ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264897192

IMMIGRANTS, EDUCATION OF

Chapter · January 2014

CITATION
1

READS
728

1 author:

Michael S. Merry
University of Amsterdam
163 PUBLICATIONS **1,668** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

All content following this page was uploaded by Michael S. Merry on 20 August 2014.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

6. The sixth critical and future-oriented function of ideology is to give meaning and a sense of purpose to alternative groups challenging the state.

Joseph Zajda

See also Apple, Michael; Critical Theory; Freire, Paulo: *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Critical Pedagogy; Marx, Karl; Plato; Reproduction Theories

Further Readings

Adorno, T. (1973). *Negative dialectics*. London, England: Routledge Chapman & Hall.

Athusser, L. (1972). *Lenin and philosophy, and other essays*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Destutt, de T. (1970). *Éléments d'idéologie* [Elements of ideology]. Paris, France: J. Vrin. (Original work published 1801)

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London, England: Verso.

Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life* (p. 290). New York, NY: Wiley.

Geertz, C. (1964). Ideology as a cultural system. In D. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 47–76). New York, NY: Free Press.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mannheim, K. (1936). *Ideology and Utopia*. London, England: Routledge.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1974). *The German ideology* (C. J. Arthur, Ed.). London, England: Lawrence & Wishart.

Poulantzas, N. (1973). *Political power and social classes*. London, England: New Left Books.

Thompson, J. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

IMMIGRANTS, EDUCATION OF

An immigrant is a person who has consciously decided to leave his or her country of origin and take up residence elsewhere, namely, a country of settlement, with the view to acquiring legal status and employment. Global markets and knowledge-based economies, and also political oppression and famine, are important driving forces of immigration around the world; but other motivations include marriage, family reunification, cultural affinity, and the pursuit of higher education. Though expressed in different forms, in the host countries immigration policies have to varying degrees of success endeavored to promote within immigrants strong cultural and national identities favored by the majority group.

Immigration can be observed on all continents, though here the focus will be exclusively on immigration as it occurs in the Western hemisphere. This focus is adopted because patterns of immigration more routinely move from East to West (and South to North) and because it undoubtedly is in the West that the most elaborate and varied responses to immigration have transpired and continue to do so, particularly in the educational sphere. Nowhere have immigration and its relationship to education been more exhaustively studied than in the United States, for reasons that will be obvious: Owing to its enormous size and population, and also its founding myths and ideals, for millions the United States continues to be the land of immigration par excellence. Accordingly, migration and immigration studies elsewhere borrow heavily both from theory and from data generated in the United States. Nevertheless, migration and immigration studies have become a discipline in their own right in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and most European countries. This entry discusses theories about assimilation and acculturation, educational efforts to integrate immigrants, and theories about immigrant students' performance in school.

Though vocabulary choices sometimes vary, particularly between Europe and North America (the former preferring the language of *integration*), two central concepts warrant special attention: assimilation and acculturation. Classic *assimilation* theories postulated four distinct phases: contact, competition, accommodation, and ultimately assimilation (implying a jettisoning of one's previous cultural attachments in favor of the dominant norms). All host societies reasonably expect immigrants at a minimum to adopt a working knowledge of the dominant language, to embrace its laws and many of its cultural values, and finally to contribute in various ways to the local economy. But historically, assimilation often has entailed concerted efforts to discourage minorities from retaining their language, culture, and religion and the expectation that minority groups will integrate into the mainstream.

Classic assimilation theory, long portrayed as a straightforward linear process, is now passé. Groundbreaking work in the early 1990s by Portes and Zhou (1993) provided researchers with a modified version they dubbed "segmented assimilation," and this model now dominates immigration and migration studies. The authors argued that adaptation to immigration was a two-way process; both the immigrant communities and the mainstream society undergo change. Furthermore, in adjusting to their new circumstances, immigrants and their children avail themselves of a variety of adaptive strategies. Some, partly owing to their skin color, social class background, language proficiency, and educational attainment, experience upward mobility by gradually assimilating into the mainstream, with many adopting middle-class norms. Others find ways of adapting not through assimilating into the mainstream but rather through "selective acculturation," entailing solidarity with one's own immigrant community or ethnic group (Portes, Fernández-Kelly, & Haller, 2005; Zhou, 1997).

Acculturation refers to "the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes places as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members" (Berry, 2005, p. 698). Though a great deal of variability can be observed, acculturation involves mutual adaptation and accommodation; it may also involve "reactive" elements. In other words, acculturation does not inevitably entail yielding to the dominant culture; it can also lead to more pronounced identity expressions that involve recovering, or even discovering, attachments that stand in contrast to mainstream cultural norms. For example, ethnic or religious identities may solidify and strengthen—rather than diminish over time—as part of the acculturation process. So while groups may accept and even excel at many external features deemed important for fitting in with the society of settlement, among them educational and economic success, strong cultural identities and attachments to the country of origin may even be accentuated as groups navigate their way in their adopted homeland. In some cases, customs and traditions are passed down for many generations without losing much of their cohesive function, even as younger generations feel less attachment to the country of origin, increasingly adopt the dominant language, and may either discard or transform other cultural practices.

Which processes occur and how they unfold will depend in part on the degree of conflict between the immigrant communities and the host society; owing to linguistic, cultural, religious, and sometimes social class differences, both conflict and disadvantage can arise that may or may not attenuate over time as immigrants adapt to mainstream norms. For example, in schools, a number of misunderstandings may occur or discriminatory actions taken against certain minority groups that initially produce failure. To the extent that members of a group experience discrimination and identify with other—perhaps indigenous—stigmatized groups, one may speak of "dissonant acculturation" or "cultural discontinuity" in terms of a downward spiral, the result often being stigma, disadvantage, and even social exclusion. Of course, none of these outcomes are automatic. Much depends on the institutional features and prevailing attitudes of the host society, the characteristics of the group in question, and, of course, the personal traits and motivations of individuals. Whatever the case, strategies of adaptation for immigrants to new contexts is inevitably a two-way street. Moreover, irrespective of the challenges and hurdles, most immigrant groups have proven quite proficient at adapting to their country of settlement to one degree or another.

Educating Immigrants

The challenges and opportunities associated with the education of immigrants predate modern school systems, though it certainly can be said that support for public schooling grew—for example, in Canada and the United States—as dominant (read White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant) groups came to see the importance of integrating masses of disparate origin. Educational responses to the children of immigrants over time have been varied, and many responses are indistinguishable from efforts to address other minority groups. In North America, the rapid expansion of immigration encompassing immigrant and refugee populations from around the world, particularly since the 1960s, has led to a number of structural and curricular changes in schools, only some of which were explicitly aimed at immigrants. One example of a policy aimed at the children of immigrants was bilingual education, and as this increasingly fell out of favor, ESL (English as a second language) classrooms became more common. However, with few exceptions, neither has been a very effective instrument for addressing the interests or concerns of immigrants themselves. Nevertheless, most parents strongly prefer that their children learn to master the dominant language, as a means of getting ahead (Glenn, 1996; Olneck, 2009).

In both Europe and North America, various efforts have been made to implement intercultural encounters and to revise historical narratives to make them more inclusive of the stories of indigenous and immigrant minorities, and in these ways promote "intercultural awareness" or "culturally responsive" teaching. Yet notwithstanding lip service given to multicultural goals at the level of policy, on the ground, there is very little evidence to suggest that alterations to the public school curriculum amount to much more than window dressing and stereotypical gestures (e.g., occasional celebrations of different cultural attire, food, and music). Where educational responses are more substantive, these often are in private contexts that have fewer curricular constraints and enjoy strong community support. The lack of substantive progress in both Europe and North America is due to several factors:

1. The socio-ethnic stratification of minority pupils both between and within schools
2. The sorting and selecting mechanisms schools use
3. The vagueness of learning objectives
4. Self-selection by peer group
5. The lack of adequate training of teachers and the lack of correspondence between a majority of teachers and their pupils in urban districts
6. Increased focus on testing and core subjects
7. Parental resistance
8. Severe budgetary constraints

Whatever the drawbacks and unsettled disputes, the first generation of immigrant children continue to grow up learning the language of the host country at school (to be sure, some better than others), though many continue to speak the language of their parents at home. For many children of immigrants, there is a dual frame of reference and a strong motivation to succeed given the sacrifices their parents have made. Many may even experience school more positively than other minorities actually born in the country. Meanwhile, others find themselves caught in a cultural dilemma: Unable to identify with the host country (except in crude consumerist terms) and also unable to identify with the country of their parents, with its traditional customs and folk religion, some experience great difficulties in developing the feeling that they belong (Bankston & Zhou, 2002; Matute-Bianchi, 1991; Perlmann, 1997). For some this leads to new hybrid identities, while for others the combination of disaffection and school failure creates a set of problems that are manifest more in some groups than in others.

Theoretical Responses

Many theoretical approaches applicable to the education of immigrants were not specifically developed with immigrants in mind but rather were focused on indigenous minority groups or descendants of slaves. Attempting to explain the reasons why certain minorities were falling behind at school, theories of cultural deficit in the 1960s quickly yielded to cultural difference alternatives, stressing diverse forms of cultural capital that are simply not valued in school. Others attempted to explain differential treatment of various working-class and minority groups in schools using the tools of Marxism, the resultant analysis being that schools reproduce the social-class backgrounds of their pupils owing to the organizational features of schools, the middle-class expectations of teachers, and the sorting and selecting mechanisms schools use. Eager to cast aside some of these rather determinist forecasts for working-class and minority students, and moreover, inspired by the work of Paulo Freire, resistance theories resurrected the centrality of *agency.* More recently, in response to high levels of segregation, a theory of "voluntary separation" has been developed, arguing that spatial concentrations of even stigmatized minority groups—many of which began as immigrant communities—can turn their segregation to their advantage when they resist, rearrange, and reclaim the terms of their segregated experience. Here, the success of immigrant and minority groups explicitly does not depend on integrationist strategies but rather maintains that communities and schools can be arranged that promote important forms of equality, enhancing well-being and self-respect. Furthermore, voluntary separation can facilitate the cultivation of civic virtues that promote the good of the community (Merry, 2013).

But there can be no doubt that the work of John Ogbu has left an imprint on the field of immigrant education like no other. He argued that to make sense of why some minority groups on average perform better or worse in school, one must look at the relevant variables *outside* the school. It is the *community forces* behind these students that illuminate general patterns in school success or failure. Community forces broadly describe how different groups perceive, interpret, and strategically respond to schooling in ways that correspond to their unique histories and adaptations to their minority status.

Ogbu's work is perhaps best known for a typology he created to describe different minority orientations to dominant culture generally and to education specifically. Though developed to explain the situation of immigrants and other minorities in American culture, his typology has been reinterpreted and applied around the world. It consists of the following categories: *semivoluntary* minorities (e.g., asylum seekers), *autonomous* minorities (self-sufficient groups that no longer face high levels of discrimination), *voluntary* minorities, and finally *nonvoluntary* minorities. Ogbu focused most of his attention on the last two categories.

Roughly speaking, voluntary minorities, namely, immigrants, experience strong academic achievement for several reasons:

a. They are seeking opportunity and are optimistic about achieving it.
b. They have a dual frame of reference, one that casts their country of settlement in a more favorable light.
c. They hold the view that obstacles encountered, such as discrimination and prejudice, are temporary and can be overcome with tenacity and hard work.
d. The orientation toward the school and other social institutions is one of "pragmatic trust," that is, schools are seen as purveyors of the knowledge, skills, language, and behaviors necessary for social mobility. Accordingly, a kind of meritocracy is internalized by this group, enabling success.

Meanwhile, *involuntary minorities* (also named "caste-like minorities") describe persons either forcibly conquered (indigenous groups) or brought against their will to an alien context (slaves and their descendants). These groups have been stripped of their primary cultural traits and forcibly assimilated. "Oppositional" orientations and patterns, on Ogbu's theory, will be commensurate with the degree of negative experiences and distrust experienced. Owing to a long history of institutional racism, their experience with discrimination, and the perception that education will not yield a payoff in the labor market, many minorities fitting this category develop oppositional attitudes toward school and, together with similar peers, may even come to see certain markers of identity (e.g., speech patterns, unrecognized cultural traits, performance, and dress) as something to be maintained rather than surrendered to mainstream expectations.

Though Ogbu's typology is somewhat fluid and has come under considerable criticism, its influence on the field of immigrant education remains uncontested and its theoretical strength lies in its comprehensiveness and cross-national applicability in explaining school success and failure among different types of minority groups. Of course, as with all theories, many exceptions to the rule can be found, and as this applies to immigrants in particular, some immigrant groups do extremely well, while others do not, notwithstanding their "voluntary" characteristics. For critics, predicting educational outcomes simply is an elusive task owing to complex identities and attachments, as well as varied structural processes and interactions in school. But critics largely agree with Ogbu that any attempt to understand school success or failure must look at what happens *in* the school as well as *outside* the school. School characteristics certainly matter: the student–teacher ratio, demographic concentrations, the organizational structure, finance schemes, leadership, teacher qualifications and expectations, mobility rates, the curriculum, disciplinary procedures, peer groups, and so on. All of these make for a complex portrait of school life. But features outside the school matter just as much if not more: neighborhood characteristics (crime rates, safety, and public services), family characteristics (educational attainment, divorce, abuse, nutrition, intimacy, social aspirations, structured free time, first language, etc.), and cultural forces emanating from the group in question. Furthermore, the immigrant status (country of origin but also destination), generational status, size of the local community, and perceived or experienced prejudice also affect the overall quality of life and influence the opportunities one may or may not have. Other variables to consider include the degree of acculturation, the language used at home, relationships with teachers, the influence of peer groups, parental beliefs, modeling, and involvement with a child's education, and finally the level of trust and assent persons experience vis-à-vis the existing opportunity structures.

Michael S. Merry

See also Assimilation; Bilingual Education; Citizenship and Civic Education; Freire, Paulo: *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Critical Pedagogy; Multicultural Citizenship

Further Readings

Bankston, C., & Zhou, M. (2002). Being well vs. doing well: Self-esteem and school performance among immigrant and nonimmigrant racial and ethnic groups. *International Migration Review, 36*(2), 389–415.

Berry, J. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29,* 697–712.

Glenn, C. (1996). *Educating immigrant children: Schools and language minorities in twelve nations*. New York, NY: Garland.

Matute-Bianchi, M. E. (1991). Situational ethnicity and patterns of school performance among immigrant and non-immigrant Mexican-descent students. In J. Ogbu (Ed.), *Minority status, oppositional culture and schooling* (pp. 205–247). New York, NY: Routledge.

Merry, M. (2013). *Equality, citizenship and segregation.* New York, NY: Palgrave.

Ogbu, J. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18*(4), 312–334.

Olneck, M. (2009). What have immigrants wanted from American schools? What do they want now? Historical and contemporary perspectives on immigrants, language and American schooling. *American Journal of Education, 115*(3), 379–406.

Perlmann, J. (1997). Second generation decline? Children of immigrants, past and present: A reconsideration. *International Migration Review, 31*(4), 893–922.

Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P., & Haller, W. (2005). Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(6), 1000–1040.

Portes, A., & Zhou, M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 530*(1), 74–96.

Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented assimilation: Issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation. *International Migration Review, 31*(4), 975–1008.

INDIAN RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS AND EDUCATION

Indian philosophy and religion will initially seem alien to the outsider. However, behind the initial strangeness, there are shared concerns and common issues that can help us see familiar issues in new ways. Indian philosophy and religion include traditions that have their birth on the Indian subcontinent (including present-day India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal)—omitting the transplanted traditions (Islam, Christianity, and Zoroastrianism). Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism are major Indian religions; there are nine major philosophical schools, or *darsanas*. This entry introduces basic elements of Indian philosophical and religious thought and briefly comments on the value of Indian philosophy for contemporary educational thought. Due to space restrictions, it will focus on classical Hindu and Buddhist traditions, saying little about Jainism and Sikhism, despite their importance.

Basic Overview

In general, Indian philosophy is practical, concerned with ameliorating suffering and attaining liberation. It is a means by which people try to achieve wisdom and thereby make life better—indeed, make it in part a spiritual quest. So while one can identify characteristically religious practices in all major Indian religions (e.g., rituals, prayer, charity, and meditation), the pursuit of knowledge through philosophical analysis is taken to be itself a form of religious activity. Yet the character of philosophizing—applying careful reasoning to solve abstract puzzles regarding the coherence and justification of fundamental concepts and principles—is fairly similar in Western and Indian traditions.

Central Concepts

While there is wide diversity in the religious and philosophical traditions of India, we can identify several shared concepts. Let us briefly examine some of the most important. These terms are Sanskrit in origin.

Karma. The term literally means “action” but is usually taken to refer to the idea that actions have effects. It can be seen as a metaphysical principle but in Jainism is taken to refer to a type of substance. Karma has ramifications during one’s lifetime, but the effects of one’s actions are supposed to last beyond one’s earthly life. Indeed, the principle of karma holds that one’s actions in this life will determine the form of life in which one will be reborn.

Samsara. It literally refers to wandering but is sometimes translated as reincarnation, rebirth, or transmigration. This can be misleading because reincarnation suggests entering a new body, as though

View publication stats