Using diversity to advance multicultural dialogues in higher education

Introduction: Multiculturalism in higher education as a vehicle of social cohesion

Kymlicka argues that: "Talk about the retreat from multiculturalism has obscured the fact that a form of multicultural integration remains a live option for Western democracies" (Kymlicka, 2012: 01). This chapter makes a case for revitalising multiculturalism in higher education through learning and teaching, employing students' cultural capital as a resource. Drawing on a range of research, cultural and educational theories and my own teaching experience, I argue for a culturally sensitive pedagogy that values student experience as a learning resource and highlights the ways in which our experiences and histories are connected, thereby helping to develop a shared sense of belonging and promote cohesion.   A major objective is to demonstrate the value of advancing multicultural dialogues to address issues of diversity and social cohesion in the light of twenty-first century migration flows. Cultural diversity in relation to social cohesion is discussed within a context of a rapidly changing social, cultural and political landscape. Referring to a Year 3 sociology module on border crossings and migration at a London university, and the aid of an extended module evaluation which included student perceptions of multiculturalism, the chapter briefly traces the path taken by multiculturalism in the UK, counters the view that it is now a redundant concept, and proposes a more dynamic mode of multiculturalism which can be fostered in higher education in the UK. In principle, this approach could be extended to the wider citizenship, for instance perhaps engendering a more culturally shared ethos in the Prevent strategy. Adopting a fluid approach to the concept of culture, I argue here that the experience of diversity itself can become a basis of commonality and cohesion, as cultures are not hermetically sealed, but instead historically overlap and flow into each other.

The migration module is part of a wider sociology programme, designed with the aim of teaching various sociological perspectives of migration flows, within a historical and global context. More specifically, it aims at developing students' understanding of the different motivations behind migration; the impact the process has on migrants' lives; and on the communities of origin as well as the communities of their destination. Through the design of an assessed group assignment students are required to research and present the impact of a migrant group of their choice upon the wider society in the UK, including the responses to migrant presence.   The approach to learning on the module is designed to involve students in the construction of knowledge - through their own experiences and making connections with each other's various experiences, whilst grounding their arguments within relevant theories. The students' experiences are framed within a discussion of current academic literature on diversity in education (Doyle, 2010; Grever, *et al*., 2008; Howard, 2003; Killick, 2012; McAllister & Irvine, 2002; Moncrieffe, 2015; Northedge, 2003; Preece, 2009; Swartz, 2009; Tomalin, 2007). Both the mid-semester and the final assignments give the students an opportunity to examine how meaning is achieved through language and how 'common sense' perceptions of migrants and migration are shaped by dominant discourses, and crucially how power relations operate in the construction of knowledge. The module is drawn upon here

to highlight the significance of culturally responsive pedagogy in validating student experience.

The extended evaluation was designed as a questionnaire with ten semi structured questions and plenty of space for participants to develop their responses. Consent was sought from the students and they were under no obligation to complete the questionnaire though it was distributed to everyone. The objectives were explained and the students were reassured that their responses would remain anonymous. Aware of potential power relations, and to minimise researcher bias effect on student responses, distribution of the evaluation questionnaire was left till the last session of the year. The students completed the questionnaire after we had met for the last time, as it was a final module in their final year. A couple of students from the group volunteered to collect all the forms, put them in an envelope and post it in the lecturer's pigeon hole. As all student assignments are electronically submitted their handwritten responses to the questionnaire were unidentifiable. Had the evaluation been started earlier there would have been time an opportunity to improve the response rate. Using a convenience sampling method 40 questionnaires were distributed and 28 were returned completed. Though the sample is too small to generalise from, the responses gave some valuable insight into the students' perceptions of multiculturalism.

Notwithstanding policies relating to radicalisation, it is arguable that a prime forum for fostering social cohesion and advancing multicultural dialogue is the higher education sector (Killick, 2012; Swartz, 2009). As most UK universities are increasingly emerging as spaces where diverse groups of students are thrown together, they offer a significant opportunity where connections can be made and assumptions challenged, thereby opening rather than constricting dialogue. Students' debates can continue and extend beyond the classroom – if students' experiences and history are validated through their academic work they are more likely to take the debates into their respective diverse communities and further develop them there. In such an approach to learning and teaching students are centred as normative, facilitating the development of reciprocal relationships built on self-knowledge, mutual trust and respect, thereby strengthening connections between teachers, students, families and each other (Swartz, 2009). Multicultural dialogues can therefore be advanced from bottom up via student experience, rather than imposed with top down authority. This approach to teaching not only challenges a monocultural Eurocentric approach to intellectual enquiry, but importantly offers possibilities for promoting social cohesion via debates that do not shy away from issues relating to possible tensions and conflicts arising from cultural differences (Banks, 2001; Ngo, 2010).

Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity: Definitions and Contestations
An initial overview of multiculturalism in Britain makes clear that British culture is inherently diverse and evolving. Whether applied to policy or as a theory for understanding difference, diversity and inequalities, multiculturalism is a highly relevant and necessary perspective for understanding issues relating to integration and cohesion (Modood, 2013). It needs to be understood as a process which is always contextual, with the State taking major responsibility for the successful development of diversity (Nye, 2007). Home Secretary Roy Jenkins (1966) described multiculturalism as "…equal opportunity, accompanied by cultural

diversity, in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance" (Jenkins, 1967). This view envisages integration to be a two-way process and promotes policies of equality. A genuinely interactive process however never truly materialised, and the widespread view expressed by a number of politicians and commentators, is that multiculturalism has in contrast led to segregated communities. To Stuart Hall, multiculturalism in the UK was not established as the result of conscious policy but evolved incrementally and unplanned, with British society 'feeling' multicultural as the presence of ethnic minority communities became more visible and began shaping national life. (Hall, 2000).

Whilst Britain may have drifted into multiculturalism, to use Stuart Hall's term, the points at which multiculturalism came under fire are arguably more easily identifiable. It could be said that an early point 1989 was the 'Rushdie Affair' (Asad, 1990), which promoted the 'clash of cultures' debate in the UK. More recently a spate of 'riots' in Burnley, Oldham and Bradford in 2001 - dubbed by the popular press as the 'Northern uprisings' led to a series of reports and policy recommendations relating to community cohesion (Cantle, 2001). Since these disturbances in Northern England, the events of 9/11 in the USA and the 7/7 London bombings in the UK, there has been increasing concern that diversity erodes social cohesion and destroys relations of trust and mutual help in local communities (Collier, 2013; Goodhart 2004, Putnam, 2007). These authors' perspectives - that too much diversity hampers social cohesion and a sense of common solidarity, has become part of some people's 'common sense' thinking, and are frequently employed by those wishing to limit immigration to the UK - leading to a strong association of immigration with security risk, re-igniting discourses of fear of the 'Other' (Bigo, 2002, Cheong, et al, 2007; Ibrahim, 2008). The module reviews and challenges these discourses.

Nevertheless, I would argue that Britain is generally viewed by the rest of the world as a multicultural society, with its multiculturalism visible in the celebration of 'idealised' cultural difference (Fortier, 2005), as evidenced for example by the popularity of the yearly Notting Hill carnival, South Asian cuisine on most high streets, and African or African-Caribbean music resounding at garden parties and summer festivals. In the bid for the London 2012 Olympic Games London was promoted as a multicultural city, arguably playing a significant role in winning the bid (Falcous, M and Silk, 2010). Sadly, at the heel of the celebrations of the bid's success, the following day after the successful bid London was struck by a series of terror attacks by radical Islamists, highlighting a sharp contrast between a multiculturalism that appreciates and celebrates 'easy' cultural difference and the more challenging differences in cultural values amongst some sections of British society, such as 'honour killings' and religious doctrine. It has been argued that the politically correct ethos behind multiculturalism may inhibit open communication and debates relating to the more challenging cultural differences (O'Donnell, 2007).

The initial responses in Britain to counter racism and prejudice in the early days of ethnic minorities settlement, have been criticised by some as inadequate and enabling the development of segregated lives. Referring to Troyna, Richard Race highlights the weaknesses of cultural tourism such as the '3 Ss Multiculturalism': saris, samosas and steel bands which leads to superficial changes, in contrast to anti-racist strategies that can counter racism (Race, 2015:29). Alleyne refers to the focus on easy cultural differences as 'fat-free multiculturalism', and he argues that

celebrating difference as good in itself does not help to redress the inequalities which continue to structure the lives of ethnic communities (Alleyne, 2002). For those who fear that diversity undermines national solidarity multiculturalism is also a source of anxiety. The way issues of multiculturalism, Britishness and national identity are debated in public and education discourses inevitably influence how teachers approach it in the classroom (Keddie, 2014: 540).   What is evident from my own interaction with students in seminar debates and their assignments is that students are just as likely to identify with Britishness as they are with other identity markers such as religion, ethnicity, gender and social class. However multifaceted aspects of identities (Keddie, 2014:541) mean that cohesion cannot be exclusively or mainly understood through the lens of national identity. Certain authors advocate a more complex account of diversity in debates of integration and cohesion (Olssen, 2004; Parekh, 2007; Vertovec, 2007, 2010; Bloemraad and Wright, 2014). Others focus on the evidence that a long-term goal of multiculturalism has always been about an embracing and inclusive form of integration and inclusive Britishness – rather than segregation (Alleyne 2002; Modood and Salt, 2011; Uberoi and Modood, 2012).

The historical overview makes it clear that while feeling part of British culture may be important for social cohesion, reductionist and racialized understandings of Britishness and their associated assumptions need to be problematized. The critique of multiculturalism increasingly takes place within a context of anxieties relating to acts of terrorism and a climate of fear of 'The Other' (Abbas, 2008). These anxieties are then associated with the perception of ethnic minorities' unwillingness to integrate into mainstream British culture – which furthers the argument that multiculturalism has exacerbated divisions rather than encouraged integration (Uslaner, 2011). However, such a rigid and static notion of British culture and Britishness is unhelpful, since there are no evident unifying features. Furthermore, globalisation has impacted on Britain in rapid and unpredictable ways. If British culture is difficult to define, multiculturalism is equally slippery and ambiguous, but the latter is nevertheless blamed for ethnic divisions and conflicts in British society. Bloemrad and Wright disentangle the multiplicity of meanings of multiculturalism and outline them as follows: demographic diversity; political philosophy of equality or justice; set of policies to recognize and accommodate ethno-racial and religious diversity or public discourse recognizing and valorizing pluralism (Bloemrad and Wright, 2014).   Given these complexities I argue that an approach to multiculturalism that recognizes the multiple levels at which identities operate enables us to identify where there is potential for connecting, sharing and integration. This requires a move away from seeing communities as bounded and hermetically sealed and static.

As far as the education system is concerned, what is often neglected is the opportunity to value cultural diversity as an important resource in learning. Cultural diversity enriches the learning process by providing the opportunity for students and teachers to learn about one another, and it can also be usefully applied in an advantageous way to consolidate understanding of abstract concepts and theories. Moreover, when 'difference as deficit' is challenged cultural diversity produces "…an emancipatory model of education that offers teachers an opportunity to engage with a broad body of knowledge that can be used to strengthen their connections with students, families and each other (Swartz, 2011:1067).

The cultural diversity of the students on the migration module enabled students to learn about migrant communities via group work. Students taking the module understood the different perspectives on migration flows through making connections with their own and each other's histories. This approach to learning challenges power dynamics, as teachers and students develop "reciprocal relationships built on self-knowledge, mutual trust, and respect, which they experience in the context of curriculum and instruction that are inclusive, representational, and indigenously voiced (Swartz, 2011:1067). Although Swartz's research refers to the USA her model of education operates within the spirit of a connective multiculturalism - giving students a sense of affirmation to their diverse identities, and valuing their shared experiences as cultural capital. This chapter illustrates how diversity can be employed in the learning process, rather than seeing difference as problematic.

Diversity: Unlocking student cultural capital
For the first assessed assignment of the migration module, students are required to search material from their own and each other's communities, and present contributions made by migrants. They are expected to work on the assignment together in small groups throughout the process and keep a portfolio of every group member's contribution. Some students resist this group exercise as they are accustomed to essay questions and prefer as a rule to work individually on assignments. From my close observation of students this year and from student evaluation, I noted that, once underway there was a positive buzz of excitement about working in groups. Bar minor disagreements amongst group members, students seem to value the opportunity of researching migrant contributions – based on their own and each other's experiences - and they are pleasantly surprised at how significant these can be. During the process of research the students learn about each other's cultures and discuss the parallels and differences between different communities. Importantly, they are encouraged to make historical connections and understand the sociocultural, political and economic relations involved in migration flows in and out of the UK. Students' appreciation and the benefits of understanding the relationship between multiculturalism and national identity through their group assignment were apparent both through the quality of their presentation, their final individual written assignment, as well as the student module evaluation forms.

When students' diverse cultures and histories are recognized and valorized in academic study they feel integrated into a wider learning community and this sense of belonging has positive implications for cohesion. Educational researchers see learning "…as acquiring the capacity to participate in the discourses of an unfamiliar knowledge community, and teaching as supporting that participation" (Northedge, 2003:17). Perceived as an asset by educationalists, and employed to highlight and strengthen connections, cultural diversity can be capitalized upon for learning purposes, and in the process, promote cohesion. Migration flows, widening participating policies and the internationalisation of degree programmes bring an increasing number of diverse students to higher education. The diversity of their different domestic and cultural backgrounds is a rich learning resource. However, a post-Brexit UK may see a reduction in student numbers from abroad, which would impact negatively on student diversity.

An element of diversity which is usefully employed on the migration module is the presence of students from overseas through study abroad programmes or student exchanges. The diverse cultural capital they bring with them is employed to gain comparative perspectives, thereby enriching seminar discussions on many levels. Thus, the students compare the different ways in which cultural diversity is dealt with in their respective countries and the impact of migration flows in their home country of study. For example, through interaction with African-American students, home students - whether from majority or minority backgrounds learn about the complexities of 'whiteness', 'gender' and 'race'. They discuss the similarities and differences of their lived experiences to understand the significance of Otherness through "intersubjective encounters [that] enables moves to identify Self with others and personalize hitherto distant places and practices" (Killick, 2012: 372). As the author indicates, international mobility presents "…opportunities for multicultural/international campuses to develop spaces for similarly rich learning for the nonmobile majority" (Killick, 2012:372). Despite initial reluctance, students on the migration module clearly enjoy interacting with the overseas students, whether or not they themselves have mobility opportunities. The benefits of cross cultural exchange on the migration module become evident in the cultural richness of seminar debates. Research indicates that student mobility brings with it benefits on various levels, including essential assets required for working in a global world (Resnik, 2009; Doyle, *et al* 2010; Brux and Fry, 2010; Killick, 2012). However, these authors also point to potential marginalisation of those who cannot take part in exchange programmes, whilst others discuss international mobility within a neoliberal global context, where increasingly host countries see international students as revenue generators. The latter highlight inequalities by pointing out that only a minority of students can take advantage of mobility opportunities to improve their skills and widen their scope for employment (Findlay *et al* 2010; Altbach and Engberg 2014). Nevertheless, from my experience of the migration module, the presence of students from abroad enrich the learning experience of the whole class, especially in understanding the impact of multiculturalism on their shared daily lives.

The extended student evaluation questionnaire sought to gain the views of students on multiculturalism. For the question "Is multiculturalism important to you personally? Explain why" on the student evaluation form, every student answered positively yes, and felt that the concept enabled them to learn about cultures other than their own. Interestingly one student showed their understanding of the complexities by qualifying their positive response: "Yes, it shows acceptance of one's culture…" and explained that it enabled them to learn about "one another's background", but this student also added to their explanation "No, regarding emphasizing people as different. Multiculturalism is a positive concept, as long as we look at each other as equal." This particular student clearly takes into consideration that emphasizing 'difference' could be problematic. However, the majority of questionnaire responses indicate that the students value multiculturalism, viewing it as facilitating intercultural exchange.

Whether on the migration module or via the extended student evaluation, the students expressed the benefits of learning about migration through their own diverse experiences. Applied in this way, students' cultural capital facilitates cohesion and promotes a sense of belonging to a wider community.   Seminar discussions and their assignments also gave the students an opportunity to

understand the power relations involved in language and the construction of knowledge.   For example, students analysed how language and images used in the mass media to portray migrants combine powerfully with political discourses of migration, thereby playing on the fear of the 'Other' – with the potential consequence of fuelling racism.

Cultural and language diversity in education: Critical Reflections
The module illustrates the significance of language as a major force in the construction of human subjectivities – an aspect often neglected in multicultural policies. Preece's work on linguistic diversity highlights the ways in which it is often framed as problematic, even in the design of multicultural programmes. Although her work is based on secondary education, similar analysis can be tentatively extended to higher education. She discusses a writing programme which was targeted primarily at students "…categorised as working class, from ethnic minorities, particularly British of South Asian descent, who were young, from non-selective schools in London and with non-traditional qualifications or traditional qualifications with low grades…" (Preece, 2009:22). The policy seems to be well intentioned, but as the programme assumed the linguistic diversity of the student population to be problematic it became associated with 'remedial' English and students in need of English language remediation. It isn't surprising therefore that students singled out as in need resisted being part of the programme, preferring instead to adopt slang to avoid being viewed as 'remedial'. The students' reaction hearteningly shows creative resistance on their part in response to the policy makers' lack of cultural sensitivity. Preece (2009) demonstrates a missed opportunity in recognizing the multilingual capital that the students bring with them. Linguistic diversity is viewed as an obstacle to learning rather than a resource. There appears to be a contradiction between programmes purporting to be multicultural and a higher education system that appears blind to cultural capital, including language, brought about by diverse students, hence missing the opportunity of validating their diverse identities. In higher education, the failure is more a neglect of rich and diverse cultural resources rather than negative labelling which takes place in Preece's study.

A pedagogic framework of the kind adopted in the module involves critical cultural reflection by both students and teachers. This is beneficial to both groups, as it attempts to achieve equity and social justice. Tyrone Howard argues that "… the development of culturally relevant teaching strategies is contingent upon critical reflection about race and culture of teachers and students" (Howard, 2003:195). He believes that the shift in ethnic demographics has important implications for students and teachers. Unfortunately, such research seems to be taking place predominantly in North America. Referring to the US, Howard (ibid) argues that the nation needs to make the necessary adjustments "to face the changing ethnic texture of its citizens". Several researchers in the field argue that culturally relevant pedagogy needs to assert the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, as well as performance styles of ethnically diverse students, if they are to make learning more relevant and effective for students (Banks, *et al* 2001; Howard, 2003; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). Villegas and Lucas (2002:30) recommend that teacher trainers use a

vision of teaching and learning in a diverse society that guides teaching towards a multicultural curriculum. They argue that culturally responsive 'classroom managers' should strive to become knowledgeable about the cultures and communities in which their students live. As discussed above, there is a need to recognise students' cultural capital as an asset and be mindful of traditional teaching practices that reflect middleclass Eurocentric values (Howard, 2003). Furthermore, as national identity and a sense of belonging have been identified as important factors to students I argue here for the importance of recognizing connected histories as well as difference. A dominant one-dimensional representation of ethnic communities as 'Other' and homogenous bounded groups with fixed cultural, religious, social and economic divisions, obscures the multiple levels of shared common experience and connections that can promote a sense of belonging and cohesion.

Diversity and Nation: Identities in a changing landscape
This section argues that shared diversity, far from being divisive, can bridge difference to the benefit of social cohesion. In the extended student evaluation one of the questions was: "What and how did you learn about multiculturalism on the Migration Module?", and the majority answers were along the lines of the following response: "In particular, different ways of looking at national identity, specifically problems in defining it and looking past threats of losing it and embracing a more hybrid identity, inclusive of all members". Clearly responses from this small sample must be interpreted with care, but nevertheless it is clear from the answers, that an interactive multiculturalism, as experienced and understood on the module, facilitates intercultural dialogue. Crucially, students found learning about a complex but inclusive national history promoted their sense of belonging. This contrasts with history which is predominantly taught from a "master narrative that is exclusive in its presentation of a dominant Anglo-centric and nationalistic version of the past" (Moncrieffe, 2014:191).

Advocating a similar approach to the one taken on the migration module, Moncrieffe argues for developing historical inquiry from the students' and teachers' experiences. He believes that students can foster a sense of connection and belonging to each other through tracing mass-migration to England. To him this approach provides "the potential to redefine and contribute to an enriched English 'master narrative' for the twenty-first century…" (Moncrieffe, 2014:202). This connective and inclusive way of understanding history is noticeable on the migration module, and crucially is a productive way of developing a sense of belonging to the UK. Moreover, this approach highlights the myth of a unified British national identity. "First, Britain is not and never has been the unified, conflict-free land of popular imagination. There is no single white majority. Second, the 'minority' communities do not live in separate, self-sufficient enclaves, and they do display substantial difference. They too must be reimagined" (Parekh, 2000:26).   This said, the Brexit campaign and voting results have revealed the strength of nostalgic feelings - of a British nation untainted by migrant presence, amongst some sections of the British population. The political discourses and media discourses of the campaign appear to have given a licence to some people to express prejudice against the 'Other'. Given reports of a hike in hate crimes it would be a serious mistake to disregard these as a temporary or unimportant (Travis: 2016:1-2). Any advancement of multicultural dialogue needs to

address these groups of people too and their perceptions of a more glorious and 'better' Britain prior to post war migration. Nevertheless, I'm arguing for a move away from debating migration and social cohesion through the lens of a fixed 'imperial' national identity which sees difference as deficit, and focusing on the multiple levels at which communities intersect and share common ground – with education being only one of them.

It is important to note that the landscape and context within which migration takes place is constantly changing. It could be argued that transnational identities have taken over the significance of identities bound by a single national identity – if indeed this ever existed.   Social relations in multiple national and wider cultural contexts have been facilitated by the continued improvement in globalized networks of communication – for example, email, Skype, mobile and various phone applications. Social cohesion needs therefore to be understood within the increasing capacity of migrants to maintain social ties with their country of origin. As transnational connections have improved and are relatively cheaper, migrants travel regularly to and from their country of origin and send remittances to family and friends. Furthermore, cheaper and ease of travel, albeit for a minority middle class group, has also facilitated connections with various parts of the world, particularly amongst young people. Migration flows may change in direction and numbers depending on national immigration policies and global geopolitics, but current trends appear likely to continue in the foreseeable future. Moreover, it is likely that patterns of transnationalism also change. There is more than one form of migrant transnationalism and there is therefore a need for continued research in this area (Vertovec, 2009). In the meantime, based on my interaction with students over the last two decades, I would argue that transnational identities do not prevent a sense of belonging to a national collective, and higher education can act as an important vehicle for advancing multicultural dialogues and improving cohesion.

Conclusions: Building bridges at universities
The argument of this chapter, based on the experience of teaching the module and the student evaluation, is that drawing on students' diverse experiences, including their transnational backgrounds, has the potential to revitalise the teaching of multiculturalism and even the framing of the concept itself. This approach to multiculturalism can develop and enhance social cohesion rather than diminish and threaten it. Those who blame multiculturalism for a lack of social cohesion argue that increasing ethnic diversity in a community erodes social capital. Social capital is understood in Putnam's terms, referring to "social life networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (Putnam, 1995:2). Based on Putnam's model of social capital as a collective good, it is then assumed that increased diversity undermines the potential of integration and cohesion - as differences are perceived to inhibit networking, and prevent help and trust in a community. However, some authors argue that research in this area is limited as a positive link between cultural difference and lack of integration cannot be established (Bloemraad and Wright, 2014; Heath and Demireva, 2014). Interestingly, even where research confirms this view, it also indicates that "…while an individual living in a diverse environment may report lower levels of social capital 'the same individual' is also likely to have more positive interethnic relations (Laurence, 2009).

The implication here is that despite perceived lower levels of networking, exposure to diversity may in effect improve the potential of social cohesion.

Furthermore, I argue that a focus on linking cultural diversity with lack of integration neglects very important issues of societal disadvantage and inequalities in society (Hooghe 2007; Gesthuizen, *et al* 2009; Laurence, 2009; Portes and Vickstrom, 2011; Uslaner 2011).   Some authors consider disadvantage - with its association of intolerance, to have a stronger negative impact upon trust, social cohesion and integration, than diversity (Kesler and Bloemraad, 2010; Laurence, 2009; Callens and Meuleman, 2016; Hooghe, M, 2007). Moreover, the findings in Laurence's study provide evidence that "…rising diversity increases tolerance by leading to more exposure to other ethnic groups, and an increasing likelihood of forming 'bridging' ties" (Laurence, 2009:16). In a global world where people are crisscrossing the globe, ties that function as bridges between communities may be more important than ties that bind people based on homogeneity. Bridging ties cut across groups and are considered essential for social cohesion and for poverty reduction in the developing world (Narayan, 1999). Though the socio-political and economic context of Britain differs from that of the developing world which Narayan discusses, it is important to understand that social cohesion is multidimensional in nature and can occur at various levels of interaction. I have demonstrated above how higher education can foster bridging ties in the process of learning. As Green *et al* argue "…when it comes to promoting social cohesion, there is clearly a case for prioritising the reduction of inequalities rather than just raising average levels" (Green *et al*, 2003:468).

Overall, this chapter argues that higher education is almost the ideal forum for bridging ties between diverse groups, promoting solidarity through culturally sensitive pedagogy. A more global world demands improvement in intercultural skills, and has led to an increase in internationalization of education and international student mobility. To Altbach and Teichler (2001), the international role of academic institutions offers a further layer of diversity at universities. A UNESCO report indicates, "…the number of globally mobile students increased to 3.4 million students in 2009, up from 2.1 million students in 2002" (Choudaha and Chang, 2012:7). The potential fall out of the post Brexit results which reflected strong resistance to immigration is not yet clear. What is evident however is that emotional, cognitive and socio-communicative multiculturalism are increasing realities – not least in the functioning of government and transnational corporations.

The above discussion argues for an opening out of multiculturalism debates, giving a voice to both connections and singularities via culturally responsive pedagogy which promotes a sense of belonging. I do not wish to imply that universities can solve the problems of social cohesion, nor indeed that the migration module discussed above is exemplary. However, I dispute the representation of ethnic communities as hermetically sealed homogenous bounded groups and argue that social disadvantage and inequalities also need to be taken into consideration in debates of social cohesion. Natalie Nougayrede (2016:38) quotes historian Tony Judt who wrote "…in an age of demographic transition and resettlement, today's Europeans are more heterogeneous than ever before". She goes on to conclude that: "How European societies embrace growing diversity will in many ways determine the fate of our democracies". We need to map the frontiers of the postcolonial with historical

imagination and an embracing of diverse identities. A twenty-first century multiculturalism needs to take account of neoliberal globalisation and shifting diasporic and transnational flows.

References

Abbas, T. (2008). Muslim Minorities in Britain: Integration, Multiculturalism and Radicalism in the Post-7/7, *Period Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 28(3), 287-300.

Altbach, P.G. and Teichley, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(1), 5-25.

Altbach, P.G. and Engberg D. (2014). Global Student Mobility: The Changing Landscape, *International Higher Education*, No.77, 11-14.

Alleyne, B. (2002). 'An idea of community and its discontents: towards a more reflexive sense of belonging in multicultural Britain', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25(4) 607-627.

Asad, T. (1990). Multiculturalism and British identity in the wake of the Rushdie Affair, *Politics & Society*, 18(4) 455-480.

Banks, J.A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W.D., Irvine, J.J., Nieto, S., Schofield, J.W., and Stephan, W.G. (2001). Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(3), 196-203.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *ALTERNATIVES-AMSTERDAM THEN NEW YORK THEN GUILDFORD*- 27, 63-92.

Bloemraad I. and Wright, M. (2014). "Utter failure" or unity out of diversity? Debating and evaluating policies of multiculturalism, *International Migration Review*, 48(S1) S292-S334.

Brux, J.M. and Fry, B. (2010). Mulicultural students in study abroad: Their interests, their issues, and their constraints, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(5), 508-527.

Burnett, J. (2004). Community, cohesion and the state, *Race & Class*, 45(3), 1-18.

Cantle, T. (2001). *Community cohesion*, London: Home Office.

Cheong, P.H., Edwards, R., Solomos, J. (2007). Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: A critical review. *Critical Social Policy*, 27(1), 24-29.

Choudaha, R. and Chang, L. (2012) *Trends in International Student Mobility, Research Report 01*, World Education Services, New York, Available at www.wes.org/RAS [Accessed 15 March 2016].

Collier, P. (2013) *Exodus: Immigration and multiculturalism in the 21st century*, Penguin UK.

Doyle, S., Gendall, P., Meyer, L.H., Hoek, J., Tait, C., McKenzie, L. and Loorpart, A. (2010). An investigation of Factors Associated with Student Participation in Study Abroad, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(5), 475-490.

Falcous, M & Silk, M.L. (2010). Olympic Bidding, Multicultural Nationalism, Terror, and the Epistemological Violence of 'Making Britain Proud', *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 10 (2), 167-186.

Findlay, A.M., King, R., Smith, F.M., Geddes, A. and Skeldon, R.(2012). World Class? An investigation of globalisation, difference and international student mobility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37(1), 118-131.

Fortier, A.M. (2005). Pride politics and multiculturalist citizenship, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(3), 559-578.

Gesthuizen, M., Van der Meer, Y., and Scheepers, P. (2009). Ethnic Diversity and Social Capital in Europe: Tests of Putnam's Thesis in European Countries, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 32(2), 121-142. Available from http://dx.doi.org/10.111/j.1467-9477.2008.00217x [Accessed on 18 July 2016].

Gijsberts M., Van Der Meer T., and Dagevos, J., (2012). 'Hunkering Down' in Multi-Ethnic Neighbourhoods? The Effects of Ethnic Diversity on Dimensions of Social Cohesion, *European Sociological Review*, 28 (4), 527-537. Available from http//dx.doi.10.1093/esr/jcr022, www.esr.oxfordjournals.org. [Accessed 16 July 2016].

Goodhart, D. (2004). Too Diverse?. *Prospect magazine*, 95(30), 7.

Goodhart, D. (2013). *The British Dream: Successes and failures of post-war immigration*, Atlantic Books Ltd.

Green, A., Preston, J, and Sabates, R. (2003). Education, Equality and Social Cohesion: a distributional approach, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 33:4, 454-470, Available from http//dx.doi.org/10.1080030579203200012757 [Accessed 15 July 2016].

Grever M, Haydn, T. & Ribbens K. (2008) Identity and School History: The Perspective of Young People from the Netherlands and England, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56(1), 76-94.

Hall, S. (2000). Multicultural citizens, monocultural citizenship in *Tomorrow's citizens: Critical debates in citizenship and education*, pp43-51

Heath, A. and Demereva, N. (2014). Has multiculturalism failed in Britain? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(1), 161-180.

Heyneman, S.P. (2003). Education, Social Cohesion, and the Future Role of International Organizations. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 78(3), 25-38.

Hooghe, M. (2007) Social Capital and Diversity Generalized Trust, Social Cohesion and Regimes of Diversity. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 40(3), 709-732.

Howard, T.C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical reflection. *Theory into practice*, 42(3), 195-202.

Ibrahim, M. (2005). The Securitization of Migration: A Racial Discourse1. *International migration*, 43(5), 163-187.

Jenkins, R. (1967). Address by the Home Secretary to the Institute. *Race & Class*, 8(3), 215-221.

Keddie, A. (2014). The politics of Britishness: multiculturalism, schooling and social cohesion, *British Educational Research Journal*, 40 (3)539-554.

Kesler C. and Bloemraad I. (2010). Does Immigration Erode Social Capital? The Conditional Effects of Immigration-Generated Diversity on Trust, Membership, and Participation across 19 Countries, 1981-2000. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(02), 319-347.

Killick D. (2012). Seeing-Ourselves-in-the-World: Developing Global Citizenship through International Mobility and Campus Community, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(4), 372-389.

Kymlicka, W. & Banting, K. (2006). Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 20(3), 281-304.

Kymlicka W. (2010). The rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies. *International social science journal*, 61(199), 97-112.

Kymlicka W. (2012). *Multiculturalism, Success, Failure and the Future*, Migration Policy Institute, *Transatlantic Council on Migration*, [Accessed 18 July 2016].

Laurence J. (2009). The Effect of Ethnic Diversity and Community Disadvantage on Social Cohesion: A Multi-Level Analysis of Social Capital and Interethnic Relations in UK Communities, *European Sociological Review*, p.jcp057. Available from www.esr.oxfordjournals.org [Accessed 16 July 2016].

McAllister, G. and Irvine, J.J. (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural teacher education, *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), 3-24.

McAllister, G. and Irvine J.J. (2002). The role of empathy in teaching culturally diverse students, A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(5) 433-443.

McGhee, D. (2005). Patriots of the Future? A Critical Examination of Community Cohesion Strategies in Contemporary Britain, *Sociological Research online*, 10(3), 1-20. Available from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/3/mcghee.html. [Accessed 17 July 2016].

McGhee, D. (2006). Getting 'Host' Communities on Board: Finding the Balance Between 'Managed Migration' and 'Managed Settlement' in Community Cohesion Strategies, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32(1), 111-127.

McGhee, D. (2006). The New Commission for Equality and Human Rights: Building Community Cohesion and Revitalizing Citizenship in Contemporary Britain. *Ethnopolitics*, 5(2), 145-166.

Mitchell K. (2003). Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: from the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan, *Transactions of the Institute of British geographers*, 28(4), 387-403.

Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: a civic idea*. 2nd ed. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Modood T. and Salt J. (2011). Global Migration, Ethnicity and Britishness in T. Modood *et al* (eds) *Global Migration, Ethnicity and Britishness*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Moncrieffe, M. (2014). Reconceptualising Mass Migration within the Primary School History Curriculum Master Narrative for a Broader Sense of Connection and Belonging to England and English History, in Halpin, E., Hunter, A., Murji, K.., Ozwerdem, A, Race R., Robinson, S., Demir, M. (Eds.) *Academic Workshop Proceedings: Sense of Belonging in a Diverse Britain*, p191-206. www.DialogueSociety.org .[Accessed 15 March 2016].

Narayan, D. (1999). Bonds and bridges: social capital and poverty, *Policy Research Working Paper 2167*, The World Bank Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network Poverty Division.

Ngo, B. (2010). Doing "diversity" at Dynamic High: problems and possibilities of multicultural education in practice, *Education and Urban Society*, 42(4), 473-495.

Northedge, A. (2003). Rethinking Teaching in the Context of Diversity, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8 (1), 17-32.

Nougayrede, N. (2016). European Muslims are not new. Nor are they all the same, *The Guardian*, Saturday 10 September 2016, p38.

Nye, M. (2007). The Challenges of Multiculturalism, *Culture and Religion*, 8(2), 109-123.

O'Donnell, M (2007). Review Debate: We need human rights not nationalism lite. Globalization and British solidarity, *Ethnicities*, 7(2), 248-259.

Olssen M (2010). From the Crick Report to the Parekh Report: multiculturalism, cultural difference, and democracy the revisioning of citizenship education, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(2), 179-192.

Parekh, B.C. (2000). *The future of multi-ethnic Britain: Report of the commission on the future of multi-ethnic Britain*. Profile Books.

Parekh B.C. (2002). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Portes, A. and Vickstrom, E. (2011). Diversity, Social Capital, and Social Cohesion, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37: 461-79, available at doi:10.1146/annurev-soc-081309-150022 [Accessed on 15 March 2016]

Preece, S. (2009). Multilingual identities in higher education: negotiating the 'mother tongue', 'posh' and 'slang', *Language and Education*, 24(1), 21-39.

Putnam, R.D. (1995). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *PS: Political science & politics* 28(04), 664-683.

Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R.D. (2007). '*E pluribus unum*. Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture'. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30: 137-74.

Race, R. (2015). *Multiculturalism and Education*, 2nd edition, London: Bloomsbury.

Resnik, J. (2009). Multicultural education - good for business but not for the state? The IB urriculum and global capitalism', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 57(3), 217-244.

Sidhu R.K. and Dall'Alba G. (2012). International Education and (Dis) embodied Cosmopolitanisms, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44 (4), 413-431.

Swartz, E. (2009). 'Diversity: Gatekeeping Knowledge and Maintaining Inequalities', *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 1044-1083.

Taylor-Gooby, P. and Waite, E. (2014). Toward a more pragmatic multiculturalism? How the UK policy community sees the future of ethnic diversity policies, *Governance*, 27(2), 267-289.

Tomalin, E. (2007). Supporting Cultural and Religious Diversity. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5-6), 621-634, Available from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/136562510701595283 [Accessed 26 March 2016]

Travis, A. (2016). Lasting rise in hate crime after EU vote, figures show, *The Guardian*, Thursday 8 September 2016, p1-2.

Uberoi, V. and Modood, T. (2013). Inclusive Britishness: A Multiculturalist Advance, *Political Studies*, Vol.61, 23-41. Available at doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00979.x [Accessed 17 July 2016].

Uslaner, E.M. (2011). Trust, Diversity and Segregation in the United Kingdom, *Comparative Sociology*, 10(2), 221-247.

Vertovec, S. (2001). Transnationalism and identity, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 27(4), 573-582.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054.

Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. Routledge.

Vertovec, S. and Wessendorf, S. (2010). *The multiculturalism backlash*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Villegas, A.M. and Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers, Rethinking the curriculum, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32.

Werbner, P. (2005). The translocation of culture: 'community cohesion' and the force of multiculturalism in history1, *The Sociological Review*, 53(4), 745-68.

Worley, C. (2005). 'It's not about race. It's about the community': New Labour and 'community cohesion', *Critical Social Policy* 25(4), 483-496.