride in [one's] heritage" and "honour Canada." These posters are displayed primarily in ESL classrooms, counseling areas and very sporadically on bulletin boards designated for multiculturalism²¹. Fundamentally, they reiterate the kind of liberal ideology *as policy* articulated above. As ideologically generated rhetoric, these statements form an institutional background or what de Certeau terms *strategy* within which a variety of "users" engage in various practices. The location of the posters seems to emphasize the need for newcomers to be tutored in these ideologies.

A further facet of multiculturalism found within school policy addresses issues of anti-racism and anti-discrimination. Beginning in the mid-1970's, the Vancouver School Board issued directives as part of their goal to further define a "multicultural education" to address manifestations of racism within the school system (Moodley 1991). Once again, Wideen et al. noted the disjuncture between policy and implementation. "[There is an] apparent disregard for implementation [of policy]... in sharp contrast to bygone days in the province, when newly developed curriculum became the impetus for the development of government sponsored workshops and information providing activities across the province" (1999, 8). Many questions are left unasked by such consistently ideologically based directives such as the VSB Policy on *Non-Discrimination* (refer to Appendix VIII, VSB Policy on *Non-Discrimination*). Some of

these questions were raised by Moodley (1991) in addressing the social aspects of multiculturalism within education. One example is the question of what cultures are to be incorporated or recognized within a classroom.

Further contained within the divisions of "multiculturalism" are the economic and educational differences between East and West sides of Vancouver (Hiebert 1998, Wideen et al. 1999).²² This diversity is seen in classrooms in this study where a classroom is comprised not only on age differences (ranging from 13 to 19 years of age) but where students are also differentiated by language, social class, religion and educational background. Moodley expresses this experience in relation to specific groups: "religion, caste, language and class, let alone socioeconomic differences between the globally oriented business elite and working class Asians" (Moodley 1986, 69-70). Social issues of class, gender, educational background and practices cut across cultural groupings as the cultural groupings themselves break apart into further regroupings, both cultural and social.²³ Some of the questions relating to the constitution of social and cultural groups will be addressed below.

One of the primary issues in multicultural policy is language use and instruction. In the field study portion of this paper (below), linguistic practices are shown to be *realisations or usages* of policies in this area. According to the Vancouver School Board, "One of the ways for integrating multicultural and anti racism awareness across the curriculum is to provide opportunities for students to communicate in their first languages" (*Multiculturalism and Anti-racism Education in Schools*). This policy is supported by the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (BCTF):

School boards recognize the developmental nature of language learning (second-language learning as well as first-language learning) and provide a continuum of services to meet the changing needs of ESL/ESD students as they progress in their language development (BCTF Policy: 9.D.123).²⁴

This coordination between both the employer and the professional organization represents a clear consistency in policy. Furthermore, at the school level, students are reminded that "English only [is spoken] in the classroom." Such consistencies in policies are indicative of an ideological background against which a variety of practices comes into being.

The policies addressed above seem on the whole to reflect a liberal ideology of tolerance and individual rights, what I have called "weak" multiculturalism. The liberalism of "valuation" would seem to require a much more extensive approach. In summary from the many issues surrounding the articulation of multiculturalism as policy as well as the critical discussions

addressing these policies, the characteristics of "weak" and "strong" multiculturalism may be distinguished.

Table 1: Characteristics of Weak and Strong Multiculturalism

Weak multiculturalism	Strong multiculturalism
passive recognition of rights and equality; "passive" diversity	active recognition of rights and equality; "active" diversity
no discussion (silence)	public discussion, differing viewpoints
passive citizenship; tolerance	active citizenship that includes identity and conduct, responsibilities, loyalties
separating	seeking coherence
cultural "distinctness"	cultural fluency
strong group identity	unifying force within a larger entity (nation); or a nation comprised of cultural groups

Chapter III

Everyday Practice in a Vancouver Secondary School: A Field Study

In this chapter I look at the ways in which multiculturalism is understood and practiced in a particular population and location. Here I focus on multiculturalism *lived* in a particular social context. If the policies and critiques of multiculturalism are thought of as its "rules," this study is an "investigation of the ways in which users—commonly assumed to be passive and guided by established rules—operate" (de Certeau 1997, xi). I address student *practices* as expression, or what de Certeau calls "uses," of multiculturalism. Students' writings, conversations and "practices" are considered, keeping in mind de Certeau's "two logics of action," *strategic* and *tactical* (1997, xx). De Certeau links language and action since it is within "the space of a language... [that] a society makes more explicit the formal rules of action and the operations that differentiate them" (xxi).

The rhetoric of ordinary conversation consists of practices which transform "speech situations," verbal productions in which the interlacing of speaking positions weaves an oral fabric without individual owners, creations of a communication that belongs to no one. Conversation is a provisional and collective effect of competence in the art of manipulating "commonplaces" and the inevitability of events in such a way as to make them "habitable."
(xxi)

Explicit linguistic expressions may find their implicit analog in actions, associations and other everyday practices. The policies and critical ideas of multiculturalism are both explicit and implicit within the school. The students make a *habitable place* for themselves through their everyday usages of these "givens."

3.1 Ethnography – a Practice

By evoking the term "ethnographic" my intent is not to claim a truth or authenticity but rather, as an exploratory study, to provide some sense of the lived, textured quality of experience from which a much fuller study can draw. I follow the ethnographic tradition with the view that an ethnographic account "does not view knowledge as a matter of getting reality right but... as a matter of acquiring habits of action for coping with reality" (Rorty 1991, 1). It is with this understanding that I use Michel de Certeau's ethnographic process which he describes in relation to time and space: "The approach to culture begins when the ordinary man [sic] *becomes* the narrator, when it is he who defines the (common) place of discourse and the (anonymous) space of its development" (1984, 5). I analyze the forces that mobilize individuals into action and

interaction. The circulation of representations by policy makers, for example, tells us nothing about the "users" (students) of these representations and, more importantly, how the representations (practices) of "multiculturalism" differ from those disseminated and imposed by the cultural and political institutions of a society. The "ways of using" products imposed by these institutions, according to de Certeau (1984), are often "subverted... not by rejecting or altering them, but by using them with respect to ends and references foreign to the system they had no choice but to accept" (xiii). There is much in this statement of de Certeau that resonates in school youth.

The ethnographic research was carried out in a single school population distinguished on the basis of its diverse student body with a large immigrant population.²⁵ In a total population of approximately 1940 students, according to a survey made by the students themselves,²⁶ forty languages and fifty countries are represented with approximately 59% of the students being born outside of Canada. The survey breaks groups into linguistic categories. The two largest groups are Cantonese and Mandarin speakers, approximately 50%, followed by English speakers, comprising 32% of the students. The survey also organizes students geographically according to their country of origin. Country of origin categories with the associated student population are: Canada 44%, Hong Kong 19%, People's Republic of China 11% and Taiwan 11%. Russia 4%, the Philippines 3%, Iran, South Korea and the United States each comprised approximately 1% of the total population. The remaining countries of origin were represented by less than one per cent. When I asked about the discrepancy between the Canadian born and the English speaking population, I was told that the place of birth did not necessarily correlate with the language spoken by the student as some students may have been born in Canada, but their first language was not English. For example, of the students born in Canada only 72% considered their spoken language to be English.

My data collection involved observation of students within the school communal spaces such as the cafeteria, library, hallways and assemblies as well as classrooms. In addition, two of the student participants acted as "guides" providing explanations, interpretations and insights into the student body²⁷. Group interviews were to form part of my data collection. However, recruitment posed a major difficulty as students were reluctant to participate in focus groups, preferring one-on-one interviews. Also, after conferring with my "guides" and other students, I made myself available during the lunch hour and mornings in addition to after school hours. I also increased class visits along with informal questioning among the general student population.

In total I have twenty-three participant interviews (one interview was a group of eight class participants), five class observations and discussions, a written assignment, a teacher interview and one interview with a Vancouver School Board Multiculturalism staff person, along with several short classroom visits to discuss my research, and informal conversations with students, teachers and administrators. Classroom visitations consisted of an explanation of the research, talking about literature dealing with immigrant experience, relating the history of immigration in Canada and, to two grade eight classes, I talked about conducting qualitative research, at the request of a teacher²⁸. Interview questions were open-ended and based on the idea of engaging in a "conversation" around personal experiences as they are rooted in the everyday and general narratives of self (gender, family, siblings, immigrant), context (time and place, background, associations, language) and notions of belonging as expressed in a "personal philosophy."

Classroom visits followed a general format of explaining the research, defined as exploratory, emphasizing my interest in the experience of newcomers to Canada and opening the floor to questions or comments by students. Ethical considerations of confidentiality and anonymity for participants were emphasized. Students under the age of eighteen years required and provided parental or guardian consent (refer to Appendix V, Parental Consent Form). When asked to consider students who were second generation Canadian, I agreed, although newcomers gave the majority of the one-on-one interviews. During these visits students did not often ask questions, except on the rare occasion when they voiced their doubts²⁹ about the "use of the research." For example, some thought that if they participated their involvement would affect little change in the education system. Other students expressed reluctance because they did not feel their daily life experiences to be of any significance or importance. Even students in high school lead busy lives. They need to see both the rationale and the significance of the study, and often engage in its critique. For example, students engaged in classroom discussions over extra-curricular groups because of the welcomed diversion in the daily routine though sometimes quite apropos to the classroom topic. In another case, a student simply asserted that objectivity was impossible in a study like this. Far from being unwelcome, these concerns allowed discussions on the subjective nature of participant observations in which I could acknowledge my own standpoint. I told them that I would endeavour to be self-reflective and, most importantly, be aware of my own standpoint while involved in the research.

3.2 The School

The school has a large student population in comparison to other schools in the district. Characteristic of comparable schools located within the *boundary* between the East and West sides of Vancouver,³⁰ this school offered a richly diverse student population. The catchment area includes lower income housing to the south and east, in contrast to the housing situated in the immediate proximity of the school³¹. The relationship between the quality of education and the relatively high income area in which the school was situated was described by a teacher. Having attended a professional development workshop on Asian student issues, she now understood "why people in Hong Kong would buy property near the school, sight unseen... The parents feel that there is a link between high priced real estate and an excellent education." While the school may attract higher income families, there were students from lower income families as well. A former vice-principal at the school commented that "often people forgot that there are other students who could not afford the many fifty-dollar field trips."

Multicultural discourse within the school was in immediate evidence as posters and a bulletin board. The British Columbia government posters were long banners placed over the inside of classroom doorways while other posters were found in the counseling area. Posters placed over doorways depicted a long line of people of diverse backgrounds with a caption that read, "Many Cultures One Society." The "Eracism Club Monthly Events Board" located in the hallway leading to the office displayed a poster of hands in various shades of brown with the caption "Together for Equality." The board also had a British Columbia calendar of religious events organized by major religious organizations. Other bulletin boards in the same proximity included the Grad Bulletin Board, the Scholarship Board, and a display of trophies. The wall opposite the Eracism Club exhibited a collection of student-made masks. There was no written information identifying the purpose of the exhibit. A door to an "ESL room" displayed two student hand drawn posters that read "Let's Stop Racism! Everyone is equal No Matter Who you Are We will Treat You Equally!" (sic) alongside were the words to "O Canada" and "God Save the Queen." The other was a small poster over the door's window showing a black and white drawing of the globe with the caption, "When the World turn Out In Only Black and White" (sic).

On entering the school with students going through the hallways, I was immediately struck by the fact that English was rarely the means of communication. The contentiousness of a policy on English as the language of the classroom was made known to me by two teachers on

my first day. I asked them what they thought of the school. They first identified themselves in opposition to "the old school". When I asked for clarification, they used the English language policy as an example. One teacher said that the "English only" rule was "racist," reasoning that "it left out a lot of people." The other teacher explained it as "a reaction against or fear of being talked about...it's paranoia...against cheating." These experiences helped me to understand that one of the primary grounds on which multiculturalism was expressed was language.

As in other schools within the district, the school has institutionally identified groups: the English as a Second Language Program students, or "ESL," and the Regular Program students, or "Regular." In addition to these programs the school offered an International Baccalaureate Program, or "IB," to students in and outside of the Vancouver School District. In the following ethnography the practices of these three groups reveal not just variants of multiculturalism, but also a *hierarchy* of practices based on individual recognition, belonging, and identity.

3.3 Student Practices in the School

A good way to begin to become familiar with student practices is to follow the students, newly arrived to Canada, through to the introduction into the Regular Program or the International Baccalaureate Program within the school. This approach amounts to a "narrative" of a potential path through a student's school years. This "narrative" is told as much as possible in the students' own words, though the choice of which words to cite and thus ultimate control of the story I acknowledge to be my own. I have no doubt selected in accord with my own background as both immigrant and teacher. What follows is one version of the students' story.

3.3.1 Practices of "Newcomers"

The first group interviewed were Grade 8 and 9 Transitional Program students.³² The teacher invited me to speak with her class on the topic of immigration, after which she assigned students an essay on the topic "Immigration: The Best of Times and the Worst of Times." The students gathered in a semi-circle and we talked informally about their experiences. When asked what they knew of multiculturalism, the simplest articulations emphasized the idea of diversity and difference. As I went around the room, the student responses were variations of the following:

Multiculturalism is different religions and cultures.
Mixed people...mixed cultures.
Multiculturalism. Everybody. 'Cause everyone's different.
Each person in their own way.

With few exceptions, students articulated their understanding of "multiculturalism" as diversity, distinctness and separation, and recognition and authenticity. Two students differed, seeing multiculturalism as "no racism" or having to do with "freedom."

My final question, "To close, what are your worst experience and your best experience as a young immigrant person in Canada?" was given as a written assignment. Responses relate the experiences of a newcomer to Canada, where they are unfamiliar with the system of schooling and find themselves displaced physically and socially.³³

These stories begin with the first days when they enter school and realize the need to understand the spatial organization in order to manage the unknown and unfamiliar. The daily rituals of lunch, recess, and bathroom break, along with not finding their way, must be negotiated. Christy's³⁴ experience was a typical first day. The "way you look" draws attention from a peer, adding to her frustration as she attempts to manage a new spatial reality.

Christy, Grade 8/9 Transitional Program

I knew no one in Canada at the beginning. The first day I went to school with my boyish hair cut, a guy came to me and asked am I a boy or a girl. I knew he was trying to embarrass me so my face turned red as burning and became extremely angry, but what else can I do other than mad? At the same day lunch time, I supposed to have math class before, but I just followed my classmates to class and not noticing the way, so I was lost and not be able to go back to my homeroom! I couldn't even remember my room number and my teacher's name. Where can I go? What can I eat for lunch? For my entire lunch time, I sat on the toilet and cry feeling lonely. I sat there very quiet until the bell ring for recess most people ran out to play but I don't know what to do. So I stand up and walk around. For the first few week it was all like that.

Appearance is a marker to distinguish "someone like me." During the class discussion, a student referred to herself as Taiwanese, causing a disturbance among five female students. They did not believe she was Taiwanese, prompting one student to explain, using herself as an example.

Female, Grade 8/9 Transitional Program

Hong Kong girls they dress, their pants is like.. I don't know. It's like you can, I don't know. You just can tell. I don't know like. You can jus, their hair has their own style and their dressing and their makeup and their jeans and like everything you can tell.

Differences become more accentuated as they encounter a new system of schooling and a new group of peers. Even though newcomers are somewhat ready to meet "different kinds" of people, when faced with the diversity in the student population, they are often unprepared. Eun-hee's surprise at such diversity is not uncommon.

Eun-hee, Grade 8/9 Transitional Program

The worst times I have had in Canada was when I was in elementary school. It was different to my country. There were different kinds of people in my class. I felt strange because I thought there would be all Canadian students.

In the class discussion, students agreed that friendships were established on the basis of "same interests," of having "the same feeling, the same class together" or the "same attitude." Newcomers were especially conscious of their difference as a response to the diversity of the student population and their own lack of English. In time, peers are sought out who speak a common language.

Jake, Grade 8/9 Transitional Program

The worst time I had when I first came to Canada was I was in a ESL room surrounded with many students that are from a different country than I was. I was really scared because I cannot speak fluence English and I don't have friends with me in that class. After a while I found a boy who can speak my own languages, Cantonese and after that, we became good friends and now we even go to same high school and our locker and beside each other.

Difference is further reinforced when newcomers learn that the social code created by the institution, namely that of "ESL," further differentiates them from other students. In the following excerpt, Robbie explains how he overcomes the sense of difference, of being outside the "Regular" group, by turning the negative connotation of "ESL" into a positive one for himself.

Robbie, Grade 8/9 Transitional Program

I believe many immigrate students have this problem. I was an ESL student when I was in grade 6. I had some arguement with some of the Regular student about sharing the same basket ball court. It was like racism. Those Regular students thought they were better just because they could speak better English. They tried to kick ESL students off the court. But we stayed together and challenged those Regular student to a game, so we got to play... I think it's not easy to be an ESL student, because of the pressure those Regular students gave us. However, some of the Regular students were once ESL students, so I don't think it's shame to be an ESL student.

Jackie perhaps summed up the "ESL" experience. After experiencing aggressive and negative behaviour from her peers, she eventually found dignity in a recognition as a "human being."

Jackie, Grade 8/9 Transitional Program

I remembered how much my mother wanted me to be a strong and tough person. It took lots of time for others to accept me as a human being and as a friend.

Lacking the ability to manage the spatial surroundings Newcomers' sense of disorientation is further exasperated by the diversity they encounter. They are also separated from "mainstream" students by the school-defined category of "ESL" which is often reiterated by the "Regular" students. New students eventually learn to "own" the "ESL" label as a worthy effort and a developing skill that creates a place for them in the new society. They also learn to insist that their recognition as rightful occupants of their position flows from a fundamental human dignity. I would call these initial moves "integrating" because they help the new student overcome displacement and move towards a more central location in the school mainstream.

Next, there are adjustments to the "integrating" movement. In their efforts to find some sense of belonging, the students form alliances and friendships based on commonalities of interests, personal outlooks and especially language. They are keen observers of "separating" factors, not only institutionally based, such as "ESL" and "Regular," but also based on appearances. They can "just tell" who are "Hong Kong girls." This skill is important because in their efforts to acquire English language skills, they find a friend who speaks their own language and can guide them.

3.3.2 Practices of Regular Program Students

The progression from "ESL" into the Regular Program is an indication of students' increased fluency in the English language. This fluency allows them to extend their sense of identity and develop a sense of belonging based upon similarities rather than differences, as students begin to identify themselves in relation to those who are most like them. Language becomes a powerful marker of identity.

Eva, Grade 11 (Regular Program)

I came like away earlier though. At the beginning right, there weren't as much Chinese people here yet. There was like a lot of American, white people around. So that, at my elementary school right, there were like a lot of like white people around, so then I was.. actually I learned English quite quickly cause there were lotsa of white.. but then now like you.. ESL come here right.. you just have Chinese friends. So it's really hard to learn the language in a way.

Amy Yeah I think there is more Mandarin cause like ahm when I just got to this school actually, I didn't know one single Chinese. Just like I'd seen people walking around but I did not have one single friend. All my friends like "bananas" so we called them.

R Bananas?

Amy Yeah bananas that's what we call them.

R What are bananas?

Amy Like yellow on the outside but white on the inside. Like uhm, we're like we we're called yellow people right because our skin kinda brownish. And are thinking like white people.

R Bananas? Can you explain?

Amy Yeah. So bananas and then I had couple bana.. friends and then.. I was sitting in this math class and this Taiwanese girls just came up and talked to me. So, yeah I make friend with her and then she just lead me to a whole bunch of Taiwanese people. So.. yeah. So yeah like I actually have more Chinese speaking, Mandarin speaking friend more than English speaking friend.

Mark came to Canada during his elementary years and returned to his country of origin in seventh grade. He recently returned and entered the eleventh grade at the school. Like many of the students interviewed, Mark identified the geolinguistic trend of Regular Program students. In fact, one of the reasons he sought me out was to practice his English.

Mark, Grade 11, Regular Program

R Have you noticed how people associate with one another in the school?

Mark Well they usually hang around in groups, just like from their own country.

R Is it country or language?

Mark Well if you speak the same language you're more likely from the same country, right.

R Well, Taiwanese speak Mandarin do they hang out with Mainland Chinese?

Mark Usually they hang out with people from Taiwan, but there's some exceptions.

School policy dictated that English be spoken in the classroom; all Regular Program students interviewed knew of this policy. In her response, Amy repeats the concerns expressed by the two teachers interviewed, but she also recognized that language use in the classroom was open to abuse.

Amy, Grade 10, Regular Program

R Do you know the language policy in the school?

Amy French and English and no other language. Yeah I think it's in the Agenda too. I personally think that's not really a good thing. Like.. I

don't mind speaking English. I even like speaking English actually. But then like what if like somebody who doesn't even speak English? You won't let him say anything and just sit there and do nothing?

R Is that what happens in class?

Amy No.. like yeah some people they know how to speak English but they just prefer to speak in their own language. That that's not really good though. Like there's both way looking at it.

R Kind of confusing isn't it.

Amy Yeah. Like if you don't speak English yeah I guess you can speak another language cause all you're just going to do is just sit there and watch everybody, right. But if you do speak English I think it's best to speak English in class. Like I hear people speaking Cantonese in class. Like in English class, the teacher was standing right there they're just like.. and the teacher just ask him questions and she didn't know if she's just speak Cantonese or not to other person. I think that's so stupid. Like you're in English class and then the teacher ask you a question and the only answer use Cantonese ask another person sitting beside you. That's just so funny. I look at them, "English please."

Students are aware Canada is a bilingual nation and see their bilingualism as a personal expression, of "being one's own person." Lin and Chris' expression of the language policy is seen as an infringement of their rights.

Lin and Chris, Grade 10, Regular Program

R Do you know the language policy of the school?

Lin I don't agree at all.

R What is the policy?

Lin Just French and English. I think that should change because look at all the people coming in right. It's impossible for a Cantonese person to start speaking French and English just like that.

//R But you don't agree with it. Is that right?

Chris I think everyone should be their own person. Like if you're Cantonese just speak English or Cantonese, but, hum.. don't just force them to speak one language because they're not going to be comfortable. You have to make the school comfortable environment especially in a multiculturalism environment. It's impossible to makes them speak French and English.

//R Why do you think they have such a policy. You said it would help one learn more. Any other reasons?

Lin [interruption]So it's none of your business what we talk about.

R Are we talking about in the classroom?

Lin The hallways.

R What about the classroom?

Lin No difference.

Chris Yeah.

Student self-identification often began by grouping themselves within a larger group, for example, Korean, Indian, Chinese. Grace observed how members of the largest group in the school grouped themselves.

Grace, Grade 12, Regular Program

Grace It's like they all say they're Chinese. But Chinese from China and from Hong Kong and Cantonese? I think they all have different languages and they think they're different from other Chinese.

R: How do you know that?

Grace Uhm because I experienced that. When I talk to someone from Taiwan and asked something.. well before I knew that person was Can..can../Taiwanese, I kind of asked them if she was Mandarin or Cantonese and she said Mandarin. And I kind of asked her what was the difference between that? And she looked kind of upset. She said two different nation and two different group.

Differentiation continued into their spatial practices in the hallways and in the classrooms. Eva explains how student lockers and hallways are divided into "ethnic neighbourhoods."

Eva //People in grade 12 choose their locker on the first floor. /Every year there's a specific places. Chinese and Hong Kong people are on that side, Taiwanese are in the main hallway and like white people are the grad hallway and like black people are down that way.

R: Black people?

Eva Yeah like Filippinos, Africans people are also that way. So then usually separated into four different areas. Every year it's that way. And then this year right at the end of the year we have a scavenger hunt. My friends start asking me, "Oh where do you want your locker? Taiwanese way or Cantonese way?" Yeah like OK? [laughter]. Yeah like, everybody knows the hallway like for specific people. You never see a white person having in the hallway like in a Cantonese place. Maybe the past times they have, but they never have a person's locker over there. It's like the rule.

R: What would happen if someone did?

Eva That would be really weird. It's not really a rule, but sort of like this is what we know of. We'll do it like follow the procedure. No one will actually break the procedure because people's friend they're always hanging out the same. Like, like you said Mandarin people here like yeah right Mandarin people hall. Right I'll be there. It's like passes like year to year. It never changes.

R: That's only grade 12 right. The rest of you don't choose. How do you get to../

Eva [interruption] Cause our lockers right. We have homeroom and within, like each homeroom class you have one or two friends right. So which homeroom has the most of our friends we eat at those lockers. And then if those lockers aren't free we eat another one because everyone has their own lockers. We walk to our locker and pick up our stuff, that's all.

Grace noted how large groups are able to separate themselves along geolinguistic lines while minorities are left to integrate into a more amorphous group "in the middle."

Grace When I was in ESL, which means I was in Grade 9, I was the only Korean in my social studies class. And there was Russians and other white people in the class, people from Iraq and all sorts of countries. Their weird thing was all the Mandarin people leave and uhm sat in one column and all the Cantonese the other column and all the other people, like non-Chinese speaking people sat in middle. And whenever there is a project, they all get into their own groups and we had to tell in English. So that at the very beginning we felt that they're racist against us because we are not Chinese and so we just start to talk about how bad they are and how rude they are.

//Yeah and around February or March, I think, the teacher noticed that all the Chinese always speaking only Chinese so they told the Chinese people to go around and talk to other people. And she gave us some project and has to talk to the people who is not your language and so in my groups there is two Chinese and a girl from Iraq and Russia and somewhere in Europe, I don't really remember, and me. So there is six of us. But what happened was that we had those not nice you know that kind of bad feeling towards Chinese that we feel that we felt like they're racist against us. We kind of felt that why don't we do the same thing to them. Then there is broken groups but uhm when they kind a suggest their idea or they say their opinion, we're like well that's not a good idea or something. And then we kind a ignored them and only talked to people who were non-Chinese.

As groups formed based on geolinguistic distinctness, their self-defined distinctness was felt and reinforced by the "amorphous middle."

Group distinctions are made as students begin to identify themselves as belonging to either the distinct groups or majority group in the school or with smaller groups. In the interview, Eva applies the label "Filipino" to a student whose locker is next to hers. The student however is South Asian.

Eva Yes! Racism is pretty much around the area. Actually it's more in like Filipino people. I see them. Cause I.. if its like in.. actually I know that Chinese people don't like Filipino people. I don't know why though, but then.. like if there's a big class and there's one or two Filipino, they usually don't get included in many ways. Especially like Hong Kong

people, they don't like Filipino. They just think.. but I don't know why.. they think they're stinky. They think they're weird and they just stick out as dumb. There's not like a lot of them in the school. They least like.. Russians. They don't like Russian's either. They think like they pronounce really awkwardly. They're not..they don't like say things something like that. So then they are like brown.. I think that's mostly like what Chinese people feel towards other people. Cause I don't hang out with white people much so that I don't know what they feel about us. But then I know that Chinese people feel like pretty racist against different background people.

Grace It's like it happens with my own race which is Korean. And Korean people you know they always care about how they look and how they talk and how they think. They kind of think same and when I first came here I uhm I didn't want to hang out with them. I wanted to get into Regular first before I make uhm friend with Koreans and it turns out like they think that.. they think that I think that I'm not a Korean. So they thought that I didn't want to be Korean. They were like oh then let her be whatever she wants to be and she's not Korean anymore. And they kind of like a wall around themselves and I had a hard time getting with them.

R: Getting what among themselves?

Grace It's like an invisible wall.

Regular students are acclimated to school practices and the diverse student population. They have a degree of English fluency. At this point, students begin to separate into groups based on first language and place of origin. "Canadians" and "bananas" are lumped together because both groups speak English and "think the same." Numerical dominance permits finer distinctions into Mainland Chinese, Taiwanese and Hong Kong versus smaller populations of "whites" and "blacks." The apparently "racial" categories are quite anomalous. "Black" may refer to Filipino or "Filipino" to South Asian. What seems to be intended is simply to designate an "other," a grouping based on what one is not. Both smaller and larger groups tend toward self defined "distinctness" and homogeneity with a concomitant eternalization of "ethnic" identity, which may be cultivated or, in the case of one student, avoided.

The Regular students express a desire to be "comfortable" at school. To achieve this, they extend the processes of separation into the spatial dimension. Linguistically homogenous groups are formed for extracurricular activities such as lunch at lockers. "Neighborhoods" are formed and managed by rules and procedures that "everyone knows." First language use is seen as a "right" on the analogy of national bilingualism. However, the policy of speaking either English or French is seen as unreasonable. English and one's own first language would be better.

This extends from the relatively "private" space of the hallways and lockers even into the more shared and "public" or "official" space of the classroom.

3.4.3 Practices of "IB" Program Students

The "IB" Program students interviewed belonged to a "Theory of Knowledge" class. This group was comfortable in engaging in discussions about Canadian bilingualism, integration, and separation and identity. These students go through a rigorous screening process before acceptance into the program. Misook expressed the importance of parent involvement in the selection process.

Misook, Grade 12, "IB" Program³⁵

I guess when you choose "IB" candidates, you have so many tests, interviews.. / Where interviews, I think, are very critical cause the teachers wants to know how you think and from there teachers assess whether the student is involved. I think that what I have noticed is that our parents are very open for whatever we are doing. Of course we have to talk to them about what we are doing and how we think and they accept and try to help us wherever we are going.

Of the students interviewed in this group, Fanny, Lily and Jenny immigrated to Canada along with their families. The complexities of identity are brought out in their conversations.

Fanny I also think like if you're not white, sometimes especially like, I don't know, it's hard of people to think of you as a Canadian. Because even though you could be born in Canada or it might be your parents are born in Canada, when they see you they still think you are not Canadian. They think you are an immigrant.

Lily I was just saying that if people identify me as more Asian I think of myself as more Canadian.

//Yeah like for me I say I would prefer myself as Taiwanese, but I then, I don't know, maybe like later on, 10 years later from now, I would say I'm Taiwanese-Canadian, just to show like because I lived there I belong here as well as Taiwan and it doesn't have to be one part or the other.

Crystal I'm Canadian. But for people to understand, I would call myself "brown" because I look brown.

//It's easier [...] to accept, so instead of going I'm biracial and giving them the whole blah blah blah about being biracial, I'm brown. It's just easier.

James For me I have literally I have dual citizenship so I consider myself Canadian-American, or just white. I have no problem being referred to as the "white guy".

Sam I wouldn't refer to myself as Canadian and I refer to myself as Korean even though I am more Canadian than Korean cause I can speak English. I can't speak Korean.

The group members were aware of their "elite" status within the school, referring to themselves as a "culture." They also felt that they were artificially separated from other student groups by school policy and they sought a more integrative practice. Through their discussions of identity, they clearly saw themselves as having plural identities as a specific educational group, members of geolinguistically distinct groups and as Canadians.

James Basically I have a huge problem to the extent which the "IB" program segregated from the regular program because we are not basically we are not given any opportunity except through our one single elective [course] to associate with the school.

//So what they do and it seems to me that they try to keep us, like I don't know why or for what purpose, they try to keep us separate from the Regular people. And it comes from the upper levels of "IB" in the school where literally, I don't know why they say that no non-"IB" people can come to "IB" functions like all this kind of stuff.

//It is socially detrimental to us in a way. Because what you see../we don't see the breadth of the difference of opinions. There is a general "IB" mindset that we all share and may be unaware of. But in the regular program they don't have that and I think it would be incredibly beneficial just to avoid that.

Crystal It's a culture of its own and the fact that I don't have electives it separates us.

Sam I was going to say that "IB" has its own culture. Like we have our own jokes and things inclusive to us.

Crystal Vocabulary too.

Sarah TOK!

James Initials.

Crystal Regulars have no idea.

James We are viewed in the school as the elite. Personally I hate that.

"IB" members articulated how language was seen as an important factor in community unity and segregation. Not only is language a matter of cultural distinctness, but it is also a central factor in cultural survival. To a degree, concern for cultural survival is placed by the student in the "older generation." Students see themselves as belonging to the culturally distinct group while at the same time as part of an evolving social group.

Crystal Uhm that's a point that was brought up earlier. *How language can help seclude a culture.* I find that if you're from a culture that's trying to create its own community they don't encourage the speaking of English because then you are trying to assimilate out and they lose. It's as if you are losing your culture into a North American society or into the greater society. They want to try to preserve that. And so when you are with

friends of that other culture the older generations will be like, be snide to you if you are speaking English with them. They are saying..no like they'll call you like a coconut or they'll call you like trying to be white.. banana! See it's not just for our culture. It's the older generations who will make fun of you for trying to assimilate out because you're losing what they are bringing from the home country. Like if you do something, like oh you're being too modern, you're being too North American, you're being too Canadian; that's what Canadian kids do. And then that becomes a problem. So language is sort of a way of holding on to that. It means that you have accepted your culture and you are of *that* culture and you're not trying to *become* something else. That becomes a real problem. It's a generation gap there as well as a culture gap. There's too much of a difference.

Just as language is a key identifier in the culturally distinct group, so is language a factor in social group cohesiveness. A bilingual fluency allows "IB" students to cross geolinguistic boundaries. Along with linguistic and social fluidity, a kind of *cultural fluency* is developed through associations with multiple groups.

Misook In "IB" we hang out with each other, we all talk in English, we always talk in English so everyone even those people came outside of the school in grade 11 and they felt so comfortable because they understood what we were talking about, and they got to integrate with us and they felt comfortable. Even though we talked in English some were from here but mostly Asian background, some from Europe or Eastern Canada, the language actually brought together the different backgrounds and then we as time passed by we exposed ourselves I guess and we learned about each other and how one country thought about some controversial issues, cultural practices.

//Whenever Chinese "IB" kids see "IB" people they talk English, but when they interact with Regular class friends, they tend to use more their own language. OK there's a big problem they do that because, if they talk in English to Regular class kids they think they are showing off by using English. So it is peer pressure.

Along with language and cultural skills, the "IB" students are committed to dialogue as a means of resolving conflicts or disagreements. They absorb a variety of influences and reconstitute them in their "own way."

Misook Most of the people in "IB", when we talk about our parents and the conflicts we have, discussion is often how our conflicts resolve. Although they try to guide us in a certain way they want, they also give us a chance to think for ourselves. We think about what our parents tell us, our school and then we incorporate and find our own way.

In finding their "own way," they challenge stereotypes, interrogate boundaries, and revise and improvise cultural categories. They may even break rules to examine the outcome.

Sam Another really common word is "jewish". Things being referred to as "jewish". But I don't..that's not something, I don't

(chorus – yeah's)

Sam Something bad is described as "jewish"

Sarah Something cheap is "jewish" apparently.

Crystal That's intended to be offensive though. That comes from the idea that Jewish people are stickly with their money.

The "IB" students combine some the practices of the two previous groups traversing both distinct groups and the anomalous middle. They are highly aware of an institutionally structured separation which they see as not "beneficial." Diversity is acknowledged through the complexities of identity which they both adopt and respect. While selectively adopting cultural distinctness, they also identify the sources of distinctness as being especially parental and articulate the reasons for this distinctness. "You're not trying to become something else." Thus they spoke their first language in a "distinct" group. At the same time, they maintain a common intra- and inter- group practice of speaking English while extending this practice to extra curricular situations so that others "got to integrate with us." They saw this as desirable because "we got to learn about each other." Discussion was seen as a way to bridge differences and they were willing to challenge "ethnic" stereotypes through articulating assumptions that underlie them. Interestingly, the IB students most clearly articulated their position vis-à-vis the larger entity of "Canadian" society.

3.4 Student Practices as "*Propriety*"

Above I have alluded to the usefulness of de Certeau's ideas of a logic of practice, especially his ideas of "*strategies*" and "*tactics*," as a way of understanding the student practices of multiculturalism. I now consider these ideas more systematically. Some of the above critiques and practices of multiculturalism have focused on the notion of marginality based on "race," class, gender and ethnicity. Instead of situating enquiry on social designations de Certeau looks for a pattern of connection between marginal positions which helps to make them better understood in their diversity and their difference. He extends the idea of marginality to the society as a whole, viewing it as neither totally homogeneous nor unified. "Marginality is today no longer limited to minority groups, but is rather massive and pervasive... Marginality is becoming universal. A marginal group has now become a silent majority" (1984, xvii). Applying de Certeau's ideas to multiculturalism we may look to the relations among groups as "part of a continuing investigation of the ways in which users – commonly assumed to be passive

and guided by established rules – operate" (xi). De Certeau's method foregrounds critical attention on everyday practices; "to make explicit the systems of operational combination" and thus to reveal patterns of action and interaction continuously created by "users" or consumers of hegemonic rules and regulations of a "dominating" group in society. Such "users" are neither passive nor docile (xii). Since the present study addresses the gap between policy ("dominating") and student practices ("dominated"), de Certeau's approach seems to apply.

3.4.1 Language and Space in *The Practice of Everyday Life*

Walking, dwelling, reading and studying are everyday spatial practices that are both complex and contingent. Individual spatial practices are coded as ways of proceeding and constraints. These practices regulate the changes or movements of place made by stories in the "form of places put in linear or interlaced series." In student narrative and experience this is met, for example, as "I walked into the class room" or "The first time I went to school." When acted out by actors, the places are linked by "modalities" that relate the kind of passage enacted (de Certeau 1984, 115).

According to de Certeau, each story is a "spatial practice" and every practice has a related *tactic*, a mode of surviving the dominant rationality by turning social codes into "metaphors and *ellipses* of one's own quests" (my emphasis xvii; Chow 1993, xi). The narrated stories tell of the "adventures" experienced when entering the unfamiliar; they are ways in which the storyteller encounters and moves from structure to action. The movements and accommodations, the limitations or boundaries are the "narrative actions" considered in our analysis.

De Certeau's "two logics of action," *strategies* and *tactics*, are used as a framework for understanding the ongoing conflict and competition related to the functioning of groups (or individuals) in social situations and relationships of dominance within the spatial. A *strategy* is a social order comprised of signifying practices within time and space and deals with the external social categories or social codes that "transforms the uncertainties of history into readable spaces" (1984, 36).

[A] 'strategy' [is] the calculus of force-relationships which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an 'environment.'

Strategies are institutional productions at many levels, such as the system of policies, ideologies and politics of multiculturalism, education, the family and so on. A *tactic* is a calculated action determined by the *absence* of a proper locus (place), and is an operational logic that relies on

time instead of space. It transforms the turmoil of everyday life through manipulation for the purpose of one's own enjoyment. Rey Chow's "metaphors and ellipses of one's own quests" (Chow 1993, xi; de Certeau, xvii) thus correspond to *tactics* as a mode of surviving a dominant social code. The idea of *tactics* is useful because it allows us to unveil the rhetorical stance as both symbol and motive presented in discourses of multiculturalism. Here we identify essentialist notions of culture and history as well as those forces that create new solidarities informed by a *strategic* attitude which repeats what one seeks to overturn (Chow 1993, 17).

The discipline of rhetoric... describes the "turns" or tropes of which language can be both the site [propre] and the object [consumer or user], and, on the other hand, these manipulations are related to the ways of changing... the will of another (de Certeau 1984, xx).

For de Certeau, *the spatial* becomes a metaphor for such public spaces as a school where implicit principles of tolerance, rules of standardized behaviours, or *propriety*, prevail. *Propriety* is an implicit contract on coexistence in which each person cedes individuality in favour of a collective. The process of "living with," enacts an intuitively knowable system of value judgments (1998, 17). The goal is to accumulate symbolic benefits for not standing out or being noticed. An individual becomes a partner in a "social contract" that makes life easier. *Propriety* is the management of the public face of each of us; how one is seen and how one avoids any dissonance in behaviours or disruption of the perceived social environment. It is the management of a space that produces stereotypical behaviours and social codes for the purpose of easy recognition. Using as a thematic map the spatiality of the school and the student activity therein, the *strategic* public space is transformed into a private and particularized space through the many adaptations, manipulations that people make in their everyday activities (*tactics*) (de Certeau et al. 1998, 8-9).

Students for the most part identify their arrival as newcomers to a school as the most problematic of times. As both new to the country and new to the school, they face a formidable array of *givens*, what de Certeau would identify as *strategies*. On one hand, there are national immigration policies, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship, new laws, a new city, neighbourhood, climate, food, and so forth. On the other hand, there are the very immediate realities of a new school building, a very different body of students, school and classroom procedures, educational policies, pedagogical practices, the behaviour of teachers and many similar things, but above all, language. From the standpoint of de Certeau, students will not be passive receptors and reproducers of institutional *strategies*. Alongside the trauma these

"givens" may bring about, students will manipulate them for survival in the first place and ultimately for their own purposes and ends, that is, "enjoyment" (1984, xxii). I would liken the activity of learning to the activity of reading, which Certeau describes thus: "A different world (the reader's) slips into the author's place.... This mutation makes the text habitable, like a rented apartment" (1984, xxi). In the learning environment, "[a] different world (the student's) slips into the school's (teachers, administrators, school boards, Ministry of Education) place. This mutation makes the school "habitable."

Entering a school's social order, students as "users" of the social space manipulate social codes and practices in their own interest. It does not take long for a newcomer entering a classroom for the first time to identify someone who speaks his/her own language. This allows the student to "insinuate" themselves into the social space. Another *tactic* is seen when students refuse to accept the negative intention of "ESL" and infer new meaning from it. The student "poaches on it, is transported into it, pluralizes himself in it like the rumblings of one's body" (1984, xxi-xxii). Students tactically *incorporate* school strategies.

Students are concerned not only with finding others who speak a common language or have a common activity but also with the working through of what is in their midst. The spatialization of the school becomes an integral part of all the choices, performances and practices of everyday living. In the mode of de Certeau, the spatial is transformed by implicit usages (*propriety*) in a private and particularized space.

The everyday use of the public space of a school can be discussed in terms of a neighbourhood, "a dynamic notion requiring progressive apprenticeship that grows with the repetition of the dweller's body's engagement in public space" (de Certeau 1998, 11). This neighbourhood is comprised of walkways (hallways), workplaces (classrooms), and home (one's locker). The analogy between neighbourhood and home (locker) follows several criteria. The two are joined by trajectories, or two "exogenous though coexisting elements," interdependent as one has no meaning without the other. To enter a school, go to one's locker, arrange, rearrange, put in, take out is a "cultural, non-arbitrary act: it inscribes the inhabitant in a network of social signs that preexist him or her" (1998, 12). The neighbourhood is the space of the relationship between entrance/exit; inside/outside where one intersects with others such as between locker and locker, locker and classroom, classroom and library and so on; between the known/unknown, masculine/feminine, activity/passivity. It is always a relationship between oneself and the physical and social world of the school where one can glean "segments of meaning" from the

location of the front door, of one's locker, the parking lot, the classroom, the cafeteria and "events" that occur in these spaces; where lockers and hallways are separate from the classroom and marked by a "spatio-temporal coercion" – arrive on time, don't run in the hallways, going to school. Within the space of the neighbourhood, the subject "refabricates it for his/her own use by undoing the constraints of the urban [school] apparatus and, as a consumer of space, imposes his/her own law on the external order" (12). Through knowledge of surroundings, daily walking through, relationships with neighbours (administrators, teachers, students and other staff) and storekeepers (cafeteria staff), there is not only an accumulation, production and organization of the "object of a knowledge, but [also] *the place of a recognition*" (1998, 12-13, emphasis in original).

A neighbourhood is a "spatial relationship to other as a social being" (1998, 12) wherein one finds recognition without which one is not "a human being." The *tactic* of developing connections with those who speak a common language or have a common nationality allows a newcomer to be "recognized" through the exchanges and relationships with others. Entering an unfamiliar spatiality, the first day is a destabilizing moment and becomes problematic and newcomers cannot find their way nor be able to participate in the rituals or performances of daily school life, and are left to "follow [imitate] other students." Their newness sets them apart, transgressors into a "given" social space, the neighbourhood, and they feel singled out and "stared at" by other students. Only a certain range of difference is tolerated and if there is deviation from the stereotypical, there is testing and checking.

My own presence was quickly noticed on the first day as a group of Grade 8 students approached me in the cafeteria and began to interrogate me – "Who are you?" "What are you doing?" "Are you a teacher?" Any transgression of space is noticed and users encountering an unpredictable event, would seek a reason for it. Such events are measured against a backdrop of *propriety*, where a transgression is read against a known standard, unnuanced and recognizable. At the moment of transgression one becomes legible to others and provide clues to the transgressor of what is proper. My age, dress and my walking through a cafeteria full of students provided the students a "way of reading" my presence – teachers walk and act like that. Another example was when I asked a group of girls why they insisted that another student was not Taiwanese. They said, "You just can tell." Space is managed through *proprieties* that produce "stereotypical behaviours... for the purpose of easy recognition" (1998, 8-9). These codes are implicit, not articulated, but simply known. The students were well aware of the conventions in

dress or how one looks and the relationship to identity. When a student deviated from a prescribed convention, or *propriety*, the result was confusion over or misinterpretation of identity. Gestures, physical closeness, intonations, and dress are some of the factors of implicit discourse alongside explicit conversations between members of a group and are signs favouring a process of recognition.

3.4.2 Habitable Space as "Neighbourhood"

Now, let us shift the focus to view the school as a "city," looking more closely at the "neighbourhoods" within it. A neighbour according to de Certeau and Giard is "neither intimate nor anonymous" (1998, 12). The school itself is therefore more like a city than a neighbourhood, as a city is comprised of many anonymous or anomalous groups. These groups, spatially situated, are "the place of law," practiced by the social collective that is the neighbourhood, "of which no dweller is absolute keeper but to which all are urged to submit in order to make everyday life possible" (1998, 23). The quality of relationships between groups is monitored by *propriety* such that discrete groups are formed and the moving into another group's space (physical closeness) is notable. In observing students in the hallways at lunch hour, they walk in groups or pairs, usually talking with one another and rarely interacting with anyone they pass. If alone, they do not make eye contact, or at the very least try not to do so unless they recognize someone. I watched one of my participants, whose habitual place of gathering was a friend's locker, walk down the hallway after school. Three separate groups of three or four students were situated at various locations along the hallway. As she passed, she did not look at or acknowledge them, nor did they acknowledge her. In order to traverse the space she first went to her locker, opened it, looked inside for a brief moment, and closed the door without taking anything out or putting anything into it. The motion was quick. On closing her locker, she gave a quick glance and continued down the hall. Having a destination gave her a reason to be in that space. A lack of any eye contact between the student and the groups allowed her to traverse the neighbourhood with minimal disruption. In a neighborhood, "the level of propriety is proportional to the lack of differentiation in the corporal manifestation of attitudes" (de Certeau 1998, 18). Where the student is not "at home" even though at her own locker, the *impropriety* is minimized through a *lack of recognition*.

The everyday practice of recognizing and being recognized is organized according to spatiality within the "city" or school. Students were aware of the management of space. Both Eva and Misook were able to described the spatial organization of the school.

[F]rom the entry way by the Library to the corner facing the cafeteria, IB kids. On the same side of office Mandarin speakers and the other Mainland China, Malaysia, born in Canada. They call themselves Canadian and Cantonese. Entrance right past Library, Cantonese. By the gym Filipinos and the rest.

As I observed, "the rest" referred to groups of South Asians, both male and female, Russians (males) and Eastern Europeans (males) and a group of English speaking males. Regular Program students and "IB" Program students gathered in the main entrance, along with French Immersion "IB" males. French Immersion students were in an alcove on the second floor overlooking the cafeteria below and a group of female French Immersion students occupied the hallway by the small Gym. The graphics room was for Grade 8 and 9 Mandarin speakers. Similarly, in the Cafeteria during lunch hour, groups are formed according to linguistic, age and gender criteria, for example, an all female, Cantonese, Grade 8/9 group or an all male, Mandarin speaking, Grade 9 group. A few groups formed according to gender and age, that is, students with different first languages. In these groups English was the common language. Not only were students aware of these practices of group formation but so was the Librarian who knew that an "older group of Russians" occupied the north east corner stairwell by the Library (but not accessible through the library). In addition to the social code "ESL," the social codes "Regular" and "IB," designated a difference repeated by both students and teachers alike.

I also observed that while groups were in close proximity to one another (across from each other in the hallway), there was *no interaction between groups*. I observed the two large groups by the main school entrance over a period of two months during the lunch hour without seeing any interaction between them. Students moved through or around groups without eye contact, or verbal or any other form of recognition.

Just as hallways are spatially organized according to large groups, lockers too, as specific destinations for individuals and gathering places for friends and associates, often reflect distinct social groupings. Students in Grades 8 through 11 are allocated lockers according to the location of the homeroom. Students, who do not have lockers in close proximity to their friends, often choose one student's locker as a place to congregate: "So which homeroom has the most of our friends we eat at those lockers. And then if those lockers aren't free we eat another one because everyone has their own lockers." By "free" the student means here that a specific group had not already occupied the space. Students are making *tactical* adjustments (lockers by friends) to the

institutionally assigned spatial divisions (lockers by homeroom), and these *tactics* obey certain neighbourhood *propriety*, particularly noticeable in the congruence of social distance and physical distance.

A significant change in the allocation of locker space occurs in Grade 12. The graduating class is given lockers located on the first floor (prime real estate near the main entrance) and these lockers are assigned according to a system. In this system groups of ten students, self-chosen, compete in the scavenger hunt where the outcome determines the order of choice of lockers. Theoretically this would result in students likely having assigned lockers in congenial groupings of ten. In fact, in choosing locker locations, the students actually follow historically established guidelines in respecting socially claimed geographic space. A *tactic* of separating into even more distinct groupings becomes a symbolic representation of *ownership* of the spatial where transgression is avoided. "It's like the rule.... You never see a white person having in the hallway like in a Cantonese place." Thus in Grade 12 some of the students tend to group into monocultural neighbourhoods. The student above identified these groups as those that happen to have the largest populations in the school and so are capable of occupying large blocks of space.

While students clearly identify with a distinct group enlisting either a geolinguistic or social code of identity, they often are unaware of the other groups within the "city." Aligning oneself within a distinct group, the process of differentiation homogenizes all others into more anomalous identifiers – "black," "white," "Caucasian," "Frenchies," "bananas." This *tactic* of self-identification grants distinctness and therefore power, or at least influence. A self identified Taiwanese student will also identify him/herself as Mandarin speaking, grouping themselves in the larger group of Mainland Chinese students, and as a member of an even larger group "Chinese" that includes those from Hong Kong, Mainland China and Taiwan. Even if a self-identified "Chinese" student complains about there being the large "Chinese" majority this *tactic* of self-identification allows one to align with the dominant and powerful groups within the "city" where such alignment is perceived to be beneficial. Grace commented that students usually elect "the Chinese girl" as President of the Student Council.

And this year it's also the Chinese who is also the President. Sometimes because it's kind of, it's kind of helpful if you have a power that can help you and if somebody who can speak the language is in the power or position that can help you, advise you.

Everyday practices of the Grade 12 students (who are at this stage are no longer "ESL" students) are an expression distinction. If we can grant the Grade 12 students a fairly high level of self-awareness, then we can say that some of these students have developed a tactical *multiculturalism of distinctness* and separation along geographical and linguistic lines, particularly if these lines separate large homogenous populations. On the evidence above, "homogeneity" is a rather fluid principle, realized in context-sensitive tactics. The tendency to divide into distinct (and by implication *indistinct*) groups can be found in earlier grades as well. Students may separate themselves into groups in the seating arrangements within a classroom, where, once again, lines of separation are based according to who belongs to what population. The size of group populations within the school may determine the possibilities of spatial organization. One student noted that when first coming into a classroom and sitting down, students identify one another and separate on the basis of geographic and linguistic lines with an *indistinct* group left to the space remaining. In sum, there is a strain of multiculturalism practiced by larger self-aware groups with a strong tendency toward distinction and separation.³⁶

On the basis of the above, some general observations can be made regarding the practices of the mainstream or "Regular" Program students. The tendency towards distinction and separation creates groups with either a geographic, linguistic or social code of identity. The groups define themselves through social relationships between agents, and create "culturally distinct" neighbourhoods, or distinct locales, through a variety of practices. In this way groups establish a kind of "metaphoric or fictive kinship." These groups are highly aware of their own "distinctness" but less aware of at least some of the "distinctness" of other groups, tending to regard them as indistinct or "other," thus "defining themselves in relation to what they are not" (Eriksen 1999, 37).³⁷ In these ways, the mainstream student groups practice a kind of "ethnicity," having at least some of the features noted by T. H. Eriksen.

A different set of multicultural practices are seen in two smaller non-mainstream, institutionally identified groups, namely "ESL" and "IB." When entering into a new environment, "ESL" students are aware of their displacement and seek recognition. They demand their right as "human beings" by emphasizing the need to assimilate through learning to read and write in English. The institution (school) conveys egalitarian, modernist values where equal rights and the protection of individual freedoms are upheld, and newcomers call on these basic values centered on the individual and tending toward homogeneity. It is the safest path, to blend in, particularly if they do not fit into an already established and entrenched group or where

such groups can be seen to be a threat to one's individuality and equality. "Individual rights" is the ground upon which they later build the structure of multiculturalism, and clearly prioritizes, a *sine qua non*, an existing condition, "They were all ESL once."

As newcomers to a society and school, "ESL" students employ a *tactic* of assimilation to overcome the affects of dislocation, but do not hesitate to use the institutional designation of "ESL" as a group identity, giving themselves a position of strength from which they can negotiate. But, in time newcomers begin to identify difference within the spatial and social and develop *tactics* to manipulate the spatial and power relations for their own enjoyment. Finding oneself in a minority or "anomalous group in the middle," the students use (perceived) majoritarian practices of separation as a tactic of "distinctness." The "tactic" of a numerically dominant group becomes a "strategy" to the smaller group and is incorporated in its own turn through ownership and subversion of the practice. This is reminiscent of de Certeau's idea that "Marginality is today no longer limited to minority groups" (1984, xvii). This is clearly the dialectic on which de Certeau bases his work.

For very different reasons, the "IB" Program group, a *strategic* designation, identified themselves as distinct and separate from the mainstream school population but also as an institutionally segregated minority. Separation is imposed through control of events or functions in which other students are not allowed. While some members displayed ambivalence over this segregation, members referred to themselves as a "culture" that has its own cultural practices such as jokes and a particular vocabulary that "Regulars" do not understand. They also referred to themselves as a community, differentiated from the Regular Program group seen as comprised of many little groups, whereas in "IB" everyone knows each other. Any connection with the Regular Program is seen as "a big boundary to cross," and yet, during student elections, thirteen out of eighteen candidates were from the "IB" Program group, with five "IB" students elected to the seven member Student Council. As Kymlicka and Norman suggest, the civic awareness and active participation in the political process provide an identity as members of the school at large, as well a much larger community as *International Baccalaureate* students.

The cohesiveness of the "IB" Program group also centered around use of English as a common language, despite the linguistic and geographic diversity of the members who Misook described as "mostly Asian background, some from Europe or Eastern Canada." The "IB" Program students extended the school policy of speaking English in the classroom to speaking English outside the classroom. This practice continued even though, as Crystal noted, the

"language of the school [English] becomes the minority," acknowledging that English is not the majority language spoken in the school.

Full participating members of school, a city, a country, and of an "international program," the students in the International Baccalaureate Program defined themselves as a distinct group reproducing the *strategic* "givens" of the school. In a way, the "IB" *tactic* was flexible, in some ways *using* the *strategic* policies, while at the same time practicing a *tactic* of separation. They practiced integration when taking on leadership roles and exercising "official language" fluency, as well as a separation imposed by the institution but maintained by the students. They practiced a multiculturalism of respect for diversity and multiculturalism as a process of "active citizenship."

While there were variations among the three identified groups, there were definite patterns of group formation that reflected multicultural practices. The "ESL" group responded to initial feelings of dislocation and isolation with a practice of a multiculturalism of integration, insisting on the vocation of a newcomer to gain a skill in English language. This seems to be consistent with the policy vision of multiculturalism within a bilingual framework (Trudeau in 1971 House of Commons Debate as cited above), at least with respect to English. This group is far from seeing this position as too assimilating (as Abu Laban and Stasiulis). While others used "ESL" in a derogatory fashion, it was also possible for the "ESL" group to identify with this as a social code affording recognition. While the label "ESL" is a *strategy* imposed by the institution, the owning of the designation is a *tactic* to make the "ESL" space more habitable. Very new "ESL" students may also overcome isolation through association with an individual of the same linguistic or geographical origin. However, rather than identifying with a larger group, newcomers remain more fragmented and seek to become familiar with the new society as a whole (multiculturalism within a bilingual framework). As newcomers reach a degree of integration, small groups based on language and place of origin may begin to form and develop a *propriety* of difference based on easily recognizable features such as dress.

The Regular Program students are much more adept at management of space through which they practice what can be called a multiculturalism of distinctness. Being by far the majority of students in the school, the practices of this group are much more diverse. In all cases, *propriety* marked *tactical adjustments* that maintained a social and physical distance, and was often based on historical practices. While institutional *strategies* often make general spatial designations such as lockers, numerically dominant groups tend to practice a *tactic* of separation

into specific areas or "neighbourhoods," again along lines of language or place of origin. Identity may be organized in degrees of a generality from speakers of a specific language such as Cantonese or Mandarin to a larger ethnic marker such as "Chinese." Through the agency of a *propriety*, a numerically larger group may achieve a certain appropriation of space with a tendency for its *tactics* to become a new level of *strategy* "which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a "proprietor", p. 42) can be isolated from an environment" (1984, xix). Numerically smaller groups practice a multiculturalism of "mixed" distinctness, maintaining linguistically homogenous groups informally, while assimilating the usage of English while in official or formal situations such as the classroom. This linguistic versatility may also indicate a kind of cultural versatility or a degree of mastery of a variety of social situations.

The third group, the "IB" Program group, was again a group organized by institutional policies and to a certain degree incorporated institutional *strategies* in its practices of a "flexible" multiculturalism. On the one hand, this group identified themselves as distinct and separate, accepting institutionally imposed segregation. On the other hand, students in the group were often able to traverse spatial boundaries of the "neighbourhoods." There was often a questioning and reflecting on *proprieties* and identities that distinguished this academically accelerated group. In addition, perhaps as a *tactic* of appropriation of institutional policy this group practiced an "active citizenship" (Kymlicka, see above). The "IB" Program group incorporated a certain "style" in their multicultural practices that I investigate in more detail below.

CHAPTER IV

Multicultural Practice as a Critique of Policy

The emergence of Canadian multicultural policy with the Trudeau speech of October 8, 1971 on the implementation of a policy of multiculturalism within the bilingual framework of the nation was accompanied from the start by its criticism. Critiques of the policy range from the policy being in the service of "nation building" to a policy that had merit as a means rather than an end, a "work in progress" (Abu Laban and Stasiulis). Henry and Tator argued that although there is an attempt at recognition of diversity and equality, the policy continues to reproduce the inequities that already exist in Canadian society. Other critiques follow a similar line of reasoning with criticism based on social groups such as gender and class (Okin and Wolf) and religion (Masigno et al.).

The *Multiculturalism Act* is written from the perspective of the "nation" and as a "nation" within the international sphere.³⁸ Multicultural policy is prescriptive, directing the government in its relationships with individuals and groups within the nation. From this perspective the nation *recognizes* diversity in which multiculturalism is a "fundamental characteristic" of "Canadian identity," and subsumed under a "Canadian society." Government is to "promote" understanding within a diverse population.

The policy is ambiguous. Does it see the nation acting toward the individual or group; individuals acting towards each other or groups or the nation; groups acting towards each other or the nation? Whereas a rights-based multiculturalism is centered on the relationship between the individual and the nation, a multiculturalism based in "distinctness" grants the group priority in certain "rights," presumably vis-à-vis the nation. If the nation is seen as *comprised of* these distinct groups, then it is interaction among the groups themselves that is the foundation of multiculturalism, since the "nation" is essentially distributed among the groups. Thus the basic assumption of national multicultural policy is that there is an interaction among diverse groups, and that interaction gives rise to understanding between groups. This is in fact in the wording of the policy to "promote the understanding and creativity *that arise from* the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins" (refer to Appendix VI, Canadian Multiculturalism Act). This assumption is based on an "active" diversity where interaction among groups is seen as continuous and dialogic.

The dichotomy that has developed in critical debate is one that distinguishes a multiculturalism of recognition and rights of specific *groups* from a multiculturalism that flows from constitutional guarantees of *individual* rights and freedoms. Groups and individuals in a "rights" based multiculturalism are subsumed as part of a higher principle of nation building which is served by national multicultural policy. As the nation moves towards a policy of diversity and indeed defines itself as a country that recognizes "distinctness," this definition seems to fragment the larger entity (the nation); but more importantly, the "distinct" level is only defined vis-à-vis a larger or higher group. Although policy assumes a "two-way process of accommodation" (Abu-Laban 1999, 202-203) between newcomers and other Canadians, it does so within the context of the nation. Concordant with universal rights, groups intermediate between the nation and the individual are accorded privileges, but also, as citizens, members have an obligation and duty to participate in the larger entity, the nation. How do these privileges and obligations play out with regard to those communities or groups that are within the larger groups comprised of the two founding nationalities of Canada as well as Aboriginals? If, for example, we look at "the rest of Canada" (factoring out Aboriginals and Quebecers), we can see that it is comprised of a diversity of peoples where inter- and intra- class structures cut across ethnicities and historical divisions. To what extent and by whom are these groups given recognition? Furthermore, do they grant recognition to other separate distinct groups and open interaction and interparticipation?

The ethnographic study of student multicultural practices revealed that many of the above issues are implicitly expressed through the everyday usages of both social and physical space that make it congenial and habitable. Student tactical uses of "official" multicultural rhetoric (school policy, signage, teacher's attitudes) implicitly raise issues of individual rights and freedoms, group rights and distinctness, and the interactivity of distinct groups. In sum, the issues articulated in critical discussion, multiculturalism versus national bilingualism, the rights of groups and those of the individual, and national or ethnic identity are precisely the issues reflected by students' characteristic questions and practices.

To demonstrate the ways in which student practices critique official (strategic) multiculturalism, I now look at congruencies between these practices and the categories of Taylor's "two liberalisms." It is useful to take Taylor's expression of liberal multiculturalism as "normative" since his work reflects a main current in the Canadian approach to multiculturalism

in a national arena (English and French Canada). Policy makers, Charles Taylor, departments of education, individual teachers and others speak and act against this "background."

In "Politics of Recognition" (1994) Charles Taylor links the need, or a demand, for recognition with a "politics of multiculturalism," while rejecting any liberalism that does not offer a place for collective identities. He views personal identity as constructed (and constructing) with the cultural group one shares. The recognition of equal value of each cultural group that permits a "conversation" between diverse communities is linked to the notion of authenticity, difference, and the principle of equal dignity. According to Taylor, the need for recognition is a basic need that others must be sensitive to because "*misrecognition*" is harmful, causing "real damage, real distortion" particularly if society were to "mirror back... a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture" (25 emphasis in original). It is within the educational sphere that "*misrecognition*" can be challenged. In order for a cultural group to gain recognition it would mean a change in the negative images created by dominant groups whose tendency it is to inculcate "an image of inferiority in the subjugated" (66).

Taylor's notion of *survivance*, or cultural survival, is based on his interpretation of the political move to name Quebec as a "distinct society." Taylor seems to suggest that fundamental liberal rights of non-French speaking Quebecers need not be fully recognized, as strict adherence to them fails to accommodate the survival of a group's identity. Cultural survival and self-determination are identified as rights above and beyond universal human rights and freedoms. Taylor envisions this as a "non-procedural liberalism" that ensures cultural survival. Cultural survival is grounded upon the recognition of the historical significance of cultural groups within the nation and extension of individual rights to cultural groups. Taylor examines the collective goals to design policies that would enable the cultural survival of groups within the larger context of Canadian society, especially policies that implement French as the official language of Quebec. His argument for such policies aimed at cultural survival is to actively *create* members of a community in the assurance that future generations continue to identify as, for example, French-speakers (58-59, my emphasis). Survival then is the placement of restrictions imposed by a minority group on the majority in the name of the collective goal of cultural survival even when such restrictions are in conflict under the *Canadian Charter of Rights*.

A "distinct" society then can achieve its collective goals but must also respect diversity and provide safeguards for the fundamental rights of those who do not share in these common

goals (59). Once the ideal of distinctness is broached and a previously "indistinct" society becomes a "distinct" society, not only does it have its own smaller "distinct" societies within, but equally importantly, because it too must have been a part of something larger, it seems to leave those outside "indistinct," a vast vagueness that is captured by the phrase "the rest of Canada." In other words, if Quebec achieves its "distinct" designation, there is an implication that at the same time the rest of Canada becomes a large "indistinct" society. Since the effect of homogenization of a culture under the Rousseauian principle of "equal dignity" was one of the arguments for acknowledging the value or "equal worth" of a cultural group, it is hard to see how recognition of "distinctness" does not also have homogenizing tendencies. Does it not homogenize everything both within and outside the "distinct?"

Educational institutions are part of the apparatus (policy) of a liberal democratic society whose primary philosophical assumption is based on the individual,³⁹ expressed by the seminal philosopher of education, John Dewey. He asserts that education address each student's "specific capabilities, needs, and preferences" because "not all minds work in the same way" (Dewey, 1944 (1916), 130). Such an approach forms the bedrock of liberal education and rests firmly on the same principles as Taylor's identification of individual dignity as at the heart of modern liberalism.

Whether within a "distinct" or an "indistinct" society, it is especially important for my study to consider finer levels of organization, the "smaller distinct societies" referred to above, or what perhaps may simply be thought of as "communities" or even "neighbourhoods." The connotations surrounding "community" can be diffusely defined as centered on locality or neighbourhood or converging around social, ethnic and religious commonalities. A community therefore is comprised of a group of individuals actively pursuing or practicing common interests and goals. But, to what extent do these communities belong to a nation or a larger public or, better, *comprise* the larger entity? As individuals we are recognized and have legal status of "Canadian" and so belong to a nation and a larger public. Both Kymlicka and Taylor draw attention to national minorities such as Aboriginal groups in Canada and Quebecers as being accorded special privileges and rights. Taylor further argues for the added provision of cultural survival for future generations, though he does not especially refer to immigrant groups or communities. This approach seems to allow a great deal of latitude in defining "distinctness" (and consequently "indistinctness") from the lumpy mix of cultural groups or communities comprising the nation.

Just as Taylor links the individual to the group, so does Dewey who sees the education process as involving the "control and growth of both the immature individual and the group in which he [sic] lives"(322). Dewey's program addresses the whole society "aiming at its own perpetuation through education" which is "intentionally progressive" and democratic and whose goal in education is to identify "mutually shared interests distinct from the preservation of established customs" (322). While Dewey writes from the perspective of a more homogenous nation or "societal culture" (Kymlicka) than Taylor, one may argue that his prescription for education still operates as the background against which change takes place.

Dewey's thought clearly lays the groundwork for the enculturating function of education, the relationship between the individual and the higher entity. In this, it is wholly consistent with Taylor's notion of *survivance*. The question arises simply of the nature and extent of the trans-individual entity – a nation, two or several nations, cultural groups *constituting* a nation, or another sort of "human community"? This is a question of how finely "recognition," "distinctness," or "*survivance*" may be divided. Further, even this recognition is contained in an ideology (liberal, democratic), a history ("national"), and a set of social practices conditioned by locality.⁴⁰

4.1 Types of Multicultural Practices

The formation of neighbourhoods within a particular school population may be seen as a counterpart to a Taylorian notion of "distinctness" and *survivance*. What we see in this school population are not just variants of multiculturalism, but also a hierarchy of practices whereby individual recognition is achieved through integration and collective goals through distinctness. As newcomers to the country, the "ESL" group pursue the primary goal of a "politics of recognition" whereby individual recognition is bound up with individual rights. The everyday practice of needing a "place," and finding recognition as a "human being," is rooted in the modernist notion of the dignity of the individual. In time newcomers are eager to join the mainstream, but their cultural recognition and cultural goals rest on their being recognized as individuals. A secondary goal of distinctness is maintained by the many variants of the "Regular" student population who pursue collective goals through separation and were inhospitable to difference. There seemed to be a relationship between population size and group formation. The students self-identified as "Chinese" were able to refine their identity into smaller geographical and linguistic groupings. Students who were members of geolinguistic groups without sufficient members grouped together in "mixed" groups that used English as the

language of communication. Groups in between organized themselves geographically, "Russian," "Filipino," "Korean," but were linguistically flexible. They spoke a common language in their social groups, and English in the classroom whenever the numbers were not sufficient to break into linguistic groups. These groups may include students who are fluently bilingual or trilingual. Thus numerically larger groups extend the notion of "distinctness" to their own group. "National bilingualism" becomes local bilingualism. In some cases, "distinctness" does seem to create an "indistinct" grouping as in the "anomalous middle" in the self-segregated classroom. However, student practices largely value the cultural mixture of the middle as an example of cultural fluency.

Although students were articulate about the liberalism of individual rights and freedoms, they remained unclear and selective in their characterization of the broad issue of multiculturalism, identifying it, for example, as diversity or a lack of racism, or speaking one's own language. Since students of the "ESL" and "Regular" groups make little reference to a larger social entity, which could range from nation to the school, we can identify these student practices as a "weak" multiculturalism. Thus, the "ESL" students practice a "weak" multiculturalism of integration and the "Regular" students practice a "weak" multiculturalism of distinctness. To the extent that "Regular" students gain skills in one of the official languages, or transcend cultural boundaries through association, the "weak" multicultural practice of these students becomes stronger. Kymlicka sees bilingualism (the maintaining of one's first language along with English) as strengthening the nation and ultimately as a cohesive force in multiculturalism (97). Thus, in "weak" multiculturalism there are tendencies toward a "stronger" form. I will argue below that bilingualism, already practiced by two of the three student groups in the study, can form one of the bases for a multicultural pedagogy of "active" diversity.

The "IB" group practiced an "active" multiculturalism that stems from the "liberal" background. Here I would argue that liberalism has cultural roots though its *cultural* background is not brought into the multicultural mix by Taylor. The "IB" *tactic* is to adopt more holistically the institutional *strategy* of liberal multiculturalism. They recognize and accept their cultural distinctness while taking on the structural, strategic distinctness granted by the educational institution. Endorsing a "culture of liberalism" is a *tactic* seen as a benefit that allows for success not only within the school as a whole, but nationally and globally; a success that is ensured through the practice of a multiculturalism of distinctness *together with* integration. To the extent that the "IB" group participated in a larger entity such as the strong participation in student

government, community work and their engagement in a discussion of foundations of liberal values, and their bilingual fluency, their practices represents a "strong" multiculturalism. The fact that they recognize themselves as an academically elite group, and are so recognized by the school, they identified as a fragmenting factor. This "weakens" their multicultural practice. I have called this a flexible multiculturalism (refer to APPENDIX VII – Multicultural Practice by Student Groups). A good example of this flexibility is that they recognize a concern of the "older generation" for cultural survival, which they adopt to a degree in the process of creating their "own way."

While I have attempted to define a "range" of practices of multiculturalism, I have done so using three institutionally and socially identified groups. However, typologies do not allow for individual distinction particularly since one person may practice either a "weak" or "strong" multiculturalism depending on the context. In addition, I have placed multiculturalism on a continuum allowing for subtle distinctions among a great variety of multiculturalisms. A multitude of practices of inclusion and exclusion exist with each individual (and by extension, each group). One may belong to or move between groups and so will conform to the rules (*propriety*) of the group they are in for that time. The implicit rules of *propriety* are unspoken, silent, but are inherent in these practices. Hence, practice combines both the explicit and implicit, spoken and unspoken, and thus is more nuanced than the highly determined positions of "weak" and "strong" multiculturalism. Against a "background" of liberal ideology and practices certain features may be foregrounded either as a rule or as a situation calls this forth. In either case, these spaces *between* foregrounded features, these silences articulate the doings and makings, the *strategies* and *tactics*, policy, and critique of multiculturalism.

Questions remain at both the level of meaning and value, or worth, accorded to cultural groups. For example, does "recognition" impose an obligation to further "recognize"? To what extent is "recognition" granted within a "recognized" group? How finely divided are the cultural groups? How do social factors intersect with multicultural practices? Does practice consist of a multiculturalism of recognition and rights, or does it extend to the valuation of other cultural distinctnesses?

A Taylorian liberalism includes a discussion of the "value" or worth of cultural *features* and artifacts. According to Taylor, cultural products are separate from a cultural group and we need only recognize and acknowledge distinctness of the latter, not automatically bestow value upon the cultural features or artifacts but only accord them respect – "There is no reason to

believe that, for instance, the different art forms of a given culture should all be of equal, or even of considerable, value" (66). Value requires judgment. Taylor acknowledges that there may indeed be a foundation of "equal worth" in all cultures but that this is only a beginning. He sees actual study of a culture as not accomplished through the standards of one's own culture but rather through a Gadamerian "fusion of horizons" where we learn to "move in a broader horizon, within which what we have formerly taken for granted as the *background* to valuation can be situated as one possibility alongside the *different background* of the formerly unfamiliar culture" (67, my emphasis).

Multicultural policy provides a relativistic interpretation in which all cultural features are of value, and in the absence of an absolute standard everything is included, predicated on the doctrine of equal rights.

[The] Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians... as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians...(refer to Appendix VI, Canadian Multiculturalism Act).

Educational policy conveys egalitarian, modernist values where equal rights and the protection of individual freedoms are upheld. The question remains, to what extent these discourses and practices tend toward a "fusion of horizons?" It seems that a "fusion of horizons" cannot occur without a critical mass of the elements to be fused, that is, strong elements of all the "cultures," "ethnicities," including their social/political/cultural factors in modified, integrated or hybridized ways. This would require at one level multicultural policies that are fully enacted and funded, curriculum and textbooks with in-depth treatment of the variety of cultures represented in student populations, not just based on number of students, the training and preparation of teachers with sufficient historical, sociological and ethnological resources, and most importantly, a sense of a real "usefulness" of these *strategies* on the part of their consumers (administrators, teachers, staff and students of the schools) along with the society as a whole. This enterprise clearly engages the entire societal background. It lays open the question of not only considerations of culture and multiculturalism, but also advantage and disadvantage, class and gender, nation and community, national and transnational, as well as the ebbs and flows of capital, both economic and cultural.

4.2 Student Practices as Styles of Multiculturality

The student multicultural practices that have been discussed are associated with particular groups, namely "ESL," "Regular," and "IB." In the first group students recognize their difference as a response to the diversity of the student population and the lack of English skills. As a result, they develop friendships that facilitate their integration into the "mainstream." In the Regular group, the development of English fluency allows students to make friends and do so on the basis of first language and/or geographic origin. They begin to separate themselves into distinct groups. In the "IB" group, students develop a flexible bilingualism that allows them to traverse linguistic and geographic boundaries. They are also able to articulate and challenge norms.

It is possible to see these group-associated practices as modalities of multiculturalism independent of specific group association. For example, "IB" students are no less interested in developing English skills and making friends who speak the same first language than "ESL" students. "Regular" students may practice a multiculturalism of "distinctness," but may join other groups as well. Both "ESL" and "Regular" students are as capable of challenging and articulating norms as "IB" students. Indeed all three modalities of multicultural practices may be present in any of the groups depending on context. I believe that viewing the types of multicultural practices as free of specific group association, as context-sensitive "styles" of multiculturalism has some explanatory power.

One style is most likely to see "distinct" groups in stereotypical terms, where everything works the way it should and the unstated "Other" is undesirable. Ethnic designators are highly marked: "Indianness, Chineseness, Canadianness." There is a greater insistence on social rules, blindness to nuance and diversity within the group and to the ever-changing contingencies of daily living. In this style of multiculturalism, there is the idea that history has a single source in a particular ethnic group or region, offering a simple paradigm often in the form of portraying a singular national history or national ideal. Herein identity is an exploitation of an idealized difference between cultures and rarely explored within a culture. I call this a "passive" style of multiculturalism.

The other style of multiculturalism is most likely to tend toward a more nuanced set of practices, wherein an individual encounters happenings, participates in events, makes choices, undergoes changes, meets or exceeds social rules, within a development that unfolds through time. The individual is complex, ever changing and unbounded. This style provides an

historical diachronic contingency of "lived experience" with practices that are "authentic" even when they challenge or transgress norms. Such practices do not veer away from paradoxes, anomalies and contrasts that lie between the individual's real lived experiences with all their contingencies and the rule-bound social life in which such anomalies are viewed not only as aberrations, but as errors. I call this an "active" style of multiculturalism.

These styles of multiculturalism can be seen in terms of the ethnographic study and the consideration of the policies and critique of multiculturalism. A convergence of these ideas can be seen in a multiculturalism of "distinctness" with its emphasis on recognition of the group, clearly falling within a "passive" style of multiculturalism in which "eternal" codes of behaviour (*propriety*) are preserved and identity essentialized as a stereotype. If practitioners of this style of multiculturalism see the "distinct" group as part of a multicultural society or follow the Taylorian move of the extension of recognition of the individual to recognition of the group, and thus reciprocate the recognition of other groups, then, this style of multiculturalism has an element of cohesive or "strong" multiculturalism in that it is practiced within a context of either a higher entity (the nation) or a higher principle (a culture of liberalism). It is also consistent with distinctions of multicultural policy, of multiculturalism within a national bilingualism. Thus multiculturalism *includes* multiculturalism.

On the other hand, an "active" style of multiculturalism that looks more to historical contingencies and nuance of context, is clearly consistent with a Taylorian multiculturalism of dialogue – a discussion of value moving towards a "fusion of horizons." We can think of the "active" style of multiculturalism as dialogic or discursive thus potentially building a public discussion contributing to a more cohesive society through an active citizenship. This multiculturalism may also be practiced simply at the level of individualism and thus is a fragmenting or "weak" form of multiculturalism, although maintaining an element of "strength" in its convergence to a higher principle designated by a liberalism of individual rights and freedoms.

A "passive" style of multiculturalism is consistent with a multiculturalism of "distinctness" which Taylor shows has to do with the *survivance* of the group. Such a multiculturalism is also consistent with Aihwa Ong's transnational citizenship, the weakest possible form of multiculturalism. However, *within* a multicultural society, the distinct group gains recognition through liberal principles of that society. The diverse nature of this society may express itself through the *tactic* of self-identification along linguistic (use of first language) and geographic

(locale, neighbourhood) identifiers. Based on a principle of recognition the practice of distinctness raises the question, to what the extent the distinct group recognizes other groups as "distinct?" If other groups remain "indistinct" as in "the rest of Canada," this results in a certain inarticulateness or silence with regard to the "indistinct."

"Distinctness" as multiculturalism clearly grows out of liberal tradition. As a "passive" style of multiculturalism it raises the question of essentialism: Is the "distinctness" that is granted to the group also granted within the group? Does the culture of liberalism imbue or colour or hybridize the culture of "distinctness?" Is diversity *within* the group simply renamed *as* the group and thus silenced? Without an understanding of the past cultural and historical context of "Canadian multiculturalism," while at the same time lacking the permission to negotiate the structural, strategic distinctness of larger social and educational institutions, a group, in order to practice "multiculturalism," has to encounter and contemplate historical process. This is a long, slow process but belongs in the schools as enculturating faculties in society. Such a process is cultivated in one elite group ("IB") with all others left to interpret the background and practice a "weak" multiculturalism that is consistent with policies predicated on the doctrine of equal rights.

Taylor argues that debate can bring about understanding through a Gadamerian "fusion of horizons." Recognition and respect of other cultures or cultural groups comes from and through discussion in which learning is not accomplished from the standpoint of one's own culture, but through language, through a process of learning about different cultures and histories. It is a process of negotiation in which one finds new meaning in other cultures. The "IB" Program group met boundaries between "distinctness" and "indistinctness" head on. Here I would like to make a few observations on the *practice*, in this case, the performance or actual utterance of racial designators by the "IB" Program students. First the students use the terms "oriental," "brown," "white," "black," and "jewish" in their primary denotative meanings. Secondly, unlike their Regular Program counterparts, they are very aware of the derogatory usage of these terms. Nevertheless, the "IB" Program students do not avoid them. In fact, they wish to explore the boundaries of meanings of these terms and do so in an unfettered and highly improvisational way. What they come up with are some familiar factors associated with the notions of performative aspects of speech, such as identity and group formation (turning "insult, brutality and contempt" into sources of "solidarity, joy and collective strength," Gilroy 2000, 12) as well

as notions of language change, and the development of secondary and tertiary meanings of words.

The "IB" students debate "the history which has become internal to a name... [having] force... [which] works in part through an encoded memory or a trauma" (Butler 1997, 36-37). They seem to agree that it would be naive to avoid the derogatory connotations of racial designators, and they are sensitive to context, both in which they arise and in which they seem not to arise. Interestingly, in at least one part of the conversation, they evoke the context of language acquisition and experimental playing with words, using a word over and over again, perhaps alternatively filling the word with meaning and then emptying it of these meanings. Ultimately, at least some of the students bring in a dimension of history through which they place a complex debate over the meaning and performance of racial designators in the past as if it is long ago. They do this by referring to "old terms," "old people," and "old colloquial definition," all familiar but distant, and contrasting the immediately known and familiar speaker of the terms, the performer and the user, "like if one of my friends said that I know exactly what they meant and I know how to react." In this way they are making a claim to change the meanings of words through repeated usage in specific contexts. I am unable to judge whether they are successful in this, but I believe that these are highly self-conscious usages, their *tactics* (in contrast to *strategies* of educational policies, debates by philosophers, and literary expressions which may be assigned in class) are worthy of our attention. The practical multiculturalism of youth is clearly under construction—"a work in progress."

Chapter V

Summary and Pedagogical Directions

The work of the various officials, critics, educators and students considered above (including my own work) has all taken place within a specific cultural context and historical, political, social, and educational background. This background is a very powerful presence; it stands behind the entire enterprise. It may take the form of an unspokenness or it may also be the object of critical scrutiny when it is discussed by the Canadian philosopher, Charles Taylor. When it is articulated, we can give it a name like "Canadian liberal multiculturalism," or simply "Canadian multiculturalism," allowing the ideal of "liberalism" to stand quietly in the background. It is this multiculturalism that has permeated public policy and everyday life, and which is mirrored by education policy and the various practices found within schools themselves. Although multiculturalism has been variously articulated and debated, its presence in multiple social discourses makes it a motivating factor whose articulation is best understood as a *rhetoric* of multiculturalism, implying the factor of *motive* captured by de Certeau's theory of *use*.

An expressed prescription of a "Canadian multiculturalism" is presented to a public by policy-makers as a unifying or "strong" (cohesive) multiculturalism, including ideas of mutual respect, integration, harmonious intergroup relations, social cohesion and a shared sense of Canadian identity. Within this prescription, Charles Taylor reinforces the ideals of "Canadian multiculturalism" in according respect and recognition to all cultures. According to Taylor, just as respect and recognition are due to an individual as an authentic self, so may these be accorded under certain circumstances to a group. Personal identity is constructed (and constructing) with the cultural group one shares. Thus, one of the principal concerns of Charles Taylor is the place of collectively held traditions, especially collectively held rights, for example speaking one's own language.

Kymlicka's proposal of a strong or cohesive multiculturalism is affected by his view that in fact a *choice* is made by an immigrant population. A somewhat different view of this choice is described very clearly by Aihwa Ong in her discussion of transnational citizens. Ong uses a term "*flexible citizenship*" to refer to a flow of populations parallel to the global flow of capital. The choice envisioned here is not so much to be a part of a society but rather a *tactical* choice to make "use" of specific parts of that society. This is clearly a less cohesive kind of multiculturalism than assumed by Kymlicka. The "transnational citizen" chooses a more multi-centered form of multicultural citizenship resembling what is termed by Kymlicka as a "passive

citizenship," that is, a citizenship that receives and partakes of the benefits of a society as opposed to an active citizenship that includes identity along with responsibilities.

Multiculturalism may be viewed as a set of "*tactics*" measured according to a principle of "*usefulness*" set against an official or even ideological background of rights and privileges. As predicted by de Certeau, groups within a locale may transform multiculturalism as policy into a *tactical* multiculturalism of "distinctness." Through the implicit rules of practice, *propriety*, a *tactic* of "distinctness" may become a *strategy* of exclusiveness providing a dominant group a means of identity and sense of belonging through what it is not, namely, the anomalous and "indistinct." Language becomes a powerful symbol of "distinctness" in which one maintains a right to speak a first language within a social and institutional space, and the freedom to associate provides a safe path towards belonging even though it may lead to the loss of individuality or equality. A Taylorian authenticity and a demand for recognition by minority (or newcomer) groups within a locale respond to the hegemonic view or image of inferiority. For the "ESL" group in this study, this image is compounded – newcomer, new language, and for some, ethnicity or country of origin differs dramatically from a dominant which may be either the "mainstream" culture or one of the large "neighbourhoods" within the school. The expression of individual rights is the ground upon which the structure of multiculturalism is built. A somewhat stronger form of multiculturalism is practiced by members of minority groups forming polyethnic groupings as a *tactic* of resistance to the hegemony of dominant groups. But within the social space of the neighbourhood, these groups default to a "weaker" form.

The practices of multiculturalism found in this study reveal social distinctions being made first and foremost on the basis of language and geography. Neighbourhoods are historically defined, with groupings based on spatial and social definitions. Within these groups there are further social distinctions based on gender, class, academic excellence, sports or leisure activity, and so on. An important factor in the formation of linguistics groups within the school geography is group size. Smaller groups occupy less space. However, spatial boundaries are set and recognized through practice (never policy).

The larger groups within the urban space of the school seemed less ready to articulate views on multiculturalism. This "*tactic*" falls back on the official given or *background*, full of ready explanations, stereotypical formulas and rules. Not to articulate allows the mainstream to hold. Particularly in group situations there is an ideal of not stirring things up which results in

amorphous silences hanging over issues of multiculturalism, racism, identity and so on. A small distinct group such as the "IB" Program group on the other hand knows they are breaking the code or are distancing themselves from authority, but have permission to experiment. An elite group manifestly benefits from institutional policy and so may adopt the institutional strategies as their *"tactic."* Interestingly, from this, one could conclude that either "strong" or "weak" versions of multiculturalism may find their uses within a population.

A number of lingering questions in this study have to do with economic class. The concerns of students and families at the lower end of the economic scale may be different from those addressed by multicultural policy. As noted above, multiculturalist policy may be seen as advantageous to communities with the wherewithal and institutions to take advantage of it. Similar issues may be noted of other social categories, especially gender, caste, and "race." These categories remain problematic within the framework of multiculturalism and need further study.

Another set of questions has to do with differing educational systems and the histories and realities of educational practices in the various countries of origin of immigrant students and those in Canada. Since multiculturalism operates on an ideological level, at least as far as educational policy is concerned, there seems to me to be a large gap between top down policies and the realities of students in a school and classroom. Immigrant students have a variety of views of what it means to be educated in Canada while teachers and school administrators remain virtually in the dark as to the variety of policies and practices of education in countries of origin. To speak of a "fusion of horizons" with such enormous gaps in the foreground seems like a remote speculation.

A third set of questions regarding language acquisition, language use, and especially the motive for language learning and use were raised by this study but not answered. As noted above, Kymlicka articulates one of the fundamental assumptions of multicultural policy or Canadian liberal "background": that students and families immigrating to Canada will seek to acquire fluency in English and integrate into Canadian society to ensure their own success. However, at least in the secondary school milieu, success in negotiating the multicultural practices of everyday life may depend on not using English and in adhering to principles of distinctness. On the other hand, "transnational citizens" are clearly motivated to learn English but are seeking integration not into Canadian society but into a transnational community. Given these different motives for language acquisition and use, the "fusion of horizons" model seems to

be at least deferred in favour of more immediate concerns. In all of these studies, I believe the approach of de Certeau with its emphasis on the variety and subtlety of everyday practices would yield the most complete and nuanced results.

Finally, is the multiculturalism revealed in this study a multiculturalism, to adapt Taylor's terms, of "recognition" or a multiculturalism of "valuation"? Some student practices, expressed in terms of de Certeau's neighbourhood and *propriety*, suggest a multiculturalism based on tolerance, recognition and individual rights. Group formation on the basis of social distinctness and social codes and fragmentation of the space into neighbourhoods with distinct boundaries seems to point toward a "passive" *style* of multiculturalism. In contrast, an "active" recognition is "dialogical" and implies an awareness not only of self or one's own group, but also of the context or what I have here called background. With this movement across boundaries, some form of cultural hybridization is inevitable, if only because cultural practices are being recontextualized. Stuart Hall wants to stress differences that do not exclude, but rather differences that are "hybridized but not erased." This notion of "hybridization" is expressed in Hall's description of "diaspora identities" as those constantly producing and reproducing themselves through transformation and difference (2000, 403).

A "fusion of horizons" sounds like an end point. If the essence of a "fusion of horizons" is a discussion, then it is not a result, but a process. Indeed in many of the theoretical discussions of multiculturalism, an ongoing dialogism is seen as the cohesive factor in a multicultural society, the factor that makes this a society rather than a conglomerate of isolated parts. This discussion breaks through the silences of fragmentation through a process of active engagement. The value of the discussion may not lie in its outcome but rather in the fact of talking together. Thus, multicultural education is a "work in progress" and as a dialogue it is also a "work of process".

5.1 Pedagogical Directions

Three strong tendencies in student practices that have emerged from this study are the retention of first language, the formation of distinct groups and group spaces, and a flexible style of multiculturalism able to traverse bounded and unbounded spaces (linguistic, cultural, social, and geographic). These active tendencies in lived student practices provide some direction with regard to pedagogy.

Among two of the student groups, there was a strong motivation to develop second language skills. In both groups this motivation was accompanied by a move toward first language retention. Kymlicka (97) sees the maintaining of one's first language along with the second language as facilitating the process of learning the second language and ultimately as a cohesive force in multiculturalism as a valued "national" resource (see Multiculturalism Act, Appendix VI, Canadian Multiculturalism Act). Bilingual ESL students contribute the same skills as native English or French speakers who are bilingual. Students whose multicultural practices are flexible, easily traversing bounded and unbounded spatialities, refer to acquired language skills as facilitating "learn[ing] about each other and how one country thought." Recent research has confirmed this in "multilingual" speakers, who see their "identity as complex and ambiguous and can see very positive aspects to this complexity," especially a kind of cultural fluency⁴¹ in "being able to see things in more than one way" and "[b]eing able to relate to speakers with different cultural backgrounds, to move from one world to another" (Lamarre, 2000). In my experience as an English as a Second Language teacher, I have "renamed" this for my students as "bilingualism." Students see themselves not as "second-class" learners struggling to master a skill that others have mastered, but as moving forward with enhanced abilities in two (or more) languages. They are encouraged to hone their first language skills along with second language skills. In addition to this, they seek higher levels of language use in their first languages by researching and studying personal, family or local narratives, folk tales and folk traditions, and literary forms in both languages.

Because culturally distinct groups are formed through bounded spatialities and proprieties, these groups may well be studied by the students themselves who are either within or outside of these groupings. According to John Willinsky, schools "need to be engaged in study of their own historical construction[s]" (259). Willinsky is referring to such "colonial" categories of "East" and "West" or "Asia" perpetuated in official institutions and specifically schools. In the study above, these categories were articulated by the IB students, those most acculturated to "official" categories. Regular students were more likely to speak in terms of "Chinese and Hong Kong people, Taiwanese, and white, and black people" (see above p. 35). This is the inverse of the "divisions" Willinsky addresses. Thus we may extend Willinsky's call for a critical examination of the "divisive" categories of identity to not only those strategically assigned, but those in use by the students themselves.

Students often have a tendency to regard everyday practices as unimportant or trivial. Yet they are keen observers of these practices. They "can tell" where spatial makers lie and who inhabits a particular space. At the same time, they are actively finding others with the "same interests," "the same feeling, the same class together," or the "same attitude." Students can be enlisted to not only describe such things as the spatial layout of their school, and the distinct groups inhabiting distinct spaces, but they may also be assigned to group themselves according to various markers of inclusivity. For example, students may group themselves in ethnically distinct groups and describe the markers that constitute the group as well as the makers of diversity within the group. Students may also group themselves according to social markers, for example, age (in multiage classes), family situation (with or without siblings), or type of locale of origin (city, town, village, rural). Such socially defined groups may be given assignments to study another group of which none of them is a member. These practices encourage the students in the active exploration of diversity from a standpoint of inclusivity rather than exclusivity.

Finally, in Canadian multiculturalism there is the question of the relationship of cultural groups to the "nation." Specifically, is multiculturalism something that is granted standing within a nation or is the nation itself constituted by a "multitude" of cultural groups? The idea of multiculturalism as a "two-way process" suggests a dialogue in which groups engage each other as much as they engage the "larger entity" which "contains" them. On this view, cultural groups *comprise* the nation. This becomes crucial when one considers the enculturating function of education. If the nation is an entity that contains cultural groups, then enculturation is a one-way process of training students in what Kymlicka calls a "societal culture." The cultural groups themselves constitute the nation, then the nation itself is a cultural product and the process of enculturation is a multiple one of acquiring cultural fluency in those cultures constituting the nation.

Although I have spoken of bilingualism as if it were being proposed as an institutional strategy, in fact, students already practice this amongst themselves. It is my informal observation that students are curious about and teach each other something of their languages. They are constantly exploring. In some ways, multicultural policy is a description of what the students are already doing. The gap between policy (at least symbolic) and practice may be created by the educational institutions lagging behind. In this instance, pedagogy is directed not toward the students, but toward the institutional apparatus of education.

Yvonne Hébert et al. (2001) in their discussions on English language learning have pointed to the importance of pre-service teacher education and professional development, recognizing teacher modelling as a crucial element in the "process of identity formation that is central to adolescence and to immigration." While Hébert clearly envisions this pedagogy as part of "integration into Canadian society" creating "valuable Canadian citizens" (as Kymlicka), I would argue for a "two-way process" in which change is bidirectional, among groups, between individuals and groups, with both teachers and students engaged in a *dialogic* process of learning.⁴²

Because of the dynamic nature of the diversity of the classroom, a constantly changing cultural and social composition, pedagogy becomes more of a process than an outcome. Makers and implementers of policy may enter into that gap between *strategies* and *tactics* to inform themselves and create a more *habitable* space. In such a classroom of contingency, a continuous dialogue regarding the valuation within the composite of cultures is crucial. Questions not only of the inevitable inconsistencies of cultures but also difficult questions with regard to social issues would no doubt challenge the comfortable norms and silences that mark practices of inclusion and exclusion. Teachers as learners of cultural fluency may be more accessible to students and ultimately both involved together in the ongoing process of enculturation.

ENDNOTES

¹ A paper written by Marvin Wideen and Kathleen A. Barnard entitled "Impacts of immigration on education in British Columbia: An analysis of efforts to implement policies of Multiculturalism in schools" (November, 1998) in particular, focus on the lack of funding or implementation of multicultural policy by governments. Refer to Appendix III, Parliamentary Action, for information on the lack of implementation of legislation due to lack of funding for example. < <http://riim.metropolis.net/frame/e.html> >

² The quotation marks indicate the usage of the term by participants in the study and as practice by educators and students alike. For definitions refer to the Appendix I, Terminology

³ De Certeau links Bourdieu's theory of *habitus* and *field*, the "mode of generation of practices" with Foucault's analysis of the apparatus that exercises power or "what produces them [practices]" (1984, xiv, 58). For Bourdieu, *habitus* refers to socially acquired, embodied systems of dispositions and/or predispositions. It refers not to character, morality, or socialization, but to structural classificatory and assessment tendencies, socially acquired, and manifested in outlooks, opinions; in how to act and respond within a specific historical and cultural setting, and in embodied phenomena such as posture, ways of walking, sitting, standing, and so forth. Practices or perceptions are not products of the habitus, but are the product of the *relation between* the habitus and the specific social context or 'field' within which individuals act. It is within this field that interrelations are determined by the different kinds of 'capital'. An important property of fields is that one form of capital to be converted into another, e.g., education into good jobs, and as such can be viewed as sites of struggles in which individuals seek to maintain or alter the distribution of the forms of capital. (Thompson 1991, 14)

⁴ The *Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future* (also known as the Spicer Commission) established in 1991 found that Canadians were divided on the topics of growing ethnic diversity of Canada and official multiculturalism: "Overwhelmingly participants told us that reminding us of our different origins is less useful in building a unified country than emphasizing the things we have in common. ... While Canadians accept and value Canada's cultural diversity, they do not value many of the activities of the multicultural program of the federal government. These are seen as expensive and divisive in that they remind Canadians of their different origins rather than their shared symbols, society, society and future. (Marc Leman, Political and Social Affairs Division, Parliamentary Research Branch, 93-6E, Revised 15 February, 1999.)

⁵ Other Canadian authors, such as Richard Gwyn (1995) and Jack Granastein (1998) have criticized Canadian multicultural policy for its negative impacts. Gwyn criticized the political elite for their mistaken view that a backlash towards multiculturalism among the majority of Canadians is caused by employment anxiety rather than the fear of becoming strangers in their own land.

⁶ Multiculturalism and Canadians: Attitude Study, 1991 (Toronto: Angus Reid Group, 1991).

⁷ Isajiw, Wsevolod W. (1999, 92). The 90.4% refers to immigrants from United Kingdom (25.2%); North and West Europe without UK (26.9%); Eastern Europe (16.6%) and Southern Europe (21.6%).

⁸ Ibid. This represented West Central Asia and Middle East (7.9%), Eastern Asia (24.3%), South-east Asia (11.4%) and Southern Asia (13.5%).

⁹ One cannot forget Jacques Parizeau statement to the public blaming the loss of the 1995 Quebec Referendum on the "ethnic vote."

¹⁰ Canadian Multiculturalism Act, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. 24 (4th Supp.): [1988, c. 31, assented to 21st July, 1988]. (Refer to Appendix IV)

¹¹ Peter Li: (1999). The Ethnocultural Counsel comprised a coalition of thirty-five national ethnic organizations that represented over 1,000 local and provincial groups,

¹² Breton (1999, 299), argues that when a symbolic order is 'remodelled', this leads to symbolic controversies over matters such as: bilingualism, public policies (welfare, immigration, multiculturalism), constitutional changes, words or expressions "distinct society", "founding peoples", institutional changes (self-government for First Nations) as well as changes in the names of government departments or agencies, changes in government cheques and stamps, to name a few.

¹³ http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/eps/pes-yearbook/96_docs/feinberg.html 10/24/02.

¹⁴ According to Gadamer (2002, revised 1989, 306-307) a horizon of the present is a continuous process of forming, adapting, and moving, and cannot be understood or formed without the past: "understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing by themselves."

¹⁵ In *Truth and Method*, Gadamer relates the "fusion of horizons" to the text: "Part of real understanding... is that we regain the concepts of a historical past in such a way that they also include our own comprehension of them" (2002, revised 1989, 374-375).

¹⁶ A. Ong 1999, 67-68. While Confucian values make us what we are, what makes a good entrepreneur depends on many factors which are not peculiar to Chinese entrepreneurs. Among these factors, Wang includes acquired skills

in the English language and in Western business practices. Wang's ambivalent remarks highlight the culturally hybrid makeup of overseas Chinese and yet promotes the kind of cultural essentialism -- "Confucian values make us what we are..." Similarly multicultural experiences were also mentioned by Lee Kuan Yew, but in a way that seems to reify Chinese distinctness. Lee noted that overseas Chinese can teach the mainland "the economic value of multiculturalism, derived from coexisting with and absorbing the good points of other cultures." The implication is that although ethnic Chinese have lived among other cultural groups, they have remained "Chinese" in a basic, unchanging way, since cross-cultural learning is only significant for Chinese economic advancement. In effect cultural hybridity has been employed to highlight the economic peculiarity of the Chinese.

¹⁷ The reference to citizenship made in the Canadian Multiculturalism is in the following:

AND WHEREAS the Citizenship Act provides that all Canadians, whether by birth or by choice, enjoy equal status, are entitled to the same rights, powers and privileges and are subject to the same obligations, duties and liabilities;

¹⁸ The following is a quote taken from *Citizenship and Immigration Canada*, 1994 as cited in Abu-Laban, 1999, 202: There are two extremes on a continuum which describe the participation of newcomers in society. One such extreme encourages *assimilation*, meaning that it is primarily up to the newcomer to adjust and adapt, if necessary, by abandoning any cultural differences, in order to fit into the new society. The other encourages *segregation*, meaning that newcomers are separated or marginalized from society and denied equal access to its institutions and entitlements.

Canada's approach, known as *integration*, encourages a process of mutual adjustment by both newcomers and society. This approach sets us apart from many other countries. Newcomers are expected to understand and respect basic Canadian values, but society is also expected to understand and respect the cultural differences newcomers bring to Canada. Rather than expecting newcomers to abandon their own cultural heritage, the emphasis is on finding ways to integrate differences within a pluralistic society.

¹⁹ Speaking notes for The Honourable Hedy Fry, P.C., M.P. Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women) on the occasion of the annual dinner of the Canadian Islamic Congress Ottawa, Ontario, October 15, 2001.
http://www.canadianheritage.gc.ca/progs/multi/pubs/speeches/index_e.cfm#Speeches

²⁰ The speaking notes for the Honourable Jean, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) Status of Women) at the Atlantic Metropolis Conference June 15, 2002 Halifax, Nova Scotia confirm that the federal position is still much the same: Canada is a nation that prides itself on the diversity of our population, and the level of prosperity, tolerance and solidarity Canadians enjoy. Canada is a nation that values compassion and fairness. But we still have work to do if we are to achieve our goal of a diverse, fully inclusive and democratic society. A society that can and must move beyond tolerance to respect. A society that is well on the way but is not there yet.
http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/pubs/speeches/10_e.cfm accessed September 03, 2002.

²¹ In my current school, these posters are in the computer room used by all students in the school.

²² June Beynon et al. (January 2003) provide an historical context of the "Punjabi" and "Chinese" communities in Vancouver.

²³ For a discussion on the constitution of "feminine identity" following immigration see Isabel Dyck and Arlene Tigar McLaren, "Becoming Canadian? Girls, Home and School and Renegotiating Feminine Identity," March 2002.

²⁴ A collaborative publication by English As A Second Language A PSA of the B.C. Teachers' Federation, Vancouver School Board and Program Against Racism Co-ordinator B.C. Teachers' Federation,
<http://www.mecbc.org/multiculturalism.htm>, and <http://www.bctf.bc.ca/ESL/Respect/policies.html>

²⁵ For further discussion on settlement patterns of immigrant populations see "Immigrant Experiences in Greater Vancouver: Focus Group Narratives," Daniel Hiebert, Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, 98-15, September 1998. In the early 1990's, immigration patterns of settlement in the City of Vancouver reflect a variation and complexity of concerns: "These were most clear when we spoke about economic issues. Concerns about accreditation and access to the labour market were expressed most vocally in Surrey and East Vancouver. In Kerrisdale, conversely, immigrants who entered Canada under the auspices of the business program had quite a different set of concerns that were related to the security of their investments in venture capital funds (a requirement of their immigration) and the cost of conducting business in Canada. The quality of the school system was also a major topic of conversation in some areas and not others (notably East Vancouver). Finally, the optimism expressed by second-generation immigrants was most obvious in Richmond and Kerrisdale, and somewhat muted in Surrey." (39-40) < http://riim.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html >

²⁶ The Principal of the school provided the survey information.

²⁷ Both students were in their final year at the school and while they were both over the age of 18 years, parental permission was granted and both parents were supportive. It is my regret that I cannot add their names to this study as their identification may in some way identify the school.

²⁸ The teacher provided the lecture notes to which I applied it to my own research procedure.

²⁹ Without exception, all of these questions were asked by members of the International Baccalaureate group.

³⁰The diversity of the school population is also characteristic of East side schools.

³¹For further discussion of East and West sides of Vancouver and the experience of immigrants see Daniel Hiebert, 1998.

³²Students can stay in "ESL" anywhere from less than one year to a five-year period after which they have to transfer to Transitional classes before entering into the Regular Program.

³³I had asked that students not be identified in these writings, and therefore do not know their gender or age. However, geographic origin is often mentioned in the writing, which I will not change. I also leave the language of the excerpts in the students' own words and spelling.

³⁴I have attempted to keep the pseudonym the same, for example, if the name is Korean, I will use a Korean pseudonym. If the student is Korean and has an English name, I give an English pseudonym.

³⁵Misook gave a separate interview and was not a part of the TOK class interviewed.

³⁶Isabel Dyck et al. (March 2002, 13) also identify the tendency to separate on basis of first language. A Korean girl experienced peer "hostility" when she choose to speak English rather than Korean.

³⁷T. H. Eriksen. (1999) Taking a sociological view, ethnicity can be defined as group identification based on the "social relationship between agents" who consider themselves culturally distinct from members of other groups. Eriksen suggests that such groups are characterized by a "metaphoric or fictive kinship" and define themselves in relation to what they are not (37-40).

³⁸If we look at the *Multicultural Act*, we find that the Act is closely interwoven with *The Constitution of Canada*, the "Official Languages Act," the *Citizenship Act*, the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, is "party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination," and "The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights."

³⁹Gutmann (1993) notes that the state, on the other hand, does not recognize collective goals beyond the basic aims of freedom, personal security, welfare and safety and so on.

⁴⁰One way to answer the question of who is recognized, from the point of view of educational *practice* is to look briefly at textbooks actually used in the schools. One can make the assumption that as required reading, these documents are powerfully persuasive and normative. For this exercise, I will choose a history text in common use in Vancouver area secondary schools⁴⁰. Introducing the study of the Twentieth Century, the book begins with "nation-building," the building of the railway, the Conservative and Liberal parties, resources, trade, and tariffs (Morton 1988, 6-15).

Here follows a subchapter entitled "What Kind of Canada?" (15-19) in which the topic of "multiculturalism" is introduced. The groups mentioned are first British, French, language and religion (Anglophone/Protestant; francophone/Roman Catholic), the "90%" forming the nation "Canadian." Following this is "United States, Scotland, Germany, and Scandinavia," next Ukrainians, Chinese, *Canadien*, Japanese, "East Indian" in that order. "Galicians"(Ukrainians), "Sikhs" (a religious group originating in the Panjab), and "Doukhobors" (a religious group originating in Russia) appear in picture captions. Racial designators included in the text are black Americans, Asians, whites, and native people. Groups in the first instance are recognized on the basis of nation, language, and/or religion. The "90%" are recognized on the basis of all three categories. This is followed immediately by national groups in which language and religion may be presumed, "United States, Scotland, Germany, and Scandinavia." A sundry group follows, mixing nation, language and religion. The remainder is presumably handled by the broad racial categories of black, Asian, white, and native.

Two things are apparent in this brief analysis. First, that the groups receiving recognition are very broad. Second, recognition is granted in a specific context, namely that of the nation. This raises the question of how groups may be further identified, either more fully, through a more complete set of designators (nation, language, religion) or more finely, through more specific designators on a par with "Doukhobor" or Panjabi Sikh as against "East Indian," "Asian," or the like. Secondly, these groups are recognized within an overarching framework of "the nation" or "nation-building."

⁴¹This study referred to "cultural openness" but I prefer to call this "cultural fluidity" in keeping with the notion of an active style of multiculturalism emphasizing contingency and lived experience over time.

⁴²Toohey (2000) has noted the importance of teacher modeling in pedagogy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Laban, Yasmeeen and Daiva Stasiulis.
1992. Ethnic Pluralism under Siege: Popular and Partisan Opposition to Multiculturalism. In *Canadian Public Policy*, XVII: 4, 365-386.
- Abu-Laban, Yasmeeen.
1998. welcome/STAY OUT: The Contradiction of Canadian Integration and Immigration Policies at the Millennium. In *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXX, No. 3, 190-211.
- Alarcón, Norma.
1996. Conjugating Subjects in the Age of Multiculturalism. In Avery F. Gordon and Christopher Newfield, eds., *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 127-148.
- Anderson, Benedict.
1999. The nation and the origins of national consciousness. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, eds., *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, multiculturalism and Migration*. Polity Press: Cambridge, UK, 43-51.
- Bakhtin, M.M.
1981. In Michael Holquist, ed., Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans., *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Birnbaum, Pierre and Tracy B. Strong.
1996. From Multiculturalism to Nationalism. In *Political Theory*, Feb. 24, 1, 33-45.
- Bourdieu, Pierre.
1991. In John B. Thompson, ed., Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, trans., *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- Breton, Raymond.
1999. Intergroup Competition in the Symbolic Construction of Canadian Society. In Peter S. Li, ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 291-310.
1988. The Evolution of the Canadian Multicultural Society: The Significance of Government Intervention. In A.J. Fry and C. Forceville, eds., *Canadian Mosaic, Essays on Multiculturalism*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 25-44.
- Butler, Judith.
1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Canada Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future.
1991. *Report to the People and Government of Canada*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Chow, Rey.
1998. *Ethics after Idealism, Theory-Culture-Ethnicity-Reading*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
1993. *Writing Diaspora, Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Clifford, James.
1999. Diasporas. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, eds., *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 283-290.
- de Certeau, Michel, Luce Giard and Pierre Mayol.
1998. In Luce Giard, ed., Timothy J. Tomasik, trans., *The Practice of Everyday Life, Volume 2: Living & Cooking*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

1984. In Steven Rendall, trans., *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dewey, John.
1944 (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Toronto: The Free Press.
- Drew, Julie
1999. Cultural Composition: Stuart Hall on Ethnicity and the Discursive Turn. In G. Olson and Lynn Worsham, eds., *Race, Rhetoric, and the Postcolonial*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 205-39.
- Eagleton, Terry.
1996. Phenomenology, Hermeneutics, Reception Theory. *Literary Theory, an Introduction*, 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 47-79.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland.
1999 (1997). Ethnicity, race and nation. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, eds., *The Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 33-42.
- Feinberg, Walter.
2002. The Goals of Multicultural Education: A Critical Re-evaluation. University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign: 1996-2001 Philosophy of Education Society.
http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/eps/pes-yearbook/96_docs/feinberg.html 10/24/02. Accessed January 3, 2003.
1998. *Common Schools, Uncommon Identities: National Unity and Cultural Difference*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Friedman, Jonathan.
1996. Response. *Current Anthropology*, Volume 37, Issue 5, December, 737-762.
- Fry, Hedy.
2001. "Speaking notes for The Honourable Hedy Fry, P.C., M.P. Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women) on the occasion of the annual dinner of the Canadian Islamic Congress Ottawa, Ontario October 15, 2001." Canadian Heritage and Multiculturalism. http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/wcar/res/speeches/points_e.shtml. Accessed January, 2001.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg.
1996. The Universality of the Hermeneutical Problem. In Richard Kearney and Mara Rainwater, eds., *The Continental Philosophy Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 111-121.
- Geertz, Clifford.
1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz*. United States of America: Basic Books.
- Guibernau, Montserrat and John Rex
1997. Introduction. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, eds., *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*,. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1-14.
- Gilroy, Paul.
2000. *Against Race, Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, Henry A. and Patrick Shannon.
1997. Cultural Studies and Pedagogy As Performative Practice: Toward an Introduction. In Henry A. Giroux and Patrick Shannon, eds., *Education and Cultural Studies: Toward a Performative Practice*. New York and London: Routledge, 1-12.

- Gould, Carol C.
1996. Diversity and Democracy: Representing Differences. In Seyla Benhabib, ed., *Democracy and Difference*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 171-186.
- Granatstein, J. L.
1998. *Who Killed Canadian History*. Harper Collins.
- Gunew, Sneja.
1994. *Framing Marginality: Multicultural literary studies*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.
- Gutmann, Amy.
1995. Civic Education and Social Diversity. In *Ethics*, Volume 105, Issue 3 April, 557-579.
1993. The Challenge of Multiculturalism in Political Ethics. In *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Volume 22, Issue 3, Summer, 171-206.
- Gwyn, Richard.
1995. *Nationalism without Walls: The Unbearable Lightness of Being Canadian*. Toronto: McClelland and Steward.
- Hage, Ghassan.
1998. *White Nation, Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press Australia.
- Hall, Stuart.
1996 (1989). In David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, eds., *Stuart Hall, Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 441-449.
- Hartsock, Nancy C.M.
1983. The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In S. Harding and M.B. Hintikka, eds., *Discovering Reality*, Reidel Publishing Company. 283-310.
- Hawkins, Freda.
1998. Canadian Multiculturalism: The Policy Explained. In A.J. Fry and C. Forceville, eds., *Canadian Mosaic Essays on Multiculturalism*. Amsterdam: Free University Press, 10-23.
- Hekman, Susan J.
1995. *Moral Voices, Moral Selves: Carol Gilligan and Feminist Moral Theory*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Henry, Frances and Carol Tator.
1999. State Policy and Practices as Racialized Discourse: Multiculturalism, the Charter, and Employment Equity. In Peter S. Li, ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition, Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 88-115.
- Isajiw, Wsevolod W.
1999. *Ethnicity and Race in the Canadian Context*, Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.
- Issac, Julien and Kobena Mercer.
1996. De Margin and De Centre. In David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, eds., *Stuart Hall Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, London: Routledge, 476-483.
- Keating, Michael.
1997. Canada and Quebec: two nationalisms in the global age. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, eds., *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 170-185.

- Kuper, Leo.
1997. Plural societies. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex , eds., *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 220-228.
- Kymlicka, Will and Wayne Norman.
1994. Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory. *Ethics*, 104:2 January, 352-381.
- Kymlicka, Will.
1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Claredon Press.
- Lautard, Hugh and Neil Guppy.
1999. Revisiting the Vertical Mosaic: Occupational Stratification Among Canadian Ethnic Groups. In Peter S. Li , ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 219-252.
- Leman, Marc.
1999. *Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future*. Political and Social Affairs Division, Parliamentary Research Branch. 93-6E, Revised 15 February, 1999.
- Li, Peter S.
1999. Race and Ethnicity. In Peter S. Li , ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 3-20.
1999. The Multiculturalism Debate. In Peter S. Li , ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press,, 148-177.
- Madeline A. Kalbach and Warren E. Kalbach.
1999. Demographic overview of ethnic origin groups in Canada. In Peter S. Li , ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 21-51.
- Magsino, R. F.; John C. Long; Raymond G. Theberge,
2000. Canadian Pluralism, the Charter, and Citizenship Education. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 2000 Special Issue, Vol. 32 Issue 1, 89, 22p.
- Martin, Bill.
1998. Multiculturalism: Consumerist or Transformational? In Cynthia Willett, ed., *Theorizing Multiculturalism, A Guide to the Current Debate*. Massachusetts, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 121-150.
- McCarthy, Cameron.
1995. Multicultural Policy Discourses on Racial Inequality in American Education. In Roxanna Ng, Pat Staton and, Joyce Scane, eds., *Antiracism, Feminism, and Critical Approaches to Education*. University of Toronto: OISE Press, 21-44.
- Moodley, Kogila A.
1981. Canadian Ethnicity in Comparative Perspective. In Dahlie, J. and T. Fernando, eds., *Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada*. Toronto, Methuen.
1984. The Ambiguities of Multicultural. *Currents*. Urban Alliance on Race Relations, Fall, 5-7.
1991. Transcending multiculturalism: The internationalist challenge. *The European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 4 Issue 2, p315, 18p.
- Morris, William, Ed.
1973. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Boston/New York/Atlanta/Geneva, Illinois/Dallas/Palo Alto: American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc. and Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Morton, Desmond.
1988. *Towards Tomorrow: Canada in a Changing World. History*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Canada, 1988.
- Newfield, Christopher and Avery F. Gordon.
1996. Multiculturalism's Unfinished Business. In Christopher Newfield and Avery F. Gordon, eds., *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 76-115.
- Okin, Susan Moller.
1999. In Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard, and Martha C. Nussbaum, eds., *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ong, Aihwa.
1996. Cultural Citizenship as Subject-Making: Immigrants Negotiate Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States. *Current Anthropology*, Volume 37, Issue 5, December, 737-762.
1999. *Flexible Citizenship, The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Ortner, Sherry.
1994. Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties..In Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner, eds., *Culture/Power/History, a Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, 373-411.
- Osbourne, Peter and Lynne Segal.
1999. Interview with Stuart Hall: Culture and Power. In Rodolfo D. Torres, Louis F. Miron, and Jonathan Xavier Inda, eds., *Race, Identity, and Citizenship, A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 389-412.
- Rex, John.
1997. The concept of a multicultural society. In Montserrat Guibernau and John Rex, eds., *The Ethnicity Reader, Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*,. Cambridge: Polity Press, 205-219.
- Richmond Review*.
1996. Editorial, February 28.
- Rogers, Mary F.
1998. The Politics of Knowledge. In M.F. Rogers, ed., *Contemporary Feminist Theory: A Text/Reader*. Boston: McGraw Hill, 66-108.
- Root, Maria P.P.
1999. Multiracial Asians: Models of Ethnic Identity. In Rodolfo D. Torres, Louis F. Miron, and Jonathan Xavier Inda, eds., *Race, Identity, and Citizenship, A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 159-168.
- Rorty, Amelie Oksenberg.
1994. The Hidden Politics of Cultural Identification. *Political Theory*, Volume 22, Issue 1, February, 152-166.
- Rorty, R.
1991. *Objectivity, relativism and truth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seltzer, Richard, Michael Frazier and Irelene Ricks.
1995. Multiculturalism, Race and Education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 64, 2 Spring, 124-140.
- Smith, Dorothy E.
1999. *Writing the Social, Critique, Theory, and Investigations*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press

- Taylor, Charles.
1994. The Politics of Recognition. In Amy Gutmann, ed., *Multiculturalism*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.
- Thompson, John B.
1991. Introduction. In John B. Thompson, ed., Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, trans., *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 37-42.
- Trudeau, P.E.
1971. Speech, House of Commons, 8 October 1971. *House of Commons Debates, Official Report. Third Session – Twenty-Eighth Parliament*, Vol. VIII, 1971. Ottawa, Canada: Queen's Printer for Canada, 8545-46.
- Ujimoto, K. Victor.
1999. Studies of Ethnic Identity, Ethnic Relations, and Citizenship. In Peter S. Li, ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 253-290.
- Wah, Fred.
1996. *Diamond Grill*. Edmonton: NeWest Press.
- Weinfeld, Morton and Lori A. Wilkinson.
1999. Immigration, Diversity, and Minority Communities. In Peter S. Li, ed., *Race and Ethnic Relations in Canada*, second edition. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 55-87.
- Wolf, Susan.
1994. Comment. In Amy Gutmann, ed., *Multiculturalism*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.

International Metropolis Conference Papers, Research on Immigration and Integration

- Beynon, June. "Summary, 5th International Metropolis Conference Vancouver, B.C.," Session #10: Language and Identity: Education in Multicultural Societies. Paper presented at the the Fifth International Metropolis Conference, Vancouver, Canada. November 14, 2000. <http://international.metropolis.net/events/vancouver/workshop10.html>. Accessed October 2003.
- Hébert, Yvonne, Wen-shya Lee, Jennifer, di Luzio, Linda, Xiaohong Sun, Shirley, Frideres, Jim (U Calgary, Canada) and Berti, Chiara (University of Genova, Italy). "Preferential Use of Urban Spaces as Forms of Attachment among Canadian Youth," Version 08.01.2002. Paper and Power Point Presentation at the 6th International Metropolis Conference Rotterdam, the Netherlands. November 26-30, 2001. http://international.metropolis.net/events/rotterdam/papers/36_Hebert.htm. Accessed September, 2003.
- Hébert, Yvonne, Wen-Shya Lee, Jennifer, Parel, Rolande and Racicot, Christine. "Conceptions of Self and English Language Learning: Implications for Educational Policy and Practice." Abstract of paper presented at the 4th PCERII Regional Workshop, Winnipeg, Nov 2001. http://international.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html. Accessed November 2003.
- Kilbride, Kenise Murphy, Anisef, Paul, Baichman-Anisef, Etta, Randa Khattar. "Between Two Worlds: The Experiences and Concerns of Immigrant Youth in Ontario." Joint Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Settlement – Toronto. <http://ceris.metropolis.net/virtual%20library/other/kilbride2.html>. Accessed September, 2003.

- Lamarre, Patricia, Paredes-Rossell, Josefina, Dagenais, Diane, Jacquet, Marianne. "Language socialization practices of multilingual youth: Montréal and Vancouver." Paper Presented at the Fifth International Metropolis Conference, Vancouver, Canada, November 13-17, 2000. <http://international.metropolis.net/events/vancouver/workshop10.html>. Accessed October, 2003.
- LaRocque, Linda, Woodbridge, Renu. "Policies which affect practice: First language retention in Kent." Session #10: Language and Identity: Education in Multicultural Societies Paper presentation at the Fifth International Metropolis Conference Vancouver, B.C. November 14, 2000. <http://international.metropolis.net/events/vancouver/workshop10.html>. Accessed October, 2003.
- Toohey, Kelleen. "Teachers, children and guided participation: A case study in two classrooms." Paper presented at the Fifth International Metropolis Conference, Vancouver, Canada, Session #10: Language and Identity: Education in Multicultural Societies. November 13-17, 2000. <http://international.metropolis.net/events/vancouver/workshop10.html>. Accessed October, 2003.

RIIM (Research on Integration and Immigration in the Metropolis) Working Paper Series

- Dagenais, Diane and Berron, Catherine. "A Case Study of Multilingualism and Educational Choices in Immigrant Families." Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Working Paper Series, #99-20. July 1999. http://riim.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html Accessed July 2003.
- Hiebert, Daniel.
1998. Immigrant Experiences in Greater Vancouver: Focus Group Narratives. In *Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Working Paper Series, #98-15*. http://riim.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html. Accessed June 2003.
- Tonks, Randal G. and Paranjpe, Anand C. "Am I a Canadian, an Ethnic, or an Ethnic-Canadian?: Dilemmas of Second Generation Immigrant Youth." *Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Working Paper Series, #99-16*. June 1999. http://riim.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html Accessed July 2003.
- Wideen, Marvin and Kathleen A. Barnard.
1999. "Impacts of immigration on education in British Columbia: An analysis of efforts to implement policies of Multiculturalism in schools." *Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Working Paper Series, #99-02*. http://riim.metropolis.net/frameset_e.html. Accessed July 2003.

Policy and Legislation

- B.C. Ministry of Education.
1996. *The BC School Act*, RSBC 1996. Governance and Legislation Branch, October 23, Chapter 412; C-10-C112.
- British Columbia Teacher's Federation and the Vancouver School Board.
1995. BCTF Policy: 9.D.123. "Multiculturalism and Antiracism Education in Schools" <http://www.mecbc.org/multiculturalism.htm>, and <http://www.bctf.bc.ca/ESL/Respect/policies.html> Accessed November 24, 2001.
- Department of Canadian Heritage.
2000. *Annual Report on the Operation of The Canadian Multiculturalism Act 1999-2000*. Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada 2001 Catalogue No.Ci95-1/2000. <http://www.multiculturalism.pch.gc.ca> Accessed December 1, 2001.

Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration.

2001. *Multiculturalism Act* [RSBC 1996] Chapter 321. Victoria, British Columbia: Queen's Printer.

Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada, Human Rights Directorate, Multiculturalism and Citizenship and Communications Branch.

1992. *The Charter of Rights and Freedoms: a guide for Canadians*. Ottawa, Ontario: Human Rights Directorate, Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.

Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.

1990. *The Canadian Multiculturalism Act : a guide for Canadians*. Ottawa, Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.

1988. *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, R.S.C. 1985, Chap. 24 (4th Supp.): [1988, c. 31, assented to 21st July]. Ottawa, Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada.

Vancouver School Board.

1995. *Multiculturalism and Anti-racism Policy (Revised June 1995)*, (File ACA-E).

Vancouver School Board.

1999. *Non-Discrimination* (File AC). Based on Board actions of 1975 September 16, 1978 June 19, 1980 December 15, and current practice. Adopted: 1982 October 18 SMT Responsibility: AS-LS. Revised: 1996 December, 1996 February, 1999 February.

APPENDIX I Terminology

binary/binarism (Hall 1999, 402) ...binarism which is intrinsic to essentialism. The binary's relation to power is like meaning in language; it is an attempt to close what, theoretically, you know is open. So you have to reintroduce the question of power. The binary is the form of the operation of power, the attempt at closure: power suturing language. It draws the frontiers: you are inside, but you are out. There is a certain theoreticism from the standpoint of which, having made a critique of essentialism, that is enough.

capital (Bourdieu 1991) **economic capital** -- material wealth in the form of money, stocks and shares, property; **cultural capital** -- knowledge, skills and other cultural acquisitions as exemplified by educational or technical qualifications and **symbolic capital** -- accumulated prestige or honour.

ESL – English as a Second Language. Marks are not given to students, only study habits are recorded on report cards.

essentialism (Henry and Tator 1999, 108 n.2) Essentialism is the practice of reducing complex identities of a particular group to a series of simplified characteristics and denying individual qualities. The term is also applied to the simplistic reduction of an idea or process, for further discussion on the difference as an ascriptive or a voluntary distinction or identity. For further discussion see Carol C. Gould. ("Diversity and Democracy: Representing Differences." *Democracy and Difference*, ed. Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996, 182-183.)

ethnicity: the concept of ethnicity is distinguished from "race" with a focus on the subjective perception of the physical and cultural characteristics of a group, by both those who share these characteristics and by those who react to them. For further discussion, see *the Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*, Guibernau and Rex (Eds.) 1999; Hall interviewed in Drew 1999, 228-230.

T. H. Eriksen. (1999, 37 - 40) Taking a sociological view, ethnicity can be defined as group identification based on the "social relationship between agents" (37) who consider themselves culturally distinct from members of other groups. Eriksen suggests that such groups are characterized by a "metaphoric or fictive kinship" and define themselves in relation to what they are not

IB – The International Baccalaureate Program was established to provide an intellectually rigorous and academically demanding common curriculum for students in schools around the world. Its strengths come from the best of many national systems. The International Baccalaureate is a widely recognized two-year comprehensive program encouraging critical thinking, research skills and service as a part of the learning process. It will prepare students for post secondary success at any university, locally, nationally or internationally. The course work is more broadly based and provides a greater depth of study than does the provincial course or many of the other enrichment programs available.

To succeed in this program requires commitment, ability and interest. Students willing to devote the time necessary, having the motivation and self-discipline required, will find the achievement of the Diploma a great satisfaction. The Diploma identifies, on an international standard, a student whose capabilities have been challenged and one who has proven equal to this challenge. <<http://churchill.vsb.bc.ca/>> Accessed February, 2003.

multiculturalism

As policy, 1970 Pierre Elliot Trudeau a “celebrating of difference”; embodying a commitment to mutual respect, tolerance and accommodation...we should celebrate our cultural traditions and not be ashamed of our differences.

As policy, 1997, Hedy Fry’s Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and the Status of Women article reported in *Profile, Newsletter of the Royal Society of Canada* in the Spring of 1997 that acknowledged,

As a national policy of inclusiveness, multiculturalism’s activities aim to bring all Canadians closer together, to enhance equal opportunities, to encourage mutual respect among citizens of diverse backgrounds, to assist in integrating first-generation Canadians, to promote harmonious intergroup relations and to foster social cohesion and shared sense of Canadian identity (as cited in Abu-Laban, 1998, 203).

Vancouver School Board policy under review states that “All people have the right to their fundamental freedoms and protection from discrimination” and that it is committed to,

- eliminating ethnocentrism, prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination and racism, in any form
- developing and supporting an environment which affirms, respects, reflects and celebrates the racial, ethno-cultural and religious diversity of our society;
- supporting educational equity through the provision of quality programs for all learners regardless of their race, colour, ancestry, national or ethno-cultural origin, or religion;
- creating a workplace environment which values and welcomes diversity.

Memorandum from Janis Jones, Manager of Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism, District Learning Services, Vancouver School Board, October 15, 1997.

The policy does not define multiculturalism directly. However, it does provide definitions for ‘diversity’ and ethno-cultural group,

- *diversity*, the unique characteristics that all persons possess which distinguish them as individuals and which identify them as belonging to a group or groups. Diversity is a concept that includes notions of age, class, culture, disability, ethnicity, family, gender, language, place of origin, race, religion and sexual orientation.
- *Ethno-cultural group*, a group of people who share a particular cultural heritage or background. Every Canadian belongs to some ethnic group. There are a variety of ethno-cultural groups among people of African, Asian, European and indigenous North, Central, and South American backgrounds in Canada. Some Canadians may experience discrimination because of ethno-cultural affiliation ethnicity, religion, nationality, language.

Memorandum from Janis Jones, Manager of Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism, District Learning Services, Vancouver School Board, October 15, 1997.

(d) (Hall interviewed in Drew 1999, 227)...“the term *multicultural* simply describes the many [ethnic] segments, whereas adjectivally *multicultural* describes a society that has been

mess up or mongrelized by the variety of peoples who probably do tend to locate themselves more in one group than in another but who are not so formally fixed into groups.”

“The term *multiculturalism* can operate in very different contexts and have very different meanings (228).”

nation (Sarup 1996, 181) is often used to mean the whole people of a country, often in contrast to some group in it. It is often used to refer to the nation-state, a form of identification that subsumes local loyalties such as tribe, city, region. The development of **nation-states** has occurred within the historical phase called modernity. The nation has been both progressive and regressive at different periods. If one considers the process of decolonisation, or the liberation movements, the struggle to create a new nation, nationalism was necessary.

nationalism (Sarup 1996, 181) consists of many varied and often contradictory elements that vary at different times...another way of saying this is to say that nationalism has no essence; it is a ‘sliding’ or ‘floating’ signifier.

Regular – a student attending classes in the Vancouver School System.

self - is socially constructed and site of ideological production and reproduction

state - refers not to a political entity but to a general power structure.

tolerance (Henry and Tator 1999, 108 n. 4) implies positions of superiority and inferiority as it implicit assumes that some attributes/behaviours associated with minority groups need to be accepted, condoned, or sanctioned. Thus, acceptance by the dominant culture is dependent on the goodwill, forbearance, and benevolence of those who do the tolerating.

Transitional – a student is often required to take these courses as a preparatory step before entering into regular classes. Most often the first time newcomers are given marks.

Meech Lake Accord – (Peter S. Li, 1999, 172 n. 4) refers to the 1987 agreement of the first ministers of Canada on constitutional changes after the Constitution of Canada was patriated from England to Canada in 1982 within of the ten provinces (except Quebec) approving the patriation.

Appendix II

Transcription Conventions

R	Researcher
/	shift, interruption or break in thought or speech pattern
..	3 second pause
....	5 second pause
.. ..	10 second pause
[...]	unclear
[]	clarification, observation provided
//	break in the transcription
<i>indented line</i>	interruption or overlapping speech

APPENDIX III – Chronology of Canadian Multicultural Legislation

reference: "Canadian Multiculturalism" prepared by Marc Leman, Political and Social Affairs Division, Parliamentary Research Branch. Revised 15 February, 1999: 93-6E.

- 1948** Canada adhered to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which applies to all human beings, regardless of sex, race, religion, culture or ideology
- 1960** Parliament passed the *Canadian Bill of Rights*, which prohibits discrimination for reasons of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex.
- 1967** Racial discrimination provisions that had existed in Canadian immigration law since the early twentieth century were abolished.
- 1969** The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism released Book Four, on the contribution of other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada.
- 1970** Canada ratified the *International Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, which had entered into force in January 1969.
- 1971** The federal government announced multiculturalism policy within a bilingual framework.
- 1972** First appointment of a (junior) Minister for Multiculturalism.
- 1973** The Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism (later renamed the Canadian Multiculturalism Council) was established as an advisory body to the Minister.
- 1974** Saskatchewan was the first province to adopt legislation regarding multiculturalism.
- 1977** Parliament adopted the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, which established the Canadian Human Rights Commission to monitor and mediate disputes over human rights in Canada.
- 1982** The *Canada Charter of Rights and Freedoms* enshrined equality rights in the Constitution and acknowledged our multicultural heritage.
- 1984** House of Commons Special Committee on Visible Minorities in Canadian Society issued its *Equity Now!* Report.
- 1985** Establishment of House of Commons Standing Committee on Multiculturalism.
- 1988** Royal Assent was given on 21 July to the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* after Parliament had adopted the legislation with all-party support.
- 1990** Multiculturalism Canada tabled its first annual report on the implementation of the *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* by the Government of Canada.
- 1991** Royal Assent was given to the *Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship Act* on 17 January. On 21 April, the new Department was officially established with Gerry Wiener appointed as the full-time Minister.
- 1993** The Liberal Government elected in October announced that Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada would be split along its two main components: the multiculturalism programs would be merged with the Canadian Heritage Department established by the previous administration and the citizenship programs would be amalgamated with the newly established Department of Citizenship and Immigration.
- December 1994** – The federal government announced that it would not pay out any compensation to national ethnic groups to redress past indignities meted out by the Canadian government. This decision contrasted with the precedent set by the previous

Conservative government which paid out millions of dollars in compensation to the families of Japanese Canadians interred during the Second World War.

1997 Minister of State for Multiculturalism, Dr. Hedy Fry, announced a renewed multiculturalism program.

APPENDIX IV – Parliamentary Action

Bill C-93, *Canadian Multiculturalism Act*, adopted by Parliament in July 1988, given immediate Royal Assent.

The Act recognizes the need to increase minority participation in society by mainstreaming Canada's major institutions. All government agencies, departments and Crown corporations, not just the Ministry responsible for multiculturalism, are expected to provide leadership in advancing Canada's multicultural mix.

The Act makes the government of Canada accountable to both Parliament and the public for ensuring compliance with its provisions by requiring annual reports. A multiculturalism secretariat was established to support the government in implementing improved delivery of government services in federal institutions.

Bill C-37, *Canadian Heritage Languages Institute Act*

Introduced September 1989 and adopted by Parliament in January 1991. This act provided the establishment of a Heritage Languages Institute in Edmonton with the purpose of developing national standards for teacher training and curriculum content for ethnic minority language classes in Canada.

February 1992 Budget tabled by Finance Minister Don Mazankowski deferred the establishment of the Canada Heritage Languages Institute until further notice.

Bill C-63, *Canadian Race Relations Foundation Act*

Introduced in February 1990 and adopted by Parliament in January 1991. This Act was to establish a race relations Foundation in Toronto, with the purpose of helping to eliminate racism and racial discrimination through public education. The federal government in the budgets tabled in subsequent years deferred funding. At the end of October 1996, Secretary of State for Multiculturalism Hedy Fry announced the establishment of the Foundation with a one-time endowment of \$24 million from the federal government.

Reference: *Canadian Multiculturalism*. In Marc Leman, Political and Social Affairs Division, Parliamentary Research Branch. Revised 15 February 1999: 93-6E

Consent: I understand that my child's participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that she/he may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy.

I consent / I do not consent (**please circle one**) to my child's participation in this study.

I have received a copy of this consent form for my records.

Subject Signature (or Parent or Guardian Signature)

Date

Signature of Witness

Date

Student's Name: _____

Please write in PENCIL

APPENDIX VI - Canadian Multiculturalism Act and Multicultural Policy

R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)

An Act for the preservation and enhancement of multiculturalism in Canada [1988, c. 31, assented to 21st July, 1988]

Preamble WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada provides that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination and that everyone has the freedom of conscience, religion, thought, belief, opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association and guarantees those rights and freedoms equally to male and female persons;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada recognizes the importance of preserving and enhancing the multicultural heritage of Canadians;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada recognizes rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada and the Official Languages Act provide that English and French are the official languages of Canada and neither abrogates nor derogates from any rights or privileges acquired or enjoyed with respect to any other language;

AND WHEREAS the Citizenship Act provides that all Canadians, whether by birth or by choice, enjoy equal status, are entitled to the same rights, powers and privileges and are subject to the same obligations, duties and liabilities;

AND WHEREAS the Canadian Human Rights Act provides that every individual should have an equal opportunity with other individuals to make the life that the individual is able and wishes to have, consistent with the duties and obligations of that individual as a member of society, and, in order to secure that opportunity, establishes the Canadian Human Rights Commission to redress any proscribed discrimination, including discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin or colour;

AND WHEREAS Canada is a party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which Convention recognizes that all human beings are equal before the law and are entitled to equal protection of the law against any discrimination and against any incitement to discrimination, and to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which Covenant provides that persons belonging to ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities shall not be denied the right to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion or to use their own language;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards race, national or ethnic origin, colour and religion as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada;

NOW, THEREFORE, Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

SHORT TITLE: Short title 1. This Act may be cited as the Canadian Multiculturalism Act.

INTERPRETATION: Definitions 2. In this Act, "federal institution" «institutions fédérales» "federal institution" means any of the following institutions of the Government of Canada:

(a) a department, board, commission or council, or other body or office, established to perform a governmental function by or pursuant to an Act of Parliament or by or under the authority of the Governor in Council, and

(b) a departmental corporation or Crown corporation as defined in section 2 of the Financial Administration Act,

but does not include

(c) any institution of the Council or government of the Northwest Territories or the Yukon Territory or of the Legislative Assembly for, or the government of, Nunavut, or

(d) any Indian band, band council or other body established to perform a governmental function in relation to an Indian band or other group of aboriginal people; "Minister" «ministre» "Minister" means such member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada as is designated by the Governor in Council as the Minister for the purposes of this Act.

Canadian Multiculturalism Act <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-18.7/26882.html>. Accessed July 2003.

R.S., 1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.), s. 2; 1993, c. 28, s. 78. MULTICULTURALISM POLICY OF CANADA Multiculturalism policy 3.

(1) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Government of Canada to

(a) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism reflects the cultural and racial diversity of Canadian society and acknowledges the freedom of all members of Canadian society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;

(b) recognize and promote the understanding that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of the Canadian heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of Canada's future;

(c) promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and shaping of all aspects of Canadian society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to that participation;

(d) recognize the existence of communities whose members share a common origin and their historic contribution to Canadian society, and enhance their development;

(e) ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their diversity;

(f) encourage and assist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Canada to be both respectful and inclusive of Canada's multicultural character;

(g) promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;

(h) foster the recognition and appreciation of the diverse cultures of Canadian society and promote the reflection and the evolving expressions of those cultures;

(i) preserve and enhance the use of languages other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of the official languages of Canada; and

(j) advance multiculturalism throughout Canada in harmony with the national commitment to the official languages of Canada.

Canadian Multiculturalism Act <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-18.7/26882.html>. Accessed July, 2003.

APPENDIX VII – Multicultural Practice by Student Groups

ESL - A multiculturalism of integration

1. Feeling of dislocation and isolation; diversity.
2. Used a *tactic* of association on basis of linguistic and geographic identifiers.
3. Used a *tactic* of assimilation: emphasis on skill development, i.e., learning English; self identification as a learner.
4. Demand for recognition, social code "ESL."
5. *Propriety* - difference is highly accentuated in dress, behaviour, try to fit in.

Regular - A multiculturalism of distinctness

1. Management of the spatial.
2. *Propriety* marked *tactical adjustments* maintaining a social/physical distance; historical practices.
3. Dominant groups used a *tactic* of "distinctness" and separation along geographic and linguistic lines—neighbourhoods.
4. Minority groups used a *tactic* of assimilation and "distinct social groups."
5. Some minority groups used a *tactic* of integration (linguistic versatility).

IB – a flexible multiculturalism

1. Incorporated institutional *strategies*.
2. Identified selves as distinct and separate (accepting institutionally imposed segregation).
3. Traversed some spatial boundaries while maintaining others.
4. Practiced an active citizenship (Kymlicka).

International students

These students were incorporated into the above categories.

APPENDIX VIII VSB Policy on *Non-Discrimination* (File AC)

The Board of School Trustees (the "Board") believes in equitable treatment for all individuals regardless of race, colour, ancestry, ethnic origin, religion, socio-economic status, gender, sexual orientation, physical or mental ability, or political beliefs. The letter and spirit of the *Canadian* and *B. C. Human Rights Acts* shall be carefully observed, enforced, and supported, so that all members of the school community may work together in an atmosphere of respect and tolerance for individual differences.

This policy of non-discrimination shall prevail in all matters of instruction and course selection: in employment, promotion, and assignment of staff; in providing access to facilities; in the choice of instructional materials and the provision of career guidance and counseling; and in all matters pertaining to community relations. Specifically, the Board will not tolerate hate crimes and propaganda, and will vigorously enforce policy and regulations dealing with such matters.ⁱ

Based on Board actions of 1975 September 16, 1978 June 19, 1980 December 15, and current practice. Adopted: 1982 October 18 SMT Responsibility: AS-LS. Revised: 1996 December, 1996 February, 1999 February.