Durham E-Theses

How can K12 Education reduce prejudice?

HUGHES, CONRAD,LAWRENCE,MARQUARD

How to cite:

Use policy

Durham University School of Education

Hatfield College

EdD Doctoral Thesis

Academic Year: 2017-2018

Name: Conrad Hughes

ID No: Z0933010

Supervisors:
Professor Steve Higgins (Principal Supervisor)
Dr Anna Llewellyn (Secondary Supervisor)

Title of Thesis:

How can K12 Education reduce prejudice?

Word Count: **59799**

Abstract

This thesis investigates how K-12 education can reduce prejudice. Firstly, I define what I mean by prejudice and explain what my research methodology is for the study. Through a conceptual examination of existing research, including theories on why people are prejudiced and what we know about prejudice reduction from social psychology, I go on to propose four areas of individual cognitive and social development in which educational strategies can act on prejudicial thinking and lessen it. These are:

- Understanding beyond the other;

- Critical Thinking;

- Metacognitive thought;

- Empathy.

I also synthesise findings into two institutional approaches that are effective. These are:

- The contact hypothesis;

- Specific pedagogical principles that are embedded in international education.

These six areas are brought together in a multi-facetted response to the problem of prejudice. The thesis problematises the construct of prejudice reduction by grappling with its complexity through a critical account of the substantial literature on the subject. This means not only contextualising studies according to the parameters of their method but also engaging with prominent discourses in associated fields in a reflexive manner. The thesis is an original contribution to knowledge in that it builds a bridge between work on prejudice in the schools of social psychology, cognitive psychology and neurobiology and K-12 education. My study offers a framework synthesising effective classroom interventions that can be adapted and adopted in a variety of contexts to combat the central operating system of prejudice formation.

Table of Contents   **Page**

Chapter One: Introduction

This introductory chapter will take the reader through a definition of prejudice, a literature review on major publications on prejudice, theories of why people are prejudiced, how we can reduce prejudice and what the role of education might be in this reduction. The chapter gives the reader a clear idea of my ontological and methodological approach, which I justify.

Definition: what is prejudice?

The etymological root of the word prejudice is the Latin praejudicium, meaning ''precedent'' (Allport, 1954, p. 6) but in a modern sense the term more accurately denotes a priori, unwarranted and usually negative judgement of a person due to his or her group membership: it is a "unified, stable, and consistent tendency to respond in a negative way toward members of a particular ethnic group" (Aboud, 1988, p. 6).

Prejudice comes about because of the mind's intuitive categorisation and oversimplification of experience into manageable information (for a synthesis of studies in cognitive science that point this out, see Kahneman, 2011). This can lead to stereotyping, especially when dealing with human beings and the social categories we might use to define them (gender, ethnic origin, creed, nationality, class, political beliefs for example). Stereotyping becomes prejudice when it is hardened into a stable, judgemental and negative belief about individuals based on perceived properties of the group to which they belong.

Prejudice and cognition

Cognitive psychology has discussed the mind's predisposition to overgeneralisation (Allport, 1954, pp.7-9; Kahneman, 2011; Amadio, 2014). For example, Dhont & Hodson (2014), suggest that the prejudiced person has lower cognitive ability and overgeneralises in

cognitively challenging situations such as ambiguity. However, this comes from a literature review of mainly self-reported cases of prejudice and is not the result of direct empirical research, it should therefore be appreciated with caution. This much said, a 2017 study in Belgium by De Keersmaeker et al. compared 183 IQ scores and self-reported racial prejudice results to show a positive corollary between lower cognitive ability and prejudice.

An idea that has been investigated more thoroughly is not that which suggests that prejudice comes from lower cognitive ability but more cognitive bias that leads to over-generalisation as a type of sloppy thinking. Concepts associated with this over-generalisation include the "illusory correlation" (perceiving unfounded or untrue relationships between groups and behaviours) and the "ultimate attribution error" (mistakenly attributing negative traits to entire groups). Devine (1989) outlined a two-step model of cognitive processing whereby initial stereotype formation needs to be tempered with a conscious, cognitive effort. As such, reducing prejudice requires cognitive functioning that resists "the law of least effort" (Allport, 1954, p. 391).

However, the cognitive constituents of prejudice are complex. Since prejudice begins with an exaggerated or false premise, the syllogistic thinking to elaborate arguments for the premise can be valid without the premise ever becoming true: the prejudiced mind will rationalise "beliefs held on irrational grounds" (Thouless, 1930, p. 150).

Pettigrew & Meertens (1995) have suggested that one can distinguish between "subtle" and "blatant" prejudice, the former being more insidious, carefully justified and therefore less easily detectable than the latter. In other words, prejudice can disguise itself behind rational arguments. Coenders et al. (2001) criticised the study on the basis of methodological flaws,

most especially a neglect of interdependent items in their research. They conclude that Pettigrew & Meertens did not separate blatant and subtle prejudice in any satisfactorily empirical way, making a claim that has not been tested carefully enough.

This is but one of many examples of the problems that are inherent in numerous claims about prejudice since it is a difficult construct to operationalise, most especially if one attempts to find sub-divisions of prejudice. Yet, Pettigrew & Meertens' claim seems to ring true anecdotally since it is not difficult to think of examples of what one might term subtle prejudice (slightly negative overgeneralisations, equivocal jokes, over deterministic use of language).

Prejudice and emotions

Neuropsychological studies on prejudice (Olson & Fazio, 2006; Amodio & Hamilton, 2012; Amodio, 2010, 2014) have pointed to correlations between brain activity and intergroup contact that suggest strong corollaries between emotions (essentially linked to the amygdala) and perception of other groups that happen automatically and at a subconscious level. Prejudice is linked to a lack of careful self-reflection as it tends to be self-gratifying in its function (Allport, 1954, p. 12; Fein & Spencer, 1997); it is a ''will to misunderstand'' (Xu, 2001, p.281) that one uses to protect a ''deep-seated system of emotions'' (Thouless, 1930, p. 146). Prejudice often masks fear and/or anger, often with the self and as such masks ''beliefs held on irrational grounds'' (Thouless 1930, p. 150). Fiske, Cuddy, Glick and Xu (2002) have suggested that stereotyping is often predicated by strong emotional states ranging from pity and sympathy to contempt, disgust, anger and resentment (p. 881). Therefore, reducing prejudice implies a degree of self-regulation, self-criticism but also emotional regulation and emotional self-awareness. The chapter on empathy comes back to this point in more detail.

Prejudice and culture

Prejudice is also very much embedded in cultural constructs such as language, tradition, symbolic representation and historical discourse. Critical approaches to mainstream master narratives of "Otherness", framed in postmodern notions of power relations and alterity point out that prejudice is hidden in many cultural norms. There is theoretical and qualitative research to suggest that a necessary step towards undoing prejudicial thinking is undoing unspoken assumptions and biased representations that lurk in textbooks, language and power constructs (Radke & Sutherland, 1949; JanMohamed, 1985; Steele, 1992; Johnston & Macrae, 1994; Appia, 2005; Sen, 2006; Simandiraki, 2006; Hughes, 2009). The chapter entitled "Transcending Otherness" grapples with this issue in detail.

Argument

In this thesis, I propose six areas of educational development in which educational strategies can act on prejudicial thinking and lessen it. These are grouped as chapters:

- Understanding beyond the other;

- Critical Thinking;

- Metacognitive thought;

- Empathy;

- The contact Hypothesis;

- Certain pedagogical principles that are embedded in international education.

The first four areas are domains of individual cognitive and social development. The last two involve institutional approaches. My argument is that the research shows that each of these

areas can reduce prejudice if activated the right way. I propose that by employing all six, K-12 schools will reduce prejudicial thinking in learners.

A large amount of experimental work on prejudice reduction has been done in the specific areas of cognitive and social psychology and several decades of writing in the areas of critical thinking and the philosophy of education have been published. My study brings them together in the context of K-12 education. In this regard, the work is an original contribution to knowledge since no synthesis of this type or magnitude has been done before. My thesis is a largely descriptive work without any empirical study.

The fundamental aim of this thesis, therefore, is to contribute to the field of knowledge in education by synthesising research findings on the reduction of prejudice and linking these findings to educational theory and practice so as to leave the reader with a structured, comprehensive model for the reduction of prejudice in schools.

Methodology

Assessing social phenomena can be done either through experimental methods with a positivist world-view whereby researchers seek to eliminate subjectivity, control variables and produce clearly operationalised data through statistical modelling or, on the other hand, through naturalist methods whereby the researcher engages purposefully and consciously with the social phenomenon in question and embraces interaction, subjectivity, human impressions and thoughts (for a more detailed discussion of research methodology, see Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Coolican, 2009 and Gaete et al., 2017). At the core of the former method is an emphasis on reliability, pure science method and a belief that truth can be extracted through experiment. At the core of the latter method is an emphasis on validity by allowing freedom of individual

expression and efforts not to create contrived inauthentic settings; it is predicated on a belief that truth is constructed and reconstructed through interaction and experiences (Kvale, 2007; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). This much said, qualitative or quasi-experimental methods can be considered to be at an epistemological disadvantage "since they lack quantitative gauges such as regression results or observations across multiple studies, they may be unable to assess which are the most important relationships and which are simply idiosyncratic to a particular case" (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 547).

Pring (2000) has argued that traditional epistemological separations of qualitative and quantitative methodology become arguments about style that tend to miss the more central point of what good research is. Bryman (2008) points out that multiple research methodologies can be considered in social science research. My references come from more than one methodological school since the domains of prejudice reduction and education have been investigated in a number of ways. Indeed, prejudice is a complex social phenomenon that can be looked at from numerous points of view and epistemological traditions (social, cognitive, symbolic, cultural, neurological). To cover the domain of education for a reduction in prejudice, one cannot avoid seminal philosophical, sociological, psychological studies that draw on qualitative methods such as case studies, focus groups and discursive work (this involves the research in social psychology that was predominant from the 50s, particularly the work of Sherif (1966), Tajfel (1970) and synthesised by Dovidio et al. (1996, 2003, 2010). At the same time, I will also refer to studies that use meta-analyses and controlled experiments (these tend to characterise the last three decades of research), notably studies done by Xu et al. (2010), Vorauer et al. (2000), Pettigrew (2008), Todd et al. (2011) and De Keersmaecker et al. (2017).

The advantage of referring to mixed method approaches is that it allows the thesis to synthesise a broad base of studies that cover the multiple bases of prejudice, making my analysis comprehensive. A disadvantage with such a method, and a danger that the research must keep in sight, is a danger of lack of quality control. It has to be said that some of the earlier work on prejudice reduction is characterised by issues with methodology (lack of control groups, small sample size, lack of any randomisation process). To give an example, Sherif's well known Robber's Cave experiment (1954) used middle class 12 year old boys of one ethnic origin only, making it difficult to generalise findings. I take care to point out methodological strengths and weaknesses when I discuss seminal studies to keep this in mind. Findings on the mechanisms of prejudice have evolved over time and discussion of research quality has to reflect this.

Given the nature of prejudice reduction, its context-bound, highly localised meaning-making structures, screening studies by methodological rigour, whilst academically valid as method, would lose many areas of research and create too narrow a research base. Some excellent insights into prejudice, such as those in Allport's seminal 1954 study, are not empirical but have come to influence generations of researchers and theoreticians. The salience of studies investigated in this thesis is not uniquely a question of qualitative or quantitative approach but, one of valency of impact.

The research design of my study is discursive: I aim to bring together the numerous studies on prejudice reduction into a cohesive whole that can be applied in educational settings. This approach is, understandably, susceptible to criticism for a thesis on prejudice since a discursive approach is likely to reflect personal bias. This means that the thesis has to address selection bias systematically through reflexivity and researcher positioning. Let it be made clear, therefore, that my position on prejudice is that it is a complex construct that has and will

continue to be measured in a variety of ways, some of them quite tentative. Indeed, when one looks at the research on prejudice, a broad gamut of methods presents itself, ranging from the qualitative to the quantitative. Prejudice reduction has been investigated through case studies, surveys, focus group discussions, semi-structured to structured interviews, quasi-experiments, experimental studies involving more or less rigorous sampling and use of control groups, computerised tests and meta-analyses. Indeed, there are few methods that have not been tested.

I refer to an extensive body of research in a literature review to substantiate, shape and argue my case. My criterion for selection is two-fold: on the one hand, I discuss studies that have research currency and have made an impact on the academic understanding of what prejudice is. Many of these studies (such as those by Clark & Clark, 1947 and Sherif, 1966) constitute important contributions to the field for the literature they have engendered and the theories to which they have given birth. Secondly, I look to studies that have been published in high impact journals or give strong qualitative or quantitative indices such as power, effect size or p value. One might group in this category the work of Pettigrew & Tropp (2008) and Greenwald & Banaji (2017).

Ethical considerations in studying classroom practice to reduce prejudice
This thesis' aim is to synthesise educational practice that has been shown to reduce prejudice. However, there is an ethical risk when one engages with practices that are meant to reduce prejudice because they might actually exacerbate it. Legault et al. (2011), for example, found that when participants were instructed to reduce prejudicial behaviour and thoughts by an external control, the inverse effect could take place. Their conclusion is that autonomously-generated prejudice reduction is much more effective. This finding is subtle because, at face

value, it contradicts one of the central tenets of the contact hypothesis (see McKeown & Dixon, 2017), which is that there must be a strong institutional voice against prejudice in schools (or the workplace). Upon closer investigation, however, we see preaching against prejudice or putting controls in place to prevent prejudice is not the same thing as being clear about a position on prejudice. The inverse effects desired in prejudice reducing strategies may appear if the approach is too heavy-handed, didactic and not sufficiently constructivist. The same could be said for a number of areas of learning. Therefore, this study takes into account the importance of dealing with prejudice in sensitive, pedagogic and mindful ways.

There is also the ethical issue of strategies that reduce prejudice in some areas but actually load onto it in others. An example is the Jigsaw classroom (Aronson & Patnoe, 2000) which has been shown by Walker & Crogan (1998), in an Australian Primary classroom where 103 students were tested, to reduce racial prejudice but actually decrease cooperative conditions. This leads us to a second proviso, that strategies to reduce prejudice are multi-faceted and should be appreciated from the multiple perspectives of all of their potential outcomes and consequences. Wherever potentially negative outcomes have been established, this thesis is careful to point that out. There are also areas where research is lacking, for example educational gains or detriment caused by simulation activities such as Elliot's 1968 "Blue Eyes, Brown Eyes" experiment and I would argue that caution is needed (I discuss this in the thesis chapter on empathy).

Terminology related to Prejudice

As prejudice is a minefield of terms that can be considered pejorative, it is of major importance that I make clear my position on the diction the thesis will employ to describe different dimensions of human identity. The term "Black" for example, can be considered

contentious and alternatives have been used such as BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) in the UK and "people of colour" in the US. I will use the phrase "Black people" as it is unambiguous and does not conflate the experience of Black Consciousness, Black Power, the "I'm Black and I'm proud" movement and important contributions to theories of Blackness by authors such as Steve Biko (1978), James Baldwin (2016), Ngugi WaThiong'o (1981) and Maya Angelou (1969) with the experiences of other groups or some sort of vague entity of "people of colour". In fact, I would argue that "people of colour", somewhat like the term "non-White", is far more pejorative than "Black" because it reinforces a central normative gaze that is white, as if to say that so-called "Whites" are not of colour too.

I reject the historical, pseudo-scientific theory of a Black race as propounded by De Gobineau (1856) and Galton (1883), but forcibly recognise the socioeconomic, historico-political construction of blackness as a vital entity to appreciate. How can we talk about the slave trade honestly, for example, if we refuse to use the word "Black"? Studies have shown that colour-blindness (meaning efforts not to label ethnic groups) do not reduce prejudice, they sweep it under the carpet and actually make it worse (see, for example, Richeson & Nussbaum, 2003 or the work of Helen Sleeter, 1991 or Sleeter & Bernal, 2004). Similarly, I use the phrase "White people" to designate a group that is not defined racially but structurally and socioeconomically. Systems of segregation in South African and the United States used the terms "Black and "White" and it would be, I believe, misleading, to use other terms, most especially the ludicrous alternatives to "White" that propounded during apartheid such as "European" or "Caucasian". Furthermore, the massive majority of studies on prejudice and racism use the terms "Black" and "White", so my thesis' terminology is in keeping with the research.

I refer to the Aboriginal people of Australia as "indigenous peoples of Australia" as I do to any other indigenous group such as the indigenous peoples of the United States. This terminology is at once accurate and non-polemical. I refer to people with special needs where some might use the loaded terms "handicapped" since this allows for a more inclusive, educational approach.

All in all, the use of terminology in this thesis aims to be respectful but unambiguous.

Focus of Study

By "prejudice" I refer to the general construct that involves the negative overgeneralisation of an outgroup. This could be challenged epistemologically as some might argue that not all types of prejudice are the same and that it is impossible to define prejudice centrally. Research in the field from Pettigrew & Tropp (2008) to Greenwald & Banaji (2017), as well as studies done in cognitive bias (for example, Hewstone et al., 2002) suggest a central operating system of prejudice and this is what I discuss in this thesis. The main social expressions of prejudice I discussed are given in chapter two of this study, they include the constructs of race, gender and special needs. Many more instances of prejudice could be discussed but I have chosen to remain focussed on these expressions of prejudice, as they are particularly salient in a classroom environment. I also feel that it is more productive to look at the common constituents of prejudice holistically as this allows us a more productive response to it that can be generalised across numerous settings (albeit with caution).

Although the thesis title is "How can K-12 education reduce prejudice?" and whilst research by Nesdale (2004), much in the vein of Piaget (1951), has offered a developmental approach to prejudice reduction, indicating staged behaviours and implied responses for very young

learners, the thesis focusses mainly on Secondary Schools. Some examples of what can be done in the Primary classroom, playground and general school infrastructure are given, as are references to studies done on post-Secondary students – these give more depth and breadth to the study. However, the thrust of this study is focussed on Secondary learners (from about 15 to 18).

What is original in my contribution to knowledge is that my thesis brings together decades of research in a unique focus on educational implications.

My ontological perspective is subjectivist in that I believe that while rigorous standards of reliability and validity characterise good research and should be taken into account when selecting which studies to which we should refer, the overarching complexities and context-defined nature of prejudice as a construct mean that what we should be looking for is resonant meaning that should be understood with caution in its local parameters and not generalised too hastily.

Literature Review: major existing published research on education and prejudice

The literature review I offer here covers the major publications on prejudice and education that have featured in scholarly publications and high impact journals. The purpose of this section of thesis is to establish the central points of context for the study.

Major published studies on prejudice

The essential reading on prejudice remains Allport's seminal *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954). This might seem like a dated reference but like other milestones in education (the work of Vygotsky and Bloom for example), the study has remained a reference. Most studies on

prejudice will relate to Allport's work and his contact hypothesis (which is examined later in this thesis) has been studied over the decades with resounding results to suggest it is the most effective manner of reducing prejudice. The other major texts are *Understanding prejudice and discrimination* by Plous (2002), *On The Nature of Prejudice* edited by Dovidio, Glick & Rudman (2008) and *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology*, 2nd Edition by Brown (2010) and *The Sage Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination* (2013) edited by Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick and Esses. One might add to this the less mainstream *Social Change and Prejudice* (including the earlier *Dynamics of Prejudice*) by Bettelheim & Janowitz (1964) and *Foundations of stereotypes and stereotyping* edited by Macrae, Stangor & Hewstone (1996). These all approach prejudice from the perspectives of social psychology and sociology rather than education.

Books on prejudice and education

When it comes to prejudice and education specifically, the major reference is my own book *Understanding Prejudice and Education: The Challenge for Future Generations* (Hughes, 2017). The premise of that publication, which was developed from this doctoral study, is what I develop in the pages that follow in this thesis.

Other than this, there are a few websites that summarise pedagogic approaches to prejudices reduction,[1] published papers (such as my own 2014 article published by Springer in UNESCO's Prospects Journal (Hughes, 2014) and unpublished dissertations (which, of course, will inform my account, with some caution).

---

[1] http://www.understandingprejudice.org/ ; http://www.teachersagainstprejudice.org

There are books that deal with racism and education such as Gillborn's *Racism and Education* (2008) and *Education and Racism* (2013) by Leonardo & Grubb, addressing themes such as racial inequality, segregation and marginality. Other studies that could be mentioned include Grissom & Redding's 2016 study of the underrepresentation of students "of colour" in gifted programmes or Cole's *Critical Race Theory and Education* (2017), a Marxist analysis of the pervasive effects of colour blindness and assumptions that lead to institutional racism.

Articles and major academic studies indirectly related to the reduction of prejudice through education

When it comes to articles published in high impact journals and substantive academic papers published on the role education can play in reducing prejudice, a number of studies can be mentioned (Haegel, 1999; Jasinska-Kania, 1999; Peri, 1999; Byran and Vavrus, 2005; IB, 2013; UNESCO, 2006). The theoretical underpinnings of these positions rest on the common thesis that intercultural competence involving domain-specific, cognitive, metacognitive, and affective critical cultural awareness is needed to quell prejudice (Byram 1997, 2009; Hill 2000; Hogan & Mallet, 2005). Different typologies and models of intercultural awareness have been developed such as those by Haywood (2007) and Deardorff (2009), and those surveyed by Spitzberg and Changnon (2009).

Some of the effective, research-informed strategies in international education that have aimed at increasing empathy, understanding, cognitive flexibility and metacognition include:

- Service Learning (Berger-Kaye, 2010);
- Concepts-focussed learning (Erickson, 2007; Land, 2012);
- Inquiry (Short et al., 1996; Kolb, 1974);

- Reflection (Paris &Ayres, 1994; Pellegrino, Chudowski & Glaser, 2001*)*;

- Theory of Knowledge (Hughes, 2014b).

Much social psychology has developed models to combat prejudice including the seminal work of Flavell (1978), Pintrich (1985, 2000), Bandura (1977), Tajfel (1982, 1986) and Greenwald & Banaji (1995, 2002, 2017). Allport's contact hypothesis (1954) remains the strongest researched strategy for a reduction in prejudice. However, there is general agreement that the contact hypothesis, which will be explained in depth in this thesis, is rarely applied properly (Amir, 1969; Stephan, 1987; Pettigrew, 1998; Dovidio, 2005; Paluck & Green, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Barlow et al. (2013) and Laurence et al. (2018) argue that the contact hypothesis has not been tested sufficiently across the subtle differences of ingroup and outgroup perception within demographic contexts where groups are minorities or in the majority, arguing that good tests need to take this and pre-test outgroup negative or positive valency towards the outgroup into account.

Numerous studies on constructivist pedagogical methods imply a reduction in prejudice. This is because the areas of thinking, feeling and being that they seek to develop are all inextricably linked to the construct of prejudice reduction. For example, conversation leading to productive thought, if done the right way, can reduce prejudicial thinking (Rockeach, 1971; Myhill, 2006; Lipman, 2003, Lemke, 1990; Lyman, 1981, Alexander, 2006).

Research on critical thinking implies educational responses to prejudice formation such as the studies of Flavell (1976), Rothbart (1981), Wilder (1984), Johnston & Hewstone (1992), Nisbet (1993), King & Kitchner (1994), Fein & Spencer (1997), Halpern (2002), Higgins

(2013) and Taleaga (2015). Since prejudicial thinking is uncritical, overgeneralised and unmindful by nature, a critically-informed way of thinking clearly reduces such lazy thinking.

There is a body of literature that points to the development of empathy as a response to the emotional constituents of prejudice. Paul (1992, 2000), Lipman (2003), who separates thinking into caring and critical, making it clear how important the affective domain is in decision making and Kohlberg (1969, 1976, 1981), whose moral thinking framework designates distinct levels of moral decision making. These models suggest specific educational interventions, essentially in the area of critical thinking but with an emphasis on thinking with feeling (see Newton, 2014) or the dispositional dimension of thinking as opposed to the purely rational ones.

Research from social psychology including theories from Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford, 1950 and Kinders & Sears, 1981, (who describe an authoritarian personality behind acts of prejudice, implying a more empathetic mindset as necessary to quell this) ;Vivian, Brown & Hewstone, 1995 (who point out the importance of reducing anxiety between groups to arrive at a point where prejudice can be reduced) and Aronson (2000), whose jigsaw classroom leads to a less competitive, judgemental mode of interaction between learners and creates a more caring, communal ethos, also point to the development of empathy as a manner of reducing either prejudice or discrimination.

More recent research on the relationship between empathy and prejudice include Eisenberg et al. (2010) and Vescio et al. (2003) who point out intergroup relations and persepctive taking can be improved through greater empathy. This thesis' chapter on empathy goes into more detail on the substance of empathy as a factor to reduce prejudice.

Cognitive psychologists such as Gardner (1983, 2009), Morin (1999), Halpern (1997, 1999, 2002), Siegel (1985, 1988) and Sternberg (1993, 2003) suggest that for prejudicial thinking to be reduced, groups and individuals must be able to tolerate significant amounts of cognitive conflict and resist recourses to intuitive, simplistic and/or visceral responses to unknown situations. Social psychologists, nodding to Piaget, have discussed this in terms of cognitive stages of development. These include Frenkel-Brunswick (1948), Radke and Sutherland (1949), Berger & Luckmann (1966), Remy, Nathan, Becker and Torney (1975), Aboud (1988), Aboud and Amato (2001) and Cushner (2008). Teichman's 2016 paper "Stereotypes and Prejudice in Conflict: A Developmental Perspective" points out, referring to the substantive work done on prejudice formation developmentally by Nesdale (1999), Nesdale & Flesser (2001) and Aboud (1988), that in "multiethnic nonviolent social contexts" (p. 18), prejudiced attitudes develop in children from 3-4 but decline from around 7-9 years of age. This further reinforces the idea that it requires a certain level of cognitive sophistication to quell prejudice; as the mind develops, prejudice is less likely to proliferate. The problem with this viewpoint is that it does not address the attitudinal side of prejudice where negative overgeneralisations are held on to not out of cognitive simplicity but emotional resentment (this could include the need to scapegoat and sentiments of fear, jealousy, anger and so on).

The relationship between prejudice and stereotypes

Prejudice can be differentiated from stereotyping since stereotypes are merely representational – they are "pictures in the head" (Lippman, 1922) of individuals or societal fabric.[2] Fiske, Cuddy & Glick (2007) have shown how contextual factors influence stereotype

---

[2] According to Fiske et al.'s stereotype content model (2002, reviewed in 2008 by Cuddy et al.), stereotypes tend to be articulated along a warmth-competence axis meaning that groups tend to be essentialised in terms of a number of combinations as either warm (friendly, close) or competent (clever, high-performing).

formation in extremely significant and dynamic ways: people erect stereotypes according to levels of competition, power and status and these need to be re-evaluated in each specific set of circumstances.

Prejudice, on the other hand, is not just a cold thought but an emotionally-driven attitude that can lead to acts of discrimination and violence.

Allport suggested a scale of prejudice that goes from "antilocution" through "avoidance" and "discrimination" to "physical attack" and finally "extermination" (1954).[3] This would suggest that reducing prejudice means reducing strong feelings of antipathy to outgroups and/or members of those groups before these thoughts translate into actions.

Trying to measure prejudice

Prejudice is a subtle construct that is difficult to measure. This is due to two fundamental reasons. Firstly, one needs to define exactly where prejudice starts in the spectrum of human attitudes, behaviours and beliefs. This in itself is almost impossible. When exactly does a statement veer from substantiated generalisation into prejudice? Which moral and sociological standpoint does one use to judge another as prejudiced?

Developing metrics for prejudice is exceedingly difficult – there is no quantitative way of evaluating what is essentially a fluid, interconnected, culturally-specified perspective of the world. Therefore, one cannot extract scores on prejudice tests and draw them up in a Gaussian curve to allow for statistical analysis of range and distribution without nagging questions about the criteria for measurement scales in the first place, and these threaten the validity of

---

[3] Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner (1996) point out that empirical research suggests that this is only moderately true.

the study throughout. This is not to say that metrics have not been developed to report on degrees of prejudice. Hundreds of studies spanning nearly 100 years have attempted to do this and many of them will be discussed in this thesis.

The second reason why prejudice is so difficult to measure, another threat to the validity of any experimental or quasi-experimental study of prejudice, is the so-called Hawthorne effect. This means that when subjects are interviewed about their views on other groups, they will tend to play up to the dominant cultural paradigm of the day that suggests conformity to a certain set of declared values. In other words, asking someone what he or she thinks about homosexual people, immigrants or racial groups other than her/his own will not yield a genuine response but more one crafted in the light of the interviewer's background. After all, who wants to be seen as prejudiced and would be happy to share prejudiced views openly? One way around this is to study attitudes, behaviours and statements without informing the subject what the purpose of the study is. This is highly problematic from an ethical standpoint as it amounts to lying to people involved in a study and measuring something of which they are not aware. Much of the quasi-experimental work in psychology in the aftermath of World War Two was done this way such as the 1954 Robbers Cave experiment by Mustafa Sherif (Sherif, 1961, 1966), in which twenty-two boys were split into two groups without knowing of the existence of the other group and left to build solidarity within each group before being brought into competitive contact with one another, the Milgram experiments (1960-63, see Milgram, 1963), which involved study participants believing that they were administering electric shocks to subjects when in reality they were not and Zimbardo's Stanford Prison experiment (Zimbardo, 1971) whereby participants played prisoner and guards in simulated prison conditions and engaged in sadistic, unethical behaviour to the point that the study had

to be abandoned. Since then ethics boards in universities and research laboratories have made this type of study difficult if not impossible to carry out.

Levy, Paluck & Green (2009) summarise a research review on what works in prejudice reduction with six critical points, including the following:

> 1. Notwithstanding the enormous literature on prejudice, psychologists are a long way from demonstrating the most effective ways to reduce prejudice. Due to weaknesses in the internal and external validity of existing research, the literature does not reveal whether, when, and why interventions reduce prejudice in the world.
>
> 2. Entire genres of prejudice-reduction interventions, including diversity training, educational programs, and sensitivity training in health and law enforcement professions, have never been evaluated with experimental methods.
>
> 3. Nonexperimental research in the field has yielded information about prejudice-reduction program implementation, but it cannot answer the question of what works to reduce prejudice in these real-world settings.
>
> 4. Laboratory experiments test a wide range of prejudice-reduction theories and mechanisms with precision. However, researchers should remain sceptical of recommendations based upon environments, interventions, participants, and theories created in laboratory settings until they are supported by research of the same degree of rigor outside of the laboratory. (p. 360)

So reporting on what works well in prejudice reduction is a complex enterprise that must take into account the inherent weaknesses that exist in the related research design. However, enough has been said and done to synthesise the research and consider it critically – we are by

no means in a position to say nothing at all about prejudice reduction. Furthermore, much research in education on learning, higher-order thinking and critical thinking, can be related to prejudice reduction.

Why are people prejudiced? A short overview of theories of prejudice

Milner (1975) suggests that the first real recognition of prejudice was in the 1920s during WW1, where soldiers of mixed backgrounds were exposed to a similar fate and the early Black Civil rights movement in the United States prompted the increased community of psychologists to investigate beyond the predominance of scientific racism that prevailed as a belief system (Garth, 1925). The social psychologist Floyd Allport is attributed as spearheading this change in perspective (Milner, 1975). This first movement, therefore, was essentially to identify and locate prejudice.

Duckitt describes the next two decades (1930s and 1940s) as a "paradigm" whereby prejudice was seen as "an expression of unconscious psychological defences diverting inner conflicts and hostilities, often originating from externally induced frustrations and deprivations, against innocent outgroups and minorities" (1992, p. 1186). Freudian and Jungian theories of scapegoating and expiation were used to explain prejudicial attitudes, particularly group acts such as lynching.

These early theories of prejudice were relatively simplistic: whilst they attempted to explain some aspects of the emotional side of prejudice, they did not account for more sophisticated, cool-headed forms of prejudice built on rationally defended belief systems such as statistical evidence of group behaviour (the percentage of immigrants or people of a certain ethnic background involved in types of crime for instance).

The Holocaust created a wave of psychoanalytical theories on personality disorder, now seeing prejudice not only as an emotional response but, in extreme cases, as a psychological dysfunction. The research of Rokeach on dogmatism (Rokeach, 1960) and Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson & Sanford on the authoritarian personality (1950) along with Allport's seminal insights into the prejudiced personality (1954) pointed to the complex traits that make up the so-called prejudiced personality. Allport saw different forms of prejudice as linked to each other in a broad, prejudiced personality: "people who reject one out-group will tend to reject other out-groups. If a person is anti-Jewish, he is likely to be anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti any out-group" (1954, p. 68). Furthermore, Allport grouped characteristics of the prejudiced personality (insecurity, fear, rigidity, poor self-knowledge – what he called "ego weaknesses") under the following seven traits:

> emotional ambivalence (complex and volatile relationships with parents and self); moralism and rigid conventionalism; dichotomising (oversimplified black and white thinking about groups); need for definiteness, structure, order; externalisation (an understanding of behaviour in terms of external forces and not inner processes); institutionalisation (a desire to belong to strong, monolithic institutions) [and] authoritarianism (discipline, strong leadership). (Duckitt in Dovidio et al., 2005, p. 396)

For Allport, therefore, the prejudiced personality can be opposed to a tolerant personality built on liberal values, open-mindedness and a high tolerance for ambiguity. The prejudiced person is seen as someone who is suffering from an unbalanced set of psycho-emotional and social states and shows limited cognitive potential since he or she relies on over-simplification.

Whilst much of what Allport said about prejudice in the 50s holds today and is respected, I would argue that it is not altogether helpful to over- pathologise prejudice at an individual level since this strips the phenomenon of some of its more complex socially-created elements such as language, media, historical narratives and the plethora of representations of human difference that are embedded in inherited symbols that in themselves bear the seed of prejudice. Much prejudice is structural and finds itself in institutionalised norms. Examples can be found in the English language with terms such as "blackmail", "mankind", "white lie" and so on (even if one might argue that these terms are less and less politically correct and are being rephrased). Allport's concept of a prejudiced personality gives us clues but by no means evidence for the type of education that might be designed to lessen prejudice.

The wave of prejudice theory-generation in the late 40s and 50s was the most incisive in social psychology, marked by well- known experiments such as the 1939 Clark doll experiment (Clark & Clark, 1947), where people were asked to comment on racially typified dolls and Mustafa Sherif's Robbers Cave experiment in 1954 (Sherif, 1961, 1966), where subjects were grouped in a fairly hostile environment and gradually lapsed into aggressive interaction (see Sherif's Realistic Conflict Theory), this suggesting not only a prejudiced personality, but group prejudice. Allport is still considered the definitive voice on prejudice and prejudice reduction (see contact hypothesis) but the theory that prejudice comes out of a personality type can be challenged by more recent theories on socio-cultural influences and cognitive psychology.

Duckitt (1992) refers to the 60's and 70's as a period in theories of prejudice that focussed less on personality structure than social conformity. Countries with legally institutionalised or

culturally normalised prejudiced values, such as Apartheid South Africa (towards so-called "non-Whites", Israel (towards Palestinians), Australia (towards indigenous peoples, Afghanistan (towards women) and India (towards so-called "untouchables) will pressure people, either consciously or subliminally into conforming to and/or internalising those values. A number of experiments in social psychology such as the Asch conformity experiments (1951) and the 1963 Milgram experiment (Milgram, 1974) as well as recent studies on online behaviour such as that of Neubaum et al. (2018) remind us of the manner in which individual judgement is controlled by collective thought. Prejudiced viewpoints are not simple products of free independent thought but come from a vortex of social pressure.

There are also far more subtle forms of institutionalised prejudice that run through most educational and nationalist narratives as the antithetical shadows of a stable, decent society. These include commonly held and media-reinforced positions and assumptions held about deviants (drug users, criminals, mentally unstable people, "drop outs"), outsiders (immigrants, tourists, foreigners) and members of religious communities (sects, non-Western religions, Voodoo, Animism). A good example of this type of normalised prejudiced can be appreciated in an investigation of the Windrush generation scandal in the UK where longstanding immigrants from the Caribbean's rights to UK citizenship were questioned by the government (see McKee, 2018). Institutionalised prejudice is part of a continuum of stereotypes that are essential to the structure of society, at least in the conventional Western sense with class-defined roles (working class, upper class, poor, wealthy) and a host of professions that bring stereotypes with them about status (sex worker, politician, lawyer, policeman, etc).

The 80s to the present can be considered as the most recent wave in prejudice theory with an emphasis on cognitive psychology and, more recently, neuroscience. With this evolution in

the schools of psychology that analyse and seek to understand prejudice, the emphasis is on the innate, linguistically, cognitively and biologically pre-conditioned dispositions within meaning, information and the human brain that, in a sense, make us all prejudiced. Pettigrew (1971) looked at prejudice in terms of cognitive biases, Gaertner (Frey & Gaertner, 1986) in terms of perceptual exaggerations whilst Greenwald & Banaji (1995) have put forward research on a universal implicit association bias whereby humans tend to make associations that are more or less prejudiced with "others".

The most recent theories of prejudice formation have been influenced by neuropsychology. The extensive work of Amadio (for example 2010, 2014) has shown how intergroup anxiety can be correlated with neural connectivity. Recent understanding of neural circuitry, particularly at the level of the limbic system, shows that prejudice is a naturally occurring cerebral response to the unknown. Hence, individually and groups need to become aware of the ubiquity of prejudice, stand outside their own thinking and question their deepest convictions.

This set of cognitive and neuroscientific theories, like previous ones, is not enough in and of itself to explain the phenomenon of prejudice as it does not take into account hardened cases of prejudice built upon resentment, frustration and sentiments of insecurity rather than mere biological architecture. Nor does it take into account collective acts of prejudice built on historical events.

Allport pointed out the fact that theories on prejudice development tend to focus on one or two elements but do not offer a global appreciation of the problem that takes numerous variables into account simultaneously, they "call attention to […] one important causal factor

, without implying that no other factors are operating (Allport, 1954, p. 207). This early point remains pertinent and is helpful to keep in mind when searching for educational responses to prejudice.

How do we reduce prejudice?

As early as the 1950s, hypotheses have been aimed at reducing prejudice. In many ways, these are as empirical, tentative and easily falsifiable as theories generated to explain why prejudice exists. However, one can cite comparative studies that support the efficacy or lack thereof of these strategies to reduce prejudice. The theory that has been shown to work the most, in so far as any study in reducing prejudice can be evaluated with enough reliability and validity to say that it does work, is Allport's contact hypothesis (1954):

> Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e., by law, custom or local atmosphere), and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups. (p. 281)

Pettigrew & Tropp (2000) reviewed 203 studies in 25 different countries and found that for the pool of 90 000 participants, 94% of cases showed a reduction of prejudice with increased contact. One of the better known expressions of this strategy in a classroom setting is the so-called "jigsaw classroom" (Aronson & Patnoe, 1997) whereby students teach each other in small rotating groups. The contact hypothesis relies on a climate of mutual respect and superordinate values. If people of different backgrounds are thrown together without direction

and goals, there is little evidence that prejudice will be reduced. Chapter Six is dedicated to the contact hypothesis will go into greater detail on the subject.

Other strategies that can be considered include intercultural education with an emphasis on intercultural and postcolonial approaches to the teaching of history (see chapters Two and Seven), dialogic learning environments allowing for intergroup dialogue, teaching values as suggested in Kohlberg's framework of moral education, conflict resolution and group work (these are treated essentially in Chapters Four and Five on metacognition and empathy).

The better-known hypotheses on how prejudice can be reduced have been synthesised by Stephan & Stephan (in Dovidio, et al., 2010) and can be outlined as such:

Established hypotheses on how prejudice can be reduced

Hypothesis	Researchers	Educational expression
Contact Hypothesis	Allport, 1954.	Jigsaw classroom (Aaronson, & Patnoe, 1997)
Intercultural education	Allport, 1954; Banks, 1973, 2012; Katz,1975; Stephan & Stephan, 1985,1986,1989.	Group discussion, role-play, simulation games, postcolonial history syllabi
Diversity training programmes	Allport, 1954 ; Landis & Brislin, 1983; Tansik & Driskell, 1977; Anand & Winters, 2017.	Lectures, readings, role-play, simulation
Intergroup dialogues	Allport, 1954; Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004; Gurin, Peng, Lopez, & Nagda, 1999; Nagda & Zuniga, 2003; Muller & Miles, 2017.	Transparent focus group discussions
Group work	Aronson et al., 1978; Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Blaney et al., 1977; DeVries, Edwards, & Slavin, 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1992; Weigel, Wiser, & Cook, 1975; Scacco & Warren, 2018.	Cooperative learning groups with group-related assessment criteria

Conflict resolution	Carruthers, Sweeney, Kmitta & Harris, 1996; Johnson & Johnson, 1996; Lam, 1989; Deutsch & Coleman, 2012.	Mediation, negotiation, third-party consultation
Moral education	Kohlberg, 1976, 1981;Watson & Ecken, 2003; Oser, 1986	Values-based educational discourse
Stereotype Inhibition	Devine, 1989; Kahneman, 201; Moskowitz, 2010.	Stimulating metacognitive awareness
Reflective Judgement Model	King & Kitchener, 1994	

None of these strategies is mutually exclusive: each one interlinks with another on certain commonalities such as the ideas of working together, discussion and learning about other people. Indeed, it is an epistemological challenge to cleanly categorise both theories on the development of prejudice and strategies to reduce it given the interrelatedness of the various constituents at work.

Furthermore, the findings in each of these prejudice-reducing educational strategies are rarely completely comprehensive: each indicates a lessening of prejudice in certain circumstances but not necessarily others (for example, Scacco & Warren's 2018 study in Nigeria found that group work reduced elements of prejudiced in heterogeneous classrooms but not homogenous classrooms; Moskowitz (2010) points out that the likeliness of success of stereotype inhibition depends mainly on the individual's goals when interacting with members of an outgroup whereas Muller & Miles' 2017 study of 19 different intergroup dialogues saw a greater awareness of discrimination and greater degrees of empathy surface in participants after dialogues but no real change in perception of conflict).

Educational practice to reduce prejudice

While these theories of prejudice reduction have been tested in experiments, quasi-experiments and through focus groups and fieldwork, there have been few systematic efforts

to apply this research in schools to curriculum design with the aim to sequence learning objectives, classroom projects, assessments and tasks in such a way that an educational experience consciously and purposefully addresses the issue of prejudice and equips students with the means to reduce it within themselves and others.

Although there is some evidence that specific elements of research on prejudice reduction are used in classroom settings (for example, the jigsaw classroom, contact hypothesis, "Blue Eyes, Brown Eyes experiment, cultural exchanges, service learning) and some educational systems place an emphasis on pedagogy related directly or indirectly to prejudice reduction (for example, international education, philosophy for children, inquiry based learning), I would argue that the time has come for the research and theory to be integrated into curriculum design more systematically. Annexe 4 to this thesis offers such a model.

An essential area that I would argue has been neglected in the researched approaches to prejudice reduction, one that runs through all of them but given its centrality requires stand-alone analysis, is self-reflection. Most of the strategies used from Allport to the present focus on people working together or looking out to other groups or individuals. However, these externalising actions will only be successful at an intrapersonal level if there is self-doubt, self-criticism and self-knowledge. Indeed, a group working together requires individual concessions, the ability to listen to others, empathy, suspension of belief and conviction and hard work on one's own profile. The chapter of this thesis on metacognition suggests that this field of education is a potentially powerful tool for the reduction of prejudice as it pushes the learner back into him or herself to ensure inner development and self-control.

Chapter Conclusion

If some of the fundamental goals of an education are to equip learners with the knowledge, attitudes and competences needed to make the right moral and social choices in life, to think clearly and to know how to live together, then reducing prejudice must feature as an essential part of education.

However, such a goal is ambitious at best for two main reasons:

1. Historically and geographically, the concept of prejudice has not remained stable and trying to give an all-encompassing definition of prejudice is difficult. This means that reducing prejudice is extremely complex since there is no overriding consensus of what it is we are trying to reduce. This is less the case for relatively stable constructs in education such as knowledge of mathematics, the sciences and languages.

2. Since Allport's work, numerous strategies for reducing prejudice have been elaborated and they will be explored in detail throughout this study. However, the empirical studies carried out to measure the effectiveness of these strategies all suffer from flaws in research method and design, all of them face considerable threats to validity and reliability and no one strategy in isolation can be said to reduce prejudice.

So the issues in the way of dealing with prejudice are profound but so too is the depth of study in social psychology and the knowledge that this has left us with. It is by wedding social psychology and education and by synthesising the numerous studies that have been conducted and looking at their potential to reduce prejudice in an educational setting that one will be best equipped to take on the challenge of reducing prejudice for future generations.

Chapter Two: Transcending Otherness

The over-simplification and essentialising of individuals, what we can call "Othering", is discussed before I look at why it is crucial to understand the concepts of history and culture beyond simplistic "Othering". The chapter engages in a discussion on the teaching of history to show how this can be done to increase or reduce prejudice. In order to take students from over-essentialising categorisation towards a more nuanced understanding of other people, the constructs of culture, race, gender (including sexuality) and special needs are problematised. Research-informed approaches are developed to offer a model for understanding beyond the Other that is developmental and age-appropriate.

Introduction

This thesis chapter discusses what is meant by the Other and focusses on five core areas of human experience that educational institutions need to grapple with to reduce the prejudice of Othering. They are history, culture, race, gender (including sexuality) and special needs (the focus will be on special educational needs as this is the main playing field for prejudices around special needs in schools).[4] The chapter also outlines what the research tells us about educational strategies to reduce the prejudice of Othering.

This chapter argues that understanding beyond the Other is taking a much bolder step than simply celebrating difference, it requires the learner to go through a complex process of recognising difference, appreciating it, then relativising it according to the context that creates

---

[4] Other differences could be treated too, such as class, religion, physicality and age but the goal of the chapter is not to outline educational strategies for each and every conceivable facet of socially exacerbated prejudice but more to offer insights into a few that can be considered and generalised to other domains. Furthermore, other faces of prejudice such as those mentioned above are treated in other chapters of this thesis.

that difference in the first place and finally, at the highest level of reflexive thought, deconstructing difference as a social edifice.

Othering

The process of maximising another person's differences and rendering the person not only an outsider, but in extreme cases, a negative of the self, can be referred to as "Othering". The Other can be described as a social construct, "the unknown interlocutor who is reduced to fit preconceived internal references and prejudices" (Hughes, 2009, p. 132). The term was developed by post-structuralist French philosophers such as Althusser (1971) and Lacan (1977) working off Levinas (1947) and de Beauvoir (1949) (who famously stated in her work *Le Deuxième Sexe* that "one is not born a woman, but becomes one").

It is useful to refer to Said who, although a dated reference, shows how assumptions about so-called Eastern culture actually derive from Western fantasies that have marked the world of art and literature and, to a large extent, the subtext and culture of the teaching of history (a famous example being the phantasmagorical painting of the death of Sardanopole by Delacroix – a painting full of dark fantasies portraying Easterners in heavily stereotypic ways). The "lure" of the East meant that Easterners were portrayed from an early period, as exotic, mysterious and dangerous.

Postcolonial philosophers such as JanMohamed (1985) and Said (1993) have used the term to describe the process whereby the coloniser uses the colonised as the "recipient of the negative elements of the self that [are projected] onto him" (JanMohamed, 1985, p. 86). Contemporary educational research on Othering includes the analysis of geopolitics by Mountz (2009) and gender by Sahoo (2013).

Sahoo's study of women's sensuality through and Indian cultural and historical gaze is a good example of the relationship between Otherness and prejudice. Sahoo argues that women have been dominated by a patriarchal perspective where their sexuality has been repressed to the point of it no longer belonging to them. The woman, therefore, becomes an "Other" unto herself until she rea-appropriates her body and her desires.[5] Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's 2014 text "We Should All be Feminists" points to the enculturation of prejudiced perspectives on femininity that take place through cultural norms: "We teach girls shame. *Close your legs. Cover yourself*. We make them feel as though by being born female, they are already guilty of something." (p. 33).

There is much to be said about the concept of "Othering". It could be argued that its roots are in the tradition of the Western philosophical dialectic that establishes a distance between subject and object. This antithetical relationship between parties was brought to a height with the philosophy of Hegel whose Master-Slave dialectic influenced much of the Western concept of self-determination as freedom. For Hegel, this could only happen in Indo-European circumstance, justifying the scramble for Africa as a plundering of land belonging to what he essentially viewed as subhumans (see Stone, 2017). In the 21st Century, modern xenophobic discourses on immigration continue to portray some foreigners not as equal human beings but as objectified "Others". Examples include the language used during the Brexit campaign in the UK (see Golec de Zavala et al., 2017, whose paper correlated right wing sentiments and patriotic sentiments to fear of immigrants), the "Othering" of Muslims across the United States with the rise of Donald Trump (see Elsheikh et al., 2017, who points out how anti-Islamic legislation has has a catastrophic "Othering" effect on Muslims) and the

---

[5] A similar analysis is brought to the fore in dealing with race by Fanon (1952), who urges his readers to look beyond the colonial gaze that shapes and limits them.

rise of the extreme right in many European countries, has exacerbated a sense of "Otherness" for millions of people

Understanding other people's history and culture as a road towards less Othering

Education can use literature, history, the arts and languages to work towards such a goal. If learners can discover more about the rich cultural heritage of the world and engage in learning experiences that give them more understanding of world history, there is a higher chance that they will be less prone to oversimplify or overgeneralise other individuals or groups out of ignorance since there will be a higher likelihood of them knowing about and understanding others' cultural backgrounds.

National History

If history is the study of the past then the salient question to ask is "whose past?". On the one hand, national examination boards will place an emphasis on national history so that learners know about their own country's traditions. However, the study of one's own history is by no means a simple process as it entails an ideological positioning that might entail prejudice formation. Textbook research shows how national history narratives can shape stereotypical and prejudicial thinking (Ben-Yehuda 1995; Blackburn 1985; Blumberg, 2008; Dean, 1983; Domnitz 1971; de Souza et al., 2017; Funkenstein 1989; Kammen 1991; Koulouri 2001; Philippou 2012; Pingel 1999, 2000; Stewart, 1950). The most extreme examples of this can be found in Nazi textbooks where anti-Semitic rhetoric was normalised and institutionalised.

Within national historical narratives, events may be portrayed in a more or less problematized light but are more typically at best over-simplified portrayals of events, at worst, propagandist endorsements of existing power structures built on one-sided, sometimes untrue versions of

the past. For example, in France, article 4, paragraph 4 of the 23 February 2005 law on colonialism asked that teachers teach the "positive values" of colonialism, a system clearly built on prejudicial values whereas in Canada, between the 1940s and 1950s, history textbooks celebrated Canada as a country that was opposed to slavery and did not allow it (Brown, 1958, p. 480; Chafe & Lower, 1948, p. 309) when in fact it did (Walker, 1997, pp. 124–126).

Montgomery points out that

> History textbooks present as rational, normal and entirely unproblematic the position that defense of the civil society constituting the nation has warranted in the past, and will warrant in the future, the spilling of blood as an essential obligation of citizenship. War is often cast in these nationalist narratives as an unfortunate duty, obligating 'all citizens' of the nation to step forward to bring justice to 'all humankind' in conflicts reduced to such binary oppositions as 'good versus evil' or 'war versus peace'. (Montgomery, 2006, pp. 20-21)

Clearly, the study of national history has an important role to play in the exacerbation or reduction of prejudicial thinking. Teachers hoping to develop a tolerance for ambiguity when looking at the past and an acceptance of the ideological nature of history writing should engage in the study of history with a critical mind, placing students before artefacts that present events from more than one viewpoint.

However, this is by no means straightforward, it implies a high level of analytical and evaluative thought that might not be easily available to all types of learner. Indeed, detecting

bias, inferences, vested interests and various tropes of persuasion and manipulation in written and visual texts requires a cognitively demanding approach (Willingham, 2007).

For an education that reduces prejudice to be successful, such events need to be treated not only openly and factually but through critically-minded discussion, discernment and higher order awareness of the effects that power and culture have on the act of narrating the past. At an affective level, students should be brought to consider historical narratives with empathy and human understanding (I come back to this in the thesis' chapter on empathy).

The study of recent history and history in the making is a debate that should be dramatised in classrooms through critical accounts of the news, structured debates about current affairs and the encouragement of student and teacher expression of opinion and belief as concerns topical themes. For a critical study of history to target prejudice reduction, schools need to take risks and go down some of the slippery paths of politics, religion and ideology. This is not an easy thing to do and something that some schools might be tempted to avoid since there is a risk that if such topics are not well scaffolded and discussed with expert assurance, they will lead to confusion and insecurity.

The schools of critical pedagogy (Freire, 1982; McLaren, 2010; Apple, 1979 and the Frankfurt School) using some of the historiographical lenses of Marxist philosophers such as Foucault (1975), Fanon (1952) and Ngugi (1981) could be activated in the study of national history as one way of stimulating criticality or a sense of the complexity of history writing. It is this necessarily complex and difficult problematising of events that can lead to a more nuanced and less prejudiced account of the past and, therefore, the future. A good example of

an account of history that takes into account the voices of minorities and historically marginalised groups is Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United States* (1980).[6]

International History

If understanding one's own history is a vital step towards reducing prejudicial thinking, then the understanding of other people's history is a similarly important step. This is for the simple reason that much prejudicial thinking, which consists of prejudgement and over-generalisation, is borne out of ignorance, in particular, ignorance of history.

For example, if one looks at statistics on salaries earned and high positions held in the business world throughout the globe, particularly in Western countries, one will see that men and White people tend to earn more and hold higher positions than women and Black people (The Economist, 2015a; Shin, 2015; Vega, 2016) . Someone who takes this information at face value and has no understanding of the historical reasons for such inequity, might draw the conclusion that men and White people are somehow superior to women and Black people. However, if one has studied slavery, colonisation and women's rights historically (or more broadly, intersectionality (Cooper, 2016), an altogether different conclusion will be drawn: unequal levels of success in today's world are very much the result of historical social and economic injustice and inequality. Disturbingly, in their 2016 paper, Mandel & Semyonov point out that economic discrimination has experienced an increase since 2000.

Studying another person's history opens the mind to some of the codes that underscore beliefs, language, customs and behaviours. Hence, for a non-Westerner to understand deeply and appreciate well the centrality of democracy in Western narratives, she/he needs to have

---

[6] The book has been a massive best seller but has also fallen foul of numerous critics who accuse it of being too Manichean and historically inaccurate (Kazin, 2004; Windeberg, 2012).

reflected upon models of citizenship in Athens, political organisation in the Roman Republic, the breakaway from the Church and Monarchy. For a non-Muslim to appreciate the significance of the Mecca for Muslims, some understanding of the five pillars of Islam, the Surahs of the Koran and the life of Muhammad is needed. For someone who is not Jewish to appreciate the Shabbat, some understanding of the Tora and the Old Testament will be required.

How can one grasp the meaning of Chinese politics without some understanding of the historical significance of the near 5000-year-old Han dynasty and the idea that China is not so much a nation state but a civilisation state? To understand the fact that many colonists were welcomed into African tribal communities and given land is linked to the ancient custom of hospitality such as the Senegalese tradition of "Teranga", a Wolof word meaning hospitality – the handing over of the land was not necessarily out of naiveté but an ancient custom.

Learning about other people's history requires a substantial effort, just as adjusting to different cultural paradigms, as Allport points out, "with plenty of people at hand to choose from, why create for ourselves the trouble of adjusting to new languages, new foods, new cultures, or to people of a different educational level? It requires less effort to deal with people who have similar presuppositions" (Allport, 1954, p. 17).

Indeed, a number of stereotypical assumptions are made on the basis of basic, undeveloped notions of international history (for example, linking all Germans with the Holocaust or assuming that all French and British people dislike one another, latching onto idiomatic but incorrect myths of history such as those that tell us Christopher Columbus "discovered"

America or, as students learnt during apartheid South Africa, that when Jan Van Riebeek arrived at the Cape Colony, it was unpopulated).

If international history is taught without criticality, it could lead to a string of clichés that students could use to fuel prejudicial and stereotypical views of other nationals and ethnicities. Prejudice tends to operate off a "kernel of truth" hypothesis, meaning that there is some element of a prejudiced belief or statement that is true, albeit usually peripheral, specific to a subset or grossly undeveloped (Dixon, 2017).[7] A smattering of international history could give students shreds of truth that would be used as kernels to build up prejudiced generalisations.

Therefore, just as the teaching of national history requires some distancing and critical thought, schools teaching international curricula need to approach the way other people are represented in careful, mindful ways that ensure students do not clutch onto simplistic essentialising facets of other people's pasts and use them to vehicle prejudiced thoughts. This involves the more sophisticated act of historiographic reasoning, something that should be done through the analysis of national history too. "History is a pack of lies" Voltaire once said, the teacher's job is to show students the deeper meaning of this disturbing statement. A comprehensive study of the way that African history has loaded onto and created stereotypes about Africa (in an American High School context) is Keim & Somerville's *Mistaking Africa* (2017). The book shows how media, myth, literature and discourse have shaped clichés about Africa, many of them prejudicial. Such a book would make for good reading for any teacher of African history, something I touch on in previous work (Hughes, 2009).

---

[7] Dixon's study overviews the "kernel of truth" hypothesis (which is based on a somewhat crude subjective/objective dichotomy) to argue that degrees of warrant for stereotyping, based on belief and culture, are needed and should be analysed more systematically.

We see how reducing prejudice through the study of history takes us to a high level of critical thinking that must problematise not only the field of one's own history but the histories of other people. At this point, we could consider the concept of another person and how education can respond to this.

At the heart of prejudicial thinking is "Otherness"[8] – the maximising of another person's differences to support a polarising discourse and mindset that creates oversimplified notions of self and other. Three core elements of identity that will be considered here are culture, race and gender as these are frequently the subject of prejudiced thinking (see Baldwin, 2017 for discussion on why these categories are common sites of prejudice). For each of these aspects of identity, we will see how education can allow learners to appreciate but also deconstruct them.

Culture

Education is vital to the preservation of culture (UNESCO, 2006, p. 13) since it involves the transmission of cultural artefacts such as language, history, belief systems and social practices. The passing down of skills and knowledge of a group makes education a vehicle for the construction of cultural identity: one learns the history, beliefs and ways of one's national and/or cultural group through an educative process, be it institutionalised or informal.

It is for this reason that religious education, national history, literature and language programmes are developed in schools, to give learners access to the traditions, codes and meaning-making instances that define their cultures (for a discussion on how a 21st Century

---

[8] For an analysis of the construction of the self with its embedded notions of "I", "me" and "other", see the landmark Mind, Self and Society by Mead (1934).

Education should be a vehicle of transmission for a diversity of cultural memes, see Delle Fave, et al., 2011).

One should not only learn about one's own culture through education but about that of others. By learning about other people's culture, individuals and groups can better understand situations, behaviours and social phenomena. Understanding other people's culture is a skill that is increasingly demanded in a globalised, culturally diverse economy.

Since individual and group behaviour is predicated by some level of culture, the better the understanding of the culture, the more in-tune and appreciative the interlocutor will be of that behaviour. This is very much the premise of ethnography, the belief that human behaviours need to be interpreted through the rites and customs that contextualise them. "The final goal [Malinowski stated in discussing peoples of the Western Pacific] is to grasp the native's point of view, his relation to life, to realise his vision of his world" (Malinowski, 1922, p. 25). [9]

Hence, learners should be afforded opportunities that enable them to see the world through the cultural gaze of others. This mind-opening experience, albeit challenging, allows individuals to relativise their own perspectives, to understand the role that culture has in shaping those perspectives but also to empathise with other people and gain some understanding of what it means to appreciate the world from their perspectives. This thesis explores empathy in chapter five.

Understanding culture has the potential to reduce prejudicial thinking because it lessens the barriers of "Otherness" that are prevalent in situations where people do not know each other

[9] For a more contemporary discussion of ethnographic practice, see Dewan, 2018.

well as individuals or groups: "Understanding a people's culture exposes their normalness without reducing their particularity ... it renders them accessible: setting them in the frame of their own banalities, it dissolves their opacity" (Geertz, 1973, p. 14).

To appreciate the cultural practices of a group, one should have some understanding of the way that these practices have developed and the particular significance they have within that culture. Often, when these cultural practices are not understood, prejudiced assumptions are made. For example, if one does not have some appreciation of the value of respect for elders and ancestry in typical African culture (Makinwa-Adebusoye, 2001, p.5), one will struggle to understand approaches to the future and notions of societal development, especially when compared to more positivist technocratic Western models of progress. Previous French president Nicolas Sarkozy said, in his 2007 Dakar speech, that "the tragedy of Africa is that the African has never really entered into history ... They have never really launched themselves into the future" (McGreal, 2007). His own minister of Sports, the Senegalese-born Yama Rade riposted that "I think that not only has the African man made his mark on history, but he was even the first to do so, because I know about the culture" (RFI, 2010).

Sarkozy's statement about Africa is an example of a judgemental and unappreciative approach to difference. A more recent statement showing similar cultural insensitivity came from French President Emmanuel Macron who said that Africa's problems were "civilizational" (Attiah, 2017). We could add to this hardened stereotypes about Chinese students that abound as problematised by Heng (2016) and Jin & Cortazzi (2011). Although the Social Anthropologist Ulf Hannerz points out that the anthropological interest "is a search for contrasts rather than uniformity", this is not so much to judge other cultures as to take

interest in them, "to become acquainted with more cultures is to turn into an aficionado, to view them as art works" (Hannerz, 1990, p. 239).

Education for less prejudice, like the premise of social or cultural anthropology, "entails a certain metacultural position. There is, first of all, a willingness to engage with the Other, an intellectual and ethic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences" (Hannerz,1992, p.252).

However, just as an oversimplified approach to international history can lead to clichés and stereotypes about individuals and groups with regards to their histories, so too and perhaps even more so, an approach to culture where oversimplified representations are easy to fall into in, allowing for sweeping judgements.

Therefore, an education for less prejudice must take the complex, cognitively challenging route of deconstructing the idea of culture itself.

Definitions of Culture

Culture is a particularly nebulous and highly problematic term. One might start with static definitions that are predicated on the notion that humans operate within set communicative configurations that are described as sets:

> the whole set of signs by which the members of a given society recognize…one
> another, while distinguishing them from people not belonging to that society" or "the
> set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of a society or

social group… (encompassing) in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs. (UNESCO, 2006, p. 12).

A more subtle, less static definition of the construct of culture reminds us that it is not merely a set but a system, implying dynamic relations: "a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" (Geertz, 1973, p. 89).

At a more contemporary and problematised level still, we have the notion that culture itself is fluid whereas individuals and groups move through culture and define themselves in continually evolving ways: "Cultures are made of continuities and changes" (Appiah, 2012, p. 1178).

Indeed, as soon as one starts grouping people into cultures such as Western, Islamic or Eastern culture and the like; a highly unstable, contextually limited definition is used that does not necessarily hold across different viewpoints or users and is, therefore, highly unreliable.

Ideas about culture are perspectival in that they change according to the person defining them. Howarth and Cornish (2012) point out how simplistically defined cultural groups are actually much more complex than their appellation implies. This is especially case when one considers that each group means something different to the person observing it. For example, the idea of Indian culture will have a quite different meaning for Indians, non-Indian tourists and different groups within what we might call Indian culture (wealthy, poor, male, female, Hindu, Christian, Muslim, etc.).

So culture, as a defining term, is both ambiguous and paradoxical and therefore intrinsically difficult to conceptualise. Educational practices must enhance sufficient higher-order thinking for students to embrace such complex configurations of meaning purposefully, without creating confusion. Students need to be educated to identify the enunciator of any discourse about culture and problematise that source of information. This is a similar design to that which urges students to interrogate historical sources critically.

Definitions of culture are also historical (Gillespie, Howarth and Cornish, 2012]): symbolic artefacts of culture tend to become outdated quickly, especially in the 21st Century where many traditions are being lost and human diversity is increasingly drawn into a homogenous "third culture". Some of the superficial signifiers of culture such as food, fashion and folklore, have a certain shelf-life and need to be revisited to accurately depict what could be called cultural practice. For example, to associate French culture with the Beret is not something that resonates in current dress codes in France but is an image inherited from the 19th and early 20th Centuries. A similar point could be made with the English bowler hat. Definitions of culture are disrupted by the movement of people between them (Gillespie, Howarth and Cornish [2012]) since individuals can easily have more than one cultural reference point and con convert from one cultural site to another through naturalisation, religious conversion, immigration, marriage or merely personal choice. Definitions of cultural groups are also "re-constitutive of the phenomena they seek to describe" (Gillespie, Howarth and Cornish [2012]), meaning that they respond to the clichés and stereotypes that are used to depict them in a type of self-fulfilling prophecy. As such, if someone is made to believe that his or her culture is defined by a certain set of symbols and practices, (s)he may well incorporate and perform these incidents to create a sense of belonging and identity.

The learner educated away from the prejudice of "Othering" should be given the intellectual arms necessary to relativise any over-deterministic categorisation of the individual or group through cultural references by recognising and understanding the tenuous nature of culture as a site of meaning.

This leaves educators with a major challenge since it is clearly difficult to find consensus over what exactly the word "culture" actually means and to whom and how one might operationalise the construct in the classroom. Teachers need to make a shift from simplistic comfort zones of what constitutes culture (Kumashiro [2004]; Motha [2006]), with standard stereotypic examples of cultural groups, to a more discursive practice where they are co-learners alongside students, constantly discovering and rediscovering the universe and discourse of culture.

Race

A common expression of prejudice, more polemical and less subtle than cultural discrimination, is racism. In the 1982 Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice, UNESCO defines racism as including "racist ideologies, prejudiced attitudes, discriminatory behaviour, structural arrangements and institutionalized practices resulting in racial inequality as well as the fallacious notion that discriminatory relations between groups are morally and scientifically justifiable" (UNESCO, 1982, 2.2). In an earlier text (1951, 1), UNESCO made a statement to deconstruct the biological notion of race, pointing out that "scientists are generally agreed that all men living today belong to a single species, Homo sapiens, and are derived from a common stock". Whilst biological definitions of race, popular during the 19th and early 20th Century, are today largely considered invalid, this mainly because of the increasingly understood genetic interrelatedness of human phenotypes, race should still be

understood as a marker in many societies to separate, control and hierarchise human beings (Epstein and Gist, 2015; Hall, 1996; Darder and Torres, 2004). Furthermore, Williams and Eberhardt (2008) found that people subscribing to a biological definition of race were more prone to stereotypic depictions of Black Americans whereas those who were more inclined to see race as a social construct were less inclined to fall prey to such stereotypes.

Race is "a complex system of ideas and practices regarding how some visible characteristics of human bodies such as skin color, facial features, and hair texture relate to people's character, intellectual capacity, and patterns of behaviour" (Markus, 2010, p. 22). Some would like to see the entire concept disbanded. For example, in 2013, French president François Hollande passed a bill to remove the word "race" from all legislation and said that "there is no place for race in the republic" (The Telegraph, 2013).

However, whether wishing to distance statements on race from early biological definitions should lead to a colour blind approach can be debated. According to the literature on racial literacy, schools should not hide away from the topic or try to gloss over it with uncritical accounts of interculturality and anti-racist thinking that discard the idea of race altogether. This is because such discourses do not grapple with the essence of the problem and may lead to politically correct situations that avoid the reality of race as a society- structuring discourse:

> liberal discourses of multiculturalism, equality and tolerance such as those prevalent in the Canadian context of multicultural diversity lull us into complacency that we have moved away from these dark pasts, but have we genuinely moved to more critically aware spaces, or have we merely languaged our way out of the shadows of the past

while remaining subject to its discourses and common-sense notions? (Lee, 2015, p. 81)

Indeed, it would be naïve to assume that by occulting the word "race", one can do away with racism. A more critical viewpoint would suggest that, on the contrary, by avoiding the notion of race, we allow it to flourish as it becomes another elephant in the classroom:

> Scholars argue that [colour blind racial ideology] has supplanted old-fashioned racism as an acceptable expression of modern racial intolerance (Bonilla-Silva, 2001). Individuals who ignore racial differences and minimize racism consciously or unconsciously perpetuate racism by justifying the racial status quo in the United States (Bonilla-Silva, 2001; Carr, 1997; Lewis, Neville & Spanierman, 2012, p. 122).

The question of race is, therefore, one that should be brought out into the open in educational systems seeking to reduce prejudicial thinking: students should be taught "racial literacy" (Guinier, 2004) since race is "the prevailing narrative in the lives of racial minority individuals and groups" (Skerrett, 2011, p. 314) and is used "to position difference and power relations in the process of identification" (Fergus, 2009, p. 345).

According to Epstein and Gist (2015), racial literacy is achieved through the following educational pathways:

1. Educational experiences need to disrupt "the common narrative structured around themes of increasing progress and greater equality in order to explicate the 'foundational, indeed constitutional' (Guinier, 2004, 98) role that racism has played in

the development of the nation" (p. 43). This means making visible "the complex ways in which racism has operated historically and today".

2. Educators need to consider using "culturally relevant pedagogy" (p. 42) which entails popular culture but also works from students' own references rather than anticipating these references and possibly falling into the trap of essentialising assumed identities with chosen stereotypical artefacts (such as using rap with Black students based on the assumption that this is culturally relevant to them).

3. Addressing race directly.

4. Creating safe, discussion-inducing environments so that experiences of racism can be discussed and shared (Tatum, 1992).

Others suggest that by educational institutions openly embracing racial diversity, positive steps can be taken. Research by Engberg (2004) and Hurtado have shown that attitudes to race and social justice are enhanced by diversity experiences in university campuses. To investigate further the effects of campus diversity, see Lewis, Neville & Spanierman, 2012, p. 121 and for more general discussions on overcoming racial divide, see Bell Hooks (2012).

Race is a polemical subject that has more currency in university circles than in schools. This is because parental pressure for safe subjects is less predominant and since critical race theory is not a field that has been associated traditionally with K-12 education but more graduate and post-graduate level political theory.

Teachers wishing to treat the question run the risk of entering a minefield since aiming for tolerance, acceptance, respect and appreciation of diversity might force them to label students racially and frankly identify different races – which in itself is a highly problematic,

unscientific enterprise and can create justified upset. On the other hand, playing down the concept of race and pretending it does not exist will not equip students to deal with the matter in their adult lives and runs the risks of allowing it to predominate in surreptitious forms such as disguised playground and institutionalised racism.

The research suggests that educational institutions should not be afraid to discuss the subject openly and to allow it to feature prominently in educational discourse and institutional consciousness (see, for example, Tatum, 1992; 2007; 2017). What is essential is for students to understand that race is a complex, socially constructed idea that has been used politically, economically and historically to advance various forms of capitalism: it is not about labelling students "Black" and "White "but explaining that concepts of Whiteness and Blackness have been ideological drivers in the past and continue to be in the present. Furthermore, educational discourse on race, if it is to be sincere and critical, cannot shy away from uncomfortable questions related to slavery, colonisation but also current affairs such as blackness in the United States, the status of non-Europeans in Europe, Aborigines in Australia or racial division in modern South Africa. It is by embracing these subjects head on and discussing them that a forum for exchange and understanding can be established.

At the level of institutional organisation, schools wishing to send out a message of respect for diversity should aim for ethnically diverse staffing including management positions so that students of different origins can believe that success is possible for them too.

Gender

In the 21st Century, it could be understood that "sex" refers to biological, chemical, chromosomal configuration, although it is important to recognise a sex continuum (including "transgender") whereas "gender" refers to a broader sociocultural notion of identity.

Like most stereotypes, concepts and symbols of gender roles are produced, distributed and exacerbated by out-of-school factors such as the family, the work place and mass media. The latter as a vehicle of gender stereotypes is particularly important (Craig, 1992) in an age of saturated information load and wide-scale, easily accessible popular iconography. Jordan (1995) reports on how carefully designed classroom learning experiences meant to reduce gender stereotypes can be easily disrupted by the stereotype and, potentially, prejudice-induced games children bring into the playground.

The archetypal representations of the male and female in traditional Western fairy tales, myths and also many modern iconographic depictions through film, the pop industry and advertising delineate some of the assumptions and prejudices people might have about either sex. In these stereotypic depictions, men are often seen as outgoing, conquering and controlling heroes while women tend to incarnate passive, patient and servile personalities. Where women are strong they become freakish witches such as Medea, Clytemnestra or Lady Macbeth. These archetypes were coined as the animus (male principle) and anima (female principle) by Jung (1964).

Schools looking to diminish gender prejudice are faced with subtle, well-anchored practices and beliefs that have been normalised by society to an extent that to unearth them and question them can be deeply unsettling. For example, to ask students to critique family models with a working father and house mother might be asking them to question their own parents' relationship, identity and familial organisation. Islamic culture's clear demarcation of

men and women is another area that is challenging to discuss with students in the light of prejudice and discrimination. There are also seemingly trivial habits that, when investigated critically, unearth prejudicial behaviours such as teachers asking boys to help carry something or teachers praising girls for their appearance.

Schools and universities must have the courage to discuss gender stereotypes and prejudice against women – as well as men – openly and reflectively. Indeed, the fact that men still earn more than women (US Labour Force statistics, 2015) or that there is an overwhelmingly predominant population of males in political leadership, that women suffer from strong acts of prejudice and discrimination in many countries in the world ("global prevalence figures indicate that 35% of women worldwide have experienced either intimate partner violence or non-partner sexual violence in their lifetime" [World Health Organisation, 2014]) needs to be analysed critically, at a demanding cognitive level.

Schools exacerbating gender prejudice

To do this comprehensively, schools can reflect carefully on the ways they themselves operate since studies have shown how schools institutionalise gender separation in, at first glance, imperceptible ways. Epstein et al. (2001) have argued that gender identity is partly influenced by the organisation of the playground in schools and that key decisions on that front can disrupt tacit gender power relations among young learners. An example of the effect of this spatial distribution of playground activities has been elicited by Prendergast (1996), who pointed out how, for British working class schools, the control of the playground by predominantly male games including football, has marginalised girls and invaded their space.

A well-known area of gender imbalance is subject enrolment in upper secondary school.

The 2013 Institute of Physics report (UK), using the UK National Pupil Database's statistics from 2010 to 2013, states that "English, biology and psychology have a balance towards 'girls' and physics, mathematics and economics towards 'boys'" (Institute of Physics, 2013). Numerous studies have shown that in schools girls tend to have lower self-esteem than boys in general (Niederle and Vesterlund, 2007; Streitmatter, 2002; Pomerantz et al., 2002) and particularly in mathematics and sciences (Kurtz-Costes et al., 2008).

Exactly why this should be is not entirely clear. Some studies in neuroscience suggest that boys tend to excel in spatial and logical-mathematical intelligences whereas girls tend to have more developed verbal and emotional intelligences (Kimura, 2000). This might explain gradual patterning in studies in schools over time (Killgore and Yurgelun-Todd, 2004; Lenroot, et al. 2007). However, there is also the likelihood that girls are made to believe that mathematics and physics are not for them through a repertoire of subconscious apparatuses within the school such as teacher genders and attitudes, university guidance counselling and societal role models (there are, for example, few well known female mathematicians, physicists or economists). The issue of girls' patterned subject enrolment may also be to do with conformity (Cooley, 2007; Sacerdote, 2001) and in this sense becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy or vicious cycle. Fine (2010) has argued forcibly that the theory of neurological gender difference is a myth since neuroplasticity transcends gender difference and is far more telling indicator of human behaviour. So social configurations of gender are related to culture and belief more than science.

The 2013 Institute of Physics report recommends that "schools should reflect on their own statistics and put in place whole-school measures to counter gender stereotyping" and that

"primary schools should reflect on the gender messages they may be giving to pupils, which may unwittingly reinforce gender stereotypes, and work to remove them" (Institute of Physics, 2013).

Van de gaer et al. (2004) found in their study of 4000 students in upper secondary schools in Belgium that girls performed better in mathematics in single-sex-schools than in co-educational schools. This would suggest that the lack of the dominant Other in mathematics classrooms allows a broader and more comfortable range of feminities and girlhood to be performed, away from the confidence–eroding myth of mathematics learning being for boys rather than girls.

However, although single-sex education may improve performances of each gender group in respective domains, it will not necessarily build a tolerant outlook on members of the opposite gender. Thorne's work (1992) on gender arrangements in elementary schools points out that teachers tend to exacerbate gender stereotypes through segregation. This practice is socialised by students who remain, for the large part, segregated in playtime activities, reinforcing patterns of gender division and will often ostracise those that cross over symbolic lines of identity. Earlier work by Wood (1984) found that sexist language among boys was less frequent when they kept company with mixed gender groups.

Hence we are faced with a similar paradox to that concerning racism: if girls have been the victims of discrimination then equity can be achieved through separatist implementation of learning conditions. However, separating girls and boys runs the risk of polarising groups and fuelling prejudiced mindsets. On the other hand, if differences between girls and boys are minimised and mixed grouping is encouraged – as would be the case with a racially

desegregated "colour blind" school – iniquities may well continue since the playing ground has not been levelled although prejudiced attitudes might be lessened. It seems, therefore, to be a trade-off between empowerment of victims of discrimination with the potential for prejudice versus less prejudice but without affirmative action.

Educating for gender differences in the 21st Century

How different are males and females and to what extent are differences constructed? Despite obvious physical differences that come from sexual identity, a large part of gender identity is constructed. Diamond points out that "one's sexual identity is prenatally organized as a function of the genetic-endocrine forces and emerges (is activated) with development. One's gender identity, recognition of how he or she is viewed in society, develops with post-natal experiences" (Daimond, 2005, p. 127).

Clichés about female characteristics usually involve "empathy, intuitiveness, adaptability, awareness of growth as a process rather than as goal-ended, inventiveness, protective feeling toward others, and a capacity to respond emotionally as well as rationally" (Alpert, 1974, p. 92). Stereotypic male characteristics involve logical thinking, competitiveness, domination and goal-orientation. These generalisations, whether true or not, have had an important effect on the collective psyche of many societies. For example, "at the end of the 60s […] there was a minor panic in the United States about schools' destroying "boy culture" and denying boys their "reading rights" because of the prevalence of women teachers and the "feminine, frilly content" of elementary education. (Connell, 1996, p. 207)

However, Connell points out that gender roles are historically and culturally constructed:

There is no one pattern of masculinity that is found everywhere. Different cultures and different periods of history, construct masculinity differently. Some cultures make heroes of soldiers, and regard violence as the ultimate test of masculinity; other look at soldiering with disdain and regard violence as contemptible. Some cultures regard homosexual sex as incompatible with true masculinity; other think that no-one can be a real man without having had homosexual relations. (p. 208)

Tulviste et al. (2010) describe a 2004 meta-analysis by Leaper and Smith: "children's language use showed that girls were more talkative and used more affiliative speech (e.g., praise, agreement, acknowledgement, responsiveness) than boys, whereas boys used more assertive speech (e.g., directives, negative speech, giving and requesting information)" (p.319). They went on to conduct a qualitative study of Swedish, Finnish and Estonian pre-school children and found that gender-correlated patterns of directive or non-directive speech (associated with gender) were primarily a result of cultural differences.

In the 21st Century, especially in the West, the entire concept of gender has been widened (see Fogg Davis (2017), who argues that we should do away with gender roles and labels altogether, Butler (2015) who argues that heterosexuality is a coercive construct or Rich (1980) who described heterosexuality as "compulsory" to communicate the normative pressure placed on gender identity. The idea that one is free to define oneself has been celebrated by some such as Koedt, Levine & Rapone who state "that the most basic right of an individual is to create the terms of its own definition" (1973, p. 370). However, on the other hand, it has been bemoaned by others such as Finkelkraut (2015) who describes the free reign of individualism as a decadent deconstruction of traditional roles and values, leading to the disintegration of the family.

Gender equality laws passed in France between 2012 and 2014 led to reforms in the educational system that were designed to teach gender equality. This led to false rumours that were circulated by parents using social media claiming that children were going to be taught that they were "not born a girl or a boy, as God intended, but choose to become one" (Samuel, 2014). This is an example of the prejudicial views that predominate in many countries about sexual categories and the fear that educational initiatives might reverse gender roles in the family structure.

All this to say that addressing prejudices related to gender requires an expanded understanding of what gender means to different constituencies and political, cultural and ideological positions in the 21st Century. It is not enough to tackle gender prejudice at the crude surface of differences between male and female, the matter could well be more complex and subtle according to the pressures of context.

Addressing gender-related stereotypes through education can be considered institutionally, through equitable gender representation of roles of power and authority (for example, heads of department, principal positions and other management positions) to send out the message to boys and girls that success in social organisations is not the reserve of one group alone. Schools should aim to strike a balance in subject enrolment patterns whenever possible so as to move away from the clichés of female primary school teachers, male physics teachers and so on.

It would appear that a co-educational environment is more prone to reduce prejudicial views of the opposite gender than single sex education but if this is done, schools must be sensitive

to the insidious presence of sexism that is likely to be reproduced in breaktime activities and other forms of informal interaction. Kitzinger (2001) points out that "heterosexism […] is one of the ways in which strict adherence to gender role stereotypes is enforced, and gender oppression maintained" (p. 277). Silverschanz et al. (2007) conducted research using 3128 students from north western universities in the United States and found that "approximately 40% reported experiences of heterosexist harassment" in the course of a year (p. 179).

Therefore, a sensitive approach that takes note of the surreptitious codes upon which sexist prejudice is formulated beyond the classroom within the tissue of school culture is needed to sustain a meaningful approach.

Special Needs

Another human category that is frequently "Othered" in society is the person with special needs. Hodkinson, referring to fieldwork he conducted in 2007 in the UK reports "I was dismayed to observe that, when questioned, a majority of mainstream children had no conception of what inclusive education was and, more worryingly, they held extremely negative views of disability and disabled people" (Hodkinson, 2010, p. 63).

Schools can make a difference by educating learners to view such individuals in more critical and sociological way so as to deconstruct the way they are represented and treated in mainstream, so called 'normal' society. Dunne describes the ways that many schools deal with Special Educational Needs (SEN) students as "a powerful othering framework" (Dunne, 2009, p. 49) mainly because of diagnosis and tracking.

The medical discourse is particularly powerful and creates strong prejudices when it comes to SEN students for two essential reasons: firstly, medical diagnoses carry a legitimisation with them that is anchored in the social authority of the medical field (see Foucault [1963] for the power of the clinic); secondly because medical diagnoses create an identity-constraining and deterministic labelling effect that is difficult to shrug off (see Molloy & Vasil, 2002, p. 661).

The medical approach pathologises difference and exacerbates the divide between those who consider themselves "normal" and individuals with special learning needs. Goodley takes this idea far by stating that "the 'difference' of people with learning difficulties, understood as being located in some biological deficit, [de-]individualizes their very humanity: ripping them out of a social context, placing them within the realms of pathological curiosity" (2000, p. 35).

A critique of schools' approaches to SEN that is that they tend to shift the onus of difficulty accessing the curriculum onto the student without questioning their own practices:

> Children with behavioural, social and emotional issues are segregated and contained in Pupil Referral Units and consequently marginalised. They are labelled as deviants without any critical interrogation of the 'within school' factors (inappropriate curriculum or assessment processes that label them as failures) or external factors (inappropriate parenting or lack of cultural capital) that may have contributed to their 'undesirable' behaviours (Glazzard, 2013, p. 184).

Glazzard's critique is at the heart of deconstructing otherness as it relies on a postmodern approach to truth and knowledge in the vein of Michel Foucault whereby edifices of

normality are no longer seen as absolute or intrinsic but socially constructed through discourses of power and tradition. This implies that education should provide learners with the means to look beyond individual differences into the contexts that decree those individuals to be different.

Educating for less prejudice towards individuals with special needs can be done through the experience of artistic works that shift the perspective from a conventional discourse, which can present the individual with special needs as object, to one where the reader sees the world through the eyes of this person and therefore empathises, understands and relates to that point of view while recognising some of the horrors of "normality". Two classic novels that do this and could be considered effective for their reduction of prejudice towards special needs are J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) and Ken Casey's *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* (1962).

Researchers in the UK have argued that, institutionally, for schools to be genuinely inclusive so that students with special learning needs feel fully integrated and valued in the fabric of school life, the entire concept of success needs to be revisited (Audit Commission, 2002; Cole, 2005; Lunt & Norwich, 1999; Black-Hawkins, Florian & Rouse, 2007; Lloyd, 2008). As long as schools are trying on the one hand to admit students of varying cognitive profiles but at the same time are competing with one another by comparing achievement on high-stakes performance assessments, they will be polarising the student body and further "Othering" students with special learning needs whose strengths might not be valued through examinations.

The question of assessments is a fundamental one that goes beyond schools into the economic system that drives so many societal values. Glazzard states that "inclusion cannot be entangled with neo-liberal values that focus on competition and education for the purpose of economic productivity" (Glazzard, 2013, p. 103). In order for students with special educational needs to escape ostracism, prejudice and discrimination, schools will have to ensure that "the teaching and learning, achievement, attitudes and well-being of every person matter" (Ofsted, 2000).

One way of doing this is to ensure that schools design assessments of character-related constructs such as wisdom, decision-making, resilience, open-mindedness and kindness. If these aspects of humanity are celebrated more emphatically in schools and regarded with the same importance as academic knowledge and technical skill, students with special learning needs will be better appreciated by other students and will feel more empowered. The International School of Geneva is an example of a school with an integrated special needs programme, allowing for frequent, non-competitive contact between students with and without learning needs in a context where the affective domain is celebrated and modelled (Ecolint, 2016).

Another way of celebrating difference is by making salient heterogeneous models of intelligence such as Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 2004)[10] which look beyond so-called "natural intelligence" or mathematical, logical or verbal intelligence alone towards less socially recognised areas such as kinaesthetic, interpersonal or intrapersonal intelligence. Similarly, the Universal Design for Learning approach (UDL, 2014) encourages

---

[10] Gardner's work has been contested by a number of researchers such as Waterhouse (2006), who points out that there is little empirical evidence of the theory, and Visser, Ashton & Vernon (2006), who have shown how it was impossible to effectively disaggregate the different intelligences from one another. This does not mean that one cannot consider Gardner's model as a way of appreciating different student predispositions and gifts but it does imply that this should be done with some caution.

schools to create assessments that allow different types of learners to access materials. By celebrating these domains and designing classroom assessment that allow them to be operationalised, a more inclusive and less prejudice-prone learning environment will be induced.

A school model to deconstruct Otherness

Based on this chapter's discussion, we could consider three levels of knowing beyond the Other that can be considered developmentally. At level 1, appropriate for young children (up until a consolidation of Piaget's pre-operational stage, so age 7), experiences should focus on diversity and an appreciation of diversity. Schools should be wary not to turn this into an educational philosophy that insists on difference and forces individuals into identities that they might not wish to appropriate but rather to focus on engineering environments that allow for an equitable exchange of cultural, ethnic, gender-related and profile-related experiences. Care should be taken to offer a physical educational programme that does not polarise groups and play on gender stereotypes (skipping and tic tac toe for girls, football and basketball for boys) but allows for single sex learning environments (swimming, gymnastics, martial arts). Since students are at a pre-operational stage of cognitive development, efforts should be on creating environments that will habituate young learners to diversity rather than placing abstract cognitive demands on them.

At stage 2, leading to abstract thought and a capacity to deal with complex philosophical and epistemic notions (so up to age 11), students should be exposed to international history so as to open their minds to the different legacies and narratives that make up the rich tissue of humanity. This can include some effort to move away from ethnocentric or gender biased

accounts of history in order to appreciate diversity further. By this stage, learners are able to conceptualise diversity as an idea rather than a mere physical manifestation.

At stage 3, where learners are at the abstract level of thinking and are consolidating their understanding of systems, concepts and counter-intuitive notions (so, from a traditional Piagetian stance, after 11, but more realistically, closer to age 16), students should be exposed to an educational experience that affords them an understanding of the role of racism, sexism and powerful discourses of normality in the writing of history and the institutionalisation of power. Piaget in his research pointed out how one of the more complex extended abstract notions was reciprocity. This is a key notion to grapple with in an education that reduces prejudice as it pushes learners to deconstruct "us" and "them" overgeneralisations, seeking common ground and understanding. This is something I develop in the thesis' chapter on empathy.

Chapter Conclusion

The enterprise of educating beyond "Otherness" is a fragile one since it involves striking a balance between a critical approach to human differences and a temptation to render differences obsolete and strive for a whitewashed third culture. Diversity enriches our lives and the aim is not to erase it but to know it.

This chapter has shown how for questions of culture and history, if an education is to reduce prejudice by reducing "Otherness", learners should be knowledgeable of different historical narratives and cultural practices to avoid prejudicial thinking borne out of ignorance and stereotypes. This is something that should be done from an early age to ensure that the two million minutes spent in school are used to cover a variety of national and cultural expressions

of humanity and not just national history and local culture since time is needed to cover a multiplicity of different histories. This much said, the pillars of self-knowledge that constitute national history are critical as they create a vantage point from whence other histories and cultures can be viewed. The extent to which a learner's own history and culture is evoked in school exclusively, aggressively and monotonically or, on the contrary, relativistically, inclusively and with some critical distance, will affect the way learners go on to learn about others.

Differences in gender and learning needs can be lessened by more inclusive approaches to curriculum, by "replacing confrontational disciplinary systems, restructuring physical education to emphasise participation rather than competitive selection, and restructuring the gender-divided curriculum" (Connell, 1996, p. 226). Schools should be mindful of the way that students socialise in free time. They can make a difference by scaffolding learning environments that are not exclusivist, gender-biased or inaccessible to students with special needs. The idea of allowing gender boundaries to be crossed and so-called "borderwork" to lessen gender stereotype reproduction and male-dominated social organisation, especially among young learners, should be considered (see, for example, the work of Thorne, 1992). This might include a variety of games on offer for students at break time other than only traditionally male-centred games such as football, classroom activities that put the emphasis less on talking and dominating group work and more on listening, supporting other people and collaborating. Teachers should not assume that quiet students are not making an effort or that low performance on an assessment is necessarily the student's fault as it could also be due to biased assessment and task design.

Cultural, gender and learning need diversity should be celebrated in schools in inclusive ways; not through labelling and explicit separatist provision but by ensuring that schools are open to the voice of different types of learners and are allowing them to have a say in their own education by bringing their diversity to the table. So knowing another person beyond "Otherness" does not only mean studying differences, but celebrating them and allowing them to influence school policy. As Danforth points out, "research and practice have effectively defined individual lives under the pathology heading without addressing the politics of knowledge, without allowing for significant personal meanings of those categorized persons (the persons we serve) to be valued as knowledge" (Danforth, 1995, p. 138).

If knowledge and integration are the first steps towards understanding the other, then the more challenging but necessary steps are those that take us beyond those definitions, allowing for individualism, freedom from labels and an ongoing becoming of human potential. Learners must understand that "no one today is purely one thing. Labels like "Indian", or "woman", for example, are not more than starting-points, which if followed into actual experience for only a moment are quickly left behind" (Said, 1993, p. 336).

To leave sites of identity behind, steps must be taken to embed in educational systems fundamental concepts of ethnology, sociology, psychology and anthropology. This is an ambitious project that requires a high level of instruction and reflection, possibly only at the senior years of schooling and at university level. Some of the key notions that must be imparted to students include:

1. The relative deprivation of identity. "Identity is always a structured representation which only achieves its positive through the narrow eye of the negative" (Hall, 1997, p. 21).

2. Gender as a site of political strife: "Man establishes his 'Manhood' in direct proportion to his ability to have his ego override woman's, and derives his strength and self-esteem through this process" (Koedt, Levine & Rapone, 1973, p. 380)

3. Race as a social construction that has been used for the distribution of power in modern human history.

4. That Special Needs are not merely biological realities and pathologies but socially-constructed representations that serve to prop up the liturgy of convention and so-called normality.

5. That essentialised notions of "Others" are embedded in and created by language: "language objectifies the world, transforming the *panta rhei* of experience into a cohesive order. In the establishment of this order language realizes a world, in the double sense of apprehending and producing it" (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 173).

This can be achieved only through "radical reform of the school in terms of curriculum, assessment pedagogy and grouping of pupils" (Mittler, 2000, p. 10). Furthermore, it seems difficult to imagine such a level of conscious-raising educational practice without awareness of and, perhaps, a striving for social justice: "social justice demands deconstructing those realities in order to disclose the multiple ways schools and their leadership reproduce marginalizing and inequitable treatment of individuals because their identities are outside the celebrated dominant culture" (Marshall & Olivia, 2010, p. 22).

Competence assessments, records of meaning-making such as portfolios or response journals should feature in this project, students should engage in pertinent, reflective dialogue, debates and artistic productions to dramatise their understanding of identity and culture. Furthermore, salient works of literature, film and Art can be used to trigger reflection and debate along these lines. The humanities, languages and arts might seem like obvious areas to transcend "Otherness", but it can be done in mathematics with approaches to non-Western traditions, physical education through a wider, less Western and male-dominated repertoire of activities for students and the sciences, where students can be brought to reflect upon the application of science in non-positivist ways, drawing on indigenous knowledge systems, themes of sustainability and bioethics. Students can also be introduced to the history of scientific paradigms in a sociological sense so that they view scientific progress not as truth or givens but a socially constructed dialectic (Kuhn, 1962).

For students to understand the other beyond "Otherness", they will have to learn about other people, unlearn the fatalism and stereotypes that lie behind such systems of representation and re-learn what it means to be another person. As Alvin Toffler said, "the new education must teach the individual how to classify and reclassify information, how to evaluate its veracity, how to change categories when necessary, how to move from the concrete to the abstract and back, how to look at problems from a new direction — how to teach himself"[11] (Toffler, 1970, p. 367).

---

[11] Although, ironically, this is one of many examples of the use of the masculine pronoun to generalise human experience suggests a prejudice against the female sex.

Chapter Three: Critical Thinking

The chapter defines critical thinking and then goes on to explain how it must be developed if learners are to escape the mind's natural inclination to bias (Kahneman, 2011). Critical thinking is not merely cognitive but involves dispositions and emotions. This means that educational strategies should move students from logical thinking, which can be used to service prejudiced positions, to wisdom, a position that reconciles logical reasoning with humane reflection. The chapter ends by synthesising some of the dominant developmental models in the field and bringing them together in a four-staged model that can be used in schools.

Introduction

My argument in this chapter is that critical thinking is a particularly useful tool to dismantle many of the elements of prejudice that are hidden to those who do not investigate claims, beliefs, perceptions and assumptions carefully. Therefore, critical thinking should be used in schools as a richly textured approach that not only sharpens the mind but dampens prejudicial thinking in numerous ways.

What is Critical Thinking?

A somewhat nebulous term

Moseley et al. (2005) discuss the difficulty in defining critical thinking as it is a complex matter that cannot be easily extracted from interrelated concepts such as creative thinking, enquiry, reasoning, cognitive processes and self-engagement. Different definitions have been given by Siegel (1988), Facione (1990), Paul (1990, 1992, 2011), Ennis (1986), Halpern (1997, 1999, 2002, 2014), Anderson and Krathwohl (2001), Lipman (2003), Moseley et al. (2004, 2005), Halpern & Butler (2018) to mention a few.

Halpern (1997) categorises critical thinking into cognitive skills that cover analysis, deduction and problem solving with an emphasis on the importance of memory and the use of language. She extends the domain of critical thinking somewhat by including decision-making and creativity. One sees how these skills cover the interrelated domains of logical-mathematical intelligence, verbal intelligence and creative thinking with a clear central emphasis on reasoning.

Black (2008) defines critical thinking with an even stronger accent placed on rational processes including the analysis of arguments, claims, explanations and inferences; the ability to sift through information so as to bring out relevant facts and the formation of good arguments and decisions (p. 7).

Paul (1990), on the other hand, subdivides critical thinking into three dimensions: cognitive macro-abilities and cognitive micro-skills but also the affective domain. The former two elements involve typical examples of rational thinking such as "refining generalizations and avoiding oversimplifications **[…],** clarifying and analysing the meanings of words or phrases, developing criteria for evaluation, generating or assessing solutions [and] analysing or evaluating actions or policies" for macro-abilities and "making plausible inferences, predictions, or interpretations, giving reasons and evaluating evidence and alleged facts, recognizing contradictions, exploring implications and consequences" for micro-skills (p. 56). Within the two areas of cognition, Paul extends purely rational thinking into less obvious areas such as "the art of silent dialogue" and "contrasting ideal with actual practice" (p. 56). However, it is in the affective dimension that he moves critical thinking away from reason into dispositions. This is explored later in the chapter.

Given the range of positions on critical thinking, rather than subscribe to one school of thought, I will define critical thinking as reflective judgement. This is especially important in a thesis on prejudice as it contrasts squarely with hasty judgement or, closer still to the etymology of the word prejudice, pre-judgement.

Critical thinking and prejudice

Critical thinking is clearly one avenue to consider in the voyage to reduce prejudice, at least from a cognitive perspective. "Education aimed at […] critical thinking is […] aimed at the fostering of rationality and the development of rational persons" (Siegel, 1988, p. 32).

One might say that whereas prejudice is an a priori or pre-judgement, critical thinking involves posteriori or reflective judgement.

Knowing how to judge situations and to do so well is essential for a number of reasons, one of them being autonomy: the good judge can think on his or her own feet and take executive decisions for him or herself, "critical thinking thus liberates as it renders students self-sufficient" (Siegel, 1985, p. 72). This is relevant since much theory of prejudice development relates it to social psychology and the way humans think when in groups. Clearly, there must be some degree of independence of thought for the individual to form an opinion that is not driven by socially embedded and group pressured stereotypes.

Furthermore, critical thinking, unlike prejudiced thinking, involves reflection (Lipman, 2003) and discernment in the face of information overload (Halpern & Butler, 2018), both skills that extend thought beyond the narrow parameters of simplistic over-generalisation, particularly

when it comes to detecting ideology, propaganda or prejudiced voice in media. Detecting bias in written or iconographic representations of ideas is a core skill that the critical thinker must develop to make informed opinions (although this in itself will not be enough to reduce prejudice as the individual has to work on the dispositions too and not merely intellect).

The fact that definitions of critical thinking are plural and far-reaching suggests that responses to prejudiced thinking should be similarly broad in scope and sequence: there can be no one simple approach to the prejudiced mindset that serves as an antidote. This is partly because prejudice as a construct covers numerous domains (the social, cultural, cognitive and ethical to mention just some). Therefore, an education for critical thinking so as to temper prejudicial thinking should cover the different elements of critical thinking.

However, just as prejudice can be considered a spectrum that ranges from generalisations that are substantiated, contain a kernel of truth and can be defended well - a type of sophisticated prejudice - all the way to emotionally charged sweeping stereotypes with little or no serious thought behind them – what we could call raw, low level prejudice; so too can critical thinking be looked at as a spectrum that ranges from a highly discerning, rigorous, cautious viewpoint to a fairly well substantiated, averagely argued and only partially logical position.

I would argue that whereas some element of critical thinking might contradict low level prejudice, it will take a high level of critical thinking to diffuse better argued prejudicial stances.

If we are to teach critical thinking, then the strategies employed will need to lead the learner out of a series of intuitive, unfounded responses to measured postulates and finally to wise,

considered reflections. A key tool for doing this is questioning, hence the prominence of the Socratic dialogue as a method for developing critical thinking.[12] I come back to this strategy later in the chapter.

Higher level critical thinking

In 1956, Benjamin Bloom placed evaluation (essentially judgement) at the top of his famous taxonomy of the cognitive domain. In other words, the capacity to make sound judgement was seen as the highest cognitive function. Of course, we should be careful to put this into some context as different types of thinking are necessary for different applications: evaluative thinking involves complex cognitive processes and is in this sense at the highest level. Furthermore, evaluation can be done well or poorly: it is not because it features at the apex of Bloom's original taxonomy that any form of evaluation is necessarily complex: some evaluation, particularly that used in prejudicial thinking, tends to be intuitive and undeveloped. The taxonomy was reviewed in 2001 and "creating" was allocated the highest level of the cognitive domain but evaluating was still put in second place and continued to be recognised as a sophisticated level of thinking.

The idea that sound judgement is an intellectually demanding enterprise was ratified between the 1950s and the 1980s when psychologists started to identify what is commonly known as the "executive function" of the brain. Broadbent (1958) identified parts of the brain that were devoted to controlled thought (attention, focus) as opposed to automatic functioning (stimulus response). These notions were further developed by, amongst others, Shiffrin and Schneider (1977), Posner and Snyder (1975), Shallice (1988) and Baddeley (1986) to identify the pre-frontal cortex as a domain of the brain where executive functioning matures through

---

[12] It should be noted, however, that Socrative dialogue could still be used by a prejudiced teacher and is not in itself a panacea.

developmental phases of maturation. Diamond (2013) points out how executive function involves features of thinking that are essential to understanding prejudice such as inhibitory control (selecting information for the sake of processing economy) and the masking of prejudiced thinking (the executive function of self-control means that individuals temper their behaviour, rationalise their thoughts and prevent certain ideas from turning into action).

So judging is a neurologically and cognitively sophisticated human activity, that is to be done by weighing up all the available criteria (from the Greek "kriterion" meaning standard for judgement). Critical thinking is a higher-level cognitive enterprise.

Since a core aim of any good education is to ensure that students make sound judgements, "learning to think critically is among the most desirable goals of formal schooling" (Abrami et al., 2009, p. 1102). However, this is not a straightforward or easy goal and suggests that educating for less prejudice is a cognitively challenging enterprise.

Our cognitive architecture's natural disposition to prejudice

Human beings are naturally disposed to shortcuts in their thinking (see Harari, 2014) since they are not inclined to seek disconfirming information, complex multiple identities or exceptions to the rule. "In everyday life, humans are cognitive misers, spending just enough energy to get the job done" (Dai & Sternberg, 2004, p. 27). Webster and Kruglanski have identified the "desire for predictability, preference for order and structure, discomfort with ambiguity, decisiveness, and closed-mindedness" as fundamental drivers in thinking (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994, p.1049). Thus, humans are quick to generalise predictive principles about others. For example, if one were to believe that all snakes were dangerous, it would follow simply to avoid snakes, an easy rule to adhere to, requiring no real thinking or any

degree of cognitive conflict. Under this belief, one would simply walk the other way upon seeing a snake in the vein of automatic stimulus response. If, on the other hand, one were to admit that some snakes are dangerous and some are not, it would imply that not all snakes need be avoided and that some could be approached. This is an altogether different state of affairs that activates knowledge of the different types of snake, a tiresome enterprise requiring research and in-depth knowledge, either by learning all the known types of snake by heart or developing the awareness and skills to identify distinctive features of venomous or non-venomous snakes. Under this belief, a snake in the grass could be avoided or approached. Thus, as opposed to a stimulus-response automatism, one would need to evaluate the situation, analyse the snake in question by activating prior knowledge and applying theory and then make a decision: either to avoid the snake or not. In reality, whilst most people know that some snakes are dangerous and others are not, out of ignorance and to err on the side of safety but also on the side of the least cognitive demand possible, they simply avoid all snakes.

This is a metaphor for stereotype formation: it is a short cut in thinking that involves simplification[13] and essentialism rather than careful deliberation, weighing up and informed, conscious decision-making (see Dovidio, 2014). As such, one viewpoint might be that "the real problem of intellectual education is the transformation of more or less casual curiosity and sporadic suggestions into attitudes of alert, cautious, and thorough inquiry" (Dewey, 1933, p. 181). To be critical of Dewey's statement, one might ask how realistic it is to suggest that thinking is a response to the interruption of habit – after all, many habits are socially successful and come about through habituation, they need not be interrupted by inquiry for the

---

[13] Although this simplification of information is not systematically bad as it is needed for human beings to process information in order to think.

sake of interruption. Furthermore, the pressures of time and context often make it difficult or even impossible to think carefully and deliberately about our actions.

Dispositions

This can be explained in terms of dispositional theory, meaning that humans will only develop their thinking in so far as they are ready to follow the opportunities that allow for such an enterprise. Naturally, for reasons of economy, we are disposed to seek the easier, intuitive and most heuristic paths when seeking solutions. As such, for a person to develop critical thinking habits, he or she must be disposed to take the more difficult, counter-intuitive and cognitively challenging path. For more developed accounts of the dispositional account of thinking see Baron (1985), Dewey (1922), Ennis (1986), Facione, Sanchez, Facione, & Gainen (1995), Perkins, Jay & Tishman (1993), Ritchhart (2002, 2015), and Stanovich (1999). The dispositional theory implies that educational structures must provide students with opportunities to develop their dispositions to be critical in their thinking.

A more recent expression of this idea can be found in the work of Carol Dweck (2006) who explains through her mindset theory that motivation lies at the heart of potential critical and mindful thinking, the individual embracing the "growth mindset" being more disposed to evolve in a cognitively challenging climate. The work of Ng (2018) has offered neuropsychological evidence for the soundness of Dweck's theory of mindsets but it should be noted that Yettick (2016) points out through her study that a small percentage of teachers actually feel competent to implement educational strategies that foster mindfulness.

Perkins and Ritchhart (2004) triangulate different approaches to thinking dispositions in a triad of sensitivity, inclination and ability, well represented in the following metaphor:

[Imagine the] challenge of crossing the turbulent river. To do so by rowboat, you have to notice conditions that recommend a boat, including the boat itself, the state of the weather and such (sensitivity), decide to try the boat, rather than say walking three miles to the bridge (inclination), and be able to row the boat well enough to make it (ability). (p. 359)

The theory applies to prejudice clearly by suggesting that the critical thinker who disentangles prejudiced thoughts will be able to identify the contextual pressures that lead to a prejudiced viewpoint (sensitivity), be prepared to venture into disconfirming situations and explore "Otherness" so as to potentially contradict it (inclination) and, finally, possess and develop the cognitive flexibility necessary to deal with complexity, ambiguity, polyvalence and exception (ability). This implies that if schools wish to provide students with the dispositions to tackle prejudice then the approach should triangulate these elements.

Emotions

Another point to consider when discussing thinking is the role of emotions. Paul sees the mind as an expression of the interrelated issues of thinking, feeling and seeking. He sees emotion as a predicate of thinking: "emotions, feelings, and passions of some kind or other underlie all human behavior" (Paul, 1990, p. 348).

Derryberry & Tucker (1994) suggest that, rather than emotions predicating thought, cognitive processes involve an interrelationship between various parts of the brain through which emotions play an important role: the frontal cortex (executive function and evaluation)

interacts with limbic (emotion-arousing) and subcortical (regulatory) systems as the brain processes information into thought.

Other neurobiological approaches to the role of emotions on thinking include those of Allman et al. (2001), Posner & Peterson (1990) and Posner & Rothbart (1998) who identify the anterior cingulate cortex as responsible for self-regulation, controlling emotions and other processes often associated with the prefrontal cortex such as focus, adaptability and problem solving.

Without going into more detail, we can see that the relationship between thinking and emotions is salient and needs to be reflected upon when designing educational interventions to moderate or reduce prejudicial thinking. As such, learning experiences should not try to isolate cognitive functions from emotional drivers but rather embrace the two as inextricably linked. A history lesson on slavery, the holocaust or colonisation, for example, is more likely to become meaningful to the learner if the limbic system is aroused and some emotional connections can be made rather than approaching the subject matter in a dispassionate, dry and purely intellectual fashion. Without falling into melodrama and over-simplification, enemies of the true critical thinker, the teacher must find the delicate balance between thinking and feeling to ensure that meaning-making enterprises are developed and stored.

From logical thinking to wisdom

Critical thinking as a term is not only used to describe evaluative or judgemental thinking as some authors have situated it not only in the strictly cognitive domain but also as a series of attitudes and dispositions. Paul describes a series of affective dimensions as part of critical thinking. These include

thinking independently**,** developing insight into egocentricity or sociocentricity**,** exercising fair-mindedness**,** exploring thoughts underlying feelings and feelings underlying thought, developing intellectual humility and suspending judgment**,** developing intellectual courage**,** developing intellectual good faith or integrity [and] developing intellectual perseverance. (Paul, 1990, p. 56)

Hence, one might associate with the highest levels of critical thinking ways of responding to the world that transcend logical thought and enter into the areas of wisdom and humility.

The idea that judgement relates to more than rational thought can be found in the biblical judgement of Solomon (1 Kings: 16-28) whereby the famous wise King tests two women's claim to be the true mothers of a child by suggesting that they cut the child in half, hereby unveiling the true motives of each claim. We see how judgement involves psychology, empathy, hypothetical causation, motivation and much more than pure reason.

Critical thinking in the service of prejudice

Artful, logical argument can be put to the services of a prejudiced mindset and is no guarantee in and of itself of a reduction in prejudicial thinking. Some of the more sophisticated, well-argued levels of prejudicial thinking that are published and endorsed publicly are demonstrated with fine-tuned logical postulation, substantiation and evidence. This shows that the narrow definition of critical thinking as logic is not enough to grapple with prejudice.

The rationalisation of strong antipathetic sentiments can be witnessed in recent examples of what are arguably xenophobic, sexist, homophobic, racist andIslamophobic discourses

published by journalists and academics in France such as Eric Zemmour's *Le Suicide français* (2014) and, to a lesser extent, *L'identité malheureuse* (2013) and *La seule exactitude* (2015) by Alain Finkielkraut. Zemmour and Finkielkraut's texts bemoan the decline of Western society, arguing that mass immigration has spoilt European culture and identity. Both authors also argue against same sex marriage and feel that Islam represents a civilizational contradiction to Western values.

This form of academic discourse positions itself against political correctness and argues for intellectual freedom as a hallmark of critical thinking. Indeed, some would argue that the French satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo, the victim of bombing and attacks in 2011 and shootings in 2015, was practicing a high level of critical thinking through their provocative portrayals of Mohamed. This viewpoint is premised on the notion that critical thinking must involve enough intellectual freedom for ideas, beliefs and habits to be criticised openly. Similarly, Salman Rushdie's novel *Satanic Verses* (1988) for which the author was placed under a Fatwah or Theo Van Gogh's film *Submission* (2004), for which the producer was assassinated, can be considered polemical, provocative elements of critical thinking. This approach to critical thinking plays out some of its more affirmative and provocative elements such as critiquing text, questioning beliefs, intellectual courage and recognising contradictions (Paul, 1990, p. 56). This approach to critical thinking is in line with Karl Popper's idea of "the open society […], one in which men have learned to be to some extent critical of taboos" (Popper, 1945, p. 202)[14] and the antithesis of the totalitarian, ideological state.

Critical thinking put to the services of prejudice was particularly blatant in some of the literature around the Second World War where more salient, openly anti-Semitic literature

---

[14] Again, there is an irony in quoting this passage as we are confronted with the use of the masculine pronoun to universalise human experience, something of a prejudicial habit in itself.

bestsellers logically demonstrated arguments against Judaism. These included *Bagatelles pour un massacre* (1937), *L'école des cadavres* (1938) and *Les Beaux Draps* (1941) by Louis Ferdinand Céline in France and Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (1925) in Germany, which by the end of the Second World War had sold over 10 million copies. One could argue that the essentialising of Jews in these tracts make them anything but examples of critical thinking but the point is that they all put forward logically constructed arguments and meet some of the criteria of basic logical thought in their exposition.

However, what is clearly missing in these literary productions is a sense of humanity or any shared societal legacy: arguments in the name of hate are missing the vital components of empathy and open-mindedness needed to create a balanced, emotionally intelligent view of the world. If we are to embrace a more wide-spread appreciation of critical thinking that tends towards wisdom more than mere logical criticism, with notions of suspending judgement, humility and cultural sensitivity at the centre, a quite different picture can be painted and the above mentioned artistic productions can be cited as insensitive, unwise without careful analysis of potential social consequences. Critical thinking for less prejudice must involve some gauge of sensitivity with it and cannot be considered uniquely in the narrow sense of pure logical argument.

Educational strategies to enhance critical thinking for less prejudice
What do we know about the use of critical thinking strategies in the classroom to reduce prejudice?

The literature on critical thinking has been translated into numerous educational programmes that are well known. Many focus on cognitive acceleration and, at face value, have little to do

directly with prejudice reduction Amongst these, to give a few examples only, are: Instrumental Enrichment (Feuerstein, 1980)[15], the Cognitive Acceleration through Science Education (CASE) programme (Adey, Shayer, & Yates, 1989) or the Activating Children's Thinking Skills (ACTS) for Upper Primary level learners (McGuiness et al, 1997)

More examples could be given but the point to be made is that these approaches tend to focus on cognitive acceleration in general with an emphasis on academic or philosophical issues, most often with a focus on scientific thinking. In general, science tends to play a prominent role in research and theory of cognition, perhaps because as an epistemic domain it is more straightforward to operationalise than critical thinking in the humanities and arts. If schools are to use the tenets of critical thinking to tackle prejudice, then a programme with some focus on social psychology would be useful so that students are constantly brought back to the predilection humans have for bias, over-generalisation, hasty conclusions, lazy thinking, loose associations, unsubstantiated evaluation and stereotype or prejudice confirming thought patterns. At the centre of these fallibilities in thinking is the question of working memory power and the temptation to take short cuts so as to lessen cognitive load (Kahneman, 2011). Examples of these could be evoked across all disciplines to allow students to make connections and build up a board representation of the nature of human psychology as they learn.

A programme that does this is Philosophy for Children (Lipman, 2003), whichinvolves students discussing texts as a community of inquirers whereby they can choose topics that are of interest to them and express themselves freely so as to develop competencies in three core areas (critical thinking, caring thinking and creative thinking). The main idea behind this

---

[15] There are over 80 Instrumental Enrichment training programmes in 26 countries across the globe (Feuerstein Academy, 2016).

programme that has its roots in Deweyan notions of the democratic classroom is to ensure that students are engaging in genuinely philosophical discussions as opposed to studying philosophers but not necessarily thinking for themselves. Philosophy for Children has gained success in numerous universities and schools in the UK, USA and Australia. Methodologically sound research with cautious conclusions on the effect of Philosophy for Children on Primary School learners by Siddiqui, Gorard & See (2017) suggests moderate gains in non-cognitive areas such as social communication skills and empathy, both attributes that are clearly helpful for some degree of prejudice reduction.

At the most abstract level, by synthesising the work of Diane Halpern (1997, 2002, 2014), Matthew Lipman (2003), King & Kitchener (1994), approaching the prejudiced mindset through critical thinking can happen at four fundamental levels: memory, analysis, evaluation and decision-making. These higher-order cognitive processes can be enhanced by the use of questioning (the Socratic method), argument and debate, stereotype disconfirmation and instances that evoke some realisation or understanding. Running through these processes and strategies is what Vygostsky called "scaffolding", in other words, a series of cues designed to iteratively take the learner to successively higher levels of less-prejudicial thinking. This can be considered against cognitive maturation of the individual in the vein of Piaget's theory of cognitive development and, more generally, genetic epistemology (whereby learners accommodate and assimilate new ideas through steps of equilibration) with more recent extrapolations on cognitive development by King & Kitchener (1994) and Perry (1970).

Staged development

If, as I have argued in this chapter, we are to consider critical thinking as a response to prejudiced thinking, some idea of the way that ideas progress through cognitive maturation

needs to be considered. In the various models of this idea, thinking increases in sophistication as it entertains notions of application, generalisability, multiplicity and relativism, moving from literal, absolutist views of the world to conceptual, abstract thinking.

Piaget's model of cognitive development

Piaget's theory of cognitive development has been criticised for underplaying social elements of learning (Vygotsky, 1986), focussing uniquely on logico-mathematical intelligence (Moseley et al., 2005, p. 193), assuming overarching structures of thought that have been shown by others to be domain (subject area) specific (Bidell and Fischer, 1992) and insisting on a fairly rigid series of steps as opposed to a continuum or modal fashion of learning. At the outset, therefore, one might argue that it is not a suitable model to apply to prejudice reduction.

However, his model is still the most influential representation of developmental patterns in human intelligence and allows for specific types of educational intervention to reduce prejudicial thinking at different levels of thought. One might argue that just because Piaget's view is normative, it does not necessarily hold out that it is accurate (in fact his research method has been criticised extensively for lack of inter-rater reliability and too much subjectivity in sample analysis while Vygotsky [1978] and Bruner [1966] essentially rejected the staged development model).[16] Furthermore, researchers in prejudice such as Allport and Nesdale have borrowed Piaget's structure to analyse the way that prejudice might develop in individuals as they grow.

---

[16] Dasen (1994) found that Piaget's model did not apply well to indigenous people in Australia, suggesting a cultural specificity in Piaget's work making it difficult to generalise.

Piaget's milestone 1950 publication, *The Psychology of Intelligence*, drew up the model so familiar today (see Annexe 1 of this thesis).

If we are to turn to prejudice, the implications of Piagetian theory are that the processes needed to deal with the higher order thinking elicited by prejudice deconstruction become apparent at the concrete operational stage. This is essentially because complex notions such as reciprocation, multiple identities, relativity and (accurate) generalisability are needed to activate stereotype disconfirmation and acceptance of ambiguity.

Nesdale (2004), one of the most prominent authors of the developmental patterns of ethnic prejudice in children, outlines four basic developmental levels that resonate clearly with Piaget's stages of cognitive development:

Phase 1 (0-2/3 years) - undifferentiated: here the child can differentiate colours but does not differentiate human beings by ethnicity

Phase 2 (2/3-6/7) - ethnic awareness: children start to accommodate ethnic categories into their lexical and perceptual repertoire. An important part of this phase is ethnic self-identification.

Phase 3 (6/7-11/12) – ethnic preference: the child learns and understands that (s)he is part of a particular ethnic group. This tends to lead to an ingroup bias but does not necessarily entail an outgroup dislike. Nesdale points out that social group preference is far more salient for gender than ethnicity at this stage.

Phase 4 (11/12 onwards) – ethnic prejudice: here children shift the positive ingroup sentiments that have been kindled in phase 3 towards antipathy and negative stereotyping for a given outgroup.

In sum, Nesdale uses Piaget's levels of cognitive development to chart the growth of prejudice. In a sense, therefore, he maintains Piaget's categories but contradicts the spirit of cognitive development in them by suggesting that the natural inclination is to go from an unprejudiced to a prejudiced mindset whereas Piaget's model suggests a steady decrease in prejudicial thinking (see, for example, his work with Weil on developmental approaches to reciprocity, (Piaget & Weil, 1951).

Other researchers such as Aboud (1988) are more in line with traditional Piagetian thought and suggest a decline in prejudiced thinking as cognition matures.

King and Kitchener (1994), summarising more than 30 different studies and working off Dewey's notions of reflective thought (1933, 1938) and Piaget's theory of genetic epistemology, propose a seven-stage model that was originally intended for college level students but could be used in schools. The steps take learners from pre-reflective to reflective thought in successive steps that can be used to asses and monitor progress.

King and Kitchener's model lends itself naturally to prejudice reduction as it maps well on the idea that reflection is needed to undo initial, hasty generalisations that may be prejudiced. The following application of the model shows how this might be done in a school environment.

Applying King & Kitchener's staged model to prejudice reduction

Stage	Description	Implications for prejudice reduction	Level
Stage 1	Knowledge is extremely limited and consists essentially of literal belief in unchecked observations.	Over-generalisations created from narrow base of empirical evidence	Pre-reflective thought
Stage 2	The knower discovers right and wrong and categorises information systematically in this simplistic binary system.	Grouping of individuals into camps based on over-generalisations.	
Stage 3	Knowledge begins to become more subtle – it is understood that "in some areas, knowledge is certain and authorities have knowledge. In other areas, knowledge is temporarily uncertain; only personal beliefs can be known" (Moseley et al., 2005, p.232).	Some exceptions admitted, partial acceptance of the idea that some individuals might belong to more than one camp.	
Stage 4	The knower realises that knowledge in general is not always certain but nonetheless struggles to differentiate knowledge and justification.	Admission of the tentative nature of grouping and the real possibility of individuals not belonging too rigidly to certain groups. Fairly frequent questioning of labelling but still persists in the belief that humans can be grouped socially in absolute terms.	Quasi-reflective thought
Stage 5	Knowledge is still limited to the perspective of the knower but there is some realisation that it is defined by context, as is justification.	Understanding that grouping is contingent on context and that individuals can be seen through different lenses accordingly and hence grouped differently.	
Stage 6	Still holding on to the thought that knowledge is uncertain, the knower realises that it is constructed to a large extent by evidence and opinion and that these elements are not absolute or stable but vary across contexts.	Significant deconstruction of the ideas of social categories altogether and the need for rigorous evidence before committing to labelling into generalised camps.	Reflective thought
Stage 7	Knowledge, whilst being provisional, is constructed by reason and inquiry – an idea that can be generalised	The notion of social categories is deconstructed and understood as a convention that stands on flimsy premises. Consistent challenging of	

	across contexts and domains.	labelling, desire to see each individual on the merits of character and not physical or social identity.	

King and Kitchener's model resembles Perry's developmental scheme in that it maps the development of thought from single observations and essentialism to pluralistic, relativist postulates. The implications for education against prejudice are that educators should aim to take learners up the various stages of cognitive ability that allow for increasing tolerance of relativism.

Research conducted by Guthrie, King and Palmer (2011), using a sample of 48 university students in American colleges, found, by using the reflective judgement model, that there was an inverse correlation between levels of intellect and levels of prejudice. They identified stage 4 of the reflective judgement model as the turning point where, on the one hand, participants started to search for stronger and more diverse forms of evidence to warrant their claims and on the other, they started to grapple with information at a more abstract, conceptual level. However, one needs to be circumspect in considering this as there are signs that the research methodology was not sufficiently rigorous: the experimenters "purposefully selected" 48 students (suggesting a lack of randomisation) and measured tolerance (which, technically, is not the inverse of prejudice).

Perry's developmental scheme

Perry developed a checklist of educational views that he used through a series of interviews with nearly 500 university students (Moseley et al., 2004, p. 200) to chart levels of thinking. Perry was especially interested in learners' responses to relativism and pluralism, working off the premise that increasingly sophisticated levels of thinking would involve development

from simplistic dualism to various levels of multiplicity and interrelations and finally to self-awareness and commitment to some cause or project. Perry's framework spans the cognitive and affective domains whilst taking motivation and sense of purpose into account.

His qualitative research showed that learners follow a clear sequence of development as they grow in their tolerance of multiplicity and understanding of personal agency. This sequenced development is mapped in a chart detailing nine positions: "strict dualism […]; dualism with multiplicity perceived […]; early multiplicity […]; late multiplicity […]; relational knowing […]; anticipation of commitment […]; initial commitment […]; multiple commitments [and] resolve" (Perry, 1970, pp. 10-11). As learners develop their thinking and move up the different positions, they grow out of pure thinking and understanding into action. The taxonomy is interesting because it adds a praxis to critical thinking, insisting that it is not merely a passive act of critiquing or describing but a dispositional way of reacting to and acting within the world

The nine positions can be applied to prejudiced thinking since the prejudiced mindset tends to struggle with the concept of multiplicity on the one hand and how to respond effectively and coherently to social networks and/or social causes on the other. Perry's developmental stages allow educators to monitor and advance thinking about others in increments, taking learners from essentialism to heterogeneity and finally positive action in successive steps. The figure below suggests how Perry's work might be adapted to combat prejudice:

Perry's chart of development applied to prejudiced thinking

Perry's position	Main cognitive elements	Application to prejudiced thinking	Classroom strategies

1	Absolutism, dualism, over-simplified representation	Essentialism, adherence to stereotypes and prejudicial thinking	Identifying the stereotypes and prejudices that students hold
2	Recognition but caution of multiplicity	Recognition but caution of disconfirmation (counter examples)	Providing counter-examples
3	Partial acceptance of multiplicity	More acceptance of the role and veracity of counter examples	Discussing and exploring counter-examples
4	Simplistic relativism	Surface-level breakthrough: acceptance that the prejudiced belief might be inaccurate	Allowing students articulation and reflection on their breakthrough
5	Deeper relativism, appreciation of interrelations	Identification of features unifying humanity and deconstructing difference	Learning about conceptual frameworks that transcend differences, further deconstructing divisive prejudicial ideas
6	Dawning of the notion of commitment	Feeling of personal implication in areas of social justice	Moving from identifying parts of thought as prejudice to feeling responsible for addressing areas of prejudice
7	Initial commitment	Acting on social injustice related to prejudice (such as discrimination)	Making available projects in which students can engage (community service)
8	Exploration of commitment and responsibility	Reflecting on action taken to address some form of social injustice related to prejudice (such as discrimination)	Scaffolding reflection on project-based action
9	Affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities	Discourse and/or discursive production	Student production (research, artistic, portfolio) showing stance on values and identity in the light of learning experience

Perry's nine stages were originally conceived for students in American liberal arts colleges and one might wonder on the extent of their generalisability to other domains such as prejudice. Indeed, Zhang found that Perry's stages did not apply fluidly to students in China (Zhang, 1999) although, on the other hand, Finster found it applied well to students studying

chemistry and technology (Finster, 1989, 1991). The implications of this (that the model is generalisable across domains but not cultures, somewhat similar to Dasen's 1994 criticism of Piaget's model) is that culture plays a major role in cognitive and dispositional structures. This, in turn, implies that critical thinking for less prejudice should be adapted to a local context. The table on critical thinking I include in annexe 4 of this thesis, intended as a framework for schools, makes clear that frameworks on prejudice reduction should be adapted more than simply exported.

Despite the identification of these thinking taxonomies and the implications for classroom practice that will elicit higher order thinking, critical thinking and thinking that moves away from prejudice, studies have shown that most classroom questioning and classroom talk tends to gravitate around lower-order declarative knowledge (Gall, 1984; Torrance & Pryor, 1998; Wade & Moje, 2000; Jay et al., 2017).

Implications of staged development models for educational practice across different age groups

Educators can either refer to a particular model and consider educational strategies that are appropriate or reflect upon similarities between models and design educational experiences that are aligned with the general spirit of developmental theory.

The models discussed tend to share these core elements:

1. An initial phase that involves low levels of differentiation, nuance or weighed up criteria for categorisation. This first phase of pre-social categorisation corresponds to young ages (Piaget's sensorimotor) or baseline cognitive abilities. Educational

strategies to reduce prejudice at this cognitive level are perhaps not particularly worthwhile or realistic. As this is very much the stage of discovery and initiation, educators should be careful not to plunge learners into scenarios that are either too essentialised or complex. Some simple ground rules to enhance a climate of tolerance, such as those evoked in the chapter on "understanding beyond the other" would be helpful here such as:

a. Respecting one another in the playground

b. Encouraging mixed play environments to stimulate basic principles of heterogeneity

2. An early stage of differentiation that is essentialised, simplistically dichotomous with a tendency to overgeneralise. This second stage, similar to Piaget's pre-operational, is when learners will be tempted to make judgements quickly by cutting corners and not bothering with elaborating criteria for evaluative positions or decisions. This need to judge quickly and easily is natural and is part of the human mind's search to lessen cognitive load. At this stage, educational strategies should focus on guiding students through categorisations, ensuring that the students are making those categorisations themselves but ensuring that this is done in an appropriately evaluative manner, discussing criteria for categories and entertaining notions of sub-groups and shared group members. Some examples of how this can be done include:

a. Basic work on set theory (categorical syllogisms)

b. As part of set theory, using Venn diagrams to illustrate different types of categories and how they might intersect

c. Discussion groups on similarities and differences between people that explore – at an appropriate level – core identifying features and accidental or non-essential

differentiating features – of gender, ethnicity, age and culture. The purpose of this should be to guide learners towards conclusions that are less systematically "All Xs are Ys" to postulates such as "some Xs are Ys"

3. A more considered set of social categories begins to anchor in the student as (s)he becomes aware of societal labels erected by media, family, culture and language. Generalisations are less crude and tend to be based on empirical evidence that is still, however, often overgeneralised. This corresponds roughly to Piaget's concrete operational phase of development where the maturation of the cognitive architecture is such that general principles can be established but only through the manipulation of real-life, concrete elements. As such, learners in this phase of development are at a fairly literal level of social categorisation ("every X I have met has been a Y, therefore all Xs are Ys" or "my teacher/the news/scientists/a documentary says that Xs are Ys") and need to be guided toward a more abstract approach to making knowledge claims. Educational strategies to develop more nuanced thinking at this stage of cognition include:

   a. Discussion groups that allow students to share their personal, socially related experiences and draw conclusions from them. If groups are structured in a balanced, diverse manner, this should allow for fruitful interaction, gentle disagreement and reconsideration. Teachers should be careful to scaffold these discussions subtly.

   b. Reflection on facts drawn out of humanities, particularly in subjects such as history, economics and geography where stereotype formation can grow easily if not tempered by some healthy scepticism and deliberate analysis.

c. Media analysis with a strong emphasis on audience manipulation, persuasion by argument, statistics and image, vested interests, emotive language and iconography and how the media loads on stereotypes. Students should analyse texts and images in the classroom on a regular basis and be awarded for the degree of critical thinking they are able to evoke in this analysis.

d. Some work on the idea of social categories being human constructs that are not entirely immutable. This can be done through the reading of carefully selected literature and the arts (see Chapter Two).

e. Some work towards the understanding that mathematical axioms are not pure, natural, Platonic truths but system-enabling mechanisms or givens that must be erected for consequent operations to work. Similarly, a movement towards the idea that science is not simply a series of whats and hows with laws that represent truth but more a socially constructed community of individuals that erects, through peer-reviewed research, certain arguments above others, that what we call scientific evidence is a socially valued argument connecting data (that are not stable or error-free) and theory. This is to steadily unpack unbridled, absolutists beliefs in knowledge and to move towards relativism.

4. An abstract or theoretical level of critical thinking that allows students to make valid generalisations, temper hasty judgements, evaluate various criteria for or against categorisation, and to do so in the absence of immediate empirical data but rather on principle and through deductive critical thinking. At this stage of thinking, as we see in Perry's model, the student is also moving to action and feels directly concerned by the way that society has categorised individuals. In other words, at this final, most sophisticated stage of critical thinking for less prejudice, the student has moved away

from a merely theoretical approach to social categorisation ("some Xs are Ys") to applied knowledge involving empathy whereby he or she is ready to be engaged in social justice ("Xs in this community are being treated badly because of a prejudiced belief and I want to do something about it"). This last stage, like Piaget's formal operational level of thinking, is a glass ceiling and can extend to high levels of thinking and being. Educational interventions that can enhance good thinking and action at this stage include:

a. Lessons in psychology on the nature of generalisations and how they are erected cognitively and socially, therefore an understanding of the mind's predisposition to prejudice but at a high level of analysis

b. Drawn-out, challenging debates/discussions/conferences on the construct of social identity, politics and global affairs with opportunities for interaction and sharing of ideas, opinions and positions

c. Community Service projects that allow for action

d. Pure logic (truth tables)

e. Interdisciplinary and comparative studies that allow for synthesis and comparison across historical movements and social phenomena

Ultimately, these four generic levels of critical thinking lead towards metacognitive thought. This is because the most salient way of combatting prejudice at the individual level is through a constant effort at self-regulation, self-knowledge and healthy self-doubt. The next chapter deals with the question of metacognition in detail.

Chapter Conclusion

What this chapter has shown us is that critical thinking is hard and critical thinking used in the service of thinking for less prejudice is even harder because it pushes the thinker beyond logic to wisdom, decision-making, empathy and metacognition. Schools are faced with a challenge to create learning environments that push students to rise to high levels of thinking if prejudicial thinking is to be deconstructed and reduced.

Despite the implications of critical thinking for prejudice reduction and the numerous strategies available to activate critical thinking in the classroom, experimental work (Levy 1999, Levy et al. 2004) and a handful of field experiments run on North American students (Katz & Zalk, 1978; Katz, 2000) on cognitive training suggest weak effects (Levy Paluck & Green, 2009, p. 356).

This is no doubt related to the general dearth of strong evidence for strategies to reduce prejudice other than the heavily-researched contact hypothesis and remains, therefore, a generic problem very much linked to the difficulty of operationalising prejudice or simulating experimental conditions that allow researchers to measure its presence, development or reduction. However, this should not stop schools from seeing critical thinking as a central avenue leading to prejudice reduction since the unavoidable elements of reflective thought needed to quell prejudice figure prominently in this educational design.

The next chapter of this thesis argues that schools should embrace strategies to make metacognition clear to learners as an extension of critical thinking and a means of nurturing more self-reflection and awareness of how naturally disposed to prejudice human beings are. This awareness is an important step towards reducing unreflective pre-judgement of other people and ensuring more deliberation, caution and open-mindedness.

Chapter Four: Metacognition

Metacognitive awareness is a necessary part of an education for less prejudice because it ensures that learners think and learn about themselves as active participants in the process of prejudice formation and reduction. The chapter defines metacognition before discussing research-informed aspects of prejudice when considered through the lens of metacognition. The chapter also highlights the role of self-regulation in the reduction of prejudice. Although self-regulation is not technically part of metacognition, I have dealt with it in this chapter to link it with the broader idea of knowing oneself. This includes self-reflection on the part of those who feel that they are victims of prejudice.

The implications of these findings for education are explored through recommended teaching strategies that have been studied and have the potential to create richer, more reflective thought and less thought-inhibiting anxiety. It is argued that these are necessary for effective prejudice reduction.

Introduction

If critical thinking is an important step for the individual to take to reduce prejudicial thinking then the next step, a consummation of critical thinking and meaningful application of its constituents, is metacognition. This chapter discusses metacognition by defining what metacognition is, how it relates to critical thinking, what its relevance for prejudice reduction is and, finally, how educators can design learning experiences to ensure that metacognitive learning is activated towards the reduction of prejudice.

What is metacognition?

The prefix "meta" means "after" or "beyond" in Ancient Greek, coined famously by Aristotle in his Metaphysics, a book that he composed after (hence "meta") his work entitled the "Physics". However, "meta" has come to be associated not so much with something that happens after a phenomenon but more at a higher level, describing the structural fundaments and essential properties of the thing in question. Hence, when we speak of a metalanguage, we mean a technical language that describes everyday language.

The term metacognition was coined by Flavell in 1976:

> Metacognition refers to one's knowledge concerning one's own cognitive processes and products, or anything related to them . . . For example, I am engaging in metacognition (metamemory, metalearning, metaattention, metalanguage, or whatever) if I notice that I am having more trouble learning A than B; if it strikes me that I should double-check C before accepting it as a fact . . . if I sense that I had better make a note of D because I may forget it . . . Metacognition refers, among other things, to the active monitoring and consequent regulation and orchestration of these processes . . . usually in the service of some concrete goal or objective. (Flavell, 1976, p. 232.)

Hence metacognition involves two movements: on the one hand it is thinking about thinking, more precisely knowing how to describe one's own thinking processes, and on the other hand it involves acting on thinking: self-regulation or knowing how to self-correct thinking processes. The latter can only happen if the former is in place – in other words, one cannot self-regulate and correct cognitive strategies if one does not have a mental representation of how one learns in the first place.

More recent definitions (Demetriou, 2000; Zimmerman, 2000) have not changed much since Flavell although there have been inroads into the area of metacognition to give more granularity to the concept. Frith, for instance, has distinguished between explicit, deliberate and more implicit, automatic forms of self-regulation (Firth, 2012, p. 2214) to show how implicit, automatic metacognition tends to be heavily biased and egocentric (p. 2215). This suggests that a conscious effort needs to be made if one is to consider not only how one learns and knows, but how others might view the world.

There has been much debate as to whether metacognition should be situated within cognition – as part of critical thinking – and whether the two movements entitled in metacognition described above (self-knowledge and self-regulation) can be dissociated (for more discussion see Zeidner, Boekaerts and Pintrich, 2000; Ashman and Conway, 1997 and/or Zimmerman, 2000). For the purposes of this chapter, metacognition will be considered as distinct from critical thinking because the emphasis is on self-knowledge and the capacity to act on thinking strategies, both vital for prejudice reduction and entirely worthy of separate, dedicated discussion.

The importance of metacognition for effective leaning has been pointed out by numerous studies going back to the 70s (for example, Chase and Simon, 1973; Chi, Glaser, & Rees, 1982; Chi & Koeske, 1983; Glaser, 1992). Upon studying the way that different learners go about organising information, researchers have identified patterns that lead us to believe that some approaches are more efficient and productive than others. In essence, the process of learning can be divided into techniques that are termed novice or expert (Pellegrino, Chudowski & Glaser, 2001).

Novice learners will not have any particular strategy to learn and will make their way through new information intuitively, through trial and error, with more or less success as they deal with isolated facts with no experience of any repertoire from which to draw examples. Critically, novice learners will struggle to organise information into schemata (conceptual frameworks) and will therefore spend much more psychic energy as they try to learn seemingly dissociated elements one by one rather than connected parts of a system. Information will therefore be encoded and retrieved with some difficulty, placing increasing cognitive load on working memory. Expert learners, on the other hand, have developed mental schemata that allow for rapid, fluent information encoding and retrieval (see Hatano, 1990 and Pellegrino, Chudowski & Glaser, 2001, p. 73).

Therefore, educational practice should lead students to strategies that allow for fluent, expert-type information encoding and retrieval. These involve "knowing when to apply a procedure or rule, predicting the correctness or outcomes of an action, planning ahead, and efficiently apportioning cognitive resources and time. This capability for self-regulation and self-instruction enables advanced learners to profit a great deal from work and practice by themselves and in group efforts" (p. 78).

The implications of expert learner strategies for problem solving are that they tend to be linked to a domain and are not generic, subjectless skills: examples of expert practice tend to come from specialists in well-defined fields that incorporate a set of epistemic approaches (physicists, chess players, musicians, athletes). It is for this reason that many researchers suggest that generic courses in critical thinking are less effective than critical thinking assessments embedded in specific domains (for more discussion on this, see NRC, 1999).

Furthermore, evidence has been drawn up to suggest that metacognitive skilfulness, as opposed to lower-order natural maturation, develops over the time spent at school (Karmiloff-Smith, 1979) and that it can be taught at school. When it comes to reducing prejudice, metacognitive strategies can be used to deal with over-generalisation, hasty conclusions, unwarranted judgement of others, bias, refusal to encode disconfirming information, strong emotional responses to social situations, feelings of threat and insecurity, rigidity and a compulsion to hold on to beliefs about other people.

These skills can be taught through traditional subjects. For example, students can be made aware of overgeneralising findings in pure sciences or the social sciences not uniquely in terms of the scientific method but in such a way that they can make connections with overgeneralising about people. The problem of confirmation bias can be discussed in a science classroom with real-life connections to social situations. Another way of nurturing metacognitive awareness through a subject that can have implications for the understanding of prejudice in general is in history where issues of bias and sentiments of threat and insecurity can be analysed historically and connected to contemporary or learner-centred real-life scenarios. The aim of this conceptual approach is to equip students with the skills and knowledge to generalise what has been learnt and apply it to real-life situations. This could also be done, perhaps in more depth through a course with an entire focus entirely dedicated to the construction of "Others" such as social psychology, cultural studies, sociology, ethnology or theory of knowledge.

There are also general educational messages that should be sent to learners that can allow for less stereotype threat (which means viewing oneself through a stereotype and fearing that

others view oneself in such a stereotypical manner). A fairly rigorous study involving

randomisation and multiple screening for intervention contamination as well as confounding

factors was done on Black K-12 students in the United States by Aronson, Cohen &

McColesky (2009). They came away with the following metacognition-related

recommendations:

- Reinforce for students the idea that intelligence is expandable and, like a muscle,
  grows stronger when worked.

- Teach students that their difficulties in school are often part of a normal "learning
  curve" or adjustment process, rather than something unique to them or their racial
  group.

- Help students reflect on other values in their lives beyond school that are sources of
  selfworth for them. (p. 4)

Relevance for prejudice reduction

There are numerous parallels to be drawn between the design of prejudice reduction and the

enterprise of metacognition. Firstly, metacognitively fluent problem solvers will be open to

try different strategies if any one does not work whereas novice learners will push their

thinking more emphatically into a single strategic approach even after it has failed

(Pellegrino, Chudowski & Glaser, 2001, p. 78).

A parallel can be drawn here as a prejudiced mindset will tend to hold on to a belief about a

group rigidly and show reluctance to change position, even in the light of disconfirming

evidence (Stephan, 1989). To illustrate, we might imagine someone trying to understand how

the great pyramid was built. A metacognitive thinker would systematically run through

different options (pulleys, hydraulic pressure, gradients, scaffolding) and not merely settle on one hypothesis and insist on that no matter what disconfirmation was produced. Similarly, if someone was exposed to displeasing behaviour by a member of a group and was a poor metacognitive thinker, he or she would generalise quickly and attribute the behaviour to all members of the group and reject any disconfirmation whereas a metacognitive thinker would seek for various explanations for the behaviour in question (individual temperament, provocation, situation, context, point of view, etc.).

Therefore, educational strategies that encourage cognitive flexibility and the willingness to approach knowledge issues from different perspectives will equip learners with the means to consider people and groups from more than one single, entrenched position, hereby opening less monomaniac and more heterogeneous, less prejudice-prone paths of judgement and decision-making.

Secondly, metacognition involves the ability to stand back from oneself so to speak and evaluate one's own thinking and progress: the metacognitively apt learner will have some understanding of the way that she or he thinks and solves problems and, if operating at a high level of metacognition, will be able to continually reflect on the way that she or he thinks, recognising and evaluating thinking strategies. When considering prejudice, the individual working towards a reduction in prejudicial thinking should be cognisant of the way that she or he approaches situations and should be able to evaluate the extent to which his or her assumptions are prejudiced or not.

To give an example of this parallel, an expert mathematics learner will be able to analyse her/his performance on an assessment by judging the accuracy and relevance of his/her

working ("here I was trying to solve the problem through arithmetic rules and struggled to find the correct response whereas here I was working at a more elegant level by designing an equation and could thus check my answers easily and therefore came up with the correct answer more effectively). Similarly, if we turn to social interactions that might incur a prejudiced response, someone operating at face value might say "I saw an X and wanted to get away because I don't like Xs" whereas a metacognitive thinker might say "I saw X and wanted to get away because I don't like Xs but this was a prejudiced reaction on my part and I should have exercised more open-mindedness. I think that the reason why I responded that way was because …"

The importance of self-regulation

If prejudice is to be reduced, then the learner must find ways of standing outside of her/his own thinking to realise how thinking itself happens so as to self-regulate. This must involve a deeper reflective process than mere suppression justification (where suppressed prejudice incubates and then manifests itself in a less polemical or socially judged arena).

Whatever the approach, it is clear that if individuals are to temper prejudicial thoughts when they arise in the mind, they will need a repertoire of concepts to identify, understand and act on their own thinking. To recognise prejudice within oneself, a high level of self-awareness is needed with particularly acute knowledge of cognitive architecture and the dynamics of information processing. "Self-regulation involves cognitive, motivational, affective and behavioural components that enable individuals to adjust their actions and/or their goals in order to achieve desired results in changing environmental circumstances" (Moseley et al., 2005, p. 14).

An important element of self-regulation is motivation. When dealing with prejudice, individuals need to go further than merely think about situations or understand the underpinnings of logical constructions as they do so, they need to employ a certain desire to overcome emotionally-driven and socially influenced temptations, look inwards and formulate opinions that are sound. As such, metacognition implies a more active part of critical thinking that leads to decision-making

In Pintrich's model of self-regulated learning (2000), much emphasis is placed on motivation as a part of metacognition: part of the enterprise of knowing oneself as a learner is understanding the role of motivation in the learning process and believing in one's ability to tackle and solve a problem (Bandura, 1997). A significant difference between the enterprise to reduce prejudice and mastering a more traditional, academic domain such as a subject (mathematics, sciences, languages, etc.) is the question of motivation since there are extrinsic pressures on learners to learn subjects and perform well on assessments but there is no real impetus to reduce one's prejudice other than the importance placed on such a design by society or an institution. This therefore leaves schools with the supplementary challenge of raising student motivation to wrestle with prejudice without this necessarily being recognised as a socially important objective.

The desire to improve one's thinking is also a question of patience as it has been argued that arriving at the most elegant problem-solving techniques is by no means a straightforward process but one that requires time and a certain necessary amount of trial and error. Kaiser, Proffitt, and McCloskey (1985) have shown that children go through a number of stages of thinking before they cross the bridge from erroneous to efficient and productive problem-solving. Fay and Klahr (1996) suggest that this involves the learner employing strategies that

are partially correct or only operate in a specific context as he or she makes his way to better thinking. In order to correct the mistakes in thinking strategies, practice and time is needed.

Time and practice is also needed before young learners are able to see how one strategy can be transferred to a different type of problem. Siegler's study of transfer (1998) has shown how practice not only allows children to get better at generalising problem-solving strategies but that it leads to them developing new, untaught strategies.

This implies that teachers should be willing to let students approach problems not only in different ways but over an extended series of applications. This is to ensure that enough time is being put aside for problem-solving strategies to crystallise in the learner's mind.

In a similar vein, if educational systems are to support students as they discover ways of reducing prejudice and disentangle stereotypes and over-generalisations, effort and patience must be put into the process so that students are able to go back over their experiences reiteratively as they begin to approach a balanced approach to others and become metacognitively aware of this. There can be no quick fix solution to reducing prejudice: the metacognitively reflective approach to prejudice is a drawn out process and educational scaffolding must take this into account.

Know Thyself

For students to undo some of their prejudiced thoughts, they need to be aware of them in the first place (see Lysaker et al., 2013, for more on how metacognition involves representations of one's own thinking). Some experiments requiring participants to reflect consciously on instances of their own prejudiced thinking have yielded results. For example, Son Hing et al.

(2002) found a positive correlation between participants' implicit association test scores on prejudice to Asian people and feelings of guilt over memories of prejudiced behaviours towards those groups. "Whereas high-prejudice persons are likely to have personal beliefs that overlap substantially with the cultural stereotype, low-prejudice persons have decided that the stereotype is an inappropriate basis for behaviour or evaluation and experience a conflict between the automatically activated stereotype and their personal beliefs" (Devine, 1989).

Suppression-justification

However, becoming aware of one's prejudices or stereotypic beliefs is an extremely complex affair since few are happy to admit such thinking patterns in their own profiles. Crandall and Eshleman (2003) have shown how many stereotypes are not socially acceptable (racist, sexist or homophobic stereotypes in particular) and therefore lead subjects to suppress their prejudiced inclinations. This in turn leads to one of three possible scenarios: either a type of systematic prejudice-suppression or self-imposed thought control (see Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010) or, more complex, a need to expiate the frustration caused by such externally forced self-suppression through other, more socially accepted forms of prejudice (for example, generalisations or hate speech against child abusers) – see Dovidio & Mullen, 1992; Esses, Dietz, & Bhardwaj, 2006; Norton, Vandello & Darley, 2004. To give an example of this phenomenon, we might imagine someone harbouring strong anti-Semitic feelings realising that such a position is not socially acceptable and therefore suppressing these sentiments, becoming overwhelmed at the frustration of keeping these views quiet and consequently erupting into excessive judgement of less polemical targets of prejudice such as drug addicts or criminals. This form of suppression-justification is, in effect, a form of prejudice that hides another. This reminds us of the difficulty of attempting to measure prejudice since its manifestations will often either be hidden or redirected.

Suppressing prejudiced feelings is not a metacognitive solution, however, as it implies a type of politically correct thought control that is disingenuous and unsustainable. The aim of a deep educational response to prejudice is not merely to lead to systematic inhibition or occulting but for individuals to have the cognitive strategies at their disposal to make sufficiently reflective judgements and to endorse their thoughts and beliefs fully.

In order to deconstruct prejudicial thinking deeply, it must be approached at a structural, metacognitive level which allows the thinker to identify decision making, trait association, prediction of human behaviour and human categorisation in an abstract, metacognitive manner. This is important because on the one hand it allows a generalisable, conceptual framework that enhances understanding of prejudice at a profound level (as opposed to a superficial level dealing with effects rather than causes) and, on the other hand, means that individuals make judgements about other people with some degree of hindsight, self-criticism and awareness of their own perspective.

In a detailed discussion of the role of metacognitive reasoning in stereotype and prejudice formation, Yzerbyt & Demoulin (2010) point to entity (Lickel et al., 2000; Hamilton, 2007) versus incremental (Chiu, Hong & Dweck, 1997; Dweck, Hong & Chiu, 1993) theories of personality traits as playing a fundamental role:

> Whereas entity theorists believe that personal attributes are fixed, incremental theorists are convinced that traits are malleable. Several studies found that entity theorists make stronger trait inferences from behaviour and use traits or trait-relevant information to make stronger future behavioural predictions than incrementalists. […] Peoples'

implicit theories about the fixedness versus malleability of human attributes predict

differences in social stereotyping. (p. 12)

The idea could be seen as similar to Dweck's model of growth versus fixed mindsets which

suggest that more prejudiced ways of thinking tend to be rigid and essentialist whereas a more

open-minded disposition that accepts challenge, change and risk will be more lightly to undo

or relativise prejudiced thinking.

Educational strategies that allow students to look back at their own thinking and identify

elements of incrementalist or entitative processes will be dealing with the root cognitive

causes of stereotype formation rather than the surface, symptoms and manifestations. This

suggests educating students to use a repertoire of concepts and terms that will allow them to

critique their own thinking and identify their own styles of thinking and assumption-making

tendencies.

Houghton (2010) conducted a 9 month long action research project with 36 Japanese

university students in which they were guided through various steps to not only better

understand the nature of stereotypes but to reflect on them in written and oral tasks, designing

questionnaires to administer to "a foreigner about their values" (p. 187). The main idea behind

this qualitative research methodology was for participants to build up an understanding of

stereotypes iteratively through different pathways (written composition, reading of theory,

questionnaire design, interview) and to come back to their own stereotypic formations

constantly throughout the process.

Houghton concludes by pointing out the centrality of "the awareness of one's own cognitive processes and the ability to take conscious control of one's own cognitive tendencies in the process of understanding stereotypes" (p. 194). Much of this is done through comparing and contrasting mental representations with reality and hereby gaining metacognitive awareness of the relationship between the two.

The research design of Houghton's study should be looked at with some criticality however: this was classroom research using a grounded coding process of emerging themes that was not described. This does not mean that the study's findings should not be taken into account, but it does mean that the results should be analysed with caution.

This leaves education with the challenge of designing learning experiences that will lead students to reflect on the way that categorising tendencies in thinking quickly lead to stereotypes. Students should be aware of stereotype formation in order to master and relativise it when it takes place in their own thinking. Learners should be brought to understand that stereotypes, on the one hand, are "useful and important aspect of intelligent and efficient thinking" (Brislin, 1986, p. 44) but on the other hand, they can become harmful when used on human beings. For example, "a gender stereotype is harmful when it limits women's and men's capacity to develop their personal abilities, pursue their professional careers and make choices about their lives and life plans" (UNHR, 2018).

Metacognition and feelings of prejudice against the self
Up until now, this thesis has focussed on prejudice as a way of thinking about other groups or individuals. However, an important part of the universe of prejudice is how one perceives oneself and to what extent one believes that a prejudiced view is being used to define and

categorise oneself. Indeed, one of the more pernicious effects of prejudice is self-denigration, lack of confidence and even self-hatred that can be caused by "buying in" to prejudiced beliefs and either believing that they exist (when they might not or in any case might exist to a lesser degree than what is believed) or, at a more radical level, turning them against oneself.

To break this down into two workable concepts, I will turn to research on stereotypes: on the one hand, there is what are known as "meta-stereotypes", namely stereotypes about stereotypes or more clearly, a generalisation about a view others purportedly have about the self ("All Xs think that I'm Y just because I'm a Z. This is because all Xs think that Zs are Ys"). Meta-stereotypes can lead to feelings of paranoia and victimisation. On the other hand, there is what is called "stereotype threat" (Steele, 2018), meaning the perception that one is being viewed or assessed in a stereotypical manner and acting accordingly, usually with heightened anxiety and sensitivity and, consequently, less efficacy.

Investigating various facets of this complex psychological interplay suggests educational pathways to take so as to bring the victims and/or perceived victims of prejudice to a higher level of metacognitive awareness and therefore, intellectual freedom. A metacognitive approach (in other words, an approach that makes the phenomena of meta-stereotypes and stereotype threat salient and, further, allows the individual strategies to act on this knowledge) can lead to a more mindful, focussed and emotionally satisfying approach.

Meta-Stereotypes

Sigelman and Tuch (1997) introduced this term to describe people's beliefs about outgroup members' stereotypes concerning their ingroup. If students are to engage with prejudice at a

sophisticated level, some understanding of how individuals and groups relate to prejudice against themselves is necessary.

Although one might assume identical stereotype representations when perceived by ingroup members of themselves and in relation to outgroups (for example, "I'm an X, I believe that Xs are Ys, therefore people outside my group also believe that Xs are Ys"), in reality this is rarely the case. Coherent with Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and studies by Cuddy et al. (2008) and Van den Bos & Stapel (2009), more negative valence is attributed to outgroup members than ingroup members. This leads to contradictions whereby ingroup members will be less prone to endorse stereotypes supposedly held by an outgroup about their own ingroup when these are negative but will be more prone to accept them if they are positive. So the relationship between meta-stereotypes and stereotypes is not a linear or simple one.

Furthermore, as shown by Frey and Tropp (2006), there is a general tendency to assume that stereotypes of ingroups from the outside (or outgroups) are systematically negative. Judd et al. (2005) have synthesised numerous studies that show how individuals tend to exaggerate prejudiced generalisations about themselves when generated by outgroups. There is, perhaps, something of a tendency for the victims of prejudice to assume a maximum amount of prejudiced thinking about them when in reality the phenomenon may be more dispersed and fragmented than one would assume. Lammers et al. (2008) have shown how low status minority groups tend to perceive negative stereotypes against them to a greater degree than other groups do.

Meta-stereotyping can lead to more polarisation, avoidance, less communications and a taller, sturdier wall of division between groups. On the other hand, it can also lead to "impression management strategies" (Yzerbyt & Demoulin, 2010, p. 23) whereby members of groups (Yzerbyt & Demoulin discuss racial groups to elucidate the theory), when in the company of members of another group, will act up to assumed stereotypes by seeking to disconfirm them in the way they behave: they "spontaneously frame the interaction in terms of how they are perceived by outgroup members" (Vorauer, Hunter, Main, & Roy, 2000, p. 691).

Educational strategies aimed at reducing prejudice need to lead students away from the assumptions they have about outgroups' prejudices of themselves as these may or may not be true and are worthy of the same critical investigation and evidence-based argumentation as direct acts or utterances of prejudice.

At a metacognitive level, therefore, prejudice should be viewed as a dynamic phenomenon involving two parties whereby assumptions are made on either side of the interaction: prejudice is by no means a simple one-way street with a prejudiced person on one end and a victim of prejudice on the other. One powerful metaphor to unpack the complex interplay involved in the act of perception and how this can affect prejudice, is Lacan's 1955 "Schema L" (Lacan, 1977) to represent imaginary and unconscious relations. Lacan's schema describes just how complex human interaction is. Whilst intuitively we might think that one person perceives another in a relatively straightforward manner, the schema suggests that perception is actually made up of multiple components. The real self ("Me" with a capital "M") and his/her interlocutor (the "Other" with a capital "O") have an unconscious relation that is primarily out of awareness, driven by impulses, desires or fears. Whilst this "real" relation is subconscious, people communicate through an imaginary relation whereby the ego (or "me"

with a small "m") responds not to a real "Other" but to the imaginary "other" in his or her world view (an "other" with a small "o"). This imaginary relationship takes place through a communication line that is in awareness and it made up of language, stereotypes and cultural norms. In other words, two people never communicate directly but always through the representations they have of one another in their minds.

Lacan's work is helpful and accurate in what it suggests about stereotype and, by extension, prejudice formation. Hook (2008) points out how his notion of the "Other" creates hitherto relatively unexploited openings for social psychology

A metacognitive analysis of prejudice and stereotypes should involve some understanding that each individual in a conversation or interaction holds on to stereotypic and possibly prejudiced representations of one another that may or may not be true and that this interactive set-up takes place against more oblique, subconscious modes of interaction. This also means that humans can be prejudiced in subconscious and conscious ways

In order to accept this complex representation of human interaction, the student must be willing to tolerate high levels of ambiguity, paradox, uncertainty and double meaning.

Stereotype Threat as an inhibitor to performance

Studies by Steele & Aronson (1995), Marx (2011) and Schmader et al. (2008) – to mention a few – have shown how individuals can perform below par if they feel threatened by stereotypes. Furthermore, research has shown that individuals tend to avoid admitting to stereotypic behaviours when operating in pressurised environments. For example, Steele & Aronson have reported that when Black people are involved in intelligence testing scenarios,

and therefore feel subjected to a certain amount of pressure and scrutiny, they tend to report less openly on stereotypic behaviours involving sports and music. Similarly, Pronin, Steele, & Ross (2004) have shown that when women are majoring in traditionally male-dominated high-stakes subjects such as science and maths, they report dressing in less obviously feminine ways.

A number of neuroscientific experiments have confirmed that minority groups will react particularly, usually with heightened sensitivity and anxiety, when under the belief that they are being assessed on stereotype-related phenomena (Forbes, Schmader, & Allen, 2008; Gehring et al., 1993 and Hajcak, McDonald, & Simons, 2003). It is important to note that this usually occurs subconsciously. Forbes, Schmader, & Allen (2008), referring to a host of studies including findings in neuroscientific experiments, show how groups of African American students tend to disengage from academic feedback through devaluing feedback or discounting it as a buffer to their self-esteem. This is because groups of Black learners often grow up in tacitly or openly racist institutionalised cultures that view them in prejudiced ways, as academically or performatively inferior. Disengagement, in these contexts, becomes a defence mechanism.

It should be noted that studies have not always shown this to be the case. A rigorous study of how a minority group responds to stereotype threat is Pennington, Kaye & McCann's 2018 study of how female gamers respond in a male-dominated, stereotype-driven environment. Screened participants were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions and told to game with information that was given to them beforehand, in two conditions about women typically being outperformed by men (but in slightly different ways) and in the third, with no such indication. A second experiment was run whereby female players were observed

by female or male individuals. The findings in both experiments suggested little impact on gaming performance. One would hope that this is some indication of stronger mindsets among female gamers that are increasingly resilient to prejudiced views against them, but the authors of the study cautiously advocate for more research to be done in the field, particularly in real life gaming settings since there is a male-dominant stereotype in the domain (see Paaßen, Morgenroth, & Stratemeyer, 2016).

One might be tempted to compare the results of African American college students with female gamers but caution is needed. The important point to be made is that stereotype threat is a factor in learning that should be recognised and grappled with in educational settings.

Therefore, part of the mission of an education for less prejudice is to empower students to free themselves of the performance inhibiting affects caused by anxiety so that they can become more metacognitively aware of them and develop strategies to counter such underperformance.

Interestingly, increasing effort in the face of stereotype threat does not necessarily decrease performance outright, especially when tasks are subtle and cognitively demanding. Jamieson and Harkins (2007) conducted research on women involved in an antisaccade task (meaning that they were meant to detract their vision from a distractor on a computer screen). They found that when the women in the treatment group were told that the test was a measure of visuospatial and mathematical ability and that the results were linked to maths ability where there were gender differences, results were lower than they were in the control group where participants were told that there were no gender differences in maths ability. However, the tendency to autocorrect after an initial distraction was higher in the treatment group. This

suggests that stereotype threat creates an anxiety that impedes on performance but at the same time can lead to a higher level of self-regulation.

Further research by Schmader and Johns (2003), Beilock et al. (2007) and Croizet et al. (2004) shows that working memory is impaired in subjects under stereotype threat. More specifically, the central executive of working memory tends to become saturated, hence depleting that function's ability to make connections between information held in phonological loops, the visual sketchpad and long-term memory (see Baddeley's 2000 multicomponent model of working memory). In other words, subjects under stereotype threat experience cognitive overload. Some research suggests that impairment is particularly acute in verbal working memory (Miyake & Shah, 1999; Rapee, 1993).

In reference to work conducted by Cadinu et al. (2005), Inzlicht & Schmader (2001) point out that "women performing difficult math problems after being told that gender differences in math exist had more negative math-related thoughts and performed more poorly than did women who did not receive this information" (p. 7).

Implications for educational strategy

The research on stereotype threat points out a number of directions for educational institutions to consider. In the first place, scores on psychometric tests, admissions assessments and other ego-related tests should be considered with the hindsight offered by the literature: we know that minority groups or individuals belonging to groups that suffer from prejudice have to cope with supplementary cognitive load created by stereotype threat. This is not to say that fear and anxiety are the exclusive domain of victims of prejudice but nonetheless, test scores on assessments that might entail stereotype threat cannot be taken at face value alone.

Secondly, research findings on the relationship between stereotype threat and impaired

performance should be broadcast more widely so that students are aware of them and can be

coached to develop coping strategies. Merely knowing about the effects of stereotype beliefs

on performance can improve results: Johns, Schmader, & Martens (2005) have shown how

women taught about stereotype threat effects on performance performed better on

mathematical assessments because they were able to relativise their anxiety and approach

tasks with more mindfulness.

Thirdly, at the broadest level, student need to be taught to approach anxiety and stress as

drivers and not distractors, to learn to live with them and harness them so that performance

does not suffer because of subconscious corollaries. Again, the act of knowing about

cognition (metacognition) gives learners more control over their learning, more self-

confidence and greater serenity when engaged in tasks.

At this point, the role of the teacher in these educational strategies to use metacognition to

reduce prejudice will be investigated.

The role of the teacher in teaching metacognitive prejudice reduction

The teacher's role in guiding students towards self-aware, self-monitoring strategies to

monitor and reduce prejudice, an innovative approach to instruction and assessment is needed.

Three core instructional techniques should be considered:

Modelling metacognition as a co-learner

"If teachers are to help students become self-regulated learners, their own self-regulation has to be unleashed as well. Traditional design theories of instruction run the risk of interfering with rather than supporting this goal" (Corno & Randi, 1999, p. 296). Teachers should be willing to share their own thoughts, assumptions, beliefs and how they are not only willing to put these in parentheses, doubt and questioning but share with students examples of how they were able to change their thoughts, shift strategy and deconstruct prejudicial thoughts at a personal level, through lived experiences.

A "sage on the stage" approach whereby the theory of prejudice formation is lectured and moral lessons are given on why one should not be prejudiced might lead students to feel disconnected from the importance of the subject and, worse, resentful of it as it will appear as a homily given in an unappetising ex-cathedra manner. The co-constructivist model suggests that learning to learn is "a complex mix of dispositions, lived experiences, social relations, values, attitudes and beliefs that coalesce to shape the nature of an individual's engagement with any particular learning opportunity of individual students" (Deakin Crick, Broadfoot & Claxton 2006). Good examples of social constructivism that allow students to take ownership of the learning process can be found in Ritchhart (2015).

Therefore, an education that stimulates metacognition for less prejudice should involve a collaborative ethos whereby experiences are shared and reflected upon by the group. A clear example of this type of practice is Matthew Lipman's "community of inquiry" used to develop philosophy for children:

the teacher's main role is that of a cultivator of judgment who transcends rather than rejects right–wrong answers in the sense of caring more for the process of inquiry itself than the answer that might be right or wrong at a given time. It is the behaviour of such a teacher . . . that is especially cherished . . . it has an integrity they are quick to appreciate. (Lipman, 2003, p. 219)

This co-constructivist strategy to reduce prejudice where the teacher is there to guide reflection rather than teach subject matter explicitly has been investigated in the form of cooperative learning, a philosophy of education whereby "lessons are engineered so that students must teach and learn from one another" (Levy Paluck & Green, 2009, p. 352). Johnson & Johnson (1989) conducted meta-analyses on the effects of cooperative learning and found positive outcomes for behaviours related to prejudice-reduction such as positive peer relationships and helpfulness.

At a broad, structural level, a learning environment whereby students discuss the way they build up knowledge will allow for a free exchange of learning strategies, beliefs and mental constructs, allowing for students to learn from each other and to reflect upon their own learning strategies in the light of their peers' experiences. Constructivist educational philosophy postulates that this manner of building up knowledge is more effective at consolidating learning amongst students than more traditional didactic methods. This is particularly relevant for learning related to prejudice given the fact that each learner appropriates representations of other groups and individuals that are anchored in experience and individual context – as such students should share their thoughts as a community of learners to at once articulate their beliefs and learn from others' examples. However, to be sure that such an exercise does not merely reinforce stereotypes and prejudicial thinking, the

facilitation of these learning environments needs to be carefully scaffolded so that assumptions are questioned and prejudices unpacked in a mindful fashion. Some examples of how this can be done are given below.

Think Aloud Protocols

Think-aloud protocols (Ericsson and Simon, 1984) mean that when the learner is engaged in a task (s)he verbalises the different steps that are being taken so that the teacher or peer who is listening gets an idea of the thought processes behind the actions that are taken.

For example, a student using a think-aloud protocol when engaged in a simple chemistry experiment would tell the teacher what (s)he was doing as (s)he went along, saying things like "Now I'm rinsing each cup with distilled water to make sure there is no distortion of the pH value due to what was in there before. I'm labelling each cup and now I'm pouring ½ a cup of distilled water into each cup. Next, I take ½ a teaspoon of ammonia in this cup, ½ a teaspoon of vinegar in this one and I leave the third one with the distilled water. The reason why I do this is because I want to test the comparative pH values of each of these liquids. Oh yes and I make sure that the spoon is clean etc.".

The teacher's role in think-aloud protocols is to intervene when the student does something unusual or incorrect with questions such as:

"why would you do that?

"what would you want to show by doing that?"

"what if you did it another way?"

The think-aloud protocol can be managed in different ways: it may be too time-consuming for the teacher to go through the steps with each individual student, in which case students could be organised in small groups and, one by one, be asked to explain to the rest of the group what they were doing. The students in the group would ask questions and give feedback to the student doing the think-aloud thought processes, the teacher would roam and observe the groups, adding questions where appropriate. The student doing the think aloud would change each time the teacher would make a signal (clap hands, say something or ring a bell).

To use this method for the services of metacognitive prejudice-reduction, teachers could organise discussion groups centred on particular themes evoked in a stimulus (for example, an advert, piece of writing, website, image or extract from a film). Students could discuss how they reacted to the stimulus by breaking down their thoughts through a think-aloud protocol. Alternatively, students could explain the different levels of stereotyping and/or prejudice evocation embedded in the stimulus by sharing their thoughts verbally ("I noticed that X is represented in such and such a way, that such and such an argument is made to discredit him/her, that such and such a series of fears/anxieties about X is triggered through the use of such and such a type of language/imagery").

Levy Paluck & Green (2009) report that "training in complex thinking and in statistical logic, with the hypothesis that this will help individuals avoid faulty group generalizations […] claim modest success" but go on to cite Gardiner (1972) and Schaller et al. (1996) to explain that "after training, students are more likely to write positive stories about a picture depicting an interracial encounter, to report friendliness toward racial and ethnic out-groups […] and to avoid stereotyping fictitious characters presented in a vignette" (p. 347).

As is the case with metacognition in general as opposed to domain-specific performance, what is of particular importance is not so much the mental product created at the end of the learning encounter (in this instance "complex thinking") but the process used to achieve such an aim and the extent to which this process is verbalised, conceptualised and understood.

Classroom Discussion

Think aloud protocols can be put to the service of prejudice reduction by ensuring that students discuss their experiences, beliefs and fears concerning prejudice. The simple act of discussing prejudice freely is a productive step towards its reduction.

Studies by Rokeach (1971) showed how no more than half an hour of open discussion about prejudice-related matters such as attitudes, beliefs and social justice by university students translated into them demonstrating awareness and support for civil rights as much as a year later. For more details see Plous (2002, p. 23).

This is part of the educational philosophy that sees talk as the foundation of learning. When a teacher asks a question and the students answer, there needs to be careful follow-up to make sure that ideas are fully expressed and justified. One of the simplest principles of metacognitive learning is making sure that there is genuine conversation in the classroom, what we could call "dialogic teaching" (Alexander, 2006), meaning that talk is valorised and recognised as the main foundation of learning.

Swan & Pead (2008) suggest cues that teachers can use to ensure that students are clarifying their thoughts: to "ask pupils to repeat their explanation" for example, teachers would ask "can you just say that again?" or to "invite pupils to elaborate", teachers would say "can you

just say a little more about that …" . To view a table of classroom questions adapted from Swan & Pead that will cause some reflection on prejudice, see Annexe 2 of this thesis.

Transfer of Knowledge

One of the core purposes of metacognition is to give students sufficient mental representation of knowledge construction and the way they learn in different domains for them to become adequately self-regulatory to not only self-correct in specific domains but transfer problem-solving strategies from one domain to the next. This is particularly important when it comes to reducing prejudice since prejudiced views can emerge in many different guises and contexts. A metacognitively aware student combatting prejudice should be able to recognise its fundamental tenets whether expressed in the well-known forms of racism, homophobia, sexism and religious bigotry or more subtle forms such as class snobbery, ageism, and positions held against political groups, professions or levels of education.

However, research has shown that knowledge does not transfer easily (Lave, 1988; Bassok and Holyoak, 1989; Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1997; Ritchhart & Perkins, 2005) and does not happen of its own accord. Much of what we learn is highly specific and enclosed in a context. Furthermore, this domain-specific closure of knowledge is reinforced by the silo approach to learning that is still the case in institutions where there are few interdisciplinary projects or courses that span knowledge from different epistemes.

Concretely, if students are taught to master a discipline, they will not necessarily transfer what they have learnt to other domains. Transfer needs to be taught discretely and purposefully. As Pellegrino, Chudowsky and Glaser put it:

Transfer depends on the development of an explicit understanding of when to apply what has been learned. Assessments of academic achievement need to consider carefully the knowledge and skills required to understand and answer a question or solve a problem, including the context in which it is presented, and whether an assessment task or situation is functioning as a test of near, far, or zero transfer. (2001, pp 91-92).

An effective way in which transfer can be developed is through concepts-focussed instruction, something I discuss in more detail in chapter seven of this thesis.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has explored metacognition as an extension of critical thinking and a vital conjugation of cognitive processes to ensure a self-aware, self-regulatory approach to prejudice, be it perceptions of prejudiced thoughts against the self, recognition of prejudiced behaviour and verbalisations by others towards third parties or prejudiced behaviours by the self towards others.

The chapter has shown how educational interventions can ensure that learners are more aware of the prejudice embedded in own thinking and the very manner in which stereotypes arise as natural cognitive mechanisms. By becoming aware of stereotyping as a cognitive mechanism, including some understanding of the manner in which this is connected to prejudice or perceptions of prejudice (stereotype threat) and how this can affect performance, learners will become more confident and aware of the context of their learning, more resilient to prejudice and less prone to fall into facile prejudiced ways of thinking without mental checks and points of self-awareness. Linked to this is the question of self-regulation, which the thesis chapter

problematised. If prejudice is hasty, negative pre-judgement of a social group, then thinking carefully about what it is and how it develops is a sure step to reducing it as many studies synthesised in this chapter have implied, tested, shown or argued.

Education for metacognition operates at a high level of reflection and implies subtle pedagogical strategies whereby the teacher must constantly come back to the individual and group's mental representations of reality. Three components of teaching for metacognitive prejudice reduction are: co-constructivism, recognising the centrality of talk in learning and the importance of mental schemata that allow for the transfer of knowledge and skilfulness.

Finally, a helpful representation of the learning continuum that should be mastered within domains and applied to social categories if teaching for prejudice reduction is to be successful at the metacognitive level, is the spectrum between novice and expert learners. Teachers will know that they have equipped their students well to reflect critically on prejudice if students do so using strategies that are effective, efficient, well-known, contextualised, conceptual and fluent.

It is clear that metacognition is not a simple state of affairs and is to be situated within Piaget's fourth, abstract stage of cognitive development. This is because metacognition comes after cognition, in the literal sense of the word "meta": it is a superstructural way of looking back at one's own thinking and metaphorically stepping out of the self to observe, evaluate, monitor and control thinking processes and products. This is why metacognition as a chapter has followed from critical thinking, which followed from the broad notion of deconstructing "Otherness".

Now that the thesis has discussed prejudice in the light of cognitive and cultural forces, it will turn to the affective domain of human experience to show in the next chapter how important the role of empathy is in reducing prejudice.

Chapter Five: Empathy

The chapter develops a tiered model to evoke successive levels of empathy in students as a way of reducing prejudice. The first level involves engagement with literature, history and art so as to evoke empathy indirectly; the second involves simulations of experiences that others go through so as to develop a sense of empathy through similar activity and the third, highest level, involves experiencing conditions directly but also moving to a new way of considering relationships so as to evolve from a "us and them" conceptualisation of the world to "we" as a collective approach.

Introduction

When considering the role of the individual in the educational combat against prejudice, I have discussed the matter from the perspectives of cognition and metacognition – so effectively the realms of reason and thinking and from those of historiography and culture. These approaches are intellectual in nature and hinge on the all-important notion of critical thinking. However, knowing and thinking is not enough for humans are sentient beings and relate to the world not only in cold abstractions but through emotions, sensations, temperament, desires and physical experience.

The 21st Century is focussing more and more on emotional and social intelligences as critical facets of learning as we move away from the old Cartesian idea of a separation between the body and the mind, premised on Plato's suspicion of the emotions and a 2500 year old Western paradigm structured on reason over passion towards character education (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005; Bialik et al., 2015), mindsets (Dweck, 2006, 2012), emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995; Salovey et al., 2004) and empathy (Gordon, 2005).

This chapter takes the reader through the construct of empathy by discussing what it is, how it relates to prejudice, how educational interventions can trigger greater empathy and, finally, how this information can be yoked together in a model of empathy for less prejudice in the classroom.

What is empathy?

Empathy as a word has its roots in the Ancient Greek *empatheia*, a term used by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* to mean "being profoundly moved or touched" (Maxwell, 2008, p.27) or "empathes" used by Aristotle in *De Insomniis* to mean "in a state of emotion" (Griswold & Konstan, 2012, p. 37).

The term is also closely related to pathos ("pity and fear" or for Liddell and Scott [1940], "passion" or "suffering"), fundamental for ancient Greek theatre. The protagonists of the works of the Attic poets (Sophocles, Aeschylus and Euripides), either by their fate or deeds, would move the audience to a state of pathos at the sight of others' suffering which would allow them to expunge their emotions through catharsis. At the origin therefore, pathos and empathy are related to the core idea that strong feelings run through people and must be evoked to maintain a balanced appreciation of the human condition. It is also connected to the notion that life involves suffering and through the medium of suffering some common understanding or fundamental recognition is evoked.

The modern use of the word empathy was coined by the German philosopher Robert Vischer in the late 19th century (see Mallgrave & Ikonomou, 1994). His term "Einfühlung", meaning "feeling into" evokes the idea that one relates to another person's inner state by understanding

what he or she is going through and can imagine and relate to their suffering (see, for example, Pijnenborg et al., 2012; Snyder et al. 2011).

Katz' 1963 study gives an eloquently phrased account of how it makes itself apparent in human interactions:

> triggered by cues in the conversation or by impressions we receive of the state of mind or feeling of the other person. We assimilate this information without being aware of doing so. We pick up the signals through a kind of inner radar and certain changes in our own emotional states make themselves felt. We mimic the other person and in the excitement of our spontaneous response our attention is almost completely absorbed (Katz, 1963, p. 5).

Indeed, empathy is something that happens primarily through emotional facets that may or may not be in primary awareness and they will manifest themselves in physical ways, often through strong feelings, laughter or tears, fear or hope. This means that empathy is not something that will necessarily translate immediately into measurable domains such as language or other mental products. Testing someone's mathematical reasoning or knowledge of history is relatively straightforward[17] whereas testing someone's empathy is more subjective and challenging as I argue further in this chapter.

There is some debate as to what it is exactly that causes empathy within different individuals.

---

[17] To be more precise, assessment only allows us to measure the construct of understanding history or mathematics through some sort of mental product or performance on a task which may or may not be valid and reliable, so even this level of testing knowledge is not straightforward.

Some studies suggest that it is an innate quality that can be measured in neural activity. Carr et al. (2003) conducted an experiment using magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) on 12 subjects, the results of which suggested that heightened inferior frontal cortical activity took place during the observation of an empathy-inducing action – this related to human's predispositions to learn through mimesis or repetition – in so-called "mirror neurons". Another set of MRIs conducted on 19 participants by Moll et al. (2006) implied that while altruism is tied to the systematic activation of a neural system that is generic to mammalians, triggering reward or aversion; when altruism is related to "abstract moral beliefs", the anterior prefrontal cortex of the human brain is activated, a uniquely human phenomenon.

Earlier work by Hogan, 1969, Davis, 1983 and Duan & Hill, 1996 suggested that a tendency to empathise is fairly stable in individuals regardless of contextual factors although this view has been challenged by researchers such as Rogers, 1975 and Ogle, Bushnell & Caputi, 2013 who see it as related to independent variables such as stimuli and environment.

A study by Paro et al. (2014) in which 1350 randomly assigned medical students responded to a series of questionnaires showed that female students manifested higher levels of empathy and were more distressed at the sight of discomfort to others than males. The idea that females are more prone to empathy than males has been confirmed by Gilligan (1982) and, for adolescents, in a longitudinal study by Mestre et al. (2009) in which participants completed the Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents by Bryant (1982) and the Interpersonal Reactivity Index by Davis (1980). These studies used items on a Likert scale that participants completed to determine degrees of empathy. This is problematic of course because responses to questionnaires might describe intention but not necessarily actual responses to situations. Using a different methodological approach, Christov-Moore et al. (2014) point out how, after

a comprehensive analysis of numerous case studies using neuroscientific measurements, that there is "converging evidence that sex differences in empathy have phylogenetic and ontogenetic roots in biology and are not merely cultural by-products driven by socialization" (p. 606).

When tackling prejudice through empathy, it will be important for instructors to keep this information in mind, not to overgeneralise or pre-determine how girls might react to situations but to consider group activity and team work configuration using a mix of gender since there is a likelihood, according to the research, that girls will respond to stimuli with greater degrees of empathy than boys.

Much of the recent research on empathy has been conducted in the field of medicine, counselling and psychotherapy where doctors and nurses are frequently put in circumstances requiring empathy as patients are often in states of anxiety, discomfort or suffering and at an emotional level desire some recognition and understanding. However, it has been argued that the importance of empathy goes well beyond the medical field and clearly has implications for education in general and more specifically educating for less prejudice:

- Research on social workers has shown correlations between levels of empathy and burnout prevention. For example, Wagaman et al. (2012) conducted a study on 173 social workers using and empathy assessment index and found that "components of empathy may prevent or reduce burnout and STS while increasing compassion satisfaction, and that empathy should be incorporated into training and education throughout the course of a social worker's career" (abstract).

- Empathy has been recognised as a core leadership quality: "Empathy is particularly important today as a component of leadership for at least three reasons: the increasing use of teams; the rapid pace of globalization; and the growing need to retain talent" (Goleman, 1998). The view that empathy is a vital part of good leadership has been reiterated by other such as Yukl (1998), George (2000) and Kellet, Humphrey & Sleeth (2002).
- Pilling & Eroglu (1994) have pointed out the centrality of empathy in the professional profiles of salespersons.
- Ellis (1982) ran a controlled trial on 332 "delinquents" (with 64 controls) and found that the nondeliquent group showed a significantly higher level of empathy, suggesting that antisocial thought and behaviour correlates negatively with empathy.[18]

At the broadest level, since much human activity is social and there is increasing recognition and valorising of social intelligence in the workplace, empathy is rightly regarded as a fundamental and extremely relevant facet of character. At a deeper, ethical level, if humans are to learn to live together, to respect and care for one another, some sensitivity is required. Recognising someone else's humanity comes through a feeling of oneness.

In the light of these findings, I would suggest that an appropriate 21st Century definition of empathy would be: a set of responses to the suffering of sentient beings that is values-driven and recognises the interconnectedness and precious value of life.

---

[18] The term "delinquent" used by Ellis is problematic as it contains much prejudice with its semantic structure. In a space where we aim for less prejudice, a better term might be "people considered anti-social".

It should be noted that, like so many areas within the domains of social psychology related to prejudice, including prejudice itself, empathy is a difficult construct to measure and operationalise and is frequently grasped through non-experimental or quasi-experimental methods, including often unreliable self-reported measures (see Batson, 1987 and Mayer et al., 2000).

Some of the more recent research in empathy has operationalised it by examining neural activity captured through magnetic resonance imaging that suggests empathetic reactions to various stimuli (usually images or films of subjects experiencing discomfort). Specific neural responses that suggest this include the anterior cingulate cortex - supplementary motor area - insula circuit that relates to pain and other sensorimotor contagion, often recorded through facial electromyography. As evidence, this motor mimicry shows that reactions occur, but the extent to which one can interpret the specific meaning of those reactions for each individual is the subject of some discussion. Therefore, while we might mention small non-randomised samples, they should not be overgeneralised or taken to suggest strong evidence.

Empathy and Prejudice

Prejudice is a type of objectification whereby a person's individuality is not recognised and he or she is seen as part of a whole, a type of stock character defined by pre-ordained traits that are, in effect, a set of clichés, stereotypes and over-generalisations. To get beyond this, the first step is to recognise another person's individuality, the fact that he or she stands outside of a set of stereotypic definitions, that he or she can be related to in terms of the universal themes that unite humanity (desires, feelings, family, belief, culture, the body and so on). Admitting a person's likeness is a gesture that moves in the opposite direction of prejudice. Of course, we need to be careful not to assume a universal empathy as individuals will be empathetic to

some cases and less so to others: empathy is always subjective and cannot be assumed to be some sort of panacea – it needs to be directed towards the "Other" for some of the structural elements of prejudice to erode.

A philosophy of empathy goes further than admitting someone else's identity and implies a network or system of values that can be seen in certain African weltangshauungs such as that coined in the Nguni phrase "Ubuntu", which comes from the longer statement "umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu" meaning "a person is a person because of other people". In this case, empathy is not so much admitting someone else's individuality but doing away with the notion of individualism and seeing all humans as interconnected. Eze explains the concept:

> It is a demand for a creative intersubjective formation in which the 'other' becomes a mirror (but only a mirror) for my subjectivity. This idealism suggests to us that humanity is not embedded in my person solely as an individual; my humanity is co-substantively bestowed upon the other and me. Humanity is a quality we owe to each other. We create each other and need to sustain this otherness creation. And if we belong to each other, we participate in our creations: we are because you are, and since you are, definitely I am. The 'I am' is not a rigid subject, but a dynamic self-constitution dependent on this otherness creation of relation and distance. (Eze, 2010, p. 90)

Todd et al. (2011) ran five experiments requiring participants to take on the perspective of subjects of other ethnic origin in simulations of racial prejudice and found that perspective taking can reduce automatic racial bias (automatic in the sense that such bias manifests itself in non-verbal behaviour such as body language and lack of eye contact that is often

unconscious). In the first experiment, participants were shown films of racial abuse and then sat the implicit association test (Greenwald, Banaji, & Nosek, 2015; Olson & Fazio, 2004); in the following experiments participants were then asked to empathise with a number of different stimuli (photographs, narrative extracts) and react in a number of ways (letter and essay writing). The quantitative analysis of results in these experiments is clearly thorough but one might ask questions about the selection method of participants (paid volunteers acting in contrived settings).

However, feeling empathy for another does not necessarily in and of itself offer an antidote to prejudice as empathy can be heightened for ingroup members and dampened for outgroup members. Avenanti, Sirigu, & Aglioti (2010) ran an experiment where magnetic resonance imaging would detect motor cortex stimulation in subjects. They showed how what they describe as empathetic resonance in participants, was heightened when faced with an ingroup member's hand being pricked but absent when the hand belonged to an outgroup member. In this case, the specific sign of empathetic resonance was muscle twitching in the participant's hand at the sight of another hand being pricked. Xu, Zuo, Wang, & Han (2009) found similar results in a study on racial in- and outgroup empathy.

Mathur, Harada, Lipke, & Chiao (2010) showed that Black and White American participants showed similar empathetic responses when shown Black and White subjects in pain but that only the Black participants showed heightened empathy-related neural activity when shown images of other Black people in pain whereas the majority of the White participants did not show heightened empathy-related neural activity when shown images of other white people in pain. This suggests that members of groups that have traditionally suffered prejudice (what we could call minority groups) have a heightened sense of empathy for their own group. For a

synthesis of studies suggesting that empathy is not necessarily an antidote to prejudice but in many circumstances might actually reinforce it, see Cikara, Bruneau, Van Bavel & Saxe (2014).

These findings would suggest that educational interventions that focus on empathy need to be conducted in careful conjunction with knowledge of the dynamics of prejudice formation: it is not enough to heighten empathy within individuals – empathy should be nurtured within a framework of perceptions and feelings about in-groups and out-groups and directed in such a way that it serves to build care for other people.

Galinsky & Moscowitz (2000) ran three experiments to show that perspective-taking reduces stereotyping. More specifically, "perspective-taking can reduce the accessibility and application of stereotypic responding because of increased overlap between representations of the self and representations of the out-group" (p.708). This means that as people begin to feel connected to another group and experience the "overlap" of self and other, they no longer hold the group as an outgroup and start to identify external factors as responsible for certain dictates. The study pointed out that stereotype suppression was not a meaningful solution as participants who did this tended to re-enact prejudicial acts or thoughts on other groups: perspective taking should be done deeply and critically so that learners are able to genuinely associate with the member of the outgroup.

In a similar vein, Finlay & Stephan (2000) ran a study whereby Black and White participants were instructed to read essays supposedly written by Black college students describing experiences of discrimination. The experimental group was asked to read the essays with empathy, imagining what it would be like to be the person writing whereas the control group

was instructed to read the essays more objectively. They found that the experimental group demonstrated lower levels of prejudicial White on Black bias in their subsequent evaluations than the control group. Hence, reading testimonies with the instruction to apply feeling to the reading can have a positive effect on empathy development.

Batson et al. (1997) and Batson, Chang, Orr, and Rowland (2002) showed how when participants are instructed to focus on a subject's feelings rather than the situation they are in, higher levels of empathetic concern are generated. These studies used polemical subjects such as murderers and drug-addicts and found that even here the wall of socially acceptable prejudice would begin to crumble when the focal point was feeling.

How can educational interventions trigger greater empathy?

At the most obvious, empirical level, evoking what it must be like to be another person in a given situation is something that is done often in educational discourses that ask students to imagine that they are someone else (a character in a work of literature, a historical figure or member of a group). Common learning experiences that activate this type of feeling include role-play, theatrical productions, "hot seating" (when a student pretends to be a character and must answer questions as that character would), perspective-taking through different types of production (literary, discursive, artistic) and representing positions that may or may not be one's own in debates.

Paluck & Green (2009), relating to evidence found by Galinsky & Moscowitz (2000) and Vescio et al. (2003) state: "writing an essay from the perspective of an elderly person decreased subsequent stereotypes about the elderly; writing an essay from the perspective of

the opposite MGP group led to more positive ratings of the out-group's personality characteristics" (Paluck & Green, 2009, p. 348).

At a deeper, and potentially more transformative level, there is the idea of putting students in the same or similar situations to those that are potential objects of prejudice. This can range from field trips to other countries (see Mendoza-Denton, 2010; Hughes, 2017), cultures and socio-cultural environments to exchanges whereby students live with members of another group or are hosted by families of other groups.

Finally, at the most radical level, educational environments can simulate real-life scenarios where students have to experience literally what it is to be another person by plunging the student in a typical other group-member settings (often work related) or making them endure what another person has to go through. This last model is less frequent in schools as it is risky and might cause extreme discomfort. However, common sense tells us that the greatest levels of empathy that lead to the most meaningful contributions to the plights of those suffering under such conditions are borne out of experience: one empathises with the poor if one has known poverty, one can understand redundancy empathetically if one has been made redundant.

Three levels of empathy-evoking experiences

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Empathy through imagination and production	Empathy through contact and communication	Empathy through direct experience of conditions

The studies by Finlay & Stephan (2000) and Galinsky & Moscowitz (2000) cited earlier in this chapter suggest that classroom instruction should incorporate the idea of empathy consciously and purposefully by instructing students to approach situations with empathy.

Hence, instructions such as "read this passage and focus on the feelings of the protagonist", "watch this extract and consider what it must have been like for X to experience Y", "in analysing this work of art, consider what might be going through the head of such-and-such a character" or "retell this passage from the perspective of X" would be more effective than detached, objective accounts. These interventions could take place at an early level of cognitive development (in fact, they resonate naturally with pre-operational phases of development), would be easy to carry out in the classroom and would represent level 1 of empathy-evoking learning experiences.

If we are to consider a higher level of empathy development (level 2), numerous educational interventions to decrease prejudice have been developed in the past decades using the premises of contact and communication with others. A fairly well-known one is "Roots of Empathy", a Canadian-based classroom programme for children from Kindergarten to the equivalent of grade 8 that claims to have "shown significant effect in reducing levels of aggression among schoolchildren by raising social/emotional competence and increasing empathy" (Roots of Empathy, 2015). The guiding principle of this approach is to stimulate empathy through the observation of a baby interacting with its mother and to consider reality from the baby's perspective and then to generalise and apply the sentiments gleaned in such an experience to the outside.

The programme aims to develop emotional literacy in students (a term coined by the psychotherapist Claude Steiner meaning *"the ability to understand your emotions, the ability to listen to others and empathise with their emotions, and the ability to express emotions productively"* (Steiner & Perry, 1997, p. 11). A reasonable amount of research has

substantiated the effectiveness of the programme (MacDonald et al., 2013; Schonert-Reichl et al., 2012; Santos et al., 2011; Rolheiser & Wallace, 2005; Jaramillo et al., 2008).

Roots of Empathy is an example of an educational design to heighten empathy that lies within the affective rather than cognitive domain. It is part of a vision of education that seeks to stimulate responses not only through discursive stimuli (lectures, readings and theory) but through real-life experiences although it is still a dynamic whereby students observe situations and draw conclusions from them that will be internalised, conceptualised, generalised and then later applied to other situations. These higher-order processes cannot be expected to take place of their own accord and will require some pedagogical scaffolding.

To turn to the highest level of empathy development (level 3 whereby real-life phenomena experienced directly by the subject are used as building blocks for learning), Goleman (1998) explains how interventions to stimulate emotional intelligence should focus on stimulating the limbic rather than the cortical system: "emotional intelligence is born largely in the neurotransmitters of the brain's limbic system, which governs feelings, impulses, and drives. Research indicates that the limbic system learns best through motivation, extended practice, and feedback". Goleman contrasts this type of learning with the colder, analytical function of the neocortex that tends to express more activity on intellectual tasks. The point is that deep learning experiences that will stimulate empathy require emotional arousal rather than pure theory or technical information. He goes on to lament that most training programmes are centred on neocortex rather than limbic activity, hereby doing little to arouse emotions, proving to be not only inefficient but with potentially negative effects for job performance.

Just as Goleman has argued that "to enhance emotional intelligence, organizations must refocus their training to include the limbic system", I would argue that education must place students in situations where they make emotional connections with the world around them and learn deeply through active experiences rather than second or third hand information alone. A powerful manner in which this can be done is by ensuring that students actually live out directly what others have to go through in their lives.

This brings us back to the core idea that effective learning for more empathy is learning by doing. The famous lines by the fictional character Atticus Finch in Harper Lee's novel *To Kill A Mocking Bird* (1960) sums it up clearly: "You never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view … until you climb into his skin and walk around in it."[19]

Empathy for Less Prejudice

Thus far, the following points about learning for more empathy have been established:

1. Learning experiences that evoke empathy have been shown to lessen prejudicial attitudes;

2. Empathy is not in itself necessarily an antidote to prejudice as it can be directed towards ingroups and dampened for outgroups, it requires scaffolding;

3. One can consider a developmental spectrum of empathy ranging from passive to active to experiential episodes: empathy becomes more meaningful as we move into the realm of actual lived experience.

---

[19] Of course, this is easier said than done as someone from a privileged perspective might never fully grasp another's perspective, even having been through many of the same experiences. However, living out the realities of another person must cause some degree of reflection and consideration, no matter how small.

In the light of this information, we can consider some classroom projects that unite these points as examples of empathy-evoking learning experiences that have the potential to lessen prejudice. Examples will be given according to the levels established earlier:

Level 1: Empathy through imagination and production

The main concept to be developed at this first level is empathy through mental products such as art works, narrative, films, music, historical anecdotes, eye-witness testimonies and biographies. By having students engage with material that describes the plight of others and then reflect on those empathetically, a bridge is built between the self and the other.

Autobiographies are commonly used to evoke a feeling of empathy in the reader. Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl* (1952), used with young children to stimulate thoughts on what it must have been like to be a Jewish child during the Holocaust, is an example. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett & Shandler (2012, pp. 184-185) describe the structure of empathy in the novel as a process whereby the readers are less focussed on Anne's fate as a Holocaust victim and more on the universal themes of humanity that she evokes. This hinges on the idea that whereas sympathy is related to explicit recognition of a condition in time and place, empathy is related to connections that transcend social categories.

Therefore, in order to evoke an empathetic reading of *The Diary of a Young Girl*, instructors would do well to concentrate less on the historical dimension of her experience and more on the human themes of happiness, fear and innocence that characterise her and give her universal credence.

In *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1963) by Alexander Solzhenitsyn is a book that opens students' minds about the realities of being a prisoner of war in a Soviet Gulag but more universally, about the plight of someone in extreme discomfort whose very humanity is threatened by the cruelty and harshness of life in prison. The protagonist and narrator, Shukhov, muses "can a man who's warm understand one who's freezing?".

The Long Journey of Poppy Nongena (1978) by Elsa Joubert takes the reader through the events that mark the life of a woman living under Apartheid and allow for instances of empathetic identification.

Works of literature that use the first person narrative or narratological techniques to plunge readers into the psychic reality of a character can, arguably, evoke greater empathy than accounts told from the outside so to speak: "If an author wants intense sympathy for characters who do not have strong virtues to recommend them, then the psychic vividness of prolonged inside views will help him" (Booth, 1983, pp. 377–8). Booth goes on to give an example from Jane Austen's novel *Emma* (1815): "By showing most of the story through Emma's eyes, the author insures that we will travel with Emma rather than stand against her" (245).

Works of Art that are commonly used to evoke feelings of empathy include Picasso's *Guernica* (1937), a painting that renders palpable the fear and distress of the victims of the German bombing of the Spanish town in 1937 and stimulates empathy for the victims of fascism in general. Grade 11 classroom teacher Katherine Joyce describes how she used the painting in conjunction with historical artefacts and pieces of information to evoke not only empathy but philosophical discussions about war:

The students clearly saw the painting as representing the horror of war. They felt that viewing this painting and then exploring it more in depth gave them a sense of the horror that people in and connected to Guernica reacted to the bombing, and that using this in connection with other sources, such as newspaper reports and letters, gave a fuller picture of the event. This empathy, this ability to take a more nuanced historical perspective, allowed us to delve further into the question of why people fight wars, and more specifically allowed us to explore more fully cause and consequence, because we could now bring an understanding of personal and collective emotion into the discussion. (Joyce, 2015)

Another famous artwork that can be used to evoke empathy is Goya's *The Shootings of May Third 1808* (1818) where the facial expressions and symbolic posture of the victims of the shootings evoke strong feelings of empathy for victims of war.

Films that develop empathy for the protagonists through the use of focalisation or a first person narrative include David Lynch's *The Elephant Man* (1980) which discusses disfigurement; Steve McQueen's *10 Years a Slave* (2013), allowing for a harrowing, closely focalised experience of slavery; Steven Spielberg's *The Color Purple* (1985), evoking the reality of black America in Georgia at the beginning of the 20th century; Raoul Peck's *I Am Not Your Negro* (2016), a deconstruction of American history from the perspective of those who have suffered from discrimination to Black people and indigenous peoples; Ryan Coogler's *Black Panther* (2018) that celebrates Blackness and pan Africanism Jim Sheridan's *My Left Foot* (1989), allowing for empathy with people suffering from physical handicaps or Ang Lee's *Brokeback Mountain* (2005), a film that plunges viewers into the realities of

homosexual love in a world that is repressively heterosexual or John Wierick and Jacob

Krueger's *The Mathew Shepard Story* (2002), a film that sensitises viewers to the

homophobic murder of Shepard in the late 90s. Batson et al. have pointed out that *The*

Elephant Man and *The Color Purple* are particularly effective in the way that they induce

feelings strongly related to empathy such as compassion, sympathy and tenderness (1997, p.

105). These films are at various levels of age appropriateness, so should be selected

accordingly, and should not merely be viewed but problematised and discussed too (Rokeach,

1971). Using media can be a successful way of reducing prejudice for learners with little

opportunity for intergroup contact, as shown by Aboud et al., 2012.

Works of Art have the potential to evoke empathy not only by inducing strong emotional

responses to the plight of others but also by drawing attention to areas that are not often

discussed or problematised, hereby raising awareness as well as empathy. Fraser writes of

works that dramatise violence such as *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and *Guernica*

"if one is made to feel more or less deeply uncomfortable, it is because one is being

confronted with facts that one hadn't known, or hadn't thought carefully enough about, or is

still reluctant to feel intensively about" (Fraser, 1974, p. 47).

Level 2: Empathy through contact and communication

The central idea behind this level of empathy evocation is to have students reflect on what it

must be like to be another person by placing them in simulations of situations where they

endure through role-play what another person would have to in real life. Learning experiences

tend to be symbolic or staged so as to tease out the core elements of the experiences affecting

those with whom the students are to empathise.

Model United Nations

In 1953 the International School of Geneva initiated a simulations of the United Nations General Assembly and called it the Students' United Nations. By having students aged between 15 and 20 draft, debate and vote for resolutions the experience was meant to stimulate higher-order thinking through debate and to familiarise students with the realities of diplomacy.

Crucially, the rules stipulate that students are not to represent their own countries in the simulation, hereby ensuring that the enterprise would put them in situations where they had to defend ideas that were not their own, represent different countries and positions and research issues and national standpoints on such issues as preparation for the debate: "the objective is to participate in a realistic simulation of the United Nations' General Assembly in the role of delegates. The rules stipulate that each delegation is composed of two students who may not represent their own country" (Ecolint, 2016).

The rules of the General Assembly further ensure that students discover and reinforce knowledge of situations other than their own national concerns: "Each delegation must have adequate general knowledge of the country or international organization which it is representing, as well as of the subjects which will be debated in the General Assembly" (Ecolint Student League of Nations, 2014, p. 11).

Since then, the Model United Nations system as it has come to be known has grown considerably and is practised in most international schools. Many cite empathy as a fundamental goal of the simulation: Nyborg Gymnasium cites as goals "insight,

empathy, responsibility, unity" (Nyborg, 2016), London International Model United Nations states that it

> aims to extend cultural empathy, understanding of international affairs and knowledge of the United Nations among young people through the medium of Model United Nations. By equipping youth with mediation, analytical and leadership skills, while stressing the interdependence of the modern world, it is hoped that the next generation of global leaders will face issues of common concern with the spirit of international cooperation. (LIMUN, 2016)

The Schutz American School points out that "participation in MUN leads to the development of empathy, tolerance, and a broadening of perspective" (Schutz, 2016) whilst Mickolus & Brannan (2013) explain that Model United Nations stimulate "the skills of diplomacy, the value of empathy, and looking at international issues from multiple points of view" (p.2).

By engaging students in Model United Nations programmes, schools will be taking a step towards empathy-developing skills and experiences.

Simulations

To be included in the repertoire of activities that operate at level 2 of empathy development, we can mention games that emphasise symbolically the experience of suffering prejudice. These simulations follow a number of different formats, often involving a separation of the class into two categories (those who are "dots", those who are "non-dots" for example), students categorised with a symbol that the teacher has attributed to them.

In general, the idea is to treat one group more favourably than the other and then to scaffold some discussion on what it felt like to be on either side of the iniquity.

Some simulation games go far and evoke the literal substance of discrimination rather than a symbolic representation. For example, World History teachers might use slavery simulations in lessons where students would take on the roles of slave and slave master in order to evoke deeper understanding. Activities such as this are dangerous as they risk traumatising students and/or trivialising the event simulated.

> Educators who oppose the use of simulations for emotionally vulnerable subjects generally point to three main concerns: the effects of simulations on children's psychological development, the ability of simulations to oversimplify history and oppression, and the fact that few teachers possess the appropriate training to facilitate simulations successfully. (Teaching Tolerance, 2008)

Blue Eyes Brown Eyes exercise

Possibly the most famous of these empathy-evoking simulations is the 1968 "Blue Eyes Brown Eyes exercise" invented by the classroom teacher Jean Elliott. The now well-known story comes from a third grade classroom in Riceville, Iowa on the day after the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr.

Elliot was asked by her students why King has been assassinated and her response was to sensitise them to racial prejudice by simulating a climate of discrimination. She divided the blue-eyed and brown-eyed students, gave armbands to the blue-eyed students and stated "the brown-eyed people are the better people in this room […] they are cleaner and they are

smarter." (Bloom, 2005) Elliott went further to give a pseudo-scientific explanation for the division, telling her students that melanin was an intelligence-enhancing chemical that could be found in greater concentrations in brown-eyed children. She later reversed the participants so that the blue-eyed children were given special privileges that the brown eyed were not.

Elliot made a number of observations during the activity, notably a lack of self-esteem and performance in the discriminated group and heightened confidence in members of the privileged group.

Scientific evidence on the effectiveness of the blue eyes brown eyes activity is not particularly strong. A study by Byrnes & Kiger (1990) on non-Black teachers' attitudes to Black people showed moderate statistical improvement in attitudes although while participants reported that the experience was meaningful to them, it also caused high levels of stress.

Williams & Giles (1992), criticised the method due to ethical issues such as the level of consent, the stress and levels of coercion implied. Byrnes and Kiger (1992) responded to this by suggesting that the downsides of the method were outweighed by the gains.

Weiner & Wright (1973) ran a controlled experiment with 3rd grade non-Black schoolchildren over three days and found more willingness to blend with Black students on the third day of the experiment and three days later.

The blue eyes brown eyes activity is often described as an experiment but it is more properly a quasi – experiment since the conditions for true experimental work (randomisation, control groups, masking) are not used and the analysis tends to be fairly anecdotal. Like all level 2

empathy learning experiences involving simulation, extreme caution and sensitivity is needed and the emphasis should be on the quality of reflection and unpacking that takes place afterwards.

A repertoire of level 2 type learning experiences can be found in the toolkit and case studies developed by the Ashoka organisation (Ashoka, 2016).

Level 3: Empathy through direct experience of conditions

Exchanges

Examples of the highest level of empathy-evocation would be those that plunge students not only into strong simulations of others' experiences but ensure that they live under those conditions directly for a period of time.

An instance of this is the "radical empathy" programme that took place in 2014 between University Heights High School (situated in the South Bronx) and Ethical Culture Fieldston School, a prestigious "$43,000-a-year tuition" school in New York (Lovell, 2014). The programme, centred on four pairs of students from either school, saw visits, focus group discussions and sharing of stories between students over an eight-year period.

A specific and highly important part of this learning experience was the so-called Narrative 4 project whereby students from schools in radically different socioeconomic areas were paired up and each asked to write a story that described who they were. The next step was for each student to take ownership of his or her partner's story and tell it in a first person narrative, in this way "shattering stereotypes by walking in each other's shoes," as one of the Narrative 4 facilitators put it)" (Lovell, 2014). Narrative 4 has reached out to schools across the globe to

extend the model to South Africa, Ireland, Afghanistan and many American states (Narrative 4, 2016).

Another example of level 3 empathy building is the Arava Institute for Environmental Studies situated in a kibbutz in the Negev desert in which "groups of Israeli, Palestinian, Jordanian and overseas students – cumulatively numbering by 2011 about 600" created "a network of regional environmentalists who are able and willing to work together" (Schoenfeld et al., 2014, p. 171). Schoenfeld et al. interviewed 38 participants who had experience of the institute's work and, based on the outcome of this qualitative inquiry, complied the following six empathy-building strategies that are seen as particularly effective as used by the Arava Institute:

1. Using "Arab and Jewish 'Program Associates.' Older, more mature students, similar to university dons or housemasters, live in student residences. They are problem solvers, advisors and role models in a setting where academic study and the cultivation of empathy go together" (p. 172)

2. "the intimacy of a small group living together for months in an isolated setting – talking over meals, engaging in recreation activities and in small classes – is a major aspect of learning to understand each other and developing sympathy and trust" (p.172).

3. Fieldtrips and projects (by overseas students travelling to the Middle East)

4. Working together on practical work (in this example, dry lands agricultural projects)

5. "staff and students taking responsibility for restoring relations after difficult interactions" (p. 181)

6. Seminars on Peacebuilding and Environmental Leadership.

At the core of this programme is the idea of putting oneself in someone else's shoes. As one participant explained:

> I invited several of the non-Israeli students to stay with us in Jerusalem. … We went sightseeing, visited the famous Ben Yehuda Midrahov, and even sat in a cafe. Several days or weeks later … a suicide attack in Jerusalem hit the same cafe where we were sitting just a few days earlier. That was a shocking moment to my Jordanian friend ... He could much more easily identify with the Israelis after he could relate to the location, the time and the place. He realized that had the attack been just a few days before, he could have been there too. (p. 180)

Approaching problems collectively

If communities, such as schools, break down the individualistic dimension of conflict and consider it as a communal problem that is not merely a question of aggressors and victims but shared responsibility, each person shares the situation and therefore the strategies to remediate it. This also means that many people feel affected by the phenomenon in question and thus can empathise with the individuals involved collectively. Schools should be clear about the importance of empathy in collective gatherings such as assemblies and special events or presentations, highlighting the general idea of a community respecting each of its members rather than isolating individual cases in any polarising dichotomy of victim and aggressor. Furthermore, schools can use groups of students to develop an ethos of empathy by ensuring that they work together in various configurations that cut across dividing lines of age and ability to work on conflict resolution collectively. Examples of this type of collective approach include the students in a class or whole school setting behavioural rules or a code of

conduct together, community events such as debates or interactive workshops on bullying and/or conflict and open discussions on bullying that are scaffolded in such a way that there is consensus at closure. For more detail on collective approaches to bullying in schools, see Rock, Hammond and Rasmussen, 2002.

Movements such as these that look at models of collective responsibility, transcend the notion of empathy in a traditional sense of feelings for one person or group by another since a common base of sentiment, response and problem-solving is created in what could be described as intergroup emotions theory (Smith, Seger & Mackie, 2007) in which lowered levels of self-consciousness and increased feelings of unity lead to a collective mindset. Lamm & Silani (2014) point out that:

> lack of self-awareness and self/other distinction is one putative mechanism of collective affective experiences such as the high synchrony between individuals that occurs during mass phenomena, such as at music concerts or at political demonstrations. There, the individual becomes part of a larger crowd, and loses his or her ability for self-awareness and self/other distinction. (p. 11)

This phenomenon can be explained neurobiologically: the dorsal and anterior medial prefrontal cortex appears to be active in a lessening of influence by others (see Brass et al., 2009, Lamm et al., 2010, Lamm et al., 2007). Whilst the associations one usually makes with groupthink tend to be Orwellian and negative (suggesting an unthinking tyranny of the masses), if schools are able to create values-driven collective cultures, this facet of human behaviour can be used in a positive sense to allow for collective empathy.

Non-educational examples of collective empathy include those developed by Muller, Pfarrer & Little (2014), who discuss a model of corporate philanthropy whereby approaches to giving are taken collectively. Schools can learn from these as they demonstrate an increasingly necessary collective decision-making ethos to solve world problems.

Indeed, a considerable educational challenge is that of creating practical responses to global problems such as biocapacity, poverty and conflict that necessarily harness shared knowledge and group approaches since they are too complex, interrelated and challenging to be solved by any one person or single lobby. As long as we view these problems as belonging to another person or to some future generation, we will not be in the right mindset to solve them. Therefore, level 3 empathy in education is not only about putting individuals and groups in situations where they can relate to "others' problems", it means evoking a philosophy that allows them to see themselves as sufficiently connected to those problems in the first place to want to solve them as their own.

The 21st Century is an era of huge changes to social, political, environmental and economic structures. It is increasingly clear that educational systems that prepare young people to solve these problems need to view them with some degree of sensitivity and empathy so that isolationist, selfish outlooks are not allowed to predominate as these will neither solve these problems or seek out responses for the good of humanity as a whole.

After decades of scientific progress and positivism in the Western World, one might argue that it is time to return to indigenous knowledge systems that have a collective view of the ecosystem.[20] This broadens the notion of empathy from an individual or group, human

---

[20] See my earlier point about Ubuntu philosophy.

phenomenon to one where humans are seeking to understand the world around them, feel part of it and respond to the threats that face it as part of a weltanschauung: "It is the common experience of all human societies that these are the elements that constitute the large majority of any members of any social system" (Ayoob, 2002, pp. 40–41).

Chapter Conclusion

Theories about empathy as a response to prejudice are difficult to measure as this chapter has argued. Although neuroscientific advances allow us to measure mimicry and various neural responses to images, mental products or emotional outflows of others, it remains particularly difficult to know the extent to which they represent genuine states of empathy as opposed to biological automatisms which may or may not contain degrees of considered feelings for others. This essentially means that in order to assess empathetic responses from students, qualitative measures are more likely to be successful, those that ask student to express their feelings about a situation in some detail. These would include essays, portfolio assignments, interviews, discussions, works of art, presentations and self-reflections.

Trying to assess levels of empathy in any strictly hierarchical sense would be difficult if not counter-productive since, like creativity, empathy is a subtle, flexible construct. Therefore, schools might aim to develop as many empathy nurturing learning experiences as possible so that an appreciation of the degree of empathy someone is engaging in is based on widespread evidence. To allow empathy to develop, schools should ensure that conversations are happening around those experiences that allow for feedback on degrees of self-reflection, and awareness of other people's predicaments.

Qualitative social science research has shown that engaging students in educational experiences that teach them, show them, model for them or even ensure that they directly experience the plight of others will draw them into more empathetic dispositions. The three stages of empathy evocation that I have developed in this chapter will allow instructors developmental approaches.

For a particularly rich developmental empathetic experience concerning one group or person, students might begin with exposure to literature and/or art works from or about the group or person, then progress into simulating the conditions in which that group/person operates and, through games and classroom learning experiences try to understand what it might be like to be them. Finally, a field trip or exchange would allow for theory, beliefs, indirectly garnered experience and assumptions to be reinforced or debunked by a real-life experience. Provided that this process is scaffolded with questions that allow the student to progress is his/her empathetic understanding ("what was it like to?", "how did it feel when you?", "tell me/us about the time when you?", "what would you have done in that situation?", "can you relate to this or think of something similar that might have happened to you once?"), the experience would be meaningful,

I have also argued that at the highest level of empathetic thinking and being, the entire notion of "us and them" or "me and you" should be broken down and de-dramatised so that a common understanding overrides difference and allows for a broad appreciation of what it means to be human.

At the root of this is not only a cultural, anthropological issue but an epistemological one. Empathy requires a level of being that goes beyond the cognitive: "knowledge alone will not reduce prejudice; knowledge is something of a prerequisite to prejudice reduction, not the sole means" (Pate, 1981, p. 288). This mindset can be extended to the environment in general so that sentient and non-sentient beings and artefacts are respected and treated as assets for humanity in general. This way of thinking is necessary for the preservation of the planet and provides educational structures with the significant challenge of creating environments where mindful respect of the entire environment is promoted.

Chapter Six: The Contact Hypothesis

The contact hypothesis is analysed as an essential factor in educational settings that are aimed at reducing prejudice. The original tenets of the theory (Allport, 1954) are analysed in the light of additions to the theory's mediators by various researchers. Pettigrew & Tropp's meta-analytic studies (2006, 2008) are investigated to highlight salient points about the contact hypothesis that should be retained for application in educational settings.

The manner in which the contact hypothesis can be approached in schools is examined with particular reference to the jigsaw classroom method. The chapter shows how schools can socialise their values by paying attention to student demographic organisation during institutionalised events and practises.

Introduction

When discussing the conditions that should be established for prejudice to be reduced between people or groups, the best-known and most thoroughly researched strategy in the school of social psychology is the contact hypothesis. This chapter investigates the contact hypothesis' core principles before turning to the substantial research that has been conducted since its inception in the 1950s to show its effectiveness. The chapter will critically examine the reliability and validity of the case studies mentioned. The second half of this chapter looks at known, tried and tested applications of the theory in classroom settings but also outside of the world of education. This information allows for a synthesis of best practise that can be considered when applying the contact hypothesis in schools.

The fundamentals of the theory

Also known as intergroup contact theory, the idea can be attributed to Gordon Allport who put the hypothesis forward in chapter 16 (entitled "The Effect of Contact") of his seminal *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954). Writing in the newly formed school of social psychology at a time when segregation in the United States was at a height and in the wake of some initial work to suggest that contact between members of different groups could reduce prejudice (see Williams, 1947; Stouffer et al., 1949), Allport's theory was based on studies done before him, his own observations and research conducted by his own students.

The theory can be thus summarised: prejudice can be reduced if there is contact between people of different ethnic groups provided that the following four prerequisites are respected –

1. There must be equal status between the groups;

2. The groups must share common goals;

3. There must be intergroup cooperation and;

4. Authorities, law or custom must support the contact.

It is important to grasp these four pillars for without them contact can lead to animosity. Indeed, there is something of a commonly held belief that diversity will reduce prejudice of its own accord but this is not the case. "Casual contact [Allport pointed out] has left matters worse than before. […] Theoretically, every superficial contact we make with an out-group member could by the 'law of frequency' strengthen the adverse associations that we have" (Allport, 1954, p. 264). Pettigrew goes on to explain how "more interracial contact can lead either to greater prejudice and rejection or to greater respect and acceptance, depending upon the situation in which it occurs. The basic issue, then, concerns the types of situations in which contact leads to distrust and those in which it leads to trust" (Pettigrew, 1971, p. 275).

So contact should be governed by certain prerequisites for it to have a positive effect on prejudicial thinking.

Since Allport's 1954 formula, other conditions for successful contact have been added, notably the idea that if participation is voluntary (Amir, 1969, 1976) and if contact is intimate (Cook, 1962), the chances of prejudice reduction are even greater.

Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux (2005) have synthesised 13 points that epitomise some of the prerequisites that researchers have added to the contact theory since Allport's formula: they point out that contact should be regular, "should involve a balanced ratio of in-group to out-group members" (p. 699), should allow for members engaging in contact to do so to the extent that there is a feeling not only of contact but genuine acquaintance, allowing for friendships to form. Furthermore, contact should not be constrained to one environment but should happen across numerous different settings and should be recognised as important to those involved. Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux also reiterate some of Allport's original ideas: "contact should occur between individuals who share equality of status […]; should be organized around cooperation toward the achievement of a superordinate goal […] should be free from anxiety or other negative emotions" (p. 699), should not take place in interactions that are too competitive and should be socially or institutionally endorsed. Ideas that have been developed subsequent to Allport's theory include the notion that the contact hypothesis should aim to establish counterstereotypic encounters (in other words, interactions that do not conform to some of the clichés that can be traditionally associated with group encounters such as the workplace) but at the same time, for there to be a disconfirming effect, "contact should be with a person who is deemed a typical or representative member of another group" (p. 699).

Pettigrew reformulated the contact hypothesis in 1998, adding friendship as an essential factor and pointing out that contact would be more beneficial when added to some learning about the outgroup. Pettigrew also pointed out, referring to a broad set of empirical studies (p. 68), that the changing behaviour of participants, the extent to which they might generate affective ties and the need to reappraise intergroup relations were all important conditions. Pettigrew's revised model stresses a process of decategorisation, salient categorisation, and recategorisation whereby the individual is involved in a reflective thought process while considering members of other groups.

It should be noted that the contact hypothesis was designed with ethnic groups in mind, so some caution should be taken when transferring its tenets to other domains of prejudice such as class, gender or sexuality. Research has shown, however, that the contact hypothesis can be applied to different constituents with success. Herek & Glunt (1993), for example, conducted telephone surveys with 937 participants in the United States and found a strong correlation between interpersonal contact and positive attitudes toward homosexual males. Schwartz & Simmons (2001) conducted research on college students in the United States to test their attitudes towards the elderly and found after self-reported data (which, of course, can be fairly unreliable), that the quality of contact led to more favourable attitudes towards the elderly. Other studies that have extended the realm of contact hypothesis beyond ethnic relations include Adsett & Morin (2004) who have studied its effect on linguistic diversity and Manetti, Schneider, & Siperstein (2001) who investigated its impact on views towards children with special needs. However, Pettigrew has tempered the idea of contact hypothesis transfer by positing that its effects have been far stronger in lessening traditional prejudicial bounds such

as racism, ethnocentrism and homophobia and less effective in reducing less overtly criticised forms of prejudice such as that formed against the mentally ill (2008).

The contact hypothesis is a powerful, extensively researched strategy. It has been described as "one of psychology's most effective strategies for improving intergroup relations" (Dovidio et al., 2003, p. 5). In theory, putting the contact hypothesis into practice in schools should be fairly straightforward as there is something of a formulaic repertoire of conditions available for review and the central idea within it is simple to understand.

Putting theory into practice: practicality, anxiety and generalisation

However, there are a number of concerns to be taken into account before the contact hypothesis can be implemented in schools. Amichai-Hamburger & McKenna (2006) have pointed out that three obstacles stand in the way of contact theory operationalisation:

> (1) practicality—creating a contact situation involves overcoming some serious practical obstacles; (2) anxiety—the anxiety felt by the participants may cause a contact to be unsuccessful or at least not reach its potential; (3) generalization— the results of a contact, however successful, tend to be limited to the context of the meeting and to the participants. (p. 825)

These obstacles can be looked at in more detail:

Practicality

The practical obstacles that experimental conditions can eradicate but which reality might present include participant motivation for contact, environmental conditions that ensure a

sufficient valency of contact – the problem here being that this can seem forced and potentially counter-productive if attempted in real-life settings and the extent to which superordinate goals about equality and tolerance will be internalised by members of an institution, something that is practically beyond the control of authorities. There is also, in reality, no ongoing assessment or tracking system as there is in experimental or quasi experimental settings, meaning that regress into prejudice can take place easily without it necessarily being noticed or acted upon.

The problem of practicality that arises when trying to put the theory into practice, illustrated by Dixon, Durrheim and Tredoux (2005), is premised on the fact that outside of experimental conditions, casual contact between individuals or groups in the real world does not resemble the type of contact that Allport had in mind: optimal contact "usually takes the form of short-lived laboratory analogues or highly localized interventions in the field" (p. 700). In opposition, most human interactions are determined by mundane events and conditions that are often functional and driven less by a desire for there to be fruitful social contact between individuals or groups and more in the name of market-driven productivity or practical, logistical goals. The reality is that it is mostly the workplace that will bring people of radically different backgrounds together in any protracted sense where genuine interaction will be necessary.

While equitable working conditions – where they exist – might ensure that contact takes place under some of Allport's less lofty conditions, for example under the premise that people are of equal value and are working together on a common goal, as Amir (1969) points out, this type of professional encounter "produces only casual interactions rather than intimate acquaintances" (p. 337).

Informal social gatherings such as parties or other types of non-professional congregations such as church services tend to be self-selecting and do not, therefore, bring people of different orientations, belief systems or groups together but, if anything, run the risk of reinforcing ingroup cohesion and hostility towards outgroups. One could argue for these cases that whilst ethnic and social differences might be lessened under a "broad church" or particularly diverse social setting, denominational differences will be exacerbated, therefore exchanging one form of prejudice with another and merely creating a larger ingroup.

Furthermore, at least when looking to ethnicity, the number of cross-race interactions and friendships that occur in society are few and far between. A survey by Sigelman, Bledsoe, Welch & Combs (1996) showed that over 70% of White Americans had no Black friends whilst Gibson's 2001 survey in South Africa found that only 6.6% of White people and 1.5% of Black people had friends of another race group.

Anxiety

The second point on anxiety is something to take into account since where there is prejudice there will often be fear and this can make contact unlikely or, if it is to occur, confrontational. In fact, negative contact, a trigger for heightened prejudice or manifestations of prejudice, can ensue in those cases where anxiety peaks so it is crucial to ensure that an atmosphere of relative trust and confidence reigns. However, this becomes difficult if not impossible to instil in an environment where there is prejudice in the first place.

Another problem with the contact hypothesis is the relationship between individual and group prejudice. Whilst the contact hypothesis is essentially designed to quell prejudiced thinking in

the individual and affect his/her approach to another individual (since the contact that will be taking place can only really be at an individual level), it does not hold that group-to-group prejudice will be affected in any way. In fact, Dixon, Durrheim and Tredoux (2005, p. 703), referring to Forbes (1997, 2004), point out that a complex counter-productive effect might be created at a group level by contact across boundaries at an individual level. This takes place when individuals within an ingroup reach out to members of an outgroup and therefore transgress the cultural barriers that have been made sacred. As such, interracial or interreligious relationships can threaten the identity of the larger group and cause violent reactions. This clamping down on intergroup contact at an individual level by group pressures is a well-known phenomenon that can be seen in literary archetypes such as Shakespeare's <u>Romeo and Juliette</u> (1597) where the young couple transgress the family feud between the Montagues and the Capulets or Leonard Bernstein's <u>West Side Story</u> (1961) where Tony and Maria transgress the division between the American and Puerto Rican gangs.

Educational interventions that break down social boundaries should be wary of the pressure individuals might have to face outside of the classroom in their families and communities. Learning to live together should not be a message that remains within school walls and disappears once the learner is away from them; it is something that must transcend schools by taking wider social pressure into consideration.

Generalisation

The problem of generalisation in contact hypothesis theory is due to a number of issues pointed out by Amir (1976), Ford (1986), Stephan (1987) and Forbes (1997). Pettigrew & Tropp (2006), as a means of leading up to their own research, argue that much of this is due to incomplete sampling and lacunae in research methodology: studies have either been restricted

to particular groups (for example, one type of ethnic group) whereas comparative analyses have dealt with relatively low numbers of studies without strict inclusion rules (p. 752).

Whilst these issues can be improved through more rigorous approaches, assuming the data for meta-analysis exists, there is a broader question over the type of research method that would best suit a domain such as prejudice reduction. It should not surprise us to see that quasi-experimental design is prominent in the assessment of prejudice reducing interventions given that degrees of prejudice are highly contextual, subjective instances that cannot be standardised as easily as more straightforward constructs (such as knowledge of an academic domain).

However, these problems are generic to most scientific research and are more methodological than pragmatic in nature. Educational settings will be necessarily contextual and fit-for-purpose according to specifics, which means that measuring their impact will necessarily involve some gauge of relativity. For more on issues around the limits of educational research, see Ercikan & Roth (2014).

Indeed, participants in experiments using the contact hypothesis will have their own inner experiences and semantics to define group dynamics and these might deviate substantially from the categories and a priori coding that are used by social scientists:

> explanations as to why particular respondents have experienced attitude change are not derived from a careful examination of their own experiences and perspectives but are simply "read off" from the presence of particular conditions within the contact (i.e., that it was cooperative, that the participants were of equal status, etc.). Given the

context-specific character of racial and ethnic relations, and their highly contingent and contradictory forms, the production of such ungrounded assumptions is highly questionable. (Connolly, 2000, p. 176)

So, for an educational institution, what will matter is how the community in question responds to contact hypothesis conditions on its own terms rather than whether theoretical, textbook conditions can be successfully monitored, measured, standardised and replicated. Hence, the most useful evidence for the contact hypothesis may well come through a series of case studies, each different from the next, as frustrating as this might be for the positivist thrust of certain types of research design seeking, for epistemological reasons, comparability and generalisability.

This is not to say that systematic reviews or meta-analyses have not been conducted to point to generalised findings (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; 2006).

Research by Pettigrew & Tropp

Pettigrew & Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of 713 independent samples from 515 studies dealing with racial prejudice. This piece of research is commonly considered to be the most comprehensive to date. They screened samples for various elements that might have impeded the reliability of their results, for example, those cases where participants could choose to engage in contact with an outgroup (the argument being that cases where there was no choice would be more salient indicators of genuine contact hypothesis causality), creating a publication bias factor with a confidence interval for inclusion, by eliminating studies where results were generalised beyond the direct treatment group and where they were generalised beyond effect sizes (p. 754). Another important piece of research on the efficacy of the

contact hypothesis is that of Kende et al. (2018). They found, after working with a broad and culturally diverse sample, that hierarchical societies (the risk of stereotype in affirming this is already problematic) were less prone to be impacted by the contact hypothesis than more egalitarian societies (another label that begs questions).

A useful critical analysis of Tropp & Pettigrew's meta-analysis is the 2017 study by Paluk, Green & Green. Their study confirms the overall affirmative findings of Pettigrew but importantly identifies gaps in research that should form the substance of future studies. Most notably that the effects of the contact hypothesis on racial prejudice are relatively weak. The authors also point out that there is a relative dearth of study in the reduction of ethnic prejudice in adults. This indicates a further pathway for future studies.

The researchers used a random effect model to measure effect size because this is "particularly attractive when considering (1) studies that are quite heterogeneous, (2) treatments that are ill-specified, and/or (3) effects that are complex and multidetermined" (Cook et al., 1992, p. 310). The following target groups featured among the various studies that were used in the meta-analysis: "Sexual orientation; Physically disabled; Race, Ethnicity; Mentally disabled; Mentally ill; Elderly; Other" (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, p. 764). 72% of the samples were from the United States.

The results of the meta-analysis indicated that on average contact reduces prejudice to a small but useful degree: "the meta-analytic results clearly indicate that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice. Synthesizing effects from 696 samples, the meta-analysis reveals that greater intergroup contact is generally associated with lower levels of prejudice (mean $r = -.215$)" (p. 766).

Although Pettigrew & Tropp's study shows that the contact hypothesis when put into practice has a statistically significant effect (-0.215), the correlation is rather low and does not suggest a major impact on prejudice. What is more striking is the number of cases manifesting a negative corollary between contact and prejudice and the fact that the mean effect was higher when studies were experimental: they state "moreover, the mean effect rises sharply for experiments and other rigorously conducted studies. In addition, 94% of the samples in our analysis show an inverse relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice".

In conclusion, Pettigrew & Tropp suggest that not all of Allport's conditions for prejudice-reducing contact need to be respected for a successful outcome. They give two examples from Apartheid South Africa and segregated American neighbourhoods that show how contact led to a reduction in prejudicial thinking despite the fact that local authorities' positions on these matters were clearly directed elsewhere. The implications of this for schools are important as they suggest that institutional ethos alone might not be as effective as one might think for the reduction of prejudicial thinking.

They posit that an important factor in successful contact hypothesis scenarios is intergroup anxiety. Quoting the research done by Brown & Hewstone (2005), they argue that reducing intergroup anxiety is an important factor since much contact, if not carefully mediated, can heighten anxiety and load on to prejudice.

The meta-analysis ends with a confident assessment of the place of the contact hypothesis in strategies to reduce prejudice. They are sufficiently confident to state that further demonstration is not needed to prove its validity:

Given the current state of the research literature, there is little need to demonstrate further contact's general ability to lessen prejudice. Results from the meta-analysis conclusively show that intergroup contact can promote reductions in intergroup prejudice. Moreover, the meta-analytic findings reveal that contact theory applies beyond racial and ethnic groups to embrace other types of groups as well. As such, intergroup contact theory now stands as a general social psychological theory and not as a theory designed simply for the special case of racial and ethnic contact. (p. 768)

Tropp & Pettigrew's comprehensive analysis leaves the reader with useful tips on what works in contact theory. In 2008 they conducted a meta-analytic test of the three most researched mediators (increasing knowledge of the outgroup, the reduction of anxiety related to intergroup contact and increasing perspective taking and empathy. Their analysis led them to the conclusion that, perhaps not surprisingly, empathy and perspective taking along with anxiety reduction were more important mediators than knowledge of the outgroup.

Studies of different types of contact

Whilst the classical route for contact theory is institutionalised, physical contact between members of different ethnic groups, other studies have been conducted to investigate different types of contact. Those mentioned here suggest different avenues for contact work.

Schiappa, Gregg & Hewes (2005) have developed the Parasocial Contact Hypothesis. The idea is that "If people process mass-mediated communication in a manner similar to interpersonal interaction, then it is worth exploring whether the socially beneficial functions of intergroup contact have an analogue in parasocial contact" (p. 93). Essentially, the authors

posit, "knowing" someone through a televised setting can have similar effects on outlooks on the group that they represent as "knowing" them in real life would.

Allport himself acknowledged the power of the media to influence peoples' prejudices (1954, pp. 200-202) and it stands to reason that in a media-saturated 21st Century, positions will be altered by exposure to media. Schiappa, Gregg & Hewes take the idea quite far:

> One can learn about a minority group from mediated messages and representations, and if one has a positive experience, one's behavior is altered in that one normally will seek out additional (parasocial) contact rather than avoid it. One can develop affective ties with persons known only through mediated communication, and, whether one reappraises one's beliefs about one's ingroup or not, the resulting parasocial relationships could encourage a change in prejudicial attitudes about the outgroups to which minority characters belong. (2005, p. 97)

The authors explain how in five studies analysed in a meta-analysis, "parasocial contact is positively correlated with perceived homophily" (p. 100). They registered a mean effect size of .48 for an overall sample of over 600 participants. They went on to conduct their own research on 174 college students who were shown ten episodes of the television show "Six Feet Under" (in which the protagonist is homosexual). After pre-and post-testing using Likert-type scales to measure attitudes towards homosexuality, selecting only those respondents who had never seen an episode of the programme before, they found that "the post-test measure of prejudice toward gay men (ATG) was lower than the pre-test mean after parasocial contact with the gay characters of Six Feet Under" (p. 105).

Schiappa, Gregg & Hewes conducted similar quasi-experiments using other television programmes and generally found that these had an effect on views towards homosexuality, supporting the Parasocial Contact Hypothesis. However, they admit shortcomings in their experimental methodology: the studies were not randomized and did not use control groups.

Amichai-Hamburger & McKenna (2006) suggest that the internet provides a solution to the problems of practicality and anxiety among participants by creating a neutral environment where many of the physical facets, cues and symbols suggesting group belonging are not discernible. The argument is also that such environments are comparatively simple to design, unlike the logistically challenging and potentially artificial physical contexts that must be etched out for the contact hypothesis to be enacted.

 This argument goes some way but I would argue that without face-to-face contact, the extent and sincerity of the exchange can be put into question. Furthermore, it becomes almost impossible to determine institutional values through the medium of the internet as there is no controlling agency or buy-in factor for users (why, after all, would someone on a blog or in an e-mail thread, hearken to an institutional message?). A quick survey of most online fora, chats or responses to online postings shows how quickly dialogue can degenerate into outbursts of prejudice expiation and misuse by internet trolls.

The Contact Hypothesis and prejudice against immigrants – research on the effect of knowledge of the outgroup

McLaren (2003) has shown how contact has reduced the feeling of threat Europeans harbour towards immigrants, pointing out in particular that friendships between participants and members of immigrant minority groups lead to less willingness to see illegal immigrants

expelled. His studies have also shown that contact dampens anxiety about mass immigration, leaving participants feeling less insecure about large groups of migrants arriving in their countries.

A problem with this assertion, something that is common to the literature on prejudice, is the assumption that views on immigration can be attributed to prejudiced or open-minded mindsets based on the intrinsic value of statements about decisions to host or expel immigrants. I would argue that this is an indirect and potentially inaccurate representation of the degrees of prejudice a person might hold about a group. It is not inconceivable, for instance, that someone harbouring significant prejudices against immigrants might believe that expulsion is not an answer whilst, on the other hand, someone with a relatively low level of prejudiced sentiment towards immigrants, still believes that expulsion is a better political solution.

Part of this complexity can be felt in the modern-day state of right wing and left wing political discourses in Western Europe in which anti-immigration views are not necessarily and systematically the sole property of the right but can be felt in populist, traditionally leftist quarters too. This is clear in France where the traditional extreme right National Front party has well-known left-wing politicians or socialist joining its ranks[21] and votes swing from traditionally left-wing constituencies to the National Front (see Pécout, 2017).

So whilst contact might lead to a relaxed position on immigration as a socio-political, demographic phenomenon, this does not in and of itself mean that it will lead to less prejudice against immigrants as human beings.

---

[21] Gilbert Collard

Novotny & Polonsky (2011) correlated the amount of contact Czech and Slovak students had with Muslims with their knowledge of Islam through 716 interviews and found that less knowledge of Islam correlated with more fear and prejudice of that religion and that more contact with Muslims correlated positively with knowledge and understanding of Islam. Findings were modest and addressed with a strong cautionary note from the authors about the limits of generalisability. Nonetheless, they were able to strengthen their hypothesis that some knowledge of the outgroup is needed for prejudiced positions to be dampened. It stands to reason that knowledge of a group will be increased with contact.

The relationship between knowledge of a group and contact with a group is not necessarily positively correlated. Agirdag, Loobuyck and Van Houtte (2012) conducted a study on 620 Flemish teachers in Belgium and found that whilst Muslim and/or female teachers had a positive approach to Muslims, well educated (four years college degree and more) teachers working in schools with more than half enrolled Muslims held less positive attitudes.

Negative intergroup contact

A variant of the contact hypothesis that has been tested is negative intergroup contact. Paolini, Harwood & Rubin (2010) ran an experiment where 49 White Australians were interviewed after meeting with a woman from Sri Lanki who was briefed to act in positive or negative experience conditions (in other words, in an engaging, friendly manner for the former and a terse, cold manner for the second). The findings showed that participants referred to the woman's ethnicity in the second instance. This would suggest that negative experiences with people from other groups tend to highlight or exacerbate prejudicial thinking.

A study with a similar hypothesis was conducted by Barlow et al. (2012) to investigate White Australians' attitudes towards Black Australians alongside White Americans' views of Black Americans. 1560 participants' reflections on contact quantity and valence were correlated with prejudice indices. The authors determined two types of racism in their study: modern racism whereby race issues were discarded in the vein of a "everything is fine for Black people" manner of thinking and a more traditional mode of racism whereby Black people were associated with undesirable stock characteristics.

The results of the comparative study were rather surprising: in the Australian sample, where White Australians mainly manifested a modern type of racism, increased negative contact led to an increase in prejudice (against Black Australians) as might be expected. However, less predictably, Barlow et al. found that an increase in positive contact did not reduce prejudice but actually saw a slight increase.

The American sample, on the other hand, in which White people articulated both old-fashioned and modern forms of racism against Black people showed that an increase in negative contact correlated with an avoidance to discuss race and a lack of trust of Black people in positions of authority: "White Americans […] were more skeptical that Obama was born in the United States" (p. 1630).

In essence, the study shows that negative encounters across social group divides are important as they can have a stronger influence on attitudes than positive encounters. Therefore, when building community guidelines to reduce prejudicial thinking through contact, mechanisms should be put in place that allow for negative contact to be analysed and scaffolded with appropriate follow-up.

It is for this reason that when there are situations of conflict, the feelings and conclusions that either interlocutor derives should be discussed and problematised by the authorities presiding over the conflict resolution. In schools this can be done through constructive dialogue, pedagogic questioning ("Why do you think he or she did that?" "What makes you say that?" "Do you think it might be due to where he or she comes from or what he or she believes in? Why?" "What conclusions can you draw from this situation?").

Indeed, although much thinking on reflective dialogue asks participants to reflect on their own thought processes and emotions, I would suggest that it is equally important to ask why someone thinks that another person might have done whatever they did. This can be used as an opening or conversation prompt to lead to a richer understanding of the reasons, possibly prejudiced, that someone might attribute to another's actions.

Application in Schools

The contact hypothesis lends itself naturally to the social organisation of schools in that students are already grouped together under superordinate goals and, in theory or at least in what one would hope would be the majority of cases, the values of a school tend to promote equal opportunity for each individual, one of Allport's mediators. Since the contact hypothesis is a widely accepted strategy to reduce prejudice with convincing results, schools should embrace it wholeheartedly. However, it should be noted that the results of studies on attempts to use the contact hypothesis in schools have not been particularly strong (see Stephan, 1985; Zhou et al., 2018). This is partly due to the fact that it has typically not been implemented according to all of Allport's mediators and has led to negative interactions. For example, the efforts to use the contact hypothesis in the desegregation of American schools

brought about contact but not the social, institutional support that is needed to sustain it and render it productive.

Whether the school in question is a national, international, public, grammar or independent school, for an institutional discourse to promote superordinate values, school leadership has to position itself boldly and should not behave as mere bureaucratic management structure but should be ambitiously vocal and open about what it stands for. School leaders are accountable for school spirit and the clear articulation of values. The following strategies, which have been selected because of their clear potential to act on prejudicial thinking, can be developed in schools to reinforce the contact hypothesis.

The jigsaw classroom

The jigsaw classroom (Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Aronson & Patnoe, 1997; Aronson, 2000) is one of the best known classroom strategies that uses contact theory to enhance learning and reduce prejudice.

Aronson first used it in 1971in Houston during the climate of desegregation (1964-1974) as a way of defusing the tension that this caused since little clear scaffolding for intergroup contact had been designed by the government or districts to help socialise the desegregated classroom. Aronson observed classic teaching, with the teacher asking questions and students raising their hands and observed that this was an aggressive, competitive environment that was exacerbating the ambient racial tension, he says "we realized that we needed to shift the emphasis from a relentlessly competitive atmosphere to a more cooperative one" (Jigsaw, 2016). Subsequent research has confirmed the damaging effect of too much individual

competition on learning (see Elliot & Dweck, 1988; Smiley & Dweck, 1994; Dweck, 2012), suggesting that techniques such as the jigsaw classroom are needed to reduce anxiety.

The method can be best described in eight clear steps:

1. The students should be divided into groups (usually 4 to 6), ideally the groups will be heterogeneous in composition and will cover a range of backgrounds and ability. Each group should comprise an equal number of students.

2. The lesson content should be divided into the number of students per group (so the lesson wold be divided into 4 parts for groups of 4, 6 parts for groups of 6 and so on).

3. One student per group is assigned a corresponding part of the lesson (so in groups of 4, the 4 lesson parts would be appropriated by each member of the group). This is done for each group, so many students would be appropriating the same part of the lesson simultaneously in different groups. Students should have access to their part of the lesson only.

4. Students are given time to appropriate the part of the lesson (by reading or researching).

5. "Expert groups" are formed by grouping students for each part of the lesson: each student who is responsible for part 1 sits together, each student in charge of part 2 sits at another table and so on. The expert groups are given time to discuss the material together and rehearse the way that they will teach it.

6. The students go back to their original groups and each "expert" teaches his or her section of the lesson to the rest of the group.

7. The teacher roams and facilitates where there are difficulties. As the activity is not only about subject mastery but also social interaction, the teacher should pay particular attention to this to ensure that discussions are supportive and respectful.

8. The class is tested on the lesson.

(adapted and extended from Jigsaw, 2016)

The overarching idea with the jigsaw classroom is that it increases students' self-esteem, academic performance and perspective taking (Aronson & Patnoe, 1997). The emphasis is on students learning from each other as they work as a team, respecting one another and learning how to listen attentively to one another, respecting each interlocutor in the process. By shifting roles from peer to learner to teacher, students' egocentricity is diminished (Bridgeman, 1981). By making the class end with some formal assessment, the teacher gives importance to the students' teaching role and ensures that the exercise is taken seriously.

Interestingly, while the jigsaw method is widely referenced as a strategy to increase self-efficacy, mastery and tolerance, there are relatively few empirical studies on it. Some studies have been conducted to show how it can reduce prejudice in the classroom. For example, Walter & Crogan (1998) ran a controlled trail on 103 Grade 4-6 students in Australia and found that the Jigsaw classroom decreased the stereotyping of Asians and European Australians but, interestingly, increased social distancing between Australian Europeans and indigenous peoples (p. 391). Like other manifestations of the contact hypothesis, this shows that bringing students together, even in highly structured ways, will not necessarily undo prejudiced thinking and can actually load onto it. In Walter & Crogan's case, their analysis for the increased social distancing is that "stereotypes about Aborigines are particularly

pernicious" and also because there were few indigenous peoples in the school which meant that interactions were not substantial enough to be generalised.

Darnon, Buchs & Desbar (2012) tested the jigsaw method on 33 male vocational training students in a controlled trial and found that it created higher levels of self-efficacy.

Bratt (2008) ran two quasi-experiments (controlled) on 11 and 13-15 year olds but found no real impact of the jigsaw method on intergroup relations. Souvignier & Kronenberger (2007) ran a three-way controlled trial on 208 students from the third grade (in three different classes, each studying astronomy and geometry) to test the jigsaw method alongside a jigsaw with supplementary questioning training and a teacher-guided instruction environment. They found that the jigsaw strategy helped novice learners for some classes but that on the whole, teacher-guided instruction yielded better results for stronger students.

Whilst the evidence on the impact and success of the Jigsaw classroom is not entirely conclusive, the classroom climate it creates is worth considering and teachers should feel confident enough about it as a strategy to try it in the classroom. In any case, there is no available literature on the notion that the Jigsaw classroom increases prejudice.

School events
School events that can enhance contact between students whilst respecting some of Allport's principles include group projects, spirit or challenge days (where students are grouped in such a way as to increase contact across diversity) and assemblies. Team sports cover many of Allport's conditions for prejudice-reducing contact: the zero-sum game individual approach to goals is superseded by collective cooperation, team members learn more about each other as

they work towards a common goal and the values of team spirit bind the group in an ethical, philosophical stance of togetherness. Brown & Brown et al. (2003) surveyed American high school students on attitudes towards Black people and White people by either group in relation to team sports and found that White people who had experienced team sports with Black people were more tolerant towards Black people.

Grouping of students

Schools can focus on ensuring that students are grouped in diverse configurations and that the reasons for such diverse settings are made clear, although this is just one step in the direction of prejudice reduction. In boarding schools, students can be placed in dormitories so that cliques are broken and students are stretched to learn about others. Shook & Fazio (2008) conducted a natural field experiment in a college dormitory and found that interracial room-mating produced less intergroup anxiety and implicit racial attitudes.

In 1985, Slavin reviewed instances of cooperative learning more broadly and found that 16 of the 19 studies analysed "had positive effects of interracial friendships" (Parker, 2002, p. 140).

Assessment

If schools use the contact hypothesis to create prejudice-reducing leaning opportunities, it will be important to assess not only cognitive and academic progress but the ways in which students have grown in their interactions with others. Behaviours and attitudes need to be recognised and there should be feedback on these to show parents and students what is considered important and so as to valorise and build a discussion around working together.

Interestingly, many assessment criteria descriptors focus not on group work but on independence. For example:

"A highly organised, independent learner" (Wasely Hills High School, 2016)

"A highly motivated student who is able to work independently, takes full responsibility for their own learning" (The Ferrers School, 2016)

"Takes full responsibility for his/her learning; Works to the best of his/her ability; Demonstrates an ability to work independently"

(The Elton High School, 2016)

"Works independently and takes responsibility for their learning including independent use of success criteria" (Sherburn High School, 2014)

The spirit of academic excellence with its reliance on independent inquiry is perhaps not an encouragement to work together but more an incentive for individualism and competition. Dubey & Geanakoplos (2010) have argued that grading creates a "status game" in schools whereas Kohn (2011) has pointed out how the learning stops when the grading starts, creating instead a culture of unhealthy competitiveness. Schools need to think carefully about striking a balance between individual performance and learning to live together and work as a team.

An example of assessment criteria celebrating more collaborative dispositions include the personal development, behaviour and welfare criteria developed by Ofsted:

Pupils discuss and debate issues in a considered way, showing respect for others' ideas and points of view. Pupils work hard with the school to prevent all forms of bullying, including online bullying and prejudice-based bullying. Staff and pupils deal effectively

with the very rare instances of bullying behaviour and/or use of derogatory or aggressive language. (Ofsted, 2015)

Self, peer or formal assessment should focus on team work, collaboration, listening skills, respect and dialogue, much in the vein of social constructivist pedagogical theory (Vygotsky, 1978).

Chapter Conclusion

The idea that people can reduce their own prejudice and the prejudice of others through contact does not bear out when looked at intuitively and historically. As Forbes points out,

> tensions between the different nationalities in the Balkans seem to have grown worse during the past century, despite the increasing opportunities they have had to meet and to form close personal relations. More generally, neighbouring peoples—the French and the Germans, for example, or the Indians and the Pakistanis—seem to have the greatest trouble getting along, not those who live farther apart, such as the Peruvians and the Palestinians or the Tamils and the Turks. The more contact, it seems, the more trouble. (Forbes, 2004 p. 72)

Therefore, mere contact alone is not always a sufficient condition for prejudice reduction – it needs to be structured carefully, in the light of the considerable research on the subject, to ensure that maximal value comes from the contact. Situations can degenerate or ameliorate when there is contact:

More interracial contact can lead either to greater prejudice and rejection or to greater respect and acceptance, depending upon the situation in which it occurs. The basic issue, then, concerns the types of situations in which contact leads to distrust and those in which it leads to trust. (Pettigrew, 1971, p. 275)

This chapter has shown how optimal conditions for contact might be difficult to replicate in real life situations and, according to Pettigrew & Tropp's 2006 meta-analysis, might not all be entirely necessary for the successful effects of the contact hypothesis to be felt. However, I would argue that three conditions that are consistently referred to in the research that are essential for schools are:

1. The equality or inequality of status of the different groups in contact;

2. Their cooperative or competitive interdependence in the pursuit of common goals; and

3. The presence or absence of social norms supporting intergroup contact. (Forbes, 2004, p. 74)

I would add to these the two most significant mediators as researched by Pettigrew and Tropp (2008):

4. Reducing anxiety

5. Promoting empathy and perspective-taking.

The first point means that schools need to make it clear in their mission statements that they strongly support that human beings are of equal value, that no person is to be considered intrinsically superior to another and that each individuals' experiences carry equal weight,

importance and significance. Though this is not to say that anything goes: respecting people's positions and frames of reference does not mean that ideas should not be debated critically. The point is not for schools to embrace extreme relativism when it comes to ideas but to embrace equality and equity when it comes to human beings.

Schools should stand by the values decreeing human worth as articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948); these values should be reiterated in assemblies, classrooms, through debates, events and assessments for students, teachers and parents to internalise them and realise that they are ideas that the institution will defend and promote. This will be far more important than the mere existence of words on paper. Needless to say, it is the actions that schools will take to ensure that the human contact that characterises their communities is not segregated and ridden with prejudice that will make a real impact.

The second point is a particularly valuable challenge for schools to consider since high stakes testing, ranking systems, hierarchical admissions policies to programmes and other competitive strategies for social categorisation that are common in schools do not go in the sense of the literature on the contact hypothesis. The zero-sum game approach to social organisation is something that schools should seek to undo as they carve out a vision of society that is built on team-work, shared knowledge, cooperation, empathy, assistance, collective problem solving and solidarity. Pettigrew explains that:

> The groups share common goals and work cooperatively to achieve these goals. Group
>
> against group competition in zero-sum games – in which what one side wins, the other
>
> loses - is a certain recipe for increased intergroup hostility and conflict. By contrast, group

interdependence builds cross-group bonds; in time it can even create a single, overarching

group identity. In this situation, cooperation between the groups wins rewards for both

that are unattainable for each group working alone. (Pettigrew, 2008)

Allport's exhortation for authorities to lead a non-prejudicial culture (point 3 above) remains

critical. One cannot hope for a genuinely open-minded ethos to flourish in a setting where

strong values of common humanity are not iterated and celebrated. School leadership should

model the contact hypothesis and encourage students, parents and teachers of different

backgrounds to interact and work together. Preaching against prejudice in a segregated

environment is unlikely to go any real distance.

The fact that educationally-instigated contact might create tension for participants when faced

with patterns of segregation in broader society means that school leaders and teachers should

take particular care in scaffolding an anxiety-reducing environment (point 4 above), an

essential mediator for contact much advocated by Pettigrew & Tropp (2000, 2005), not only

so that students are more comfortable to take risks, ask questions and learn productively but

so that friendships across social lines are more likely to flourish away from the judgemental

views of life outside the educational institution's parameters and values.

At the core of this is the question of identity: with what do students identify themselves and

what is the role of the school community in this? Erickson (2011) has pointed out that

amongst the more recent iterations and adaptations of Allport's original hypothesis (for

example, Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 or Kenworthy et al., 2005), an element that has re-shaped

the way that many researchers look at intergroup contact is "the importance of rousing a sense

of identity among participants" (Erickson, 2011, p. 11).

The extent to which the contact hypothesis applies to a 21st Century world, far more interrelated, complex, ambiguous, volatile and unpredictable than the 50s when Allport first put forward the idea, needs to be problematised. We are living in a world where notions of social identity and cultural capital are not what they used to be. The entire premise of the contact theory is that group identity is fairly stable and individuals will judge it from a clear vantage point, choosing to integrate or reject cultural artefacts and expressions.

However, as Forbes points out saliently:

> As liberal societies become more and more multicultural, it becomes harder and harder to think of their problems of ethnic conflict in the old liberal way—as problems of the relations between individuals rooted in their irrational prejudices and thus amenable to resolution through the promotion of friendly personal contacts. It becomes more and more necessary to see them as problems of the relationships between groups rooted in their cultural differences and conflicting demands for recognition. (Forbes, 2004, p. 86)

This leads us to the fifth essential point about the contact hypothesis – empathy and perspective-taking. For contact to be meaningful, it must allow for students not only to exchange ideas between themselves but to make a concerted effort to see situations from viewpoints other than their own. In this sense, the contact theory put into practice should be less a question of trying to understand other people and imagining the correlations that might be made between what they say and think and where they come from, and much more an expression of the power of diversity and group work where people can learn from one another

holistically, with open minds and consider the richness and diversity of human thought as they

work together.

Chapter Seven: Principles of International Education

The construct of international education is explored in this chapter by engaging in a debate over the differences between multiculturalism and interculturality. I then situate international education and international schools historically before examining the International Baccalaureate (IB). I argue that eight elements within the IB programmes contain research-informed fundamentals for the reduction of prejudice: service learning, the learning of an additional language, world literature, international humanities, inquiry, reflection, concepts-focussed learning and theory of knowledge. By learning from the tenets of international education, any school, not only international or IB schools, can create curricular opportunities so that students' experiences are more conducive to prejudice reduction.

Introduction

This chapter runs through the elements of international education that are particularly powerful as strategies to reduce prejudice. I discuss international education with particular emphasis on the International Baccalaureate.

It is useful to briefly outline the differences between multicultural, intercultural and international education.

Multicultural education

Multicultural education celebrates diversity and separate cultural identities. Critical multicultural theory has been propounded, amongst others, by Sleeter and Bernal (2004), Gorski (2006) and Vavrus (2010), particularly in higher education in the United States. Camicia sees multicultural education as having a strong purpose and ethos: it "enables students to critically examine traditional mainstream and hegemonic narratives across subject

areas. In doing so, students develop the critical faculties necessary to challenge the hierarchies that serve as tools for prejudice construction and social injustice" (2007, p. 225). Nieto and Bode (2008) have suggested that constructive multicultural educational programmes should emphasise "tolerance […], acceptance […], respect […], affirmation, solidarity and critique" (pp. 426-427). An emphasis on tolerance is problematic since "If all we expect of students is tolerance, can we ever hope that they will reach the point where they understand, respect, and affirm differences?" (Nieto, 2002, p. 257)[22] Indeed, this leads to a problem with multicultural education, namely that as it retains an emphasis on difference, identity and respect, it tends to exacerbate and perhaps create entrenched, even antagonistic positions from which relationships are formed and is less likely to see integrated group work in the name of a higher force and risks anchoring students in separatist ethnic, cultural or gender-related identity. In short, multicultural education will not necessarily reduce prejudice.

Intercultural Education

If the multicultural classroom focusses on dialogue between cultures and common pursuits, it might evolve into an intercultural classroom.

Intercultural "refers to evolving relations between cultural groups", "interculturality presupposes multiculturalism" (UNESCO, 2006, p. 17). Different typologies and models of intercultural awareness have been developed by Haywood (2007) and Deardorff (2009), and surveyed by Spitzberg and Changnon (2009). They tend to bring out qualities such as respect, openness and curiosity (Deardorff, 2009); linguistic competence and critical cultural

---

[22] For a more detailed discussion on the inadequacy of tolerance and, more than this, tolerance as a strategy of aversion, see Wendy Brown's *Regulating Aversion – Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (2008).

awareness (Byram, 1997) with emphasis placed on interaction, evolving states of awareness and communication skills.

The construct of intercultural education is well-researched but features more in the realm of policy statements and competence models than in actual institutions: schools tend not to call themselves "intercultural" but at the same time there are numerous guidelines on intercultural awareness that can be applied to different educational models.

The conviction that intercultural education has a core role to play in reducing prejudice has been argued in various forms by numerous researchers (Haegel, 1999; Jasinska-Kania, 1999; Peri, 1999; Byran and Vavrus, 2005; Byram, 1997; IB, 2013; UNESCO, 2006). The theoretical foundations of these positions rest on the common thesis that affective, critical, intercultural awareness is needed to combat prejudice and that these qualities can be found in intercultural education.

UNESCO's guidelines on intercultural education state that education should be "non-discriminatory" and should "aim at eliminating prejudices about culturally distinct population groups within a country", 2006, p. 35) whereas teacher training and curricula should develop "a critical awareness of the role education ought to play in the struggle against racism and discrimination" (p. 36).

Intercultural education is an aspirational, philosophical statement about how education can bring people together under constructive, humane goals. One area of education where interculturality is operationalised is international education.

International Education

Ironically, although the appellation "international school" is well known and institutionalised, "international education" as a term has not been universally defined (Simandiraki, 2006). "There is "no single coherent picture of 'internationalism' within the individual that … international education aims to develop" (Gunesch, 2004, p. 252), while schools "do not have to meet any criteria to call themselves an international school" (MacDonald, 2006, p. 193).

In this chapter, by "international education" I will be referring to the same construct as "intercultural education" for the simple reason that, when it comes to reducing prejudice through education, both concepts are premised on the same fundaments of respect, tolerance and diversity. It would be unhelpfully pedantic to separate the terms here but to read more on the nuances between them see Gunesch, 2004 and Hughes, 2009.

A definition of international education that can be used in this chapter is of a system where ''emphasis should be laid in a basic attitude of respect for all human beings as persons, understanding of those things which unite us and an appreciation of the positive values of those things which may seem to divide us, with the objective of thinking free from fear or prejudice'' (Hill, 2012, p. 11).

The question is, how these humanist goals can be successfully elaborated, tracked and assessed and the extent to which international education does this.

The tenets of International Education

The first international school in the world, at least, certainly the oldest continuously operating international school – was the International School of Geneva. Marie-Therese Maurette, the

charismatic first director of the school, in a 1948 pamphlet published by UNESCO, laid out the following conditions for an "education for peace":

- Minimising national sentiments (Maurette, 1948, p. 7). Maurette once told her students, "furious as you are, you must never use nationality or race as a term of abuse. That, in this school, is the crime of crimes" (Walker, 2009, p. 79).

- Teaching young people about the horrors of war (Maurette, 1948, p. 7)

- The study of world geography and world history (pp. 8-15)

- Bilingualism (pp. 15-17)

- Global Affairs/World news (pp. 17-18)

- World citizenship (p. 19)

She added to this a spirit of camaraderie and fair play within a diverse international setting. To a large extent, Maurette's conditions for an international education are still relevant today. The idea in Maurette's model is that of the world citizen, a type of decategorisation (Ensari & Miller, 2001) of social identity and rebaptism under new auspices that transcend national or cultural differences.[23] Models of cosmopolitanism ranging from those of supranational governance to moral and economic cosmopolitanism are discussed and problematised by Appiah (2006), Bohman (2004). Habermas (2001) and Nussbaum (2006).

Haywood suggests that "international mindedness" is a better term to consider than "international education" because it focusses on outcomes rather than processes. He lists a number of non-prejudicial mindsets as signs of international mindedness such as:

---

[23] The earliest models of this coined by Sophists in some of Plato's dialogues (*Protagoras*, 337c7-d3; The *Apology,* 23b4–6) and most famously by Diogenes the Cynic who described himself not as a citizen of Sinope but as a *kosmopolites* or citizen of the world (Diogenes Laertius, VI 63).

open attitudes towards other ways of life and a predisposition to tolerance as regards

other cultures and their belief systems, […] recognition of the interconnectedness of

human affairs (in place and time) as part of the holistic experience of life, human

values that combine respect for other ways of life with care and concern for the

welfare and well-being of people in general. (Haywood, 2007, pp. 86-87)

Since the opening of the International School of Geneva, international education has become a widespread phenomenon, spreading through organs such as the International Baccalaureate (Peterson, 1987; Hughes, 2009; Cambridge, 2012), the Council of International Schools and the United World Colleges Movement (Peterson, 1987). The philosophy of most international schools is close to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the values articulated by UNESCO (2006): ''openness to cultural exchange'' (p. 13), ''mutual respect'' (p. 17), dignity, equality, friendship, understanding, and peaceful relations (p. 25).

The International Baccalaureate

Many of these schools are involved in explicitly international educational programmes, most notably the International Baccalaureate (IB), a programme for children from 3 to 19 years of age, designed in 1962 whose educational philosophy is "to develop internationally minded people who, recognizing their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet, help to create a better and more peaceful world" (IB, 2006). The IB has been described as "an education for international-mindedness; an education designed to break down the barriers of race, religion and class; an education [that extols] the benefits of cultural diversity; above all else, an education for peace" (Walker, 2011, p. 19).

The IB places "a strong emphasis on encouraging students to develop intercultural understanding, open-mindedness, and the attitudes necessary for them to respect and evaluate a range of points of view" (IB, 2015, p. 2). The Mission statement of the organisation encourages "students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right" (p.4). One sees in this statement an example of individuation (Bettencourt et al., 1992) whereby people's qualities are sought outside and beyond social categorisation.

The IB's values are synthesised in the Learner Profile, a set of qualities that are valued and developed in groups and individuals. IB learners should strive to be "inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced and reflective" (IB, 2013). All of these qualities suggest prejudice reduction in different ways.

IB and International School vision statements are clearly directed towards forming attitudes of open-mindedness and tolerance. Some discuss prejudice explicitly, for example the Swiss National Coalition Building Institute (2015) which has developed training modules that aim to have "participants develop their ability to shift prejudicial attitudes".

Wright (2014) conducted interviews with "23 women and men aged from 20 to 63" (p. 2) who had completed IB programmes between the 1960s and early 2010's and found that participants believed that the IB had provided them with critical thought, "a broader view of the world" (p. 1) and, to a lesser extent, attitudes influencing ongoing commitment to community service.

Skrzypiec et al. (2014) conducted a study on students studying the Middle Years IB Programme and found that qualities of empathy and self-reflection were being built in IB schools. In a 2010 IB Position Paper, Hare describes holistic learning in the IB as students "examining their own values and prejudices" (Hare, 2010, p. 7). These findings suggest but do not prove low levels of prejudiced thinking in IB graduates.

Investigating the curriculum of the IB

The IB is a broad-based curriculum that allows for potential prejudice reduction through the study of a number of core elements. Each of these facets of the IB philosophy has the potential to allow students to open their minds to other cultures, people and places. It is worth investigating each of these to discuss the extent to which they have the potential to reduce prejudice, bearing in mind that most of them are common elements to be found in most curricula around the world:

- Service learning;

- The learning of an additional language;

- World literature;

- The humanities;

- Inquiry;

- Reflection;

- Concepts-focussed learning;

- Theory of Knowledge.

Service earning

Service learning is central in all of the IB's programmes and is core to the idea of "learning to live together" (Delors, 1996). It is defined by the IB as the "development and application of knowledge and skills towards meeting an identified community need" (IB, 2015, p. 20). UNESCO's International Bureau of Education and the International School of Geneva state that

> the fundamental goal of service learning is to empower students to take an active part in an education that develops a profound sense of humanity. This implies values such as humility, empathy and open-mindedness, and personal conduct such as commitment and initiative that are mediated by critical, creative, alert and reflective thinking.
> (UNESCO – IBE et al., 2014, p. 29)

Service Learning can be related to Dewey's 1938 theory of experiential learning (see Giles & Eyler, 1994). In this way, service learning has the potential to break down prejudices because it involves concrete experience, contact between people, research and action that allow stereotypes to be nuanced or abandoned. Erickson and O'Connor (2000), referring to Delve, Mintz & Stewart (1990), see service learning as effective in "changing negative social attitudes towards outgroups" (Erickson & O'Connor, 2000, p. 60) whereas studies by Kendall (1990) have shown that students report a decrease in their own stereotypic depictions of other people when they are involved with them in service programmes that ensure and celebrate diversity.

Rhoads (1998) describes a project he conducted whereby over 200 students from Pennsylvania State University, the University of South Carolina and Michigan State University were observed over a six-year period as they engaged in community service

projects. 108 students were interviewed and 66 completed open-ended surveys as part of a qualitative research design. Similar to Kendall's findings, students reported that the a priori generalisations they had of other people were diminished considerably when they came into contact with members of those groups through community service projects, this being the case in particular for poor people (Rhoads, 1998, p. 288).

Service learning in and of itself will not necessarily reduce prejudicial thinking, especially if it is done in the wrong way. Erickson, referring to Erickson & O'Connor, 2000; Hollis, 2004; Jones, 2002 and Kendall, 1990, points out that "researchers have cautioned about the potential for unintended consequences of service-learning: the potential for increased prejudice, stereotyping, and victim blaming in service-learning participants (Erickson, 2011, p. 1)".

As such, the Guiding Principles for Learning in the 21st Century, published by the International School of Geneva and UNESCO's International Bureau of Education state in their principles for service learning that students should not be brought to believe that they are messiahs come to save the less fortunate than themselves but more people who are offering their help if it is needed as learners in a transaction (UNESCO-IBE, 2014, p. 30). Indeed, schools need to be wary of sending out the wrong messages to everybody involved in community service projects as they can easily turn into self-gratifying exercises in patronising charity.

Another important precursor for service learning, if it is to reduce rather than exacerbate prejudice, is to ensure that it is not short-term but sufficiently extended for profound, reflective transaction to take place. Erickson (2011) suggests two-term projects as minimal.

One could add to this the importance of participants taking a positive, anxiety-free attitudes to Service Learning (p. 11).

Service learning programmes outside of the IB are numerous including the Duke of Edinburgh International Award (Duke of Edinburgh, 2016), an extra-curricular learning experience that involves student-designed projects with different aspects to holistic development including action and community service, and the United World Colleges movement (Peterson, 1987) that places particular emphasis on service learning.

The learning of an additional language

Learning an additional language is by no means exclusive to the IB and can be found in most schools. This much said, language learning is central to the programme and can be looked at as an interesting model for schools that do not place a huge importance on second language learning, bilingualism or plurilingualism. It is also interesting to look at the IB as a model because language acquisition puts an emphasis on intercultural competence and therefore, to a certain extent, prejudice reduction.

All of the IB programmes make clear the importance of learning an additional language for greater intercultural understanding. The IB Middle Years Programme (students aged 12 to 16) Language Acquisition Guide opens with the following citation from Savignon (1983): "learning to speak another's language means taking one's place in the human community. It means reaching out to others across cultural and linguistic boundaries" (IB, 2014, p. 4). The guide goes on to point out that the study of additional languages can "develop insights into the features, processes and craft of language and the concept of culture, and to realize that there are diverse ways of living, behaving and viewing the world" and "is valued as central to

developing critical thinking, and is considered essential for the cultivation of intercultural awareness and the development of internationally minded and responsible members of local, national and global communities". Language learning "equips students with the necessary multiliteracy skills and attitudes, enabling them to communicate successfully in various global contexts and build intercultural understanding" (IB, 2014, p. 4).

The idea that learning an additional language stimulates intercultural awareness and, therefore, has the potential to reduce cultural prejudice has been explored comprehensively by Byram (2011) who argues that it is an important part of global citizenship education and should be situated within a framework of intercultural competence. Kramsch (2009, p.118) explains that language learning is a subtle manner of penetrating identity, allowing for mature reflection on the construct of culture. He posits that schools need to go much further than teaching grammar to eke out the relationship between language, symbol and identity.

Language in general has been shown to elicit social essentialism because of its embedded grammatical categorisation (Rhodes et al., 2012; Kite and Whitley, 2012). By learning another language, learners are able to better relativise the value of symbolic meaning since they can compare it with other linguistic systems. Lindholm (1994) has suggested that bilingual instruction moves towards a more constructive, less-prejudiced learning environment while Genesee (1987), Cummins (1989, 1994) and Lambert & Cazabon (1994) have discussed how bilingual instruction can raise the profile of a minority language to allow for a more equitable climate.

Learning a second language can reduce prejudice according to Tomlinson and Masuhara (2004) through "suspension of judgement" when communicating with another person (p. 7).

Byram, Gribkova and Starkey (2002) suggest that additional language learning should involve critical discourse analysis so that students are brought to investigate text for discourse. They state that "learners can acquire the skills of critical analysis of stereotypes and prejudice in texts and images they read or see" (p. 28). Wright and Bougie's research has shown bilingual programmes in the USA, particularly heritage-language programmes, can have a positive effect on social identity and have the potential to reduce "prejudice among members of the dominant group" (Wright and Bougie, 2007, p. 157).

It should be noted, of course, that many schools and national curricula are bilingual with numerous examples in the United States, Europe and the Middle East, some taking second language learning to another level by integrating it with the learning of a subject in what is known as content and language integrated learning (CLIL) (Baker, 2006). With an effort to strengthen the effect second language learning has on students' views of culture and identity, thousands of schools across the globe have the potential to reduce prejudicial thinking.

World Literature

When it comes to the study of a first language, literature itself can provide students with a mind-opening opportunity to problematise social categories, discover cultures and empathise with other people. Literature is a gateway to the authentic voices of those who have stories of the oppressed to tell, including those stories of people who have suffered prejudice. A salient example is Chimamanda Agozi Adichie's *Americanah* (2013), suitable for Upper High School students, which describes what it means to be a Black person in the United States and in Nigeria, how the image of the self is reconstrued and viewed with prejudices. Angie Thomas' *The Hate U Give* (2017), suitable for Lower High School students, describes a protagonist who lives out prejudice that is closely aligned with that the author experienced

directly in a racially divided United States. Furthermore, some of the famous works of fiction that treat prejudice directly can be used to raise awareness amongst students, something that can happen in any classroom and not only an international school. A list of the commonly-cited texts and/or authors that do this is included in Annexe 3 of the thesis.

The IB states that "the study of literature in translation from other cultures is especially important to IB Diploma Programme students because it contributes to a global perspective, thereby promoting an insight into, and understanding of, the different ways in which cultures influence and shape the experiences of life common to all humanity" (IB, 2011, p. 5). Teachers are given a literature in translation list from which to choose works that cover a wide variety of cultural expression beyond European and American classics: this is another way that the study of literature can loosen students' minds of cultural prejudice. I would argue that if schools are serious about using literature to drive intercultural competence and prejudice-reduction, whether they are part of the IB or not, they should insist on some degree of intercultural diversity in their literature departments' booklists.

There is some academic work to suggest that the reading of literature can reduce prejudice: a review by Djikic & Oatley suggests that literature creates more empathy in readers (2014) and a study by Sabine & Sabine (1983) whereby 1,382 readers around the USA were interviewed on the power of literature to transform personality showed some self-reported gains. Ross' study (Ross, 1999) showed that 60% of a sample of 194 readers reported that reading had changed their personalities. Johnson (2013) found significantly levels of empathy growth and prejudice reduction towards Arab-Muslim women in two studies involving participants reading counter-stereotypical fiction about that outgroup.

International Humanities

Students following the IB Diploma programme must study the Humanities. Schools choose from a number of options within this area which subjects to offer. "The DP history course is designed in such a way as to explicitly reinforce the emphasis on the development of international-mindedness. For example, one of the key concepts that weaves throughout the course is perspectives, and, more specifically, an emphasis on encouraging students to appreciate multiple perspectives" (IB, 2015B, p. 7).

A salient example of a subject that students can follow is Global Politics, a course that activates critical thinking, metacognition and understanding beyond the Other by "engaging [students] in respectful and attentive dialogue, discussion and debate, [for them to] progress towards forming their own, well-informed provisional viewpoints" (IB, 2016, p. 8). The subject guide emphasises that "nurturing students' capacity to listen to themselves and to others in order to understand where each is coming from is important for interpreting competing and contestable claims".

Suggested Case Studies include:

- "Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) marches in Eastern Europe from Belgrade in 2010 to present day—are attitudes changing? How and why?" (IB, 2016, p. 44)

- "Race and incarceration in the USA—what are the reasons for, and the effects of, racial profiling in American policing?"

- "Gender borders—the role of Islam in shaping women's rights in Egypt" (p. 45)

Clearly these topics have the potential to engage students in the study of areas that rife with prejudice, discrimination and/or ethnic violence. Again, the angle which teachers decide to take in covering these issues will be of paramount importance since it is here where the extent of the learning experience reducing prejudice (or, indeed, loading on them) will be defined.

Another Humanities option that students can engage with is psychology. The part of the course devoted to sociocultural cognition investigates prejudice directly, allowing students to grapple with the phenomenon in an in-depth manner. The learning objectives for this part of the course include explaining of human behaviour, investigating cognitive biases (such as "fundamental attribution error, illusory correlation [and] self-serving bias" (IB, 2009, p. 19), exploring social identity theory and studying stereotypes.

Other learning opportunities related directly to prejudice as a construct that IB students are afforded include philosophy, social and cultural anthropology and world religions.

The position that the Humanities should be studied to reduce prejudicial thinking is articulated by Martha Nussbaum (1997, 2006, 2010). Nussbaum investigates classical figures such as Socrates, Diogenes the Cynic and Marcus Aurelius to remind the reader that

> It is up to us as educators, to show our students the beauty and interest of a life that is open to the whole world, to show them that there is after all more joy in the kind of citizenship that questions than in the kind that simply applauds, more fascination in the study of human beings in all their real variety and complexity than in the zealous pursuit of superficial stereotypes. (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 84)

However, George Steiner's famous lines remind us of the failure of Western humanistic education to produce the idealised citizen Nussbaum imagines: "We know that a man can read Goethe or Rilke in the evening, that he can play Bach and Schubert, and go to his day's work at Auschwitz in the morning" (Steiner, 1967, p. 15). Hence the challenge of teaching the Humanities for prejudice reduction depends on numerous factors and cannot be expected to shift prejudicial thinking of its own accord.

For an education that reduces prejudice to be successful, such events need to be treated not only openly and factually but through critically-minded discussion, discernment and higher order awareness of the effects that power and culture have on the act of narrating the past. At an affective level, students should be brought to consider historical narratives with empathy and human understanding.

Research on the study of history to reduce prejudice in Europe (in non-International Schools) conducted by Peuker & Reiter (2007) shows that Holocaust education is instituted to a fairly high degree in European countries but that there is nonetheless a tendency to avoid the topic out of fear that it might lead to some form of confrontation between Muslim and Jewish students. They also point out, worryingly, that some teachers "seem to deem the topic not to be crucial" (p. 11). They emphasise the importance of visits to concentration camps to allow a more emotional connection with the Holocaust as this is seen as a more effective educational experience than a purely cognitive approach (p. 12). Peuker & Reiter also discuss minority groups and immigration as historical themes and urge history teachers to treat these subjects more systematically by implementing them into schemes of work. In discussing these points, they argue that teachers should not only be sufficiently knowledgeable about migration history to teach it effectively but should also be knowledgeable about varying perspectives on

migration, including controversial views. If this is not done, the authors argue, the effects can be that "topics in history are brought up in a simplistic and unproblematic way, leading to routine and superficial learning and uninterested students" (p. 13).

The sensitive areas of a history education are those that describe injustices by representatives of nation states. The slave trade for American history textbooks, colonisation for French, British, Portuguese and Spanish textbooks, the holocaust for German, Dutch, French and Italian history textbooks, the Armenian genocide for Turkish history textbooks, the history of native Americans in American textbooks to mention a few, all pose deep historiographical problems about truth, representation and values. The majority of these themes are treated in a simplistic and sometimes distinctly under-represented manner.

Schools do not have to be international or IB to teach international humanities, particularly if they have the means to choose or design the subjects they offer. Yucai High School (2016), for instance, teaches "The Analysis and Deconstruction of the Other" as part of their humanities syllabus while the C.K. McClatchy High School (2013) runs a selective Humanities and International Studies Programme. Teaching the humanities in an international manner is as much about the perspectives and frames of references that are used to discuss issues as the degree of internationalism in the actual syllabus content. Schools teaching the humanities for less prejudice can use the IB models and others from around the world as examples of how this might be designed.

Inquiry

International Education models, particularly the IB, contain a major element of inquiry-based learning, a notion whereby the psychodynamics of learning are seen as fundamental and the voyage of discovery involved in learning is promoted.

The active education movement in the early 20th Century, influenced by the writings of Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Froebel expressed itself in the educational models developed by Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky and Montessori. The founders of the International School of Geneva were versed in this education theory and the notion that learning is about inquiry has remained a cornerstone of international education.

The IB promotes inquiry-based learning most notably in its Primary Years Programme, articulated around "units of inquiry" where the emphasis is on project-based understanding through authentic, hands-on discovery. Students engage in research projects throughout their learning in the IB programmes with exhibitions, personal projects and extended essays based on themes or subjects of their choice.

Inquiry-based learning is anchored within social constructivism, a model of learning whereby knowledge is a socially produced phenomenon that must be built up iteratively through dialogue and group experience. This can be opposed to *Deus ex Machina* models where knowledge exists in an outer realm of truth and is to be absorbed and appropriated by individuals. Importantly, constructivism holds the premise that in learning humans build upon prior knowledge. As Prince & Felder put it, "New information is filtered through mental structures (*schemata*) that incorporate the student's prior knowledge, beliefs, preconceptions and misconceptions, prejudices, and fears" (2015, p. 3). Powerful, transformative learning experiences will restructure prior knowledge and iron out faulty bases in order for "good" or

correct knowledge to be better anchored in understanding (for example, for a prejudiced conclusion to be abandoned, the learner has to go back to the premise that leads to the conclusion and correct it in order to hold onto a coherent sequence of thought).

The implications for prejudice reduction in this vision of learning are considerable because the rigid construct of identity that is erected and withheld in the prejudiced mindset is reviewed as an unstable site of interaction and subjectivity – not so much a thing-in-itself to be discovered but contingent area of potential meaning. Indeed, inquiry-based learning is not just about discovering the world, it is about viewing oneself as a lifelong learner in a voyage to better know other people and oneself.

Inquiry learning is learning by experimenting, it involves students moving away from pure theory to practice. The main idea behind this vision of education is that we learn best through direct experience. The figure who has popularised inquiry learning the most is David Kolb. His experiential learning model is made up of four steps that form a cycle: concrete experience (1) should be observed and reflected upon (2), abstract, transferable concepts should be drawn from that reflection (3), and these concepts should then be tested (4) in the form of new concrete actions (Kolb, Rubin & McIntyre, 1974).

Inquiry-based learning is therefore based on the premise that we learn best when we are actively engaged in our learning, reflecting upon it critically and developing conceptual understanding from real-life experience. In many ways, inquiry-based learning has the potential to dispel or prevent prejudicial thinking because there is necessary ownership and personalisation of learning through action and experience which should, if conducted the right way and under the right circumstances, challenge a-priori sentiments and stereotypes. To give

an example, if a child does a project on a group of people (an ethnic group for example) and meets members of the outgroup as part of field work related to the project, (s)he is likely to have a far more grounded, human and personal understanding than the student who is shown pictures in class and takes notes that are dictated by a teacher on characteristics of the group being studied.

Ainsworth sees inquiry-based learning as part of the larger project of multiculturalism where teachers help "students to reduce prejudice to groups different from their own" (2013, p. 490). Indeed inquiry-based learning implies moving out of the classroom into new, real-life settings, be they natural, social or professional. It is an opportunity for the teacher to make the learning of the child come alive so that (s)he can make connections and internalise authentic examples. Houghton's previously mentioned study (2010), concluding on action research on stereotypes conducted with 36 Japanese university students who not only learned about stereotypes but took action by designing questionnaires and interviewing foreign students so as to develop a more authentic representation of the concept, states that "experiential learning seems to be one way in which meta-cognitive awareness and control may be developed in relation to stereotypes" (p. 195).

Allport pointed out that a prejudiced mindset might well use few experiences as a warrant for an over-generalisation (Allport, 1954, p. 6). For this reason, to build knowledge empirically, many experiences are needed rather than an overgeneralised few. Furthermore, inquiry should be completed with reflection if it is to be of a higher order and if we are to move beyond mere gut reaction to a subtle intellectual process rather than mere recollection of experiences.

Inquiry-based learning is by no means the exclusive property of international or IB schools and numerous examples of this type of education can be found in other school systems, notably the Montessori School philosophy that places an emphasis on student choice and discovery learning or Sugata Mitra's Self Organised Learning Environment (SOLE) pedagogical design whereby students engage in research with very little intervention from the teacher in groups of four using a computer (Mitra, 2013). Whichever form of inquiry-based learning used, educators should keep in mind the potential this classroom strategy has to reduce prejudicial thinking. As Mthethwa-Sommers (2010) points out after investigating, through action research,[24] the effects of inquiry-based learning strategies on social conscientisation:

> The inquiry-based method is therefore not the panacea or the solution for teaching social justice issues. It is, however, a vehicle for students to confront their truths, see various vantage points, experience cognitive dissonance, and reduce levels of resistance [to diversity]. (p. 62)

Reflection

Another element of learning that is emphasised in the IB – one which can be seen as part of the inquiry cycle - is reflection. Students are expected to reflect on their learning to better ensure encoding of information and meaningful afterthought in the relevance and implications of their learning.

The IB's Creativity, Activity, Service programme (CAS) places considerable emphasis on reflection by ensuring that students log their thoughts and experiences in a reflection

---

[24] Again, caution is needed when generalising findings of this sort for we are looking at a specific classroom environment where students reflected in a staged process.

portfolio. The point of reflection in CAS is to ensure that students are not only "doing" but drawing conclusions from their actions and reflecting on the consequences of their choices. (IB, 2015, p. 7). "Reflection informs students' learning and growth by allowing students to explore ideas, skills, strengths, limitations and areas for further development and consider how they may use prior learning in new contexts" (p. 9).

Using King & Kitchener's Reflective Judgement Model (1994), research conducted by Devine (1989) suggests that reflective thinkers "are unsure how to deal with the inherent ambiguity of ill-structured problems. They are more likely to recognize that a stereotype is an inappropriate criterion upon which to base a judgment" (Guthrie, King & Palmer, 2011).

The idea of reflection being a superior level of thought comes to us from John Dewey who saw the process in two movements: "a state of perplexity, hesitation, doubt; and (b) an act of search or investigation directed toward bringing to light further facts which serve to corroborate or to nullify the suggested belief" (Dewey, 1910, p. 3). In this way, reflection is synonymous with critical thinking in that it involves suspension of belief and justification, a clear cognitive response to prejudice. This is something I developed in detail in Chapter Three.

Concepts-Focussed Learning

Central to learning in all age groups in the IB is the idea of learning through concepts rather than topics. The Primary Years Programme (for students from 3 to 12) bases its curriculum on a conceptual framework centred on the following concepts that are reiterated throughout learning: form, function, causation, change, connection, perspective, responsibility, reflection. (IB, 2007, p. 16)

Learning through concepts allows for transfer: "it is by understanding the key abstract features of a concept that students will be able to recognize them in different circumstances and therefore transfer them to their learning" (IBE-ECOLINT, p. 22). Concepts-focussed learning is a necessary element of deep learning for understanding: Erickson (2013) argues that learners need to synthesise information at a higher level of abstraction than ever before because of the information-saturated world that we live in. Concepts, she states, are useful ways of creating mental schemata for information patterning (including information storage and retrieval) while enabling transfer. Indeed, it is via concepts that lessons learnt, patterns gleaned and strategies attempted can be put to new practice.

The IB Middle Years Programme (for 12 to 16 year olds) places a similar focus on concepts with the following key concepts used throughout the curriculum: aesthetics, change, communication, communities, connections, creativity, culture, development, form, global interactions, identity, logic, perspective, relationships, systems, time, place and space (IB, 2015c). The idea is that students learn subject matter through these concepts so as to gain a deeper, transferrable understanding of their properties across different domains.

Where concepts-focussed learning can reduce prejudice is in the cognitive domain through a higher-order moment of understanding that allows for a more subtle appreciation of another person or group. This goes beyond immediate sensory perception or unjustified belief into a realm of abstract thinking.

Allport (1954) explains how a prejudiced person will no doubt have erected simplified concepts that are held on to despite disconfirmation. In order to accommodate inconsistent

215

information, subcategories or exceptions to the rule will be created. This leads to fallacious categories and conceptually weak structures of thought that, in the long term, will cause confusion, cognitive dissonance and a degree of bias that will be difficult to sustain without running into contradictory thoughts.

Therefore, in order to overcome prejudice, individuals need to engage in deep conceptual understanding of themselves and those around them. Understanding prejudice itself is a deep learning experience that is deeply conceptual and could be described as a "threshold concept":

> a threshold concept represents a transformed way of understanding, or interpreting, or viewing something without which the learner cannot progress. As a consequence of comprehending a threshold concept there may thus be a transformed internal view of subject matter, subject landscape, or even world view, and the student can move on. (Land et al., 2005, p. 53).

To give an example, a woman might have developed a prejudice against men along the lines of "men do not know how to listen". When she meets a man who disconfirms this rule by listening, she will usually discard that instance as an exception to the rule or ignore the experience so as not to disturb the stereotype erected in her mind. In order to overcome the statement "men do not know how to listen" to "some men do not know how to listen", the woman will have to revisit her premise, deconstruct it and reshape it. This inner voyage is essentially one whereby a concept is dismantled and replaced or modified. Such an experience is both cognitively difficult as it is emotionally destabilising, a type of reconversion that entails reviewing a number of associated beliefs and assumptions. In this sense, using Land's

definition of the threshold concept, the woman will have to "transform" her "internal view […] or even world view".

Indeed, prejudice itself needs to be viewed and understood conceptually for learners to recognise their own prejudices and it is only once the concept of prejudice itself can be named, understood, recognised and opened to discussion that learners will be able to identify it within themselves and work towards reducing it.

Theory of Knowledge

Students enrolled the IB Diploma Programme follow a 100 hour course in epistemology called Theory of Knowledge. In many ways, this learning experience could be considered the IB's strongest response to prejudicial thinking as the course focusses on how we construct knowledge in different areas and continually asks students to ask themselves the question, "how do I know?" or "how do we know?".

Theory of Knowledge asks students to investigate knowledge through eight ways of knowing (language, sense perception, emotion, reason, imagination, faith, intuition and memory) and eight areas of knowledge (mathematics, natural sciences, human sciences, history, the arts, ethics, religious knowledge systems and indigenous knowledge systems). The course aims all relate to prejudice reduction:

1. Make connections between a critical approach to the construction of knowledge, the academic disciplines and the wider world; 2. Develop an awareness of how individuals and communities construct knowledge and how this is critically examined;

217

3. Develop an interest in the diversity and richness of cultural perspectives and an awareness of personal and ideological assumptions; 4. Critically reflect on their own beliefs and assumptions, leading to more thoughtful, responsible and purposeful lives; 5. Understand that knowledge brings responsibility which leads to commitment and action. (IB, 2013b, p. 14)

The Theory of Knowledge guide unravels many of the stereotype-inducing facets of thought and feeling that lead to prejudice. However, prejudice is not discussed explicitly at any point in the guide with the emphasis being more on the relationship between areas of knowledge and ways of knowing.

In the Theory of Knowledge course, teachers have a tool that can be used to problematise emotion, perception, logic and knowledge systems to investigate social, cognitive and behavioural enterprises of meaning making and, hence, prejudice.

Chapter Conclusion

International Education, which has its roots in The International School of Geneva's vision for an education for peace at the outset of WW1, is an expression of an approach to learning that is premised on value of respectful and humane collaboration. There is much theoretical research on the benefits of models of intercultural competence for prejudice reduction but fewer reliable studies on the effects of international school projects on prejudice reduction.

Although it is difficult to establish a coherent definition of international education, when looking at school education, the best known and most clearly articulated vision of international education is the International Baccalaureate, a curriculum framework for

students from 3 to 19 years of age with a focus on international mindedness and humanitarian values articulated in a learner profile.

There is some evidence that prejudice can be reduced through service learning, the learning of an additional language, world literature and the humanities. These elements are all developed in the IB Diploma Programme (16 to 19 year olds) with service learning and the learning of an additional language common to all of the IB's programmes. However, these educational experiences are not the exclusive remit of the IB or international education and can be found and should be developed in all schools.

Educational and psychological theory points to inquiry-based learning, reflection and concepts-focussed learning as areas with strong potential to reduce prejudicial thinking. These are developed at all age levels of the IB's programmes and are strongly characteristic of the IB but, again, are developed in numerous other educational models and should be considered by all educational institutions.

Theory of Knowledge, a course developed in the Diploma Programme, has many of the constituents necessary to discuss and problematise prejudice although the guide does not explicitly ask teachers to use the learning experience to this end.

Therefore, international education as expressed in the IB contains these central research-informed strategies that are aimed at increasing empathy, understanding, cognitive flexibility and metacognition – and therefore reducing prejudice. However, crucially, this may or may not be the case depending on the level of critical engagement teacher and/or school wishes to dedicate to them.

In earlier articles (Hughes, 2009, 2014), I have suggested that the IB offers opportunities to reduce prejudice but that these must be activated thoughtfully in international schools for any profound change to take place and that if they are not, a type of fanfare of nationalities that encourage stereotype enforcement might be the result: celebrating diversity also means encouraging diversity and this can become forced if students are reluctant to take on the essentialising national and ethnic identities that are required for international days, evenings or fairs to take place. This is particularly the case in the 21st Century where many students have multiple identities and might not want to become ambassadors for only one. For a rich discussion on the difficulty of living out multiple identities see Maalouf, 1998.

In sum, a prejudice-reducing experience of international education is something that may or may not be done by the school or teacher depending upon the open-mindedness and degree of nuance stakeholders are willing to tolerate and to what extent they are able to see beyond the limiting and sometimes unhelpful notion of cultural identity.

The questions of application and praxis remain the burning issues in international education: it is the extent to which the mission of international education is operationalised that will determine the extent to which it is used to effectively combat prejudice.

For schools that are not international schools or do not run IB programmes, this chapter has suggested elements of international education that can be used across all systems to reduce prejudice. The worldwide exemplar of international education with focus on the IB illustrates the potential for good and effective practice and could be readily relatable to practices elsewhere. Taking all together, no practice, including that associated with the IB, is

necessarily perfect. This much said, all might benefit from more attention to the fundamental tenets of international education.

Conclusion

This thesis is an original contribution to the field of education because it is the first piece of research that synthesises findings in social psychology, cognitive psychology, theories of critical thinking and the philosophy of education to provide a cohesive matrix that can be operationalised to reduce prejudice in the classroom.

This model is the following: to reduce prejudice, six dimensions (chapters three to seven) need to be tackled. The first four are at the level of the individual learner, they are:

- Transcending Otherness

- Developing critical thinking

- Developing metacognitive awareness

- Developing empathy

Whereas the last two need to take place at the level of the institution. They are:

- Institutionalising the contact hypothesis

- Using salient educational strategies that can be found in the principles of international education

An overall high-end synthesis of the thesis findings can be viewed in the following table:

Area for development	Key findings
Transcending Otherness	- The study of history and culture needs to be critical and diverse. - Schools need to be aware of and take sensitive action towards scaffolding environments that

	embrace the following constructs mindfully: race, gender, special needs. - A staged approach should be considered that allows learners to grapple with diversity according to their readiness, moving from diverse environments to more abstract, intellectually demanding notions of reciprocity and respect.
Developing critical thinking	- Critical thinking is needed to slow down hasty pre-judgement. - People can be critical thinkers in the narrow logical sense and still be prejudiced: schools need to embrace a model of critical thinking that considers the affective domain. - Work can be done on memory, analysis, evaluation and cues to enhance critical thinking for less prejudice. - Staged and/or developmental approaches can be considered to scaffold critical thinking for less prejudice, notably the models developed by Piaget, King & Kitchener and Perry.
Developing metacognitive awareness	- Metacognition allows learners to become more aware of their thinking processes, allowing for self-prejudice-detection.

	- Self-regulation should be developed in schools to develop to nurture more reflective, counter-intuitive and less prejudicial modes of thinking.
	- Stereotype threat and feelings of prejudice against the self can be mediated and scaffolded by schools.
	- Teaching methods that can reinforce the journey to less prejudice through metacognition include think aloud protocols, productive discussions and conceptual framing to allow the transfer of knowledge from one domain to the other.
Developing empathy	- Nurturing empathy in schools is necessary to reduce prejudice.
	- Findings in empathy suggesting that it is more developed in females than males. This information should be used reflectively and mindfully by administrators and instructors.
	- Three levels of empathy-evoking experiences can be used in schools (from imagination to contact to direct experience).
Institutionalising the contact hypothesis	- The contact hypothesis remains the single most efficient method for reducing prejudice institutionally.
	- It can be operationalised through certain classroom strategies such as the jigsaw classroom, schools

	events, mindful grouping of students and assessment of collaborative behaviour.
	- The five essential dimensions of the contact hypothesis that schools should embrace are that: a. members of the group have equal status, b. the group has a common goal, c. social (therefore institutional) norms should support the contact, d. contact should take place so as to reduce anxiety, e. group participants should be brought to engage in perspective-taking and empathy towards others.
Using salient educational strategies that can be found in the principles of international education	- Multicultural, intercultural and international models of education all offer elements that can help in the journey to reduce prejudice.
	- Schools that wish to reduce prejudice through the curriculum can consider the following elements: service learning, the learning of an additional language, world literature, international humanities, a spirit of inquiry, ensuring meaningful reflection on learning, concepts-focussed learning and theory of knowledge.

A more detailed synthesis of my findings with references and criteria for implementation is included in Annexe 4 of this thesis.

This thesis has shown how the comprehensive research and practice that has been carried out in social science settings has indicated how prejudice can be reduced in a number of ways. The thesis has contextualised this research within the research and practice of K-12 education. As we have seen, the rigour and generalisability of studies vary and I have critiqued studies for their methodology wherever such a discussion was helpful to advance understanding of educational prejudice reduction. Strategies should be employed cautiously and always within the pressures of local context. The ethical hazard of loading onto prejudice is never far but will be best mediated by instructors who come back to Allport's principles and what my synthesis of the research indicates.

By bringing the six areas together and acting on each one, schools stand a strong chance of reducing prejudice in learners as well as reducing prejudice in the institutional discourse and practice as a whole. However, this is not easy: we will never eradicate prejudice as it is part of what it means to be human, we can only hope to reduce it.

A worthy area of further research would be to take the areas I have researched in this thesis, put them into action through an educative framework with points of action and measure the impact on the institution and learners through time. I have proposed such a framework in Annexe 4 of this thesis.

Teacher training programmes using this research should be developed so as to give practitioners the tools they will need to reduce prejudice in themselves and their learners.

Works cited

Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In G. J. O. Fletcher & M. S. Clark (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology: Interpersonal processes* (pp. 65–85). Oxford: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E., Tredoux, C., Tropp, L. R., Spears Brown, C. S., Niense, U. and Noorf, N. M. (2012). Interventions to reduce prejudice and enhance inclusion and respect for ethnic differences in early childhood: A systematic review. *Developmental Review*, 32: 4, 307-336.

Abrami, P.C., Bernard, R.M., Borokhovski, E., Wade, A., Surkes, M.A., Tamim, R., Zhang, D. (2009). Instructional Interventions Affecting Critical Thinking Skills and Dispositions: A Stage 1 Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 78 (4), 1102–1134.

Adey, P. S., Shayer, M. and Yates, C. (1989). *Thinking Science: Student and Teachers' materials for the CASE intervention*. London: Nelson.

Adichie, C.G. (2014). *We Should All Be Feminists*. London : 4thestate.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper and Row.

Adsett, M., & Morin, M. (2004). Contact and regional variation in attitudes towards linguistic duality in Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 38, 129 –150.

Agirdag, O., Loobuyck, P. and Van Houtte, M. (2012), Determinants of Attitudes Toward Muslim Students Among Flemish Teachers: A Research Note. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 51: 368–376. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5906.2012.01637.x

Ainsworth, J. (Ed.), (2013). *Sociology of Education. An A to Z Guide*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Alexander, R. (2006). *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*. Thirsk: Dialogos.

Allman, J. M., Hakeem, A., Erwin, J. M., Nimchinsky, E., & Hop, P. (2001). The anterior cingulate cortex: The evolution of an interface between emotion and cognition. In A. R. Damasio, A. Harrington, J. Kagan, B. S. McEwen, H. Moss, & R. Shaikh (Eds.), *Unity of knowledge: The convergence of natural and human science* (pp. 107–117). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Alpert, J. (1974). *MotherRight: A New Feminist Theory*. Pittsburgh: Know Inc.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y., & McKenna, K. Y. A. (2006), The Contact Hypothesis Reconsidered: Interacting via the Internet. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 825–843. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00037.x

Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and ethnic relations. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 73–123). New York: Plenum Press.

Amodio, D. (2014). The neuroscience of prejudice and stereotyping. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* volume15, pp. 670–682. doi:10.1038/nrn3800

Amodio, D. M. & Hamilton, H. K. (2012). Intergroup anxiety effects on implicit racial evaluation and stereotyping. *Emotion* 12, pp.1273–1280.

Amodio, D. M. (2010). Coordinated roles of motivation and perception in the regulation of intergroup responses: frontal cortical asymmetry effects on the P2 event-related potential and behavior. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 22, pp. 2609–2617.

Anand, G., & Winters, M.F. (2017). A Retrospective View of Corporate Diversity Training From 1964 to the Present. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7 (3). https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.34251673

Anderson, L.W.& Krathwohl, D.R. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: a revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.

Angelou, M. (1969). *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*. New York: Random Books.

Angouri, J. (2010). "'If We Know about Culture It Will Be Easier to Work with one Another': Developing Skills for Handling Corporate Meetings with Multinational Participation." *Language and Intercultural Communication* 10 (3), 206–224. doi:10.1080/14708470903348549.

Appiah, Kwame A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Appiah, Kwame A. (2012). The case for contamination: multiculturalism as the norm in contemporary Africa in H. Lauer & K. Anyidoho (Eds.), *Reclaiming the Human Sciences and Humanities Through African Perspectives*, Volume 2. Accra: Sub-Saharan Publishers.

Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan.

Aronson, E. & Patnoe, S. (1997). *The Jigsaw Classroom* (2nd ed.). Longman: New York

Aronson, E. (2000). The jigsaw strategy: Reducing prejudice in the classroom. *Psychology Review*, 7(2), 2–5.

Aronson, E., & Bridgeman, D. (1979). Jigsaw groups and the desegregated classroom: In pursuit of common goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 438-446.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Aronson, J., Cohen, G., McColskey, W., Montrosse, B., Lewis, K., and Mooney, K. (2009). Reducing stereotype threat in classrooms: a review of social-psychological intervention studies on improving the achievement of Black students (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2009–No. 076). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgment. In H. Guetzkow (ed.) *Groups, leadership and men*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.

Ashman, A. F., & Conway, R. N. F. (1997). *An Introduction to Cognitive Education: theory and applications*. London: Routledge.

Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 1-35). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ashoka. (2016). http://empathy.ashoka.org/

Attiah, K. (2017). Macron blames 'civilization' for Africa's problems. France should acknowledge its own responsibility. *The Washington Post*. www.washingtonpost.com

Atwood, M. (1985). *The Handmaid's Tale*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart

Audit Commission (2002). *Special Educational Needs: A Mainstream Issue*. London: HMSO.

Austen, J. (1813). *Pride and Prejudice*. Whitehall: T. Egerton.

Austen, J. (1815). *Emma*. London: John Murray.

Avenanti, A., Sirigu, A., & Aglioti, S. M. (2010). Racial bias reduces empathic sensorimotor resonance with other-race pain. *Current Biology*, 20, 1018-1020.

Ayoob, M. (2002). Inequality and theorising in international relations: the case for subaltern realism. *International Studies Review*, 4 (3), 27–48.

Ayres, I., & Siegelman, P. (1995). Race and Gender Discrimination in Bargaining for a New Car. *The American Economic Review*, 85 (3), 304-321

Baddeley, A. D. (2000). The episodic buffer: A new component of working memory? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4*, 417–423.

Baddeley, A.D. (1986). *Working memory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. ISBN 0-19-852133-2.

Baldwin, J. (2016). *I am Not Your Negro* (unfinished manuscript, used in the film by Raul Peck *I am Not Your Negro*). United States: Vintage.

Baldwin, J. (2017). Culture, Prejudice, Racism and Discrimination. Interpersonal Communication Journalism Studies. DOI : 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.164

Balzac, H. (1851). *La Comédie Humaine*. Paris: Béchet, Gosselin, Mame, Charpentier, Dubochet Furne et Hetzel.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behaviour change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.

Banks, J.A. (1973). *Teaching Strategies for the Social Studies: Inquiry, Valuing, and Decision Making. Reading*, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Banks, J.A. (2012). *Encyclopedia of Diversity in Education* (4 volumes). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1629- 1643. doi: 10.1177/0146167212457953

Barlow, F.K., Hornsey, M.J., Thai, M., Sengupta, N.K., & Sibley, C.G. (2013). The wallpaper effect: The contact hypothesis fails for minority group members who live in areas with a high proportion of majority group members. PLoS ONE, 8(12). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0082228.

Baron, J. (1985). *Rationality and intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bassok, M., & Holyoak, K. J. (1993). Pragmatic knowledge and conceptual structure: Determinants of transfer between quantitative domains. In D. K. Detterman, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on Trial: Intelligence, Cognition, and Instruction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bath/International Baccalaureate conference on Interpreting International Education – Dimensions of Theory and Practice. Geneva, 11-13 September.

Batson, C. D. (1987). Self-report ratings of empathic emotion. In N. Eisenberg, & J. Strayer (Eds.), *Empathy and its development* (pp. 356 – 360). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Batson, C. D., Chang, J., Orr, R., & Rowland, J. (2002). Empathy, attitudes, and action: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group motivate one to help the group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1656-1666.

Batson, C. D., Polycarpou, M. P., Harmon-Jones, E., Imhoff, H. J., Mitchener, E. C., Bednar, L. L., Klein, T. R., & Highberger, L. (1997). Empathy and attitudes: Can feeling for a member of a stigmatized group improve feelings toward the group*? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 105-118.

Battistoni R. (1985). *Public schooling and the education of democratic citizens*. Jackson, M S: University Press of Mississippi.

Beilock, S. L., Rydell, R. J., & McConnell, A. R. (2007). Stereotype threat and working memory: Mechanisms, alleviations, and spillover. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 136, 256–276.

Bell-Hooks. (2012). *Writing Beyond Race: Living Theory and Practice*. New York : Routledge.

Ben-Yehuda, N. (1995). *The Masada myth: Collective memory and mythmaking in Israel*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Berkowitz, M., & Bier, M. (2005). *What Works in Character Education: A Report for Policy Makers and Opinion Leaders*. Character Education Partnership.

Bernstein, L. (1961). *West Side Story*. Broadway musical first produced in New York

Bettencourt, B., Brewer, M. B., Croak, M. R., & Miller, N. (1992). Cooperation and the reduction of intergroup bias: The role of reward structure and social orientation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28(4), 301-319.

Bhabha, H. K. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture, difference* (pp. 207–221). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Bialik, M., Bogan, M., Fadel, C., Horthavotha, M. (2015). Character Education for the 21st Century: What Should Students Learn? Centre for Curriculum Redesign. http://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/CCR-CharacterEducation_FINAL_27Feb2015.pdf

Bidell, T. R. and Fischer K. W. (1992). Beyond the stage debate: action, structure and variability in Piagetian theory and research. In R. J. Sternberg and C. A. Berg. (Eds.), *Intellectual Development* (pp. 100-140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biggs, J. B., & Collis, K. F. (1982). *Evaluating the Quality of Learning: The SOLO Taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome).* New York: Academic Press.

Biko, S. (1978). *I Write What I Like*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Black Lives Matter. (2016). http://blacklivesmatter.com/

Black, B. (2008). Critical Thinking – a definition and taxonomy for Cambridge Assessment. Paper presented at 34th International Association of Educational Assessment Annual Conference, Cambridge.

Blackburn, G. W. (1985). *Education in the Third Reich: A study of race and history in Nazi textbooks*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Black-Hawkins, K., Florian, L. & Rouse, M. (2007) *Achievement and Inclusion in Schools*. London: Routledge.

Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Rosenfield, D., Aronson, E., & Sikes, J. (1977). Interdependence in the classroom: A field study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69*, 121–128.

Bloom, S.G. (2005). Lesson of a Lifetime. Simthsonian. com. http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/lesson-of-a-lifetime-72754306/?no-ist=&onsite_medium=internal&page=1

Blumberg, R. L. (2008). The invisible obstacle to educational equality: Gender bias in textbooks. *Prospects*, *38*(3), 345-361.

Bohman, J. (2004). *Democracy across Borders: From Dêmos to Dêmoi*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). *White supremacy and racism in the post civil rights era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Booth, W. C. (1983). *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Boyne, J. (2004). *The Boy in Striped Pyjamas*. UK: David Fickling.

Brass, M., Ruby, P. & Spengler, S. (2009). Inhibition of imitative behaviour and social cognition. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. *Biological Science*, 364, 2359-2367.

Bratt, C. (2008). The Jigsaw classroom under test: No effect on intergroup relations evident. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 403–419. doi: 10.1002/casp.946

Bridgeman, D. (1981). Enhanced Role Taking Through Cooperative Interdependence: A Field Study. *Child Development* 52(4):1231-1238

Brislin, R. W. (1986). Prejudice and intergroup communication. In W. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication*. London: Edward Arnold.

Brink, A. (1980). *A Dry White Season*. New York: William Morrow and Co.

Broadbent, D. E. (1958). *Perception and communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, G. W. (1958). *Building the Canadian nation* (revised ed.). Toronto: J. M. Dent.

Brown, K. T., Brown, T. N., Jackson, J. S., Sellers, R. M. & Manuel, W. J. (2003). Teammates On and Off the Field? Contact With Black Teammates and the Racial Attitudes of White Student Athletes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 1379–1403. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01954.x

Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 255–343.

Brown, W. (2008). *Regulating Aversion – Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction.* Cambridge, Mass.: Belkapp Press.

Bryant, B. (1982). An Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents. *Child Development, 53*(2), 413-425. doi:10.2307/1128984

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving An Account of Oneself*. New York : Fordham University Press.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Byram, M. (2011). From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship. *Intercultural Communication Review*, 9, 17-36.

Byram, M., Gribkova, B., Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching. A Practical Guidebook for Teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Byran, A. and Vavrus, F. (2005). The promise and peril of education: the teaching of in/tolerance in an era of globalisation. *Globalisation, societies and education*, 3(2), 183-202.

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1990). The Effect of a Prejudice-Reduction Simulation on

Attitude Change 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 20 (4), 1559-1816.

doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1990.tb00415.x

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1992). Prejudice reduction simulations: Ethics, evaluations, and

theory into practice. *Simulations and Games*, 23, 457-471.

Cadinu, M., Maass, A., Rosabianca, A., & Kiesner, J. (2005). Why do women

underperform under stereotype threat? Evidence for the role of negative thinking.

Psychological Science, 16, 572–578.

Cambridge, J. (2012). International education research and the sociology of knowledge.

Journal of Research in International Education, 11(3), 230–244.

Camicia, S. P. (2007). Prejudice reduction through multicultural education: Connecting

multiple literatures. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 2(2), 219–227.

Camus, A. (1942). *L'Etranger*. Paris: Gallimard.

Carr, L. G. (1997). *"Color-blind" racism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Carr, L., Iacoboni, M., Dubeau, M.C., Mazziotta, J.C. & Lenzi, G.L. (2003). Neural

mechanisms of empathy in humans: A relay from neural systems for imitation to limbic areas.

PNAS, 100 (9), 5497-5502. doi:10.1073/pnas.0935845100

Carruthers, W.L., Sweeney, B., Kmitta, D., & Harris, G. (1996). Conflict resolution: An examination of the research literatures and a model for program evaluation. *The School Counselor*, 44, 5–18.

Céline, L.F. (1932). *Voyage au bout de la nuit*. Paris: Denoel & Steele.

Céline, L.F. (1937). *Bagatelles pour un massacre*. Paris: Denoel.

Céline, L.F. (1938). *L'école des cadavres*. Paris : Denoel.

Céline, L.F. (1941). *Les Beaux Draps*. Paris: Denoel.

Chafe, J. W. & Lower, A. R. M. (1948). *Canada—a nation and how it came to be*. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co.

Chase, W.G., and Simon, H.A. (1973). *Perception in chess*. Cognitive Psychology, 1, 33-81.

Chi, M.T.H., and Koeske, R.D. (1983). Network representation of a child's dinosaur knowledge. *Developmental Psychology*, 19, 29-39.

Chi, M.T.H., Glaser, R., and Rees, E. (1982). Expertise in problem-solving. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence* (Volume 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Chiu, C., Hong, Y., & Dweck, C.S. (1997). Lay dispositionism and implicit theories of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 19-30.

Christov-Moore, L., Simpson, E. A., Coudé, G., Grigaityte, K., Iacoboni, M., & Ferrari, P. F. (2014). Empathy: Gender effects in brain and behavior. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *46*(Pt 4), 604–627. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.09.001

Cikara, M., Bruneau, E., Van Bavel, J.J., Saxe, R. (2014). Their pain gives us pleasure: How intergroup dynamics shape empathic failures and counter-empathic responses. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 55, 110-125.

Civil Rights. (2016). http://www.civilrights.org/publications/hatecrimes/nature-and-magnitude.html

Clark, K. B., & Clark, M. P. (1947). Racial identification and preference among Negro children. In T.M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 169–178). New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.

Coenders, M., Scheepers, P., Sniderman, P. M., & Verberk, G. (2001). Blatant and subtle prejudice: dimensions, determinants, and consequences; some comments on Pettigrew and Meertens. European Journal of Social Psychology, 31(3), 281. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.44

Coetzee, JM. (1980). *Waiting for the Barbarians*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1997). *The Jasper Project: Lessons in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cole, B. (2005). 'Good faith and effort? Perspectives on educational inclusion.' *Disability and Society*, 20(3), 331–44.

Cole, M. (2017). *Critical Race Theory and Education: A Marxist Response*. London : Palgrace McMillan.

Conan Doyle, A. (1890). *The Sign of the Four*. London: Spencer Blackett.

Condor, S., & Brown, R. (1988). Psychological processes in intergroup conflict. In W. Stroebe, A.W. Kruglanski, D. Bar-Tal, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Conflict: Theory, Research, and Applications* (pp. 3-26). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Connell, R.W. (1996). Teaching the Boys: New Research and Gender Strategies for Schools. *Teachers College Record*, 98(2), 206-235.

Connolly, P. (2000). What now for the contact hypothesis? Towards a new research agenda. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 3, 169 –193.

Conrad, J. (1899). *Heart of Darkness*. London: Blackwood's Magazine.

Coogler, R. (2018). *Black Panther*. Marvel Studios.

Cook, S. W. (1962). The systematic analysis of socially significant events: A strategy for social research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18(2), 66–84.

Cook, T. D., Cooper, H., Cordray, D. S., Hartman, H., Hedges, L. V., Light, R. J., et al. (1992). Some generic issues and problems for metaanalysis. In T. D. Cook, H. Cooper, D. S. Cordray, H. Hartman, L. V. Hedges, R. J., Light, et al. (Eds.), *Meta-analysis for explanation: A casebook* (pp. 283–320). New York: Sage.

Cooley, J. 2007. Desegregation and the achievement gap: do diverse peers help? Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Coolican, H. (2009). *Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology* (5th ed.). Hodder Education.

Cooper, B. (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corno, L. & Randi, L. (1999). A design theory for classroom instruction. In C.R. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory*, Vol. II (pp. 293–318). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Craig, S. (Ed.) (1992). *Men, Masculinity and the Media*. California: Sage.

Crandall, C.S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 414-446.

Croizet, J. C., Despres, G., Gauzins, M., Hugeut, P., & Leyens, J. (2004). Stereotype threat undermines performance by triggering a disruptive mental load.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30, 721–731.

Cuddy, A.J.C., Fiske, S.T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS Map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 40*, 61-149.

Cushner, K. (2008). International socialization of young people: Obstacles and opportunities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 164–173.

Dai, D.Y., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Motivation, Emotion, and Cognition: Integrative Perspectives on Intellectual Functioning and Development*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Daimond, M. (2005). Sex and gender: same or different? In D. Inglis, J. Bone & R. Wilke (Eds.), *Critical Concepts in the Social Sciences*. Oxford: Routledge.

Danforth, S. (1995). Toward a critical theory approach to lives considered emotionally disturbed, *Behavioral Disorders*, 20, 136–143.

Dangarembga, T. (1988). *Nervous Conditions*. London: The Women's Press.

Darder, A., &Torres, R.D. (2004). *After Race: Racism after Multiculturalism*. New York, NY: NYU Press.

Darnon, C., Buchs, C., & Desbar, D. (2012). The jigsaw technique and self-efficacy of vocational training students: a practice report. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 27 (3), 439-449. doi: 10.1007/s10212-011-0091-4

Dasen, P. (1994). Culture and cognitive development from a Piagetian perspective. In W.J. Lonner & R.S. Malpass (Eds.), *Psychology and culture*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10 (85).

Davis, M.H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1): 113–126. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.44.1.113

De Beauvoir, S. (1949). *Le Deuxième Sexe*. Paris: Gallimard.

Deakin Crick, R., Broadfoot, P. & Claxton, G. (2006). *What is the ELLI Research Project?* http://www.ellionline.co.uk/research.php

Dean, E. (1983). History in Black and White: An Analysis of South African School History Textbooks. New York, NY : UNIPUB.

Deardorff, D. (2009). Synthesizing conceptualizations of intercultural competence: A summary and emerging themes. In D. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 264–270). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Defoe, D. (1719). *Robinson Crusoe*. London: W. Taylor.

De Keersmaecker, J., Onraet, E., Lepouttre, N., Roets, A. (2017). The opposite effects of actual and self-perceived intelligence on racial prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 112, pp. 136-138.

Delle Fave A., Massimini F., Bassi M. (2011) Education, Learning, and Cultural Transmission. In: Psychological Selection and Optimal Experience Across Cultures. Cross-Cultural Advancements in Positive Psychology, 2. Springer : Dordrecht.

Delors, J. et al. (1996). *Learning: The Treasure Within*. Paris: UNESCO.

Delve, C. I., Mintz, S . D., & Stewart G, . M. (1990). Community service as values education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y, S. (Eds.) (2003). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research. Theories and Issues*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Derryberry, D., & Tucker, D. M. (1994). Motivating the focus of attention. In P. M. Niedenthal & S. Kitayama (Eds.), *The heart's eye: Emotional influences in perception and attention* (pp.167-196). San Diego, California: Academic Press.

de Souza Santos, K. S., de Almeida, M. L. A., Amaral, D. F., & Santos, C. A. B. (2017). The Representation of Black People in History Textbooks. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *8*(3), pp. 144-149.

Deutsch, M. & Coleman, P. T. (2012). *Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace*. New York, NY: Springer.

Dewan, M. (2018). Understanding Ethnography : An 'Exotic' Ethnographer's Perspective. In Mura, P, Khoo-Lattimore, C. (eds). *Asian Qualitative Research in Tourism. Perspectives on Asian Tourism*. Singapore : Springer.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56 (1), 5-18.

DeVries, D. L., Edwards, K. J., & Slavin, R. E. (1978). Biracial learning teams and race relations in the classroom: Four field experiments on Teams- Games-Tournaments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 356–62.

Dewey, J. (1910). "What is thought?" Chapter 1 in *How we think*. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath, 1-13.

Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct*. New York: Holt.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience as education*. New York: Collier Books.

Dhont, K. & Hodson, D. (2014). Does Lower Cognitive Ability Predict Greater Prejudice? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23, 454-459. doi:10.1177/0963721414549750

Diamond, A. (2013). Executive Functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, pp. 135-168.

Dickson, D.R. (Ed.). (2007). *John Donne's Poetry* (Norton Critical Edition). New York: Norton.

Dixon, J.A., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal strategy: A "reality check" for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60, pp. 697-711.

Dixon, J. (2017), 'Thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant?' Transcending the accuracy–inaccuracy dualism in prejudice and stereotyping research. British Journal Of Social Psychology, 56: 4-27. doi:10.1111/bjso.12181

Djikic, M., & Oatley, K. (2014). The art in fiction: From indirect communication to changes of the self. *Psychology Of Aesthetics, Creativity, And The Arts*, 8(4), 498-505. doi:10.1037/a0037999

Domnitz, M. (1971). Prejudice in textbooks. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 5(3), 7–10.

Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., & Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 276-319). New York: Guilford Press.

Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present and the future. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 5–20.

Dovidio, J.F. & Mullen, B. (1992). Race, physical handicap, and response amplification. Unpublished manuscript. Colgate University, Hamilton, NY.

Dovidio, J.F., Glick, P., Rudman, L. (2005). *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years After Allport*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dovidio, J.F., Hewstone, M., Esses. V.M. (Eds.). (2010). *The Sage Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination*. London: SAGE.

Duan, C., Hill, C.E. (1996). The current state of empathy research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 43(3), 261–274. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.43.3.261

Dubey, P., Geanakoplos, G. (2010). Grading Exams : 100, 99, 98, … or A,B,C ? Games and Economic Behaviour, 69 (1), 72-94.

Duckitt, J. (1992). Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 47,1182-1193.

Dunne, L. (2009). Discourses of inclusion: a critique. *Power and Education*, 1 (1), 42–56.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.

Dweck, C. S. (2012). *Mindset: How You Can Fulfill Your Potential*. Constable & Robinson Limited.

Dweck, C.S., Hong, Y., & Chiu, C. (1993). Implicit theories: Individual differences in the likelihood and meaning of dispositional inference. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 644-656.

Ecolint Student League of Nations. (2014).
http://www.ecolint.ch/sites/default/files/document_files/sln_handbook_2014.pdf Ecolint.

Ecolint. (2016). www.ecolint.ch

Eisenberg, N., Eggum, N. D., & Di Giunta, L. (2010). Empathy-related responding: Associations with prosocial behavior, aggression, and intergroup relations. *Social issues and policy review*, *4*(1), 143-180.

Eliot, G. (1861). *Silas Marner*. London: William Blackwood & Sons.

Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 5–12.

Ellis, P.L. (1982). Empathy: A factor in antisocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 10 (1), 123-133.

Ellison, R. (1952). *Invisible Man*. New York: Random House.

Ennis, R. H. (1986). A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and abilities. In J. B. Baron & R. S. Sternberg (Eds.), *Teaching thinking skills: Theory and practice* (pp. 9–26). New York: Freeman.

Elsheikh, E., Sisemore, B., & Ramirez Lee, N. (2017). Legalizing Othering The United States of Islamophobia. *Haas Instittue Research Report*. www.haasinstitute.berkeley.edu

Ensari, N., & Miller, N. (2001). Decategorization and the reduction of bias in the crossed categorization paradigm. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(2), 193-216.

Epstein, T. & Gist, C. (2015). Teaching racial literacy in secondary humanities classrooms: challenging adolescents' of color concepts of race and racism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 18(1), 40-60. doi: 10.1080/13613324.2013.792800

Ercikan, K., & Roth, W.-M. (2014). Limits of generalizing in education research: Why criteria for research generalization should include population heterogeneity and users of knowledge claims. *Teachers College Record, 116*(5), 1–28.

Erickson, J.A & O'Connonr, S.E. (2000). Service Learning: Does it Promote or Reduce Prejudice? In C. O'Grady(Ed.), *Integrating Service Learning and Multicultural Education in Colleges and Universities*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Erickson, J.A. (2011). Service-Learning's Impact on Attitudes and Behavior: A Review and Update. http://web.augsburg.edu/~erickson/MCC2012/Erickson_2011.pdf

Erickson, L. (2013). Concept-based curriculum and instruction: Engaging the child's mind. [Presentation at the ninth Annual Education Conference at the International School of Geneva, 2014.]

Ericsson, K.A., and Simon, H.A. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Esses, V.M., Dietz, J., & Bhardwaj, A. (2006). The role of prejudice in the discounting of immigrant skills. In R. Mahalingam (Ed.), *The cultural psychology of immigrants* (pp. 113-130). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eze, M. O. (2010). *Intellectual history in contemporary South Africa*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Facione, P. A., Sanchez, C. A., Facione, N. C., & Gainen, J. (1995). The disposition toward critical thinking. *Journal of General Education*, 44(1), 1–25.

Facione, P.A. (1990). Critical Thinking: A Statement of Expert Consensus for Purposes of

Educational Assessment and Instruction. Executive Summary, *The Delphi Report*. Millbrae,

CA: California Academic Press.

Fanon, F. (1952). *Peau noire, masques blancs* [Black skin, white masks]. Paris: Seuil.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. (C. Farrington, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.

Fay, A., and Klahr, D. (1996). Knowing about guessing and guessing about knowing:

Preschoolers' understanding of indeterminacy. *Child Development*, 67, 689-716.

Fein, S. & Spencer, S.J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self

through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 31-44.

Fergus, E. (2009). Understanding Latino Students' Schooling Experiences: The Relevance of

Skin Color among Mexican and Puerto Rican High School Students. *Teachers College

Record*, 111 (2), 339–375.

Feuerstein Academy. (2016). http://acd.icelp.info/training-centers.aspx

Feuerstein, R. (1980). *Instrumental enrichment: An intervention program for cognitive

modifiability*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Finkielkraut, A. (2014). *L'identité malheureuse*. Paris: Stock.

Finkielkraut, A. (2015). *La seule exactitude*. Paris: Stock.

Finlay, K. A., & Stephan, W. G. (2000). Improving intergroup relations: The effects of empathy on racial attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 1720-1737.

Finster, D. (1989). Developmental instruction part 1: Perry's model of intellectual development. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 66, 659–661.

Finster, D. (1991). Developmental instruction part 2: application of the Perry model to general chemistry. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 68, 752–756.

Fiske, S., Cuddy, A.J.C., Glick, P. & Xu, J. (2002). A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow From Perceived Status and Competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82 (6), 878–902.

Flavell, J. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. Resnick (Ed.), *The Nature of Intelligence* (pp. 231-236). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fogg Davis, H. (2017). *Beyond Trans : Does Gender Matter?* New York : New York University Press.

Forbes, C., Schmader, T., & Allen, J. J. B. (2008). The role of devaluing and discounting in performance monitoring: A neurophysiological study of minorities under threat. *Social Cognitive Affective Neuroscience*, 3, 253-261.

Forbes, H. D. (1997). *Ethnic conflict: Commerce, culture, and the contact hypothesis*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Forbes, H.D. (2004). Ethnic conflict and the contact hypothesis. In Y. T. Lee, C. McAuley, F. Moghaddam, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The psychology of ethnic and cultural conflict* (pp. 69 – 88). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Ford, W. S. (1986). Favorable intergroup contact may not reduce prejudice: Inconclusive journal evidence, 1960–1984. *Sociology and Social Research*, 70, 256–258.

Foucault, M. (1975). Surveiller et Punir. Paris : Gallimard.

Frank, A. (1952). *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl* (B. M. Mooyaart, Trans.). New York: Doubleday.

Fraser, J. (1974). *Violence in the Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freire, P. (1982). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Frenkel-Brunswick, E. (1948). *A study in prejudice in children*. Human Relations, 1, 295–306.

Frey, D.L., & Gaertner, S.L. (1986). Helping and the avoidance of inappropriate interracial behaviour: A strategy that perpetuates a nonprejudiced self-image. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1083-1090.

Frey, F.E., & Tropp, L.R. (2006). Being seen as individuals versus as group members: Extending research on metaperception to intergroup contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 265-280.

Funkenstein, A. (1989). Collective memory and historical consciousness. *History and Memory*, 7(1), 5–26.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The Common Ingroup Identity Model*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press

Gaete, A., Gómez, V., & Benavides, P. (2017). The overuse of self-report in the study of beliefs in education: epistemological considerations. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 41:3, 241-256, DOI: 10.1080/1743727X.2017.1288205

Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 708-724.

Gall, M. (1984). Synthesis of research on teachers' questioning. *Educational Leadership*, 42, 40-46.

Gallup. (2011). http://www.gallup.com/poll/157082/islamophobia-understanding-anti-muslim-sentiment-west.aspx

Galton, F. (1883). *Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development*. London: Macmillan.

Gardiner, G.S. (1972). Complexity training and prejudice reduction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2,326–42.

Gardner, H. (2004). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (Twentieth Anniversary Ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Garth, T. R. (1925). A review of racial psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 22, 343-364.

Gebhard, P. & Johnson, A.(1979). *The Kinsey Data: Marginal Tabulations of the 1938-1963 Interviews Conducted by the Institute for Sex Research*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gehring, W. J., Goss, B., Coles, M. G. H., Meyer, D. E., & Donchin, E. (1993). *A neural system for error detection and compensation*. Psychological Science, 4, 385–390.

Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: the role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 1027 – 1055.

Gibson, J. L. (2001). Does truth lead to reconciliation? Testing the causal assumptions of the South African Truth and Reconciliation process. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco.

Giles, D. E., Jr.&, Eyler, J. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 327-339.

Gillespie, A. Howarth, C.S., & Cornish, F. (2012). Four problems for researchers using social categories. *Culture & Psychology*, 18, 391-402.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaser, R. (1992). Expert knowledge and processes of thinking. In D.F. Halpern (Ed.), *Enhancing thinking skills in the sciences and mathematics* (pp. 63-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Glazzard, (2013). A critical interrogation of the contemporary discourses associated with inclusive education in England. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 13(3),182–188. doi: 10.1111/1471-3802.12018

Gobineau (Compte de), A. (1856). *The Moral and Intellectual Diversity of Races* (H. Hotz., Trans.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Golding, W. (1954). *Lord of the Flies*. London: Faber & Faber.

Golec de de Zavala, A., Guerra, R., & Simão, C. (2017). The Relationship between the Brexit Vote and Individual Predictors of Prejudice: Collective Narcissism, Right Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation. Frontiers in Psychology, 8. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02023

Goleman, D. (1998). What Makes a Leader? http://www.sdcity.edu/Portals/0/CMS_Editors/MESA/PDFs/Generic/WhatMakesALeader.pdf

Goleman, D., (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY, England: Bantam Books, Inc.

Goodley, D. (2000). *Self-Advocacy in the Lives of People with Learning Difficulties*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gordimer, N. (1981). *July's People*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Gordon, M. (2005). *Roots of Empathy: Changing the World Child*. Toronto: Thomas Allen.

Gorski, P. (2006). The unintentional undermining of multicultural education: Educators at the equity crossroads. In J. Landsman & C. W. Lewis (Eds.), *White teachers/diverse classrooms: A guide to building inclusive schools, promoting high expectations, and eliminating racism* (pp. 61–78). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4–27.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2017). The implicit revolution: Reconceiving the relation between conscious and unconscious. *American Psychologist*, *72*, 861–871.

Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M.R., & Nosek, B.A. (2015). Statistically Small Effects of the Implicit Association Test Can Have Societally Large Effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108 (4), pp 553-561.

Grissom, J.A., & Redding, C. (2016). Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs. Aera Open, 2:1, https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858415622175.

Griswold, C.L., & Konstan, D. (2012). *Ancient Forgiveness: Classical, Judaic and Christian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guinier, L. (2004). From Racial Liberalism to Racial Literacy: Brown V. Board of Education and the Interest-Divergence Dilemma. *Journal of American History Education*, 91, 92–118.

Gunesch, K. (2004). Education for cosmopolitanism? Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 3(3), 251–275.

Gurin, P., Nagda, R., & Lopez, G. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60, 17–34.

Gurin, P., Peng, T., Lopez, G., & Nagda, B. R. (1999). Context, identity, and intergroup relations. In D. Prentice & D. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: The social psychology of intergroup contact* (pp. 133–70). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Guthrie, V.L., King, P.M. and Palmer, C.J. (2011). Higher Education and Reducing Prejudice: Research on Cognitive Capabilities Underlying Tolerance. http://www.diversityweb.org/digest/sp.sm00/tolerance.html

Habermas, J. (2001). *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays* (M. Pensky, Trans. and Ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Haegel, F. (1999). The effect of education on the expression of negative views towards immigrants in France: The influence of the republican model put to the test. In L. Hagendoorn & S. Nekuee (Eds.), *Education and racism: A cross national inventory of positive effects of education on ethnic tolerance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hajcak, G., McDonald, N., & Simons, R. F. (2003). Anxiety and error-related brain activity. *Biological Psychology*, 64, 77–90.

Hall, S. (1996). "Who Needs Identity? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage Publishers.

Halpern, D. (1997). *Critical Thinking Across the Curriculum: A Brief Edition of Thought and Knowledge*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Halpern, D. (1999). *Teaching for Critical Thinking: Helping College Students Develop the Skills and Dispositions of a Critical Thinker*. New Directions for Teaching and Leaning, 80 (Winter), 69-74.

Halpern, D. (2002). *Thinking Critically about Critical Thinking*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Halpern, D. (2014). *Thought and Knowledge: An Introduction to Critical Thinking* (5th ed.). New York: Psychology Press.

Halpern, D., & Butler, H. (2018). Is Critical Thinking a Better Model of Intelligence? In R. Sternberg (Ed.), The Nature of Human Intelligence (pp. 183-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781316817049.013

Hamilton, D.L. (2007). Understanding the complexities of group perception: Broadening the domain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 1077-1101.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (3rd Edition). London: Routledge.

Hannerz, U. (1990). 'Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture', in M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity* (pp. 237– 251). London: Sage.

Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organisation of Meaning*.

New York: Columbia University Press.

Harari, Y. (2014). *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. London: Vintage.

Hare, J. (2010). *Holistic education: An interpretation for teachers in the IB programmes*.

Cardiff: IBO.

Hattie, J.A.C., & Brown, G.T.L. (2004). *Cognitive processes in asTTle: The*

SOLO taxonomy. AsTTle Technical Report #43, University of Auckland/Ministry of

Education.

Hayley, A. (1972). *Roots: The Saga of an American Family*. New York. Doubleday.

Haywood, T. (2007). A simple typology of international-mindedness and its implications for

education. In M. Hayden, J. Thompson, & J. Levy (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of international*

education (pp. 79–90). London: Sage.

Heng, T. T. (2016). Different is not deficient: Contradicting stereotypes of Chinese

international students in US higher education. Studies In Higher Education, 2016: 1-15.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1152466

Herek, G.M., & Glunt, E.K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward

gay men: Results from a national survey. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30 (3), 239-244.

Hergé. (1931). *Tintin au Congo*. Paris: Casterman.

Hewstone, M ; Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup Bias. *Annual Review of Pschology*, 53, 575-604.

Higgins, S., Miller, J., & Moseley, D. (2003). Taxonomies. Teaching Thinking. www.teachthinking.com.

Hill, I. (2012). An international model of world-class education: The International Baccalaureate. *Prospects*, 42(3), 341–359. doi:10.1007/s11125-012-9243-9.

Hodgson Burnett, F. (1911). *The Secret Garden*. London: Heinemann.

Hodkinson, A. (2010). Inclusive and special education in the English educational system: historical perspectives, recent developments and future challenges. *British Journal of Special Education*, 37 (2), 61-67. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8578.2010.00462.x

Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33(3), 307–316. doi: 10.1037/h0027580

Hogan, D.E., & Mallot, M. (2005). Changing Racial Prejudice Through Diversity Education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(2), 115-125. doi : 10.1353/csd.2005.0015

Hollis, S. (2004). Blaming me, blaming you: Assessing service learning and participants' tendency to blame the victim. *Sociological Spectrum*, 24, 575–600.

Hook, D. (2008), Absolute Other: Lacan's 'Big Other' as Adjunct to Critical Social Psychological Analysis?. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2: 51-73. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00067.x

Houghton, S. (2010). Managing Stereotypes through Experiential Learning. *Intercultural Communication Studies* XIX (1),182-198.

Hughes, C. (2009). International education and the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme: A view from the perspective of postcolonial thought. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 8(2), 123–141.

Hughes, C. (2012). Child-centred pedagogy, internationalism and bilingualism at the International School of Geneva. *International Schools Journal*, 32, 1.

Hughes, C. (2014). Theory of Knowledge aims, objectives and assessment criteria: An analysis of critical thinking descriptors. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 13(1), 30-45.

Hughes, C. (2017). *Understanding Prejudice and Education : The Challenge for Future Generations*. Oxford : Routledge.

IB. (2006). *IB Learner Profile Booklet*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2007). *Making the PYP Happen*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2009). *Psychology Guide*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2011). *Language A: language and literature guide*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2013). *IB Learner Profile Booklet*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2013b). *Theory of Knowledge Guide*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2014). *Middle Years programme Language Acquisition Guide*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2015). *Diploma Programme Creativity, activity, service guide*. Geneva: IB.

IB. (2015b). *History Guide*. Cardiff: IB.

IB. (2015c). *MYP: From Principles into Practice*.

https://ibpublishing.ibo.org/server2/rest/app/tsm.xql?doc=m_0_mypxx_guu_1409_1_e&part=
6&chapter=2

IB. (2016). *Global Politics Guide*. Cardiff: IB.

Institute of Physics. (2013). Closing Doors: exploring gender and subject choice in schools.

http://www.iop.org/publications/iop/2013/closingdoors/

Inzlicht, M., & Schmader, T. (Eds.). (2011). *Stereotype threat: Theory, process, and application*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jamieson, J. P., & Harkins, S. G. (2007). Mere effort and stereotype threat performance effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 544–564.

Jaramillo, A., Buote, D., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2008). An evaluation of the implementation of the Seeds of Empathy program. Report prepared for Roots of Empathy. University of British Columbia.

Jay, T., et al. (2017). Dialogic Teaching: Evaluation report and executive summary, July 2017. Education Endowment Fund. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Projects/Evaluation_Reports/Dialogic_Teaching_Evaluation_Report.pdf

Jigsaw. (2016). https://www.jigsaw.org/history/

Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2011). "Introduction: Contexts for researching Chinese learners." In *Researching Chinese learners: Skills, perceptions and intercultural adaptations*, edited by L J and M C, pp. 1-20. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Johns, M., Schmader, T., & Martens, A. (2005). Knowing is half the battle: Teaching stereotype threat as a means of improving women's math performance. *Psychological Science, 16*, 175–179.

Johnson, D. (2013). Transportation into literary fiction reduces prejudice against and increases empathy for Arab-Muslims. *Scientific Study of Literature*, 3,1(v), 77–92.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R.T. (1989). *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co. p. 265.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1992). Positive interdependence: Key to effective cooperation. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz & N. Miller (Eds.), *Interaction in cooperative groups: The theoretical anatomy of group learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1996). Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 459–506.

Jones, S. (2002). The underside of service learning. *About Campus*, 7 (4), 10–15.

Jordan, E. (1995). Fighting Boys and Fantasy Play: The Construction of Masculinity in the Early Years of School. *Gender and Education*, 7, 69-86.

Joubert, E. (1978). *Die Swerfjare van Poppie Nongena* (The Long Journey of Poppie Nongena). Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Joyce, K. (2015). Feeling the Emotions of War: Developing Historical Empathy through the Visual Arts. Then/Hier – The history education network. http://thenhier.ca/en/content/feeling-emotions-war-developing-historical-empathy-through-visual-arts

Judd, C.M., Park, B., Yzerbyt, V.Y., Gordijn, E., & Muller, D. (2005). They show more intergroup bias and have stronger stereotypes than do I: Evidence from ethnic, gender, and nationality intergroup contexts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 677-704.

Jung, C.G. (1964). *Man and his Symbols*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking Fast and Slow*. New York : Farrar, Straus and Giroux

Kaiser, M.K., Proffitt, D.R., and McCloskey, M. (1985). The development of beliefs about falling objects. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 38(6), 533-539.

Kammen, M. (1991). *Mystic chords of memory: The transformation of tradition in American culture*. New York: Vintage Books.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1979). Problem-solving construction and representations of closed railway circuits. *Archives of Psychology*, 47, 37-59.

Katz, P. (2000). *Research summary. Intergroup Relations Among Youth: Summary of a Research Workshop*. New York: Carnegie Corp.

Katz, P., Zalk, S.R. (1978). Modification of children's racial attitudes. *Developmental Psychology*, 145, 447–61.

Katz, R. L. (1963). *Empathy: its nature and uses*. London: Free Press of Glencoe.

Kazin, M. (2004). Howard Zinn's History Lessons. Dissent.

https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/howard-zinns-history-lessons

Keim, C. & Somerville, C. (2017). *Mistaking Africa: Curiosity and Inventions of the American Mind*. New York : Routledge.

Kellett, J.B., Humphrey, R.H., Sleeth, R.G. (2002). Empathy and complex task performance: two routes to leadership. *The Leadership Quart*erly, 13, 523 – 544.

Kendall, J .C . (Ed.). (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (Vol. 1). Raleigh, N C: National Society for Experiential Education.

Kende, J., Phalet, K., Van Den Noortgate, W., Kara, A., & Fischer, R. (2017). Equality revisited: A cross-cultural meta-analysis of the contact hypothesis. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

Kenworthy, J., Turner, R., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2005). Intergroup contact: When does it work, and why? In J. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 278–292). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Killgore, W.D.S. and D.A. Yurgelun-Todd. (2004). Sex related developmental differences in the lateralized activation of the prefrontal cortex and the amygdala during the perception of facial affect. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 99(2), 371–391.

Kimura, D. (2000). *Sex and cognition*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Kinder, D. R., & Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 414–431.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). *Developing Reflective Judgment: Understanding and Promoting Intellectual Growth and Critical Thinking in Adolescents and Adults*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. & Shandler, J. (2012). *Anne Frank Unbound: Media, Imagination, Memory*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Kite, M.E., Whitley, B.E. (2012). Ethnic and Nationality Stereotypes in Everyday Language. *Teaching of Psychology*, 39,1, 54-56. doi: 10.1177/0098628311430314

Kitzinger, C. (2001). Sexualities. In Rhoda K. Unger (Ed.), Handbook of the psychology Koedt, A, Levine, E. & Rapone, A. (Eds). (1973). *Radical Feminism*. New York: Quadrangle Books.

Kohlberg L. (1976). Moral stages, moralization: the cognitive developmental approach. In Lickona T (Ed). *Moral development and behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kohn, A. (2011). The Case Against Grades. *Effective Grading Practices*, 69 (3), 28-33.

Kolb, D.A., Rubin, I.M., & McIntyre, J.M. (1974). *Organizational psychology: A book of readings* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Koulouri, C. (2001). The tyranny of history. In C. Koulouri (Ed.), *Teaching the history of Southeastern Europe*. Thessaloniki: Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe, Southeast European Joint History Project.

Kramsch, C. 2009. *The Multilingual Subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2004). *Against Common Sense: Teaching and Learning toward Social Justice*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Kurtz-Costes, B., S.J. Rowley, A. Harris-Britt, and T.A. Woods. (2008). Gender stereotypes about mathematics and science and self-perceptions of ability in late childhood and early adolescence. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 54(3), 386–409.

Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing Interviews*. London: Sage.

Lacan, J. (1977). *Ecrits*: A Selection (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Tavistock.

Lam, J. (1989). *The impact of conflict resolution programmes on schools: A review and synthesis of the evidence* (2nd ed.). Amherst MA: National Association for Mediation in Education.

Lambert, W. E., & Cazabon, M. (1994). Students' views of the Amigos program (Research Report No. 11). Santa Cruz: University of California, National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Lamm, C., & Silani, G. (2014). The neural underpinnings of empathy and their relevance for collective emotions. In C. Scheve & M. Salmella (Eds.), *Collective Emotions*. Oxford University Press.

Lamm, C., Meltzhoff, A. N. & Decety, J. (2010). How do we empathize with someone who is not like us? A functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Journal of Cognitive Neurosciences*, 22, 362-376.

Lamm, C., Nusbaum, H. C., Meltzhoff, A. N. & Decety, J. (2007). What are you feeling? Using functional magnetic resonance imaging to assess the modulation of sensory and affective responses during empathy for pain. *PLoS ONE*, 12, e1292.

Lammers, J., Gordijn, E.H., & Otten, S. (2008). Looking through the eyes of the powerful. Power (or lack thereof) and metastereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 1229-1238.

Land, R., et al. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (3)*: Implications for course design and evaluation. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning diversity and inclusivity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Landis, D., & Brislin, R.W. (1983). *Handbook of Intercultural Training* (Vol. 1-3). Elmsford New York: Pergamon.

Laurence, J., Schmid, K., & Hewstone, M. (2018). Ethnic Diversity, Inter-group Attitudes and Countervailing Pathways of Positive and Negative Inter-group Contact: An Analysis Across Workplaces and Neighbourhoods. *Social Indicators Research*, 136(2), 719–749.

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in Practice: Mind, Mathematics and Culture in Everyday Life. Cambridge*, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, A. (2005). *Brokeback Mountain*. Focus Features.

Lee, E. (2015). Doing culture, doing race: everyday discourses of 'culture' and 'cultural difference' in the English as a second language classroom. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(1), 80-93.doi: 10.1080/01434632.2014.892503

Lee, H. (1960). *To Kill a Mockingbird*. New York: Grand Central Publishing.

Legault, L., Gutsell, J. N., & Inzlicht, M. (2011). Ironic effects of antiprejudice messages: How motivational interventions can reduce (but also increase) prejudice. *Psychological Science*, *22*(12), 1472-1477.

Lenroot, R.K., N. Gogtay, D.K. Greenstein, E.M. Wells, G.L. Wallace, L.S. Clasen, J.D. Blumenthal, J. Lerch, A.P. Zijdenbos, A.C. Evans, et al. (2007). *Sexual dimorphism of brain developmental trajectories during childhood and adolescence*. Neuroimage 36(4),1065–1073.

Leonardo, Z. & Grubb, W.N. (2013). *Education and Racism: A Primer on Issues and Dilemmas*. New York: Routledge.

Lessing, D. (1950). *The Grass is Singing*. London: Michael Joseph.

Levinas, E. (1947). *De l'existence à l'existant*, Paris: Vrin

Levy Paluck, E., & Green, D.P. (2009). Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 339–67. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

Levy, S.R. (1999). Reducing prejudice: lessons from social-cognitive factors underlying perceiver differences in prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55,745–65.

Levy, S.R., West, T.L, Ramirez, L.F, Pachankis, J.E. (2004). Racial and ethnic prejudice among children. In J. Chin (Ed.) *The Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination: Racism in America* (Vol. 1) (pp. 37–60).Westport, CT: Praeger.

Lewis, J.L., Neville, H.A. & Spanierman, L.B. (2012). Examining the Influence of Campus Diversity Experiences and Color-Blind Racial Ideology on Students' Social Justice Attitudes. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 49 (2), 119-136.

Libresco, L. (2015). FiveThirtyEight. http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/here-are-the-demands-from-students-protesting-racism-at-51-colleges/

Lickel, B., Hamilton, D.L., Wieczorkowska, G., Lewis, A., Sherman, S.J., & Uhles, A.N. (2000). Varieties of groups and the perception of group entitativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 223-246.

Liddell, H.G, & Scott, R. (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon; Machine readable text*. Trustees of Tufts University: Oxford. http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/philologic/navigate.pl?LSJ.4

Lindholm, K. J. (1994). Promoting positive cross-cultural attitudes and perceived competence in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. In R. A. Devillar, C. J. Faltis, & J. P. Cummins (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 189-206). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in Education* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lippman, M. (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Lloyd, C. (2008) Removing barriers to achievement: a strategy for inclusion or exclusion? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(2), 221–36.

Lofting, H. (2014). *The Voyages of Doctor Dolittle*. United States: Createspace.

Lovell, J. (2014). The Tale of Two Schools. The New York Times Magazine. http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/05/04/magazine/tale-of-two-schools.html?_r=0

Lowry, L. (1989). *Number the Stars*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Lunt, I., & Norwich, B. (1999). *Can Effective Schools Be Inclusive Schools?* London: Institute of Education.

Lynch, D. (1980). *The Elephant Man*. Brooksfilms.

Lsyaker, P.H., Vohs, J.L., Ballard, R., Fogley, R., Salvatore, G., Popolo, R., & Dimaggio, G. 82013). Metacognition, self-reflection and recovery in schizophrenia. *Future Neurology*, 8 (1), 103-115.

Maalouf, A. (1998). *In the Name of Identity: Violence and the Need to Belong* (Les Identities Meurtrières, B. Bray, Trans.). New York: Arcade.

MacDonald, A., Bell, P., McLafferty, M., McCorkell, L., Walker, I., Smith, V., Balfour, A., & Murphy, P. (2013). *Evaluation of the Roots of Empathy Programme by North Lanarkshire Psychological Service*. North Lanarkshire Psychological Service Research (unpublished).

91, 92–118.

MacDonald, J. (2006). The international school industry: Examining international schools through an economic lens. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5(2), 191–213. maintenance and executive control. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Makinwa-Adebusoye, P. (2001). Sociocultural factors affecting fertility in sub Saharan Africa. *The Nigerian institute of social and economic research* (NISER), Lagos.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: E.P. Dutton.

Mallgrave, H. F. & Ikonomou, E. (Eds). (1994). *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873-1893*. Santa Monica: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities.

Mandel, H, & Semyonov, M. (2016). Going Back in Time? Gender Differences in Trends and Sources of the Racial Pay Gap, 1970 to 2010. *American Sociological Review*, 81 (5), 1039 – 1068.

Mandela, N. (1995). *Long Walk to Freedom*. New York: Little Brown & Co.

Mandela, N. (2003). Lighting your way to a better future.
http://db.nelsonmandela.org/speeches/pub_view.asp?pg=item&ItemID=NMS909

Manetti, M., Schneider, B. H., & Siperstein, G. (2001). Social acceptance of children with mental retardation: Testing the contact hypothesis with an Italian sample. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 25, 279 –286.

Markus, H. R., & P. M. L. Moya. (Eds.). (2010). *Doing Race: 21 Essays for the 21st Century*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Marsden, J. & Tan, S. (1998). *The Rabbits*. Vancouver: Simply Read.

Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2010). *Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Marx, D. M. (2011). Differentiating theories: A comparison of stereotype threat and stereotype priming effects. In M. Inzlicht, & T. Schmader (Eds.), *Stereotype threat: Theory, process, and application*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mathur, V. A., Harada, T., Lipke, T., & Chiao, J. (2010). *Neural basis of extraordinary empathy and altruistic motivation*. NeuroImage, 51, 1468-1475.

Maurette, M.T. (1948). Techniques d'éducation pour la paix, existent-elles ? UNESCO. http://alumni.ecolint.net/authors/maurette/

Maxwell, B. (2008). Professional Ethics Education: Studies in Compassionate Empathy. Springer Science & Business Media.

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2000). Selecting a measure of emotional intelligence: the case for ability scales. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and the workplace* (pp. 320 – 342). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McGreal, C. (2007). Mbeki criticised for praising 'racist' Sarkozy. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2007/aug/27/southafrica.france.

McGuinness, C., Curry, C., Greer, B., Daly, P. & Salters, M. (1997). *Final Report on the ACTS project: Phase 2*. Belfast: Northern Ireland CCEA.

McKee, M. (2018). Lessons from the Windrush Generation. *BMJ*, 361. https://www.bmj.com/content/361/bmj.k2017

McKeown, S., and Dixon, J. (2017). The "contact hypothesis": Critical reflections and future directions, *Soc Personal Psychol Compass* 2017;11:e12295. doi: 10.1111/spc3.12295.

McLaren, L.M. (2003). Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants. *Social Forces* 81 (3), 909-936. doi:10.1353/sof.2003.0038

Mclaren, P. (2010). Revolutionary Critical Pedagogy. Chapman University. https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/education_articles/120/

McQueen, S. (2013). *10 Years a Slave*. Fox Searchlight Pictures.

Mead, George. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mendoza-Denton, R. (2010). The Top 10 strategies for reducing prejudice (Part I). Psychology Today. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/are-we-born-racist/201012/the-top-10-strategies-reducing-prejudice-part-i

Mestre, M.V., Samper, P., Frías, M.D., & Tur, A.M. (2009). Are women more empathetic than men? A longitudinal study in adolescence. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 12(1), 76-83.

Mickolus, E.F., Brannan, J & Project Muse. (2013). *Coaching Winning Model United Nations Teams: A Teacher's Guide*. Washington DC: Potomac Books.

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*, London: Tavistock Publications.

Miller, A. (1953). *The Crucible*. New York: Penguin.

Milner, D. (1975). *Children and race*. California, SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mitchell, M. (1936). *Gone With the Wind*. New York: Warner Books

Mittler, P. (2000). *Working towards Inclusive Education: Social Contexts*. London: David Fulton.

Miyake, A., & Shah, P. (1999). *Models of working memory: Mechanisms of active maintenance and executive control*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, J., Krueger, F., Zahn, R., Pardini, M., de Oliveira Souza, R. & Grafman, J. (2006). *Human fronto-mesolimbic networks guide decisions about charitable donation*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 103, 1562, 3–8. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1622872/

Molloy, H. and Vasil, L. (2002). The Social Construction of Asperger Syndrome: The pathologising of difference? *Disability & Society*, 17 (6), 659-669. doi: 10.1080/0968759022000010434

Montgomery, K. (2006). Racialized hegemony and nationalist mythologies: representations of war and peace in high school history textbooks, 1945–2005. *Journal of Peace Education*, 3 (1), 19-37. doi: 10.1080/17400200500552094

Morisson, T. (1970). *The Bluest Eye*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Morisson, T. (1987). *Beloved*. New York: Knopf Doubleday.

Moseley, D., Baumfield, V., Elliott, J., Gregson, M., Higgins, S., Miller, J. & Newton, D. (2005). *Frameworks for Thinking: A Handbook for Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moseley, D., Baumfield, V., Higgins, S., Lin, M., Miller, J., Newton, D., […] Gregson, M. (2004). *Thinking skill frameworks for post-16 learners: an evaluation*. Learning and Skills Research Centre. Wiltshire: Cromwell Press.

Moskowitz, G. (2010). On the Control Over Stereotype Activation and Stereotype Inhibition. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(2), 140 – 158.

Motha, S. (2006). Out of the Safety Zone. In A. Curtis & M. Romney (Eds.), *Color, Race, and English Language Teaching: Shades of Meaning* (pp. 161–172). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mountz, A. (2009). The Other. *Key concepts in political geography* (pp. 328–338). London ; Los Angeles: SAGE.

Mthethwa-Sommers, S. (2010). Inquiry Based Method: A Case Study to Reduce Levels of Resistance. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22 (1), 55-63.

Muller, J. T., & Miles, J. R. (2017). Intergroup dialogue in undergraduate multicultural psychology education: Group climate development and outcomes. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 10*(1), 52-71.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0040042

Muller, A., Pfarrer, M. D. & Little, L. M., (2014). A Theory of Collective Empathy in

Corporate Philanthropy Decisions. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(1), 1-21.

SSRN:http://ssrn.com/abstract=2229122

Nagda, B. A. & Zuniga, X. (2003). Fostering meaningful racial engagement through

intergroup dialogues. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6, 111–28.

Narrative 4. (2016). http://www.narrative4.com/mission-vision/vision/

NatCen. (2013). http://www.natcen.ac.uk/media/338779/selfreported-racial-prejudice-

datafinal.pdf

National Coalition Building Institute. (2015). http://www.ncbi.ch/de/international-schools/

Neubaum, G., Rösner, L., Ganster, T., Hambach, K., & Krämer, N. C. (2018). United in the

name of justice: How conformity processes in social media may influence online

vigilantism. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 7*(2), 185-199.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000112

Nesdale, D. (1999). Developmental changes in children's ethic preferences and social

cognition. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20 , 501–519.

Nesdale, D, (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219–246). East Sussex: Psychology Press.

Nesdale, D., & Flesser, D. (2001). Social identity and the development of children's group attitudes. Child Development, 72 , 506–517.

Ng, B. (2018). The Neuroscience of Growth Mindset and Intrinsic Motivation. *Brain Sciences*, *8*(2), 20. http://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci8020020

Ngozi Adichie, C. (2013). *Americanah*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Ngugi wa Thiongo. (1981) *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Oxford: James Currey.

Niederle, M. & Vesterlund, L. (2007). Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3), 1067–1101.

Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2008). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Norris, S. P. (2002). The meaning of critical thinking test performance: The effects of abilities and dispositions on scores. In D. Fasco Jr. (Ed.), *Critical thinking: Current research, theory, and practice* (pp. 315–330). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Norton, M.I., Vandello, J.A., & Darley, J.M. (2004). Casuistry and social category bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 817-831.

Nothomb, A. (1999). *Stupeure et tremblements*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Novotny, J., Polonsky, F. (2011). The Level of Knowledge about Islam and Perception of Islam among Czech and Slovak University Students: does Ignorance Determine Subjective Attitudes? *Sociologia*, 43(6), 674-696.

NRC (National Research Council). (1999). Evaluation of the voluntary national tests, year 2: Final report. Committee on the Evaluation of the Voluntary National Tests, Year 2. "/images/interface/clear.gif"L.L. In Wise, R.J. Noeth, and J.A. Koenig, (Eds.), *Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Nussbaum, M. (2010). *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classic Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Nyborg. (2016). Model United Nations of Nyborg. https://munnyborg.wordpress.com/

Nyerere, J. (1974). Stability and change in Africa (1969) in J. Nyerere (Ed.), *Man and development*. Oxford University Press, Nairobi.

Ofsted. (2000). Evaluating Educational Inclusion: guidance for inspectors and schools. London: Ofsted.

Ofsted. (2015). http://www.clerktogovernors.co.uk/ofsted/ofsted-grade-descriptors-the-behaviour-and-safety-of-pupils-at-the-school/

Ogle J., Bushnell, J.A., & Caputi, P. (2013). Empathy is related to clinical competence in medical care. *Medical Education* 47(8), 824–831. doi: 10.1111/medu.12232

Olson, M. A. & Fazio, R. H. Reducing automatically-activated racial prejudice through implicit evaluative conditioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 32, pp. 421–433 (2006).

Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2004). Reducing the influence of extra-personal associations on the Implicit Association Test: Personalizing the IAT. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 653-667.

Orwell, G. (1934). *Burmese Days*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Oser, F. K. (1986). Moral education and values education: A discourse perspective. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.)(pp. 917–931). New York: Macmillan.

Paaßen B, Morgenroth T, Stratemeyer M. What is a true gamer? The male gamer stereotype the marginalization of women in video game culture. Sex Roles. 2016; 76 (7): 421–435

Palacio, R.J. (2012). *Wonder*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Paluck, E.L., & Green, D.P. (2009). Prejudice Reduction: What Works? A Review and Assessment of Research and Practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 339–67. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607.

Paluck, E. L., Green, S., & Green, D. P. (2017). The Contact Hypothesis Revisited. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2973474

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1723-1738. doi: 10.1177/0146167210388667

Parker, W. (Ed). (2002). *Education for Democracy: Contexts, Curricula, Assessment*. Greenwhcih, Conneticut: IAP.

Paro, H.B., Silveira, P.S., Perotta, B., Gannam, S., Enns, S.C., Giaxa, R.R., Bonito, R.F., Martins, M.A., Tempski, P.Z. (2014). Empathy among medical students: is there a relation with quality of life and burnout? *PlosOne*, 9(4):e94133. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0094133

Pate, G. S. (1981). Research on prejudice reduction. Educational Leadership, 38, 288- 291. pathologising of difference? *Disability & Society*, 17(6), 659-669. doi: 10.1080/0968759022000010434

Paul, R. (1990). *Critical thinking: What every person needs to survive in a rapidly changing world*. Santa Rosa, USA: Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Paul, R. (1992). Critical Thinking: What, Why and How? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 20(1), 3-24.

Paul, R. (2011). Reflections on the Nature of Critical Thinking, Its History, Politics, and Barriers and on Its Status across the College/University Curriculum Part I. *Inquiry: Critical Thinking Across the Disciplines*, 26(3), 5-24.

Peck, R. (2016). I Am Not Your Negro. Artemis Films.

Pécout, A. (2017). Ils ont voté Front national pour la première fois le 7 mai. Le Monde.
https://www.lemonde.fr/election-presidentielle-2017/article/2017/05/11/ils-ont-vote-front-national-pour-la-premiere-fois-le-7-mai_5126410_4854003.html

Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., and Glaser, R. (2001). *Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Pennington, C. R., Kaye, L. K., & McCann, J. J. (2018). Applying the multi-threat framework of stereotype threat in the context of digital gaming. *PLoS ONE*, *13*(2), e0192137.
http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192137

Peri, P. (1999). Education and prejudice against immigrants. In L. Hagendoorn & S. Nekuee (Eds.), *Education and racism: A cross national inventory of positive effects of education on ethnic tolerance* (pp. 21–32). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Perkins, D. N., & Ritchhart, R. (2004). When is good thinking? In D. Y. Dai & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: Integrative perspectives on intellectual functioning and development* (pp. 351–384). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Perkins, D. N., Jay, E., & Tishman, S. (1993). Beyond abilities: A dispositional theory of thinking. *The Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 39(1), 1–21.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme*. New York: Rinehart, and Winston.

Peterson, A. (1987). *Schools Across Frontiers*. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court.

Pettigrew, T. F. & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57–75. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420250106

Pettigrew, T. F. (1958). Personality and socio-cultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 29-42.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1959). Regional differences in anti-Negro prejudice. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59, 28-36.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1971). *Racially separate or together?* New York: McGrawHill.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90 (5), 751–783.

Pettigrew, T.F. (2008). Intergroup prejudice: its causes and cures. http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?pid=S0258-64442008000100006&script=sci_arttext

Peuker, M., & Reiter, S. (2007). Educational Tools, Resources and Informal Learning Frameworks that Help to Reduce Prejudice Mapping Study on behalf of the Rothschild

Foundation Europe. European forum for migration studies, Institute at the University of Bamberg. http://www.efms.uni-bamberg.de/pdf/Summary_Mapping_Study.pdf

Philippou, S. (2012). Official histories in Greek Cypriot geography and civics curricula. In Y. Papadakis & R. Bryant (Eds.), *Cyprus and the politics of memory: History, community and conflict* (pp. 51–70). London: I. B. Tauris.

Piaget, J., & Weil, A.M. (1951). The development in children of the idea of the homeland and of relations to other countries. *International Social Science Journal*, 3, 561-578.

Pijnenborg, G.H.M., Spikman, J.M., Jeronimus, B.F., Aleman, A. (2012)."Insight in schizophrenia: associations with empathy". *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 263 (4): 299–307. doi:10.1007/s00406-012-0373-0

Pillay, N. (2012). Valuing women as autonomous beings: Women's sexual reproductive health rights. United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. http://www.chr.up.ac.za/images/files/news/news_2012/Navi%20Pillay%20Lecture%2015%20May%202012.pdf

Pilling, B.K., & Eroglu, S. (1994). An Empirical Examination of the Impact of Salesperson Empathy and Professionalism and Merchandise Salability on Retail Buyers' Evaluations. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 14(1), 45-58.

Pingel, F. (1999). *UNESCO guidebook on textbook research and textbook revision*. Hannover: Hahn/ UNESCO/Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research.

Pingel, F. (2000). *The European home: Representations of 21st century Europe in history textbooks*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 451-502). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Plous, S. (2002). *Understanding prejudice and discrimination*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Polacco, P. (2007). *The Lemonade Club*. New York: Philomel Books.

Pomerantz, E.M., E.R. Altermatt, and J.L. Saxon. (2002). Making the grade but feeling distressed: gender differences in academic performance and internal distress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 396.

Popper, K. (1945). *The Open Society and its Enemies*. London: Routledge.

Popper, K. (1963). *Conjectures and refutations: the Growth of Scientific Knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Posner, M. I., & Peterson, S. E. (1990). The attention system of the human brain. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 13, 25–42.

Posner, M. I., & Rothbart, M. K. (1998). Attention, self regulation and consciousness. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B*, 353, 1915–1927.

Posner, M.I., Snyder, C.R.R. (1975). Attention and cognitive control. In Solso, R.L. *Information processing and cognition: the Loyola symposium*. Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates. ISBN 0-470-81230-3.

Prendergast, S. (1996). Boys, Bodies and Pedagogy: Constructing Emotions in School. Paper given at Gender, Body and Love Seminar, Centre for Women's research, University of Oslo.

Prince, M.J & Felder, R.M. (2015). Inductive teaching and learning methods: definitions, comparisons and research bases.

http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/InductiveTeaching.pdf

Pring, R. (2000). 'The 'False Dualism' of Educational Research'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 34, 2, 247-260.

Pronin, E., Steele, C. M., & Ross, L. (2004). Identity bifurcation in response to stereotype threat: Women and mathematics. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 152–168.

Radke, M., & Sutherland, J. (1949). Children's concepts and attitudes about minority and majority American groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 40, 449–468.

Rapee, R. M. (1993). The utilization of working memory by worry. *Behavioral Research Therapy*, 31, 617–620.

Remy, R. C., Nathan, J. A., Becker, J. M., & Torney, J. V. (1975). International learning and international education in a global age. Bulletin 47, *National Council for the Social Studies*, 39–40.

RFI. (2010). Yade criticises Sarkozy's speech on Africa. http://www.english.rfi.fr/france/20101029-yade-criticises-sarkozys-speech-africa

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). In the Service of Citizenship: A Study of Student Involvement in Community Service. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69 (3), 277-297.

Rhodes, M., Leslie, S.J., & Tworeck, C.M. (2012). Cultural transmission of social essentialism. *PNAS* 2012 109 (34) 13526-13531; published ahead of print August 6, 2012,doi:10.1073/pnas.1208951109. http://www.pnas.org/content/109/34/13526.full.pdf

Rhys, J. (1966). *Wide Sargasso Sea*. New York: Norton.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. University of Chicago Press , 5 (4), 631–660. doi:10.1086/493756.

Richeson, J.A., & Nussbaum, R.J. (2003). The impact of multiculturalism versus color-blindness on racial bias. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 417–423.

Ritchhart, R. & Perkins, D. (2005). Learning to Think: The Challenges of Teaching Thinking.

In K.J. Holyoak and R.G. Morrison (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Thinking and*

Reasoning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ritchhart, R. (2002). *Intellectual character: What it is, why it matters, and how to get it*. San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ritchhart, R. (2015). *Creating Cultures of Thinking*. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.

Rock, E. A., Hammond, M., & Rasmussen, S. (2002). School based program to teach children

empathy and bully prevention. (ERIC Document Service Reproduction No. ED471437)

https://www.counseling.org/resources/library/Selected%20Topics/Bullying/School_Based_Pr

ogram.html

Rogers, C.R. (1975). Empathic – unappreciated way of being. *Counseling Psychology*, 5(2),

2–10. doi: 10.1177/001100007500500202

Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and closed mind: Investigations into the nature of belief*

systems and personality systems. New York: Basic Books.

Rokeach, M. (1971). The measurement of values and value systems. In G. Abcarian (Ed.),

Social psychology and political behavior (pp. 611–640). Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

Rolheiser, C., & Wallace, D. (2005). The Roots of Empathy Program as a Strategy for

Roots of Empathy. (2015). Increasing Social and Emotional Learning. Report prepared for

Roots of Empathy. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

http://www.rootsofempathy.org/en.html

Ross, C. S. (1999). Finding without seeking: The information encounter in the context of

reading for pleasure. *Information Processing and Management*, 35, 783–799.

Roy. A. (1997). *The God of Small Things*. New York: Random House.

Rushdie, S. (1981). *Midnight's Children*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Rushdie, S. (1988). *The Satanic Verses*. London: Viking.

Sabine, G., & Sabine, P. (1983). *Books that made the difference*. Hamden, CN: Library

Professional Publications.

Sacerdote, B. (2001). Peer effects with random assignment: results for Dartmouth roommates.
Quarterly Journal of Economics, 116(2), 681–704.

Sahoo, S. (2013). *Sensible Sensuality: A Collection of Essays on Sexuality, Femininity and
Literature*. Dehli : Author's press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Salovey, P., Mayer, J., Caruso, D. (2004). Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Findings, and Implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 197–215.

Samuel, H. (2014). French parents in panic over warning of lessons that 'boys can be girls'. *The Telegraph* http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/10602928/French-parents-in-panic-over-warning-of-lessons-that-boys-can-be-girls.html.

Santos, R. G., Chartier, M. J., Whalen, J. C., Chateau, D., & Boyd, L. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based violence prevention for children and youth: Cluster randomized field trial of the Roots of Empathy program with replication and three-year follow-up. *Healthcare Quarterly*, 14, 80-91.

Scacco, A., & Warren, S. (2018). Can Social Contact Reduce Prejudice and Discrimination? Evidence from a Field Experiment in Nigeria. *American Political Science Review*, 1-24. doi:10.1017/S0003055418000151

Schaller, M., Asp C.H., Rosell, M.C., & Heim, S.J. (1996). Training in statistical reasoning inhibits the formation of erroneous group stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 829–44.

Schiappa, E., Gregg, P.B., & Hewes, D.E. (2005). The Parasocial Contact Hypothesis. *Communication Monographs*, 72 (1), 92–115.

Schmader, T., & Johns, M. (2003). Converging evidence that stereotype threat reduces working memory capacity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 440–452.

Schmader, T., Johns, M., & Forbes, C. (2008). An integrated process model of stereotype threat effects on performance. *Psychological Review, 115*, 336–356.

Schoenfeld, S., Zohar, A., Alleson, I., Suleiman, O., & Sipos-Randor, G. (2014). A Place of Empathy in a Fragile, Contentious Landscape: Environmental Peacebuilding in the Eastern Mediterranean. In N. Megoran, F. McConnell & P. Williams (Eds.), *The Geographies of Peace: New Approaches to Boundaries, Diplomacy and Conflict* (pp. 171-193). I.B.: Taurus.

Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Smith, V., Zaidman-Zait, A., & Hertzman, C. (2012). Promoting children's prosocial behaviours in school: Impact of the "Roots of Empathy" program on the social and emotional competence of school-aged children. *School Mental Health*, 4(1), 1-12.

Schutz. (2016). Model United Nations. http://www.schutzschool.org.eg/activities/model-un.cfm

Schwartz, L.K, Simmons, J.P. (2001). Contact Quality and Attitudes towards the Elderly. *Educational Gerontology*, 27 (2), 127-137. Science, 16, 175–179.

Seuss, T. (1961). *The Sneetches and Other Stories*. New York: Random House.

Shakespeare, W. (1597). "Romeo and Juliette". London: John Danter & Edward Allde.

Shakespeare, W. (1600). "The Merchant of Venice". London: Thomas Heyes.

Shakespeare, W. (1622). "The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice". London: Nicholas Okes.

Shakespeare, W. (1623). "The Tempest". London: Blount & Jaggard.

Shallice, T. (1988). *From neuropsychology to mental structure*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-31360-0.

Sherburn High School. (2014).

http://www.sherburnhigh.co.uk/PDF/Assessment%20Descriptors%202014-15.pdf

Sheridan, J. (1989). *My Left Foot*. Granada & Miramax films.

Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology*. London: Routledge.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment* (Vol. 10). Norman, OK: University Book Exchange.

Shiffrin, R.M., Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II: Perceptual learning, automatic attending, and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 127–90. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.127

Shin, L. (2015). The Racial Wealth Gap: Why A Typical White Household Has 16 Times The Wealth Of A Black One. http://www.forbes.com/sites/laurashin/2015/03/26/the-racial-wealth-gap-why-a-typical-white-household-has-16-times-the-wealth-of-a-black-one/#1426bc9c6c5b

Shook, N.J., & Fazio, R.H. (2008). Interracial Roommate Relationships: An Experimental Field Test of the Contact Hypothesis. *Psychological Science*, 19 (7), 717-723. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02147.x

Siddiqui, N., Gorard, S., & See, B.H. (2017). Can programmes like Philosophy for Children help schools to look beyond academic attainment?, *Educational Review*, DOI: 10.1080/00131911.2017.1400948

Siegel, H. (1985). Educating Reason: Critical Thinking, Informal logic, and the Philosophy of Education. Part Two: Philosophical Questions Underlying Education for Critical Thinking. *Informal Logic*, 7, 2-3.

Siegel, H. (1988). *Educating Reason*. New York: Routledge.

Siegler, R.S. (1998). *Children's thinking* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sigelman, L., & Tuch, L.A. (1997). Metastereotypes – Blacks' perceptions of Whites' stereotypes of Blacks. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *61*, 87-101.

Sigelman, L., Bledsoe, T., Welch, S., & Combs, M. W. (1996). Making contact? Black–White social interaction in the urban setting. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101, 1306 –1332.

Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L.M., Konik, J., & Magley, V.J. (2007). Slurs, Snubs, and Queer Jokes: Incidence and Impact of Heterosexist Harassment in Academia. *Sex Roles*, 58, 3-4, 179-191.

Simandiraki, A. (2006). International education and cultural heritage: Alliance or antagonism? Journal of Research in International Education, 5(1), 35–56.

Skerrett, A. (2011). English Teachers' Racial Literacy Knowledge and Practice. *Race Ethnicity and Education,* 14, 313–330.

Skrzypiec, G., Askell-Williams, H., Slee, P., & Rudzinski, A. (2014). *International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme: Student social-emotional well-being and school success practices*. Bethesda, MD, USA. International Baccalaureate Organization.

Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (1991). Empowerment through Multicultural Education. Albany: SUNY Press

Sleeter, C. E., & Bernal, D. D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 240–258). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smiley, P. A., & Dweck, C. S. (1994). Individual differences in achievement goals among young children. *Child Development*, 65, 1723–1743.

Smith, E.R., Seger, C.R., & Mackie, D.M. (2007). Can emotions be truly group level? Evidence regarding four conceptual criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 431 – 446.

Snyder, C. R., Lopez, S.J., & Pedrotti, J.T. (2011). *Positive Psychology: The Scientific and Practical Explorations of Human Strengths*. Second Ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1963). *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. (R. Parker, Trans.).New York: Dutton.

Son Hing LS, Li W, Zanna MP. (2002). Inducing hypocrisy to reduce prejudicial responses among aversive racists. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 381, 71–78.

Souvignier, E., Kronenberger, J. (2007). Cooperative learning in third graders' jigsaw groups for mathematics and science with and without questioning training. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 755–771. doi: 10.1348/000709906X173297

Spielberg, S. (1985). *The Color Purple*. Warner Brothers Pictures.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2–52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanovich, K. E. (1999). *Who is rational? Studies of individual differences in reasoning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 797–811.

Steele, S. (2018). 'What makes you susceptible is caring about doing well': Claude Steele on stereotype threat. Stanford Graduate School of Education. https://ed.stanford.edu/news/what-makes-you-susceptible-caring-about-doing-well-claude-steele-stereotype-threat

Steiner, C. & Perry, P. (1997). *Achieving Emotional Literacy*. London: Bloomsbury.

Steiner, G. (1967). *Language and silence: Essays 1958-1966*. London: Faber.

Stephan, W. G. (1987). The contact hypothesis in intergroup relations. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Group processes and intergroup relations* (Vol. 9) (pp. 13–40). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stephan, W.G. (1985). Intergroup Relations, in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd ed.), Vol 2 (pp. 599-658). Random House: New York.

Stephan, W.G. (1989). A cognitive approach to stereotyping. In D. Bartal, C.F. Graumann, A.W. Kruglanski, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Stereotyping and Prejudice: Changing conceptions* (pp. 37-58). Berlin: Springer.

Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social issues*, *55*(4), 729-743.

Stewart, M. S. (1950). Prejudice in textbooks. *Public Affairs pamphlet* no. 160. New York: Public Affairs Committee.

Stone, A. (2017). Hegel and Colonialism. *Hegel Bulletin*, 1-24. doi:10.1017/hgl.2017.17

Stouffer, S.A., Schuman, E.A., DeVinney, L.C., Star, S.A., & Williams, R.M., Jr. (1949). *The American soldier: Adjustment during arms life* (Vol. 1). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Streitmatter, J. (2002). Perceptions of a single-sex class experience: females and males see it differently. In A. Datnow and L. Hubbard (Eds.), *Gender in policy and practice: Perspectives on single-sex and coeducational schooling* (pp. 212–226). London: Routledge.
Studies, 47 (2), 108-121.

Swan, M; Pead, D. (2008). Professional development resources. Bowland Maths Key Stage 3, Bowland Charitable Trust. http://www.bowlandmaths.org.uk

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American* (November), 96-102.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict: The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In W.G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tileaga, C. (2015) *The Nature of Prejudice: Society, Discrimination and Moral Exclusion*. London: Routledge.

Tansik, D. A., & Driskell, J. D. (1977). Temporal persistence of attitudes induced through required training. *Group and Organization Studies*, 2, 310–323.

Tatum, B. D. (1992). Talking about Race, Learning about Racism: The Application of Racial Identity Development Theory in the Classroom. *Harvard Educational Review* 62 (1), 1–24.

Tatum, B. D. (2007). *Can We Talk about Race? And other Conversations in an Era of School Resegregation*. Boston : Beacon Press.

Tatum, B.D. (2017). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York : Basic Books.

Teaching Tolerance. (2008). http://www.tolerance.org/magazine/number-33-spring-2008/feature/classroom-simulations-proceed-caution

Teichman, Y. (2016). Stereotypes and Prejudice in Conflict: A Developmental Perspective. In K. Sharvit, E. Halperin (eds.), *A Social Psychology Perspective on The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*, Peace Psychology Book Series. Switerland: Springer. doi : 10.1007/978-3-319-24841-7_2

The Economist. (2015a). Why politicians are asking the wrong questions about gender inequality http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2015/11/women-workplace

The Elton School. (2016). http://www.eltonhigh.bury.sch.uk/pupils/reporting-to-parents

The Ferrers School. (2016).
http://www.theferrers.org/page/?title=Attitude+to+Learning&pid=125

The Telegraph. (2013). Francois Hollande to remove word 'race' from French constitution. Theory, process, and application. New York: Oxford University Press.
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/francois-hollande/9843241/Francois-Hollande-to-remove-word-race-from-French-constitution.html

Thomas, A. (2017). *The Hate U Give*. New York : Balzer & Bray.

Thorne, B. (1992). Girls and boys together . . . but mostly apart: Gender arrangements in elementary schools. In J. Wrigley (Ed.), *Education and Gender Equality* (117-132). London: Falmer Press.

Thouless, R. (1930). *Straight and crooked thinking*. London: Pan Books.

Todd, A. R., Bodenhausen, G. V., Richeson, J. A., Galinsky, A. D. (2011). Perspective taking combats automatic expressions of racial bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(6), 1027-1042. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022308

Toffler, A. (1970). *Future Shock*. New York: Random House.

Tomlinson, B. and Masuhara, H. (2004). Developing cultural awareness. *Modern English Teacher*, 13 (1), 5-11.

Torrance, H. & Pryor, J. (1998). *Investigating Formative Assessment: teaching, learning and assessment in the classroom*. Philadelphia: PA Open University Press.

Tulviste, T., Mizera, L., De Geer, B. & Tryggvason, M.T. (2010). Cultural, contextual, and gender differences in peer talk: A comparative study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 51, 319–325.

Twain, M. (1876). *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Twain, M. (1884). *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. London: Chatto & Windus.

UDL. (2014). http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl

UNESCO (2006). UNESCO guidelines on intercultural education. Paris: UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001478/147878e.pdf.

UNESCO. (1951). Statement on Race.

http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001789/178908eb.pdf

UNESCO. (1982). Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice. 2.2.

http://www.unesco.org/education/information/nfsunesco/pdf/RACE_E.PDF

UNESCO-IBE & Ecole International de Genève. (2014). Guiding Principles for Learning in

the 21st Century. Geneva: UNESCO-IBE.

United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/

United Nations. (1965). UN Declaration on the Promotion among Youth of the Ideals of

Peace, Mutual Respect and Understanding between Peoples. http://www.un-

documents.net/a20r2037.htm

United Nations. (2013). Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/news/population/number-of-international-migrants-

rises.html

UNHR (United Nations Human Rights of the High Commissioner). (2018). Gender

stereotypes/stereotyping.

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Women/WRGS/Pages/GenderStereotypes.aspx

US Labour Force statistics. (2015). http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat39.htm

Van de gaer, E., Pustjens, E., Van Damme, E. & De Munter A. (2004). Effects of single-sex versus co-educational classes and schools on gender differences in progress in language and mathematics achievement. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25, 307-322.

Van den Bos, A., & Stapel, D.A. (2009). Why people stereotype affect how they stereotype: The differential influence of comprehension goals and self-enhancement goals on stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 101-113.

Van Gogh, T. (2004). *Submission*. Netherlands. VPRO.

Vavrus, M. (2010). Critical multiculturalism and higher education: Resistance and possibilities within teacher education. In S. May & C. E. Sleeter (Eds), *Critical multiculturalism: theory and praxis* (pp. 19–31). New York, NY: Routledge.

Vega, T. (2016). Wage gap between blacks and whites is worst in nearly 40 years. CNN Money. http://money.cnn.com/2016/09/20/news/economy/black-white-wage-gap/index.html

Vescio, T.K., Sechrist, G.B., & Paolucci, M.P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: the mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 455–72.

Visser, B. A., Ashton, M. C., & Vernon, P. A. (2006). "g" and the measurement of Multiple Intelligences: A response to Gardner. *Intelligence, 34*(5), 507-510. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2006.04.006

Vivian, J., Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (1995). *Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience*. Unpublished manuscript. Wales: Universities of Kent and Cardiff.

Vorauer, J.D., Hunter, A.J., Main, K.J., & Roy, S.A. (2000). Meta-stereotype activation: Evidence from indirect measures for specific evaluative concerns experienced by members of dominant groups in intergroup interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 690-707.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kozulin, Trans. and Ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wade, S. E., & Moje, E. B. (2000). The role of text in classroom learning. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr. (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III) (pp. 609-627). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr. (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III) (pp. 609-627). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wagaman, M.A. & Geiger, J.M. (2012). The Role of Empathy in Burnout and Compassion

Satisfaction among Social Workers. Paper presented at the Council on Social Work Education

Annual Program Meeting, November 9-12, 2012, Washington, D.C.

Walker, G. (2009). *Marie-Thérèse Maurette: pioneer of International Education*. Geneva:

International School of Geneva.

Walker, J. W. S. G. (1997). *Race, rights, and the law in the supreme court of Canada:*

historical case Studies. Toronto, ON: The Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History and

Wilfred University Press.

Walker, I. and Crogan, M. (1998), Academic performance, prejudice, and the jigsaw

classroom: new pieces to the puzzle. J. Community. Appl. Soc. Psychol., 8: 381-393.

doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199811/12)8:6<381::AID-CASP457>3.0.CO;2-6

Walter, I., Crogan, M. (1998). Academic Performance, Prejudice and the Jigsaw Classroom:

New Pieces to the Puzzle. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 8, 381-393.

Waterhouse, L. (2006). Inadequate Evidence for Multiple Intelligences, Mozart Effect, and

Emotional Intelligence Theories. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(4), 247-255. doi:

10.1207/s15326985ep4104_5

Watson, M., & Ecken, L. (2003). *Learning to trust*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1049–1062.

Weigel, R. H., Wiser, P. L., & Cook, S. W. (1975). The impact of cooperative learning experiences on crossethnic relations and helping. *Journal of Social Issues*, 31, 219–44.

Weiner, M. J., & Wright, F. E. (1973). Effects of Undergoing Arbitrary Discrimination Upon Subsequent Attitudes Toward a Minority Group. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 3, 94–102. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1973.tb01298.x

Wierick, J., Krueger, J. (2002). The Matthew Shepard Story. NBC.

Williams, A., & Giles, H. (1992). Prejudice-Reduction Simulations: Social Cognition, Intergroup Theory, and Ethics. *Simulation & Gaming*, 23(4), 472-484.

Williams, M.J., & Eberhardt, J.L. (2008). Biological conceptions of race and the motivation to cross racial boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 1033-1047.

Williams, R.M. Jr. (1947). *The reduction of intergroup tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Willingham, D.T. (2007). Critical Thinking Why Is It So Hard to Teach? *American Educator*, 10-19. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Crit_Thinking.pdf

Wineberg, S. (2012). Undue Certainty : Where Howard Zinn's *A People's History* Falls Short. Amercian Educator, Winter 2012-2013. https://www.aft.org/sites/default/files/periodicals/Wineburg.pdf

Wood, J. (1984). Groping Towards Sexism: Boys' Sex Talk. In A. McRobbie & M. Nava (Eds.), *Gender and Generation* (pp. 54-84). London: Macmillan.

World Health Organisation. (2014). Violence against women. www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/

Wright, K. (2014). *International Baccalaureate Programmes: Longer Term Outcomes*. Melbourne Graduate School of Education : The University of Melbourne.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73–90. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73

Wright, S.C., & Bougie, E. (2007). Intergroup Contact and Minority-Language Education Reducing Language-Based Discrimination and Its Negative Impact. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26 (2), 157-181. http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic472736.files/Wright-Bougie-Intergroup.pdf

Xu, S. (2001). Critical pedagogy and intercultural communication: Creating discourses of diversity, equality, common goals and rational-moral motivation. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22, 279–293.

Xu, X., Zuo, X., Wang, X., & Han, S. (2009). Do you feel my pain? racial group membership modulates empathic neural responses. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 29, 8525-8529.

Yettick, H. (2016). Mindset in the Classroom A National Study of K-12 Teachers. Education Week Research Centre. https://www.edweek.org/media/ewrc_mindsetintheclassroom_sept2016.pdf

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yusafzai, M. (2013). *I am Malala*. New York: Little, Brown & Company.

Yzerbyt, V.Y., & Demoulin, S. (2010). Intergroup relations. In S.T. Fiske, D.T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (5th ed.) (Vol. 2) (pp. 1024- 1083). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Zeidner, M., Boekaerts, M. and Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Self-regulation: directions and challenges for future research. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self- Regulation* (pp. 750-769). London: Academic Press.

Zemmour, E. (2014). *Le Suicide français*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Zhang, L. F. (1999) A comparison of U.S. and Chinese university students' cognitive development: the cross-cultural applicability of Perry's theory. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(4), 425–439.

Zhou, S., Page-Gould, E., Aron, A., Moyer, A., Hewstone, M. (2018). The Extended Contact Hypothesis: A Meta-Analysis on 20 Years of Research. Personality and Psychology Review. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/metrics/10.1177/1088868318762647

Zimbardo, P. G. (1971). The power and pathology of imprisonment. Congressional Record. (Serial No. 15, October 25, 1971). Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 92nd Congress, First Session on Corrections, Part II, Prisons, Prison Reform and Prisoners' Rights: California. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: a social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 13-39). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Zinn, H. (1980). *A People's History of the United States*. London : Routledge.

Annexes

Annexe 1 : Piaget's Stages of Cognitive Development (1950)

sensorimotor stage (0–2 years): profound egocentrism, reality exists uniquely within the field of physical perception

pre-operational stage (2 to 7 years): symbols and language become apparent to the young learner

concrete operational stage (7 to 11 years): decentration, ability to entertain abstract thought in the absence of physical markers, learner begins to tolerate complex ideas such as reversibility. Physical manipulation of objects is needed to formulate thoughts well.

formal operational thought (11 onwards): not necessarily mastered by all, including adults, an ability to reason in purely abstract, internal ways.

Annexe 2: Constructivist questions using Swan & Pead's model to ensure reflection on prejudice

Taking Swan & Pead's thinking further and applying it to intergroup perception, in order to ensure that students reflect more transparently and self-consciously on their own reasoning within the parameters of prejudice, the following questions might be asked in the classroom:

Cues that drive students to restate prejudiced positions and hence to clarify their thoughts	Could you please repeat what you said about Xs (a social group)? Or you said that all Xs are Ys, could you please go through that again?
Cues that push students to elaborate their prejudiced positions and therefore further argue their case	Could you please say more about that idea that all Xs are Ys ... what else could you say about that idea?

Cues that require students to justify prejudiced thinking	Could you please explain what it is that makes you think that all Xs are Ys, please say what makes you feel that?
Cues that drive students to seek out alternative approaches to a prejudiced view	You said that all Xs are Ys, is there any other way of looking at the situation? Can you think of situations where all Xs might not be Ys?
Cues that drive students to turn prejudiced postulates they might have formulated on themselves	What do you think it's like being an X? You said that all Xs are Ys, how would you feel if we said you were an A and that all As are Bs?
Provocative cues that illicit reasoned responses to prejudiced statements	Someone in this group said that Xs do Y/ Xs are Ys, would anyone like to respond? Is this a reasonable statement or does anyone disagree?
Cues that push students to discuss prejudiced postulates amongst themselves	In groups (of two or four), please discuss the statement that all Xs are Ys and feed back to the whole class on what you think.
Cues that push students to question prejudiced beliefs	Is there anyone in the class who woul like to ask the student about his or her feelings concerning Xs?
Protocols that require students to think aloud and therefore uncover the process behind their prejudiced thoughts	Could you please go through that idea – that all Xs are Ys - step by step?

Annexe 3: A list of commonly-cited texts and authors that discuss prejudice

Secondary

- *To Kill a Mockingbird* by Harper Lee (Lee, 1960) as a general study of prejudice against a backdrop of white on black racism in the USA;

- *I Know why the Caged Bird Sings* by Maya Angelou (1969) *The Bluest Eye* (1970) and *Beloved* (1987) by Toni Morisson, *Invisible Man* by Ralph Ellison (1952) and Alex Hayley's *Roots: The Saga of an American Family* (1976) – as studies of White on Black racism and/or slavery in the USA;

- *Poppie* by Elsa Joubert (1978), *A Dry White Season* by André Brink (1980), *July's People* (Nadine Gordimer [1981]) and the early plays of Athol Fugard on Apartheid;

- The novels of Charles Dickens, the collection of works known as *La Comédie Humaine* by Victor Hugo (1851), the 20 novels collected as *Les Rougons-Macquart* by Emile Zola, *Silas Marner* (George Eliot, 1861) and *Pride and Prejudice* (Jane Austen, 1813) – on class-related prejudice;

- *The Handmaid's Tale* (Margaret Atwood, 1985) and *I am Malala* (Malala Yousafzai, 2013) on sexism;

- *The Crucible* (Arthur Miller, 1953) on the Salem witch trials and more broadly on ideological prejudice;

- *Midnight's Children* (Salman Rushdie, 1981) and *Burmese Days* (George Orwell, 1934) on colonialism;

- *The God of Small Things* (Arundathi Roy, 1997) on Indian identity and the caste system;

- *Othello* (Shakespeare, 1622), *Nervous Conditions (* Tsitsi Dangarembga, 1988), *Wide Sargasso Sea* (Jean Rhys, 1966) and *Americanah* by Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie (2013) on Otherness.

Primary

- *The Sneetches* (Dr Seuss, 1961) – on discrimination and anti-Semitism;

- *Wonder* (R.J. Palacio, 2012) – on prejudice in general;

- *Anne Frank: Diary of a Young Girl* (Frank, 1952), *Number the Stars* (Lois Lowry, 1989) and *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* (John Boyne, 2006) -on the Holocaust;

- *The Rabbits* (John Marsden & Shaun Tan, 1998) – on the colonisation of Australia;

- *The Lemonade Club* (Patricia Polacco, 2007) – on children suffering from diseases.

Works of non-fiction that discuss prejudice and can be studied at a Secondary level include:

- *Long Walk to Freedom* (Nelson Mandela, 1995);

- *The Wretched of the Earth* (Franz Fanon, 1963);

- *I write what I like* (Steve Biko, 1978);

- *Orientalism* (Edward Said, 1978).

On the other hand, books where strong stereotyping is apparent can be read, problematised and discussed. Classic examples include *Heart of Darkness* (Joseph Conrad, 1899); *Huckleberry Finn* (Mark Twain, 1884); *Robinson Crusoe* (Daniel Defoe, 1719); *Voyage au Bout de la Nuit* (Louis Ferdinand Céline, 1932); *Stupeure et Tremblements* (Amélie Nothombe, 1999); *L'Etranger* (Albert Camus, 1942) or *The Merchant of Venice* (Shakespeare,1600) and *The Tempest* (Shakespeare, 1623). For younger readers these might include *Tintin in the Congo* (Hergé, 1931); *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (Mark Twain,

1876); *The Sign of the Four* (Arthur Conan Doyle, 1890); *The Secret Garden* (Frances Hodgson Burnett, 1911); *Gone With the Wind* (Margaret Mitchell, 1936) or the *Doctor Dolittle* series by Hugh Lofting, ranging from 1920 to 1952 (Lofting, 2014).

One might also consider works that play out some of the fundamental properties of prejudice formation, hereby allowing students opportunities to investigate the nature of prejudice in subtle guises that lie beneath the more easily detectable domains of racism, sexism and class prejudice. Some works that can be used towards these ends include *Lord of the Flies* (William Golding, 1954); *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (George Orwell, 1949), *Waiting for the Barbarians* (JM Coetzee, 1980) or *The Grass is Singing* (Doris Lessing, 1950).

My criterion for the selection of these texts is that they are commonly used on examination boards and are thus easily accessible and employable. Many other texts can be cited of course, this list is an indication.

Annexe 4: Evidence-based strategies to reduce prejudice in the classroom

Understanding Beyond the Other

Level	Learning experiences	Assessment Criteria	Research Index
1. (Appreciating difference) - working closely with people who are different in a learning environment that does not make difference a handicap (playground arrangements, diverse programmes, assessments encouraging the appreciation of difference).	**Diversity Rules** Care taken to offer a physical educational programme that does not polarise groups and play on gender stereotypes (skipping and tic tac toe for girls, football and basketball for boys) but allows for single sex learning environments (swimming, gymnastics, martial arts) or intercultural sports (Kabbadi) and different voices of expression. **Respecting differences**	1. The learner shows **little** interest in other people's backgrounds. 2. The learner shows **some** interest in other people's backgrounds. 3. The learner shows **considerable** interest in other people's backgrounds. 4. The learner shows **high** interest in other people's backgrounds.	Thorne, 1992; Connell, 1996; Danforth, 1995; Gardner, 2004.

	In-class presentations on where we come from.		
2. (Diversity) - knowing more about other cultures and histories in relation to one's own culture and history (international history courses, discovery of different cultures).	**International History Courses** -International Baccalaureate Diploma programme History course. -Visits to cultural and/or religious centres. -Films/books/case studies from different parts of the world. **Intercultural competence training** -Baseline exposure to major religious texts (The Bible, The Quran, Ramayana & Mahabarta, Upanishads, Tao Te Ching). -Baseline exposure to major defining customs across different cultural systems (marriage, burial, family, hierarchy, notions of hospitality and respect, greetings, mourning, eating, etc).	1. The learner demonstrates **poor, limited** knowledge of his/her own culture and the history and culture of at least one other group. 2. The learner demonstrates **baseline, sufficient** knowledge of his/her own culture and the history and culture of at least one other group. 3. The learner demonstrates **good, reasonably in-depth** knowledge of his/her own culture and the history and culture of at least one other group. 4. The learner demonstrates **sound, in-depth** knowledge of his/her own culture and the history and culture of at least one other group.	Levi-Strauss, 1979; Malinowski, 1922; Hannerz, 1990, 192; Kumashiro, 2004; Motha, 2006; UNESCO, 2006.
3. Releasing individuals from labels, deconstructing sites of identity and understanding the role of power, politics and ideology in the shaping of identity. (Study of psychology, ethnology, Critical Pedagogy, Gender Studies; debates and artistic representations).	**Training in Social psychology, Politics, Critical Pedagogy** -Exposure to notions of peer pressure, conformity, in-and out-grouping, prejudice, stereotyping, the role of the media in representing different political and social phenomena. -Exposure to notions of femininity and masculinity, hetero-, bi- and trans- sexuality, women's' and gay rights. -Study of core literary texts dealing with some of the fundaments of identity (authors include A. Roy, S. Rushdie, C. Achebe, J. Rhys, T. Morisson, Chimamanda Ngozi-Adichie, JM Coetzee, etc). - Printemps de la Jupe (2014) : an example of gender awareness practiced in schools.	1. The learner shows **little** understanding of the complexity underlying identity (allegiances, beliefs, experiences) and articulates a **simplistic, homogenous** representation of other people based on **single facets** such as race, nationality, gender, class or profession. 2. The learner shows **some** understanding of the complexity underlying identity (allegiances, beliefs, experiences) and articulates a **reasonably nuanced** representation of other people based on **more than one facet** such as race, nationality, gender, class or profession. 3. The learner shows **good** understanding of the complexity underlying identity (allegiances, beliefs, experiences) and articulates a **nuanced, heterogeneous** representation of other	Said, 1993; Berger & Luckman, 1966; Bhabha, 1990; Hall, 1997; Koedt, Levine & Rapone, 1973; Connell, 1996; Diamond, 2005.

| | | people based on **more than one facet** such as race, nationality, gender, class or profession. |
| | | 4. The learner shows **deep** understanding of the complexity underlying identity (allegiances, beliefs, experiences) and articulates a **sophisticated, heterogeneous** representation of other people based on **multiple facets** such as race, nationality, gender, class or profession. |

Critical Thinking

Level	Learning Experiences	Assessment Criteria	Research Index
1. Low levels of differentiation, nuance or weighed up criteria for categorisation.	**Set Theory** -Basic work on set theory using Venn diagrams. -Exploring the categorical syllogism ("all men are mortal, Socrates is a man, therefore Socrates is mortal") with multiple examples, drawing out connections with the real world.	1. The learner shows **little** critical appreciation of criteria for categorisation. 2. The learner shows **some** critical appreciation of criteria for categorisation. 3. The learner shows **good** critical appreciation of criteria for categorisation and **is able to differentiate elements using rules and principles**. 4. The learner shows strong, **reflective** critical appreciation of criteria for categorisation and is **able to differentiate elements clearly using rules and principles and can explain the rationale for categorisation clearly**.	Paul, 1990, 1992, 2011; Halpern, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2014; Lipman, 2003; Siegel, 1985, 1988; Ennis, 1986; Perkins & Ritchart, 2004; Dweck, 2006, 2012.
2. Awareness of societal labels erected by media, family, culture and language. Generalisations are less crude and tend to be based on empirical evidence that is still,	**Syllogisms** -Discussion groups that explore core identifying features and accidental or non-essential differentiating so as to guide learners towards conclusions that are less systematically "All Xs are Ys" to postulates such as "some Xs are Ys".	1. The learner shows **limited** understanding of the role of convention in determining social categories and exceptions to the rule. 2. The learner shows **some** understanding of the role of convention	

however, often overgeneralised.	-Exposure to different types of syllogism (disjunctive and hypothetical) exploring notions of non-reversibility with real-world applications.	in determining social categories and exceptions to the rule. 3. The learner shows **good** understanding of the role of convention in determining social categories and **can offer basic arguments** for exceptions to the rule. 4. The learner shows **deep** understanding of the role of convention in determining social categories and **can offer reflective, discerning arguments** for exceptions to the rule.	
3 A more considered set of social categories begins, learners are guided from a literal level of social categorisation toward a more abstract approach to making knowledge claims.	**Personal testimonies related to identity and culture** Structured discussion groups allowing students to share their personal, socially related experiences and draw conclusions from them. Teachers should be careful to scaffold these discussions subtly so as to allow for gentle disagreement and reconsideration. **Stereotype analysis in the humanities** Analysis of social categories, reflection on potential stereotype formation in humanities textbooks (overgeneralisations about groups, oversimplification of historical phenomena, bias and propaganda). **Media Study** Media analysis with a strong emphasis on audience manipulation, persuasion by argument, statistics and image, vested interests, emotive language and iconography and loading on stereotypes. **Critical appreciation of axioms and scientific rules** Analysis of mathematical axioms and scientific rules with a view to understanding their relative function and instability.	1. The learner shows **little** level of abstract thinking in generalising postulates that categorise social groups or individuals. Observations of categories are **critical but literal**. 2. The learner shows **some** level of abstract thinking in generalising postulates that categorise social groups or individuals. Observations of categories are **critical, mostly literal but also theoretical**. 3. The learner shows a **good** level of abstract thinking in generalising postulates that categorise social groups or individuals. Observations of categories are **critical and theoretical**. 4. The learner shows a **deep** level of abstract thinking in generalising postulates that categorise social groups or individuals. Observations of categories are **highly critical and theoretical, allowing for transfer from one domain to the next**.	

| 4.An abstract or theoretical level of critical thinking that allows students to make valid generalisations, temper hasty judgements, evaluate various criteria for or against categorisation, and to do so in the absence of immediate empirical data but rather on principle and through deductive critical thinking. Evidence of application of theory in real-life situations. Evidence of a disposition to critical thinking. | **Study of cognitive bias** Lessons in psychology on the nature of generalisations and how they are erected cognitively and socially, therefore an understanding of the mind's predisposition to prejudice but at a high level of analysis.

Debates on current affairs Drawn-out, challenging debates/discussions/conferences on the construct of social identity, politics and global affairs with opportunities for interaction and sharing of ideas, opinions and positions.

Reflective Community and Service Critically-minded Community Service projects that allow for action and deep reflection through documented portfolio work (for example, the "CAS" programme in the International Baccalaureate Diploma).

Pure logic Truth tables.

Interdisciplinary projects in the humanities Interdisciplinary and comparative studies that allow for synthesis and analysis across historical movements and social phenomena. | 1. **Low** levels of deductive reasoning and **little** ability to identify errors in thinking or to generate well-reasoned mental products.
2. **Reasonable** levels of deductive reasoning and **some** ability to identify errors in thinking or to generate well-reasoned mental products.
3. **Good** levels of deductive reasoning and a **good** ability to identify errors in thinking **and** to generate well-reasoned mental products. **Some** disposal to critical thinking.
4. **High** levels of deductive reasoning and a **strong** ability to identify errors in thinking, to generate well-reasoned mental products **and to generate theories on human behaviour using strongly argued critical thinking. Strong** disposal to critical thinking. | |

Metacognition

Level	Learning Experiences	Assessment Criteria	Research Index
1.Novice metacognition and basic self-awareness.	**Discussion about feeling** Discussion-based activities and/or self-evaluations where participants "open up" the way they feel about members of different groups. **Transpositions of feeling** Transposition exercises that allow participants to put into symbols, artistic productions, skits, song, movement or some other form a representation of	1. **Little** self-awareness and/or awareness of one's own level of prejudiced thinking. 2. **Some** self-awareness and/or awareness of one's own level of prejudiced thinking. 3. **Good** self-awareness and/or awareness of one's own level of prejudiced thinking. 4. **Deep** self-awareness and/or awareness of one's own level of prejudiced thinking.	Lacan, 1955; Flavell, 1976; Pellegrino, Glaser & Chudowski, 2001; Lipman, 1991; Pintrich, 2000.

	the way they feel about members of different groups. Philosophy for Children at a basic level.		
2.Intermediary metacognition and self-awareness, elements of self-regulation	**Discussion about prejudice** Discussion-based activities and/or self-evaluations where participants admit their prejudices. **Transposition of prejudice** Transposition exercises that allow participants to give precise form and expression (artistic, non-verbal or other) to their prejudice with some explanation of what might explain them. **Self-regulation to dampen prejudice** Self-selected strategies to dampen prejudice such as admitting alternative viewpoints, listening and considering counter-arguments and/or bracketing one's convictions. Philosophy for Children at an intermediary level.	1. **Little** ability to accept alternative viewpoints, positions and arguments to the extent of being able to change one's own mind. 2. **Some** ability to accept alternative viewpoints, positions and arguments to the extent of being able to change one's own mind. 3. **Good** ability to accept alternative viewpoints, positions and arguments to the extent of being able to change one's own mind; **demonstrates the capacity** to reduce prejudice using self-selected strategies. 4. **Strong** ability to accept alternative viewpoints, positions and arguments to the extent of being able to change one's own mind; **demonstrates a clear, systematic capacity** to reduce prejudice **significantly** using self-selected strategies.	
3.Expert metacognition and deep self-awareness with frequent self-regulation.	**Discussion about prejudice reduction** Discussion based activities and/or self-evaluations where participants compare and contrast their prejudiced sentiments and seek ways of reducing them. **Extended transposition of prejudice** Extended transposition about prejudice Detailed descriptions of one's own thinking with an emphasis on the origin, development and closing of prejudiced thinking. This could be done through portfolios, extended pieces of	1. The learner is **able to describe** his/her thinking processes when concerned with other social groups; **positions taken are somewhat relativised** and tentative with an overarching sensitivity to diversity. 2. The learner is **able to describe** his/her thinking processes **fluently** when concerned with other social groups; positions taken are **frequently relativised** and tentative with an overarching sensitivity to diversity. 3. The learner is **able to describe** his/her thinking processes **fluently and**	

| | writing, documentaries or projects.

Self-regulation to significantly reduce prejudice
Self-selected strategies to significantly reduce prejudice such as admitting alternative viewpoints, listening actively, considering counter-arguments, bracketing one's convictions and transforming one's viewpoint.

Philosophy for Children at an advanced level. | **critically** when concerned with other social groups; positions taken are **systematically relativised** and tentative with an overarching sensitivity to diversity; **multiple strategies** to explain thought processes related to social phenomena are **explored carefully**.
4. The learner is **able to describe** his/her thinking processes **fluently, critically and elegantly** when concerned with other social groups; positions taken are **systematically relativised, using discerning arguments,** and tentative with an overarching sensitivity to diversity; **multiple strategies** to explain thought processes related to social phenomena are **explored thoroughly**. | |

Empathy

Level	Tasks	Assessment Criteria	Research Index
1.Empathy through imagination and production .	**Literature** - Hot seating; - Writing from a character's perspective; - Role play. **Theatre** - Choice of plays allowing for empathy across historical, cultural or social lines. **Art** - Focus on subjects in a painting; - Focus on expression of human experience through an art work; - Artistic production from a designated person or group's perspective.	1. The learner shows **little or no** empathy for the target person or group. 2. The learner shows **a low level** of empathy for the target person or group. 3. The learner shows a **reasonable level** of empathy for the target person or group. 4. The learner shows a **high level** of empathy for the target person or group.	Finlay & Stephan , 2000; Galinsky & Moscowitz 2000.
2.Empathy through contact and communication.	Model United Nations ; Student League of Nations; Dots/Non-dots exercise; blue	1. The learner **does not** take on the perspective of another person or group	Byrnes & Gyger, 1990

	eyes/brown eyes experiment; "Roots of Empathy"; Amnesty International letter writing; pen pals; pairing up with other classes or schools through the internet.	or relate personally to the experience in question. 2. The learner takes on the perspective of another person or group **to some extent** and **only somewhat** relates personally to the experience in question. 3. The learner takes on the perspective of another person or group **to a considerable extent** and relates personally to the experience in question **to a reasonably high degree**. 4. The learner takes on the perspective of another person or group **to a high exten**t and relates personally to the experience in question **to a high degree**.	; Schonert-Reichl, Smith, Zaidman-Zait & Hertzman, 2012; Santos et al., 2011; Rolheiser & Wallace, 2005; Jaramillo, Buote & Schonert-Reichl, 2008; "Roots of Empathy" (MacDonald et al., 2013).
3.Empathy through direct experience of conditions.	Narrative 4 (2016); Medair's Relief and Recovery Orientation Course (Medair, 2016); recreation activities and in small classes ; fieldtrips and outdoor education; science projects involving fieldtrips and direct analysis of living conditions (traffic, air and water quality); learning experiences where students have to work in conditions affecting the elderly or physically challenged (*Moi Personne Agée* (Croix Rouge, 2016) ; sports programmes where students have to be in wheelchairs, blindfolded, wearing weights to slow them down etc.; scaffolded exchange programmes.	1. The learner **does not engage** with the situation as an insider, taking into account the local context and culture and **remains separated** from phenomena as an outsider or onlooker. 2. The learner **shows some signs of engaging** with the situation as an insider, taking into account the local context and culture and **makes some effort not to remain separated** from phenomena as an outsider or onlooker. 3. The learner **shows clear signs of engaging** with the situation as an insider, taking into account the local context and culture and **makes considerable efforts not to remain separated** from phenomena as an outsider or onlooker. 4. The learner **engages with the situation as an insider**, taking into account the local context and culture and **does not remain separated** from phenomena as an outsider or onlooker.	Lovell, 2014; Schoenfeld et al., 2014.

4.Collective approaches.	**Group work** - Working together on practical work (project-based learning where students are expected to work in groups and are assessed collectively as a group). Examples include The Duke of Edinburgh Award (2016) and Outward Bound (2016); - Group work on millennium goals and the environment. **Community-based conflict resolution** - Interpeace (2016); - Friends of Roots (2016).	1. The learner **remains locked** in a me/you or us/them approach to the situation. 2. The learner **is able to relativise** a me/you or us/them approach to the situation and **shows signs of a collective approach**. 3. The learner **is able to transcend** a me/you or us/them approach to the situation and **mostly engages in a collective approach**. 4. The learner **relativises and transcends** a me/you or us/them approach to the situation and **seamlessly engages in a collective approach with a second person plural vocabulary**.	Lamm & Silani, 2014; Muller Pfarrer & Little, 2013; Ayoob, 2002.

Contact

Mediators	Environments or Strategies	Descriptors	Research Index
Equality of different groups.	Mission statements, policies, recruitment and admissions protocols.	1. Mission statements, policies, recruitment and admissions protocols give **little or no** importance to the notion of equality. 2. Mission statements, policies, recruitment and admissions protocols give **some** importance to the notion of equality. 3. Mission statements, policies, recruitment and admissions protocols give **quasi-systematic** importance to the notion of equality. 4. Mission statements, policies, recruitment and admissions protocols give **extensive and systematic** importance to the notion of equality.	Allport, 1954; Stephan, 1985; Aronson, 2000; Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux,2005; Pettigrew, 2008; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000, 2006; Connolly, 2000.
Cooperation in the pursuit of common goals.	Ground rules for project work, awarding team work.	1. Team work is **not** recognised or celebrated by school leadership. 2. Team work is **somewhat** recognised or celebrated by school leadership. 3. Team work is **often** recognised or celebrated by school leadership. 4. Team work is **systematically** recognised or celebrated by school leadership.	
Social norms supporting contact.	Ensuring diversity in class composition, school trips, exchange	1. Criteria for diversity are **not** established. 2. Criteria for diversity are established but **only somewhat** respected.	

Anxiety reduction.	Ensuring an atmosphere of open dialogue, creating outlets for student or staff fear/frustration or stress (counsellors, mentors, psychologists, human resource partners, student life leadership); ensuring that ongoing student debates take place in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence.	1. There is **little** attention given to ensure an atmosphere where individuals feel confident to speak their mind, interact with others openly and confidently. 2. There is **some** attention given to ensure an atmosphere where individuals feel confident to speak their mind, interact with others openly and confidently. 3. There is **reasonable** attention given to ensure an atmosphere where individuals feel confident to speak their mind, interact with others openly and confidently. 4. There is **a high amount** of attention given to ensure an atmosphere where individuals feel confident to speak their mind, interact with others openly and confidently.	
Empathy & perspective-taking.	**Symbolic gestures to show empathy** -Observing a minute of silence in the wake of major humanitarian disasters; -Collective statements by the school on world problems; -Commemorative assemblies that create empathy for given human stories; -Guest speakers allowing students to empathise with a person or group.	1. Symbolic gestures by the community in the form of statements, gatherings or assemblies are **essentially non existent**. 2. Symbolic gestures by the community in the form of statements, gatherings or assemblies are **few and far between without any discernible impact**. 3. Symbolic gestures by the community in the form of statements, gatherings or assemblies are **few and far between but when they take place, make an impact**. 4. Symbolic gestures by the community in the form of statements, gatherings or assemblies are **frequent and clearly make an impact**.	

programmes, student council, staff committees and decision-making bodies. | 3. Criteria for diversity are established and **mostly** respected.
4. Criteria for diversity are established and **consistently** respected.

International Education Strategies

Mediators	Environments or Strategies	Descriptors	Research Index
Service learning.	Ensuring that there is a service learning Coordinator; articulating clear expectations and principles on service	1. There is **no** service learning at the school. 2. Service learning is **mainly one-way charity**	Delve, Mintz & Stewart, 1990; Kendall, 1990; Rhoads, 1998; UNESCO-IBE, 2014; Erickson , 2011.

	learning with a focus on learning rather than charity; ensuring that service learning activities have some long-term resonance and are not only one-offs; ensuring that students are brought to problematize their own prejudices and assumptions through service learning; care is taken for service learning not to anchor students in patronising, essentialising positions.	**work** with **no or very little** student reflection. 3. Service learning is a **recognised learning process** within the school that **goes beyond charity** with a **reasonable degree** of student refection. 4. Service learning is a **central learning experience** within the school involving **reciprocal relationships between those receiving and giving service** and **frequent, careful and structured** reflection by students.	

The learning of an additional language.	-Ensuring that the curriculum allows for the learning of at least two languages; aiming for the presence of at least on non-Western language in the offering; ensuring an atmosphere of respect for linguistic diversity.	1. Students **only learn one language** at school. 2. Students **learn more than one language** at school. 3. Students learn **more than one language and are offered explicit opportunities to explore and discover different cultures** through language learning. 4. Students learn **two or three languages, are offered explicit opportunities to explore cultures deeply through language learning and are able to learn a non-Western language** in the curriculum.	Wright & Bougie, 2007; Byram, Gribkova & Starkey, 2002; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2004; Stavans, 2001; Rhodes et al., 2012; Kite and Whitley, 2012; Lindholm, 1994; Genesee, 1987; Cummins, 1989, 1994; Lambert & Cazabon, 1994; Byram , 2011; Savignon, 1983.
World Literature.	Ensuring that the literature syllabus of any given year contains authors from at least three different parts of the world; ensuring that the literature syllabus contains works addressing problems of identity, prejudice and/or discrimination; ensuring that the literature syllabus is reviewed and revised frequently whenever possible.	1. The literature syllabus is **mainly monocultura**l with **no real attention paid to texts that problematize cultural identity**. 2. The literature syllabus **explores more than one part of the world** with **no real attention paid to texts that problematise cultural identity**. 3. The literature syllabus **explores more than two different parts of the world** and contains **some texts that problematise cultural identity**. 4. The literature syllabus **explores more than three different parts of the world** and contains **many texts that problematise cultural identity**.	Djikic & Oatley, 2014; Sabine & Sabine, 1983; Johnson, 2013.
International Humanities.	-Ensuring that the study of the humanities (economics, geography, history and in some cases philosophy, anthropology, economics) allows for the exploration of various cultural world views; ensuring that at least three continents feature in students' history syllabus; ensuring that the humanities address fundamental historical	1. The humanities syllabus is **largely monocultural with no, little or superficial** treatment of fundamental historical events related to prejudice. 2. The humanities syllabus **explores two or three cultural views and continents with some** treatment of fundamental historical	Nussbaum, 1997; Peuker and Reiter, 2007.

333

	events related to prejudice (such as the Transatlantic Slave Trade, Colonialism, Decolonisation, the Holocaust, Civil Rights movement, Muslim and Western interactions); ensuring that students discuss prejudice through their humanities syllabus.	events related to prejudice. 3. The humanities syllabus is **diverse, explores three or more cultural views and continents with detailed** treatment of fundamental historical events related to prejudice. 4. The humanities syllabus is **extremely diverse, explores three or more cultural views and continents with detailed treatment** of fundamental historical events related to prejudice. The syllabus **allows opportunities for students to discuss their humanities learning explicitly through the lens of prejudice**.	
Inquiry.	Inquiry-based learning should feature in the curriculum and should allow for discovery of identity and culture; inquiry-based learning should be scaffolded by teachers and not be left to happen of its own accord; inquiry should be followed by reflection; inquiry should involve active learning, real-life scenarios and opportunities for students to come into contact with other groups and reflect on those encounters; students should be brought to inquire into their own prejudices.	1.There is **no** inquiry-based learning is in the curriculum. 2. Inquiry-based learning is **infrequent** in the curriculum with **low levels** of teacher scaffolding. 3. Inquiry-based learning is **frequent** in the curriculum with **reasonable levels** of teacher scaffolding. It **allows students to come into contact with other groups**. 4. Inquiry-based learning is **frequent** in the curriculum with **high levels** of teacher scaffolding. It **allows students to come into contact with other groups and to reflect on those encounters as well as their own prejudices**.	Kolb, Rubin & McIntyre, 1974.
Reflection.	The curriculum allows opportunities for students to reflect on themselves as learners and on what they have learnt; reflection should be extended to the social domain so that students reflect carefully on	1. There is **little or no** opportunity for guided reflection in the curriculum. 2. There is **some** opportunity for guided reflection in the curriculum with **some instances** of it being	King & Kitchener, 1994; Dewey, 1910.

	assumptions, relationships, conflicts, friendships and fears of others; reflection should be carefully guided by instructors who bring students to overarching conceptual understanding through the reflective process; students should reflect on their prejudices.	extended to the social domain. 3. There is **extensive** opportunity for guided reflection in the curriculum with **many instances** of it being extended to the social domain. 4. There is **extensive** opportunity for **rich guided reflection of a conceptual nature in the** curriculum with **many instances** of it being extended to the social domain. **There are instances of reflection that focus explicitly on prejudice**.	
Concepts-Focussed Learning.	The curriculum allows students to go from topic-based learning to conceptual understanding and, if possible, theory generation; the curriculum allows for students to learn about other people and groups within a conceptual framework, covering concepts of culture, perception, belief and social interaction; students discuss prejudice as a concept.	1. Learning is topic-based with **little or no** conceptual focus. 2. **Some** learning goes beyond topics into overarching concepts. 3. **Much** learning is conceptual, **covering concepts of culture, perception, belief and social interaction**. 4. **Most** learning is conceptual, **covering concepts of culture, perception, belief and social interaction. Students discuss prejudice as a concept**.	Erickson, 2013; International Baccalaureate (IB, 2007; IB, 2015c); Land et al., 2005.
Theory of Knowledge.	The curriculum allows students opportunities to break down knowledge into its various components (truth, belief, justification, language, experience and memory); students go beyond face-value approaches to knowledge and problematise it as a construct; prejudice is analysed as a problem of knowledge.	1. Learning objectives **focus on subject specific knowledge only without allowing** for opportunities to learn about knowledge itself. 2. Learning objectives **push students to go beyond subject specific knowledge**. The curriculum **creates opportunities** for students to learn about knowledge itself. 3. Learning objectives **push students to go beyond** subject specific knowledge. The curriculum **creates opportunities** for students to learn about knowledge itself and to	International Baccalaureate (IB, 2013b); Hughes, 2014.

		problematise it in detail. 4. Learning objectives **push students to go well beyond** subject specific knowledge. The curriculum **creates ample opportunities** for students to learn about knowledge itself and to **problematise it in detail with connections made to prejudice**.	

Annexe 5: Recently authored works

Books: authored

Hughes, C. (2018). *Seven Challenges for Education in the 21ˢᵗ Century.* Amsterdam: Brill. (this book will be published in September. It has blurbs by AC Grayling and Luc Ferry)

Hughes, C. (2017). *Understanding Prejudice and Education: The Challenge for Future Generations.* London: Routledge.

(This book has received two reviews in academic journals)

Chapters in books: authored

Hughes, C. (2016). "Concept-Driven Learning in the MYP" in *MYP: New Directions* (Edited by Mary Haden, Jeff Thompson & Judith Fabian). London: John Catt.

Research articles: authored

Hughes, C. (2017). How Can Education Reduce Prejudice in the 21st Century? *International Schools Journal* 37(1): 11-18.

Hughes, C. (2017). Education and Prejudice in the 21ˢᵗ Century. *In Focus*, UNESCO.

Hughes, C. (2014). Theory of Knowledge aims, objectives and assessment criteria: An analysis of critical thinking descriptors. *Journal of Research in International Education* 13(1): 30-45.

Hughes, C. (2014). A critical analysis of the International Baccalaureate's Middle Years Programme assessment design with particular focus on feedback. *Journal of Research in International Education* 13(3): 203-217.

Hughes, C. (2014). How can international education help reduce students' prejudice? *Prospects* 44(3), 395-410.

Hughes, C. (2009). International education and the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme: A view from the perspective of postcolonial thought. *Journal of Research in International Education* 8(2): 123-141.

Annexe 6 : Involvement in academic conferences on education

2018: Keynote on Understanding Prejudice and education at the Lublin Conference on International Education, Lublin, Poland.

2018: Presentation on Preventing Violent Extremism Through Education (with Dr Mmantsetsa Marope, UNESCO International Bureau of Education, Dr Felisa Tibbitts, Teachers College, Columbia University and Professor Medardo Tapia Uribe, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), Mexico City, Mexico.

2018: Keynote on Guiding Principles for Learning in the 21st Century at the International Baccalaureate African Education Festival, Ghana.

2017: Keynote on Understanding Prejudice and Education at the Tackling Discrimination and Prejudice Conference at Durham University's School of Education, Durham, UK.

2017: "Understanding Prejudice and Education" Keynote given at the Alliance for International Education Conference, The Hague.

2017: Conference presentation on "Understanding Prejudice and Education" at the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights panel on educating for less anti-Semitism, University of Lisbon.

2016 & 2017: Presentations in French on « Comprendre les préjugés et l'éducation » at the University of Geneva. (One presentation given to 220 undergraduate students at the school of education and psychology, another to Master's students.)

2016: "Understanding Prejudice and Education". Paper given at the International

Baccalaureate headquarters, The Hague.

2015: "How can education reduce prejudicial thinking?" School of Education, Durham

University, UK.

Annexe 7 : A short synopsis of the book and how it differs from the thesis

Understanding Prejudice and Education: The Challenge for Future Generations

What is prejudice in the 21st Century and how can education help to reduce it?

This original text discusses prejudice in detail, offering a clear analysis of research and theory on prejudice and prejudice reduction, drawn from findings in social psychology, critical thinking and education. Presenting the underlying principle that prejudice can be reduced through the development of four core attributes – empathy, understanding, cognitive flexibility and metacognitive thought – the book offers effective educational strategies for preparing young people for life.

Chapters explore a range of examples of classroom practice and provide a thorough engagement with the minefield of prejudice, set against challenging sociological, ideological, political and cultural questions. An integrative framework is included that can be adapted and adopted in schools, synthesising findings and emphasising the need for individuals and groups to work against preconceived beliefs and emotional reactions to situations, offering contra-intuitive, rational and affective responses.

Understanding Prejudice and Education is essential reading for all those engaged in relevant undergraduate, Master's level and postgraduate courses in education, social psychology and cultural studies, as well as teachers and school leaders interested in developing strategies to reduce prejudice in their schools.

(Extracted from https://www.routledge.com/Understanding-Prejudice-and-Education-The-challenge-for-future-generations/Hughes/p/book/9781138928602)

The thesis differs from the book in four fundamental ways:

1. The book is an extraction from the thesis proposal that was worked at Durham University and therefore covers similar ground. However, the thesis is more up to date in its references because of a later submission to the book and the rigorous demands that were made by its academic supervisors

2. The thesis grapples with references, their positionality and research method in more detail as part of an academic contribution to knowledge whereas the book runs through studies with less critical investigation

3. There are substantial differences in chapter structure: chapter one of the book provides a history of prejudice whereas the EdD thesis does not, the final chapter of the book is a commentary on prejudice in the world today whereas the EdD thesis conclusion relates to the scope of the academic study, synthesising findings and suggesting scope for future studies

4. I am more transparent about my ontological and epistemological assumptoions in the EdD thesis than the book, I explain my choice of terminology and point out research findings with more caution as one should in a more academic monograph

Annexe 8: book review a (attached)

Annexe 9: book review b (attached)