

MULTI- AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION- DIMENSIONS OF CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION

NICULAE CRISTEA*, ANDREIA-NICOLETA MAXIM**

ABSTRACT. Due to today's tendencies towards globalisation, mondialisation and internationalisation, the educational system is faced with a great number of challenges.

Multicultural and intercultural education represent dimensions of contemporary education which are largely moulded by the post-modernist and constructivist approach to education, the former being seen as a way to establish links between education itself and the formation of self-identity.

Intercultural education can provide those individuals pertaining to a minority or a majority with the instruments they require to build their own vision of reality by offering them several models to acknowledge the world, filtered through the existing cultural representations in a multicultural environment. This enables communication between cultures which are largely based on the same essence and between which there are relations of interdependence and mutual influence, which in turn leads to an alteration in political culture.

Our conclusion is that, despite certain apparent inadequacies between the postulates of the post-modern paradigm and some characteristics of psycho-pedagogic constructivism, intercultural education represents not only one of the major challenges of the contemporary educational systems, but also a possible solution for the prevention of major future national or international crises.

Keywords: *interculturality; multiculturality; intercultural – education; culture and identity; plurality – universality.*

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG. Die aktuellen Tendenzen der globalisierung und internationalisierung bringen im vordergrund des erzieherischen phänomens eine vielzahl von herausforderungen.

Die multi- und interkulturelle erziehung stellt die dimensionen der zeitgenössischen Erziehung dar, die tief von der postmodernen und konstruktivistischen vision der erziehung geprägt sind, eine vision die als ein feststellungsschritt der konnexionen zwischen der erziehung und der bildung der selbstidentität betrachtet werden kann.

* Public official at the Ministry of National Research

** Teacher at "Csiky Gergely" College Arad, andreia_maxim@yahoo.fr

Die interkulturelle erziehung kann dem individuum, der mehrheit oder der minderheit angehört, die instrumente zur verfügung stellen um sich eine eigene vision der wirklichkeit zu bilden indem sie ihm mehrere modelle der inbesitznahme der welt bietet, die aus der in einem multikulturellen. Umwelt bestehenden kulturellen darstellungen herausgefiltert sind. So wird die kommunikation zwischen den kulturen ermöglicht, die als grundlage dieselbe essenz haben, zwischen denen es eine wechselbeziehung gibt und die sich gegenseitig beeinflussen was zur bestimmung der politischen kultur führt.

Unsere schlussfolgerung ist, dass trotz einiger scheinbaren unstimmigkeiten zwischen den postulaten des postmodernen paradigmas und einigen kennzeichen des psychopedagogischen konstruktivismus, die interkulturelle erziehung nicht nur eine der bedeutendsten herausforderungen der zeitgenössischen erziehungssysteme bildet sondern auch eine mögliche lösung für die vorbeugung einiger zukünftigen bedeutsamen nationalen und internationalen krisen darstellt.

Schlüsselwörter: *interkulturalität, multikulturalität, kultur und identität, interkulturelle erziehung, pluralität-universalität.*

Our contemporary society is not only one characterised by globalisation, mondialisation and internationalisation, as well as by social mobility, but also one characterised by diversity, a status quo that leads to multiple challenges for the educational system. In a world of perpetual change, we need to identify and choose milestones that would provide us with an axiological type of orientation, so that we could live in an environment of mutual respect; with this in mind, we believe that it is important that the youngsters' education be based on values that are promoted both in the current society and in future societies.

The actual perspective regarding multi- and intercultural education is profoundly shaped by the postmodern and constructivist vision, with particular emphasis on the connections between education and the formation of self-identity. Thus, we find Humbold's (apud L. Bârlogeanu, 2002, p. 287) statement extremely relevant, as the aforementioned states that we should be focusing on valuing the individual, on freedom and on diversity. The concept of Mimesis holds an important position here, understood as the separation between the essential and the accidental. In other words, a national culture is none other than a community's response to an existential issue, but while the answers are formulated differently, the existence that they have in mind is largely the same. Hence the possibility of communication between cultures, since they all come down to the same essence.

For this reason, a democratic society needs real values, while at the same time those values need to be tended to through formal education. Youngsters need to become aware of the basic societal elements, as well as

eliminate the stereotypes related to public and private life which contradict the democratic values, whilst also seeing the need to develop the abilities and knowledge necessary for social integration and social participation. In this context it can be therefore stated that the ideal in education can be attained by establishing a clear relationship between anthropology and education. The stage of initiation is thus transformed into a process in which the central value is represented by the individual and his own subjectivity. If we look at things in this way, cultural judgment will not necessarily be defined as a science (Ibidem, p. 286).

In fact, in the field of education, what clearly emerged was the need to clarify the concepts of *multicultural education* and *intercultural education*, as each covers a different reality of dialogue between cultures. Pedagogical sciences have already outlined the idea that intercultural education, which emphasizes the idea of existence and *togetherness* with each other, unlike multicultural education, which is concerned with the existence *next to the other*, is feasible only if there is a constant understanding of the ethnic and linguistic self-identification and an acceptance of the real ratio between education and ethnic identity. Thus, ultimately, on behalf of interculturality, the goals of multicultural education are followed and translated into practice.

As a result, we acknowledge the existence of *The Other* and we accept the fact that *He* will express himself differently, culturally speaking, which leads to ethnic tolerance. However, interculturality means more than that and the necessity arises for specific educational programs to be elaborated which would impose concrete action when it comes to this educational approach. Intercultural education can provide the individual belonging to a majority or a minority with the tools needed for the construction of a personal view of reality, by offering several models to acknowledge the world filtered through cultural representations. Thereby, the mechanisms of self-knowledge and self-identification are set in motion, by deciphering the meaning of cultural symbols used in a multicultural environment. But creating and applying a viable program of intercultural education cannot stand under the auspice of dilettantism (F. Ouellet, 2002), since no errors are allowed when subjective emotional states are set in motion which contribute to the process of ethnic and/or cultural self-identification and hetero-identification.

Setting the educational phenomenon onto the coordinates of the multi- and intercultural diachrony requires our taking into account a number of factors. *Culture* and *identity* are key-concepts which operate with a series of principles, among which that of equality, regarded as a pragmatic value when it refers to a superior norm of democratic societal organisation, but also that of difference, pertaining to social sciences. Another concept it operates with is that of *minority/ majority*, psycho-sociologically speaking, emphasizing the

idea of dominance, since the majority enjoys symbolic advantages which set minorities at a disadvantage. One must bear in mind the fact that, on a cultural level, there is a continuous interdependence, a mutual influence which leads to alterations in the political culture.

It is also important to underline the difference between culture and identity from the point of view of the awareness of belonging. Thus, culture can exist without an identity-related conscience (speaking of an unconscious process), while ethnic identity brings along the issue of belonging (this being a conscious process based on a symbolic opposition). All this leads to the development of the dichotomy *us/ them*, which is still indifferent to cultural evolution. As well as this, we notice the awareness of belonging to a real group, not always synonymous with the virtual group. And related to this, we speak of the term “ethnic frontiers” (Fr. Barth, 2005), by which we understand keeping the ethnic identity of a minority group even under the circumstances of loss of culture. Still, placing cultural plurality in a domination structure leads to eroding the minority culture, thus exclusively diffusing the symbolic systems of the majority. Under the circumstances, belonging to a minority becomes a stigma determining the emergence of three attitude types: the effort of being assimilated, the desire of ostentatiously presenting your “difference” or the reenactment of your own culture, after Marc Bosche (see internet source).

Currently, one can notice the tendency to go back to being stigmatised and the *crisis of ethno-nationalism* (nationalism with ethnic nuances) is emphasized, which brings along *tension* when faced with the judicial universality (F. Savater, 1997, p. 144-149). The author sketches *the societal traits* which mark the identity-related processes, of which we will choose only those we regard as fundamental to the construction of ethnic identity. There is a constant claim that *television* bombards the youngster with images, this leading to the age of the iconic (Ibidem, p.53-83). This, in turn, will lead to a type of social autism – those around do not matter, just the magical eye -as well as to clumsiness in socialisation. But television bombards the child with information which he has no time to process; everything is given at once, while man needs to be offered information gradually. Progress is ahead of the natural formation pace of the individual, who normally needs time and has to discover reality gradually. What is fashionable is the right to an opinion, which is understood as the right to have your own opinion. But this is absolutised, since it is believed that every individual can have his own position without taking into account that of the other. Cognitive education is based on the idea of giving children the possibility to intellectually form themselves and to choose their own way to solve problems, any kind of problems, there being several such ways (E. Joița, 2002, p. 126). It is important, however, that several solutions be presented and that solely the ones based on arguments be

validated. We have the right to express our opinion, but we need to have the strength to discard it when it proves to be non-efficient. This state of facts should reflect *freedom* in its broadest sense.

In turn, the *time* variable is brought to the foreground in every context by today's society. Everything is done against the clock, the important thing being to obtain something in the shortest time possible. It does not matter that for certain stages in life more time is needed. Thus, the child is constantly tempted to skip stages in order to reach the goal as soon as possible. This has negative consequences, because, as was mentioned, the formation of the individual needs time. There is a tendency towards strong specialization; as a consequence of this intention, the child only pays attention to those things related to his future profession. What is important is closed *values* (F. Savater, 1997, p. 46) - meaning those values that, once formed, cannot be enriched (skills and practical abilities for instance), while open *values* (Ibidem) - which are always perfectible- are neglected.

To develop the afore stated, functionally linking the contemporary educational phenomenon -oriented towards the valorisation of diversity- to the post-modern paradigm requires an institutional and methodological reconstruction based on a number of fundamental coordinates.

First of all, we bear in mind that *the conciliation between plurality and universality* aims at harmonising the individuality (respecting the unicity of the human being) with the acknowledgement of existence of certain common elements of the human spirit, regardless of the cultural environment. Therefore, education encourages the acceptance of the collective plurality, as well as the need to discover the red thread of human existence beyond spiritual reference space delimitation. The *reflexivity* of the human being shows that education means man's study of his own self so as to become aware of the stages he passes through in life. Understanding the most intimate mechanisms in the formation of the self represents a basic element for the acceptance of your own persona, as well as in empathising with *the other*.

To those stated before we add *communication*, because *to form yourself* requires continuous communication: with yourself, with the one next to you, with your own cultural space and that of the other. Isolation leads to the destruction of empathy, to the over dimensioning of the importance of the self and of your own culture.

The originality of the personality represents the formation of human beings that would not be forced into a pattern, as that would destroy all trace of spirituality. Learning means initiation and revelation, as to *learn* means to gradually *discover yourself*, to always feel the revelation necessary to the protection of the spirit. The one that is educated must be guided, he must

receive models to follow so as not to lose himself on the road of formation. If the school or the family do not offer that, the arbitrary will set in.

Judgment is another fundamental element, because in the present context, we need to place cultural, aesthetic and spiritual judgment first. Man needs interiorizing knowledge and having individual access to culture. The human being needs to find the differentiating element, as well as the one granting similarity. Education will endow him with the instruments that facilitate comparison. The educator will provide a multitude of ways, and he who is the subject of education will then have the power to choose the way. Thus, one is granted the possibility of encountering cultures, thereby ensuring the rapport of educational values and life. *Judgment democratisation* can be achieved by adding to the aforementioned the necessity of the child parting with childhood (since keeping the child in the same state is more likely to lead to infantilism, to the desire to postpone maturation) and the eagerness to know more (desires and projects constitute the dynamism of our human identity).

Related to those afore stated, it is important to refer to separation, which operates between *education* and *instruction*, which proves to be *detrimental* to the achievement of educational aims. Such an approach annuls the valoric side of formation, impeding man's humanization (F. Savater, 1997, p. 24) (the differentiation man-human is valid). Thus, academic education, through its humanistic and positive sciences, contributes to imposing respect for truth, precision and curiosity. "Education is always an attempt to take your fellow human being out of the zoological fatality or out of the overwhelming limitation imposed by mere personal experience. It forcibly endows you with symbolic tools which will later allow for original combinations and still unexplored derivations. It is little, it is something, it is everything, it represents the inevitable embarkment onto the human condition." (F. Savater, 1997, p. 88).

With this perspective in mind, the idea emerges that learning means questioning, criticising. He who is the subject of education undergoes a type of apprenticeship which helps him integrate into the mechanisms of society without accepting everything as being valid. In much the same way, the educator does not content himself with professional pedantry, regarding himself as the supreme authority, but he rather takes on the role of child initiator. And the latter will come to discover things he already knows, but without critical spirit, valuable judgment cannot authentically achieve anything at this stage. He who is the subject of education will also be taught *to learn how to learn*. All of this can only be achieved by following development on the three coordinates: understand/ associate/ negotiate. Thus it becomes evident that one necessity that appears is that of self-appreciation models equivalenced with the reference to an ideal. Since we dwell on the idea that learning equips the child with the instruments that give him access to knowledge, coming from focusing on awareness of his own

formation, the initiation laboratory of education becomes privileged. Just like the neophyte (Ibidem, p. 25), the subject of education passes through a period of apprenticeship during which he will become familiar with the key-elements he will use later in life. This initiating journey -which leads to the aforementioned cultural space- favours value and reaching the spiritual state of existence (L. Bârlogeanu, 2002, p. 229). As shown by F. Savater (1997), education must bring to light *the true human being* resulted from *the extension of consciousness* and *the relation with the master*. In the vision of the cited author, in order to reach that desired state, it is necessary to follow two apparently antinomic directions in the process of education: *national respect* and *relativity of truth*. One must know the roots in order to keep said originality, because one cannot set off without holding possession of one's own culture. But this knowledge provides one with the tools indispensable to the analysis of any culture. Beyond turning back to the *national*, the current ideal is *democratic universality*. What is also respected is the requirement of the collectivity aiming for the conservation of its own element, but a dynamism of mentality is desired, since otherwise there would be no evolution.

In fact, in this way we may end up *deconstructing that which is considered natural and self-understood*. In other words, man becomes by birth part of a community, and his image of himself and of the group he belongs to is constructed by learning. The group norms will constitute what is seen as "normality". That is to say that the general frame, the frame by which one perceives reality is slowly being sketched (E. Stan, 2004, p. 36-39). It appears to the individual as being all-powerful, which annuls the urge to question it, and the norms of another group which are in contradiction with those of one's own community are seen as false or wrong. Post-modern education attempts to free the individual from underneath the "pressure" of automatically acknowledging this general frame. Questioning reality makes stereotype dissolution possible.

Hence, intercultural education appears as an educational endeavour which emphasizes the need to acknowledge diversity, especially ethnic diversity, following the development of communication skills -with people adopting a different reference system- and of the attitude of tolerance and solidarity. The meaning of this type of education is equivalent to the common cosmopolitan sense, aiming at the following reference points: dialogue between cultures, the values and originality specific to each culture, understanding between cultures and communities. The reasons that led to the appearance and growth of interest towards intercultural education are the refusal to accept ethnocentrism and the acceptance of the principle of cultural relativity.

Thus the school appears as the institution aiming at putting into practice the human ideal that also encompasses the principle of justice. For this reason it became necessary to create a new subject that could build into youngsters cognitive and emotional competences so that ethnic identity be not

regarded with complacency. These cover a civic objective of the intercultural pedagogy, namely the formation of a self-assured citizen, a competent actor engaged in a relationship of social cooperation. Hence, a new sense is given to the values of equality and justice, attaining the development of new competences and attitudes related to the idea of “togetherness”, through which he who is the subject of education becomes sensitive to intercultural relationships (Mark Taylor apud Emil Stan, 2004, p. 142-143). Hence the following objectives: openness to diversity, equality of chances and ensuring social cohesion, as results from the conception of M. Page (apud J. Kerzil, 2002, p. 128-129) regarding the seven complementary perspectives on intercultural education.

In spite of all this, segregation will appear, because schools are less and less ethnically and socially mixed, resulting in an ethnic oppositional culture. This oppositional identity is the one that reflects the global society (M. Fine, L. Weis, P. Lois, L.C. Powell, L. Wong, L. Mun, 1997).

Therefore, it seems necessary for educators to organize school activities that would shed a positive light upon interethnic relationships. What is also mandatory is reflecting upon discrimination, identity-related tensions and acknowledging ethnocentrism from the point of view of the interest in defending democratic values. In the 80s there was great emphasis on protecting ethnic particularities leading to a number of „perverse effects” which need to be known so that we, educators, do not hazardously attempt to educate without being prepared. F.Ouellett (2002) identifies the following hazards:

- closing the individual inside a fixed identity; rebuilding ethnic frontiers; heightening the risk of intolerance;
- the impossibility of the educator to change; stigmatising and marginalising, as well as fragmenting the curriculum.

Consequently, there are several sets of concepts educators need to be familiar with so as to adequately act on the idea of promoting and giving value to diversity:

- culture, ethnicity, ethnic identity in the postmodern culture and cultural relativism;
- the obstacles in interethnic relationships: prejudice, discrimination; equality of chances/ victimization;
- nation, community, state and multiculturalism, assimilation.

In Romania, the need for intercultural education is determined by the diverse ethnic composition, by equalizing chances in the long run and by tensions among ethnic groups. But it is limited to educating in minority languages, which is, no doubt, important for democracy, but does not punctually answer intercultural needs. Starting from this image of education, we come to the conclusion that the human being needs acknowledging the world gradually, and with guidance. The educational act is ultimately aimed at

forming the individual's personality, and this process needs a long span of time. Moreover, in order not to deprave the human side, we need to design a process consciously conducted, not left at random, of the accidental factors that may have educational effect -with positive, but also negative nuances. The educator (the term being understood in its broader sense) is the one who, in an institutionalized environment, such as a school, guides the child's steps in life. In fact, in the alternative pedagogy, the child becomes a neophyte who sets off and is to be initiated in knowledge and self-knowledge.

Human relations constitute the basis for the process of personal development, self-discovery and the discovery of others. Actually, an important role in the formation of the self is played by the mirroring of the "I" in the other and knowing one's own self after one has discovered oneself through "outer knowledge". In this way, finding one's own realization formula goes through three stages: „individualization“, „socialization“ and „personalization“. This is why human relations and communication represent the two facets of the one and the same reality. As a result, there are three sides of the aforementioned reality:

1. „being“ – from this perspective we speak of existence, being in a relationship with a person means living with that person in a certain way;
2. „having“ – this constitutes itself in the structure of verbal and paraverbal communication;
3. „modifying“ – this is essential to the partners finding themselves face to face in order to exist as separate and different personae.

Thus, rediscovering the specifics of the community one belongs to must be also achieved by enlightening the similarities with "the other", revealing unity in diversity. Based on empirical observations, which are also scientifically-based, youngsters today have not yet learned to use this type of setting themselves against the world, against "the other". We still dwell on stereotypes that are not yet assumed as such. As a result, there is a confusion in the way the self-image is constructed by an individual pertaining to a majority or a minority, as well as in understanding democratic values (A. Maxim, 1998, p. 3). This leads to the necessity of adopting the idea of intercultural education.

In a broader sense, M. Şimandan (2005) identifies a series of topics that should be debated upon not only by researchers, but above all within the various educational communities on a daily basis, namely: the risk of a cultural imbalance in case an individual situates himself between two cultures; the need for both majorities and minorities to adapt to cultural diversity; understanding interculturality in a sense that would include cultural exchange, mutual acknowledgement of the values and lifestyles against which the individual and the society set themselves; the strategies that ought to be employed so as to avoid the risks emerging from unequal cultural exchanges; the way in which intercultural education contributes to the mutual communication and understanding between different cultural groups.

The values of the community are respectable, but it is necessary to attain the universal dimension, since we relate ourselves to essence beyond particular forms. The ideal and the dream of new humanism converge towards this desiderate. Within this context of relativisation brought along by the post-modern vision acts the new constructivist paradigm, which defines itself as the passage from a normative Weltanschauung (worldview) to an interpretative one (H. Siebert, 2001, p. 35).

Thus, the stress moves in pedagogy onto autonomous learning, a holistic view of the world, the stimulation of questions and the acceptance of the fact that error is probable to occur (E. Stan, 2004, p. 113-115). We start from the idea that the human being lives in a society which is at the same time a social system and a social construct. As a result, pedagogy itself is a construct which needs to take into account the fact that teaching is not a linear process based on the sender-receiver reductionist pattern, but a circular type of interaction, recursive and perspectivist at the same time.

The central thesis of this pedagogic orientation claims that people are closed operational systems, while at the same time being autonomous and processing reality based on their background. Reality and learning are, therefore, filtered through the individual's own experience and his interests (H. Siebert, 2001, p. 158-159). Hence, reality is subjective and man can only know the world within his own possibilities and influenced by the environment he lives in.

In spite of all this, man is the one to observe the world and he will not fall under the influence of anything that causes him cognitive dissonance. The individual is resistant to those educational elements that have the tendency to change his mentality, his view of the world. He will only accept that which fits into the cognitive patterns he already possesses. It is considered that nature, feelings, action models and thought patterns are culturally conditioned, therefore being constructs.

On the other hand, there are several types of reality, says Searle, namely institutional realities, which are determined by social conventions, and the "brute" realities, which are independent of human opinion (J. Searle apud A. Teti, N. Hynek, 2007, p. 7-8).

To these we add the dichotomy: subjective/objective and perspectivist /immanent. Therefore, learning depends on the social context of the individual coupled with the individual's experience and interests/needs.

As a consequence, learning is not a value in itself, but an attribution of significances. Depending on those significances, each individual decides which educational elements are useful and which are not. This process is thus firstly based on confirmation, and under certain circumstances there might even appear a resistance to learning. "Constructivism confirms the fundamental *anthropocentrism and egocentrism* of human existence. One cannot escape

oneself and, regardless of how much one strives to be objective, *one* is still the one who observes the world.” (Horst Siebert, 2001, p. 30).

The constructivist paradigm militates for an active type of pedagogy centred on autonomy and individualization, reaching an active construction of knowledge. In this way, constructivism questions the traditional model based on input and output (Ibidem). It is considered that the internal state of the trainee determines learning, and his anterior knowledge and vision upon the world lead to individual and voluntary construction of knowledge. This autonomy is translated through rendering trainees responsible and independent (G.E. Hein, 1991, p. 3).

Due to the fact that it emphasizes the idea of the student being a neophyte and because it accepts the existence of several approaches to the same problem-situation, we consider that post-modern pedagogy represents a useful apprenticeship for the student who needs to discover that his truth is not unique, but also that he cannot be stigmatized if he does not think along the same lines as everyone else. As well as this, it is important to learn together with the others, as well, because in this way the trainee will have the ability to accept what the other thinks/ says, given the right to freedom of opinion, recognising the situation in which „the other” finds a better solution or when his solution is not the one which was sought. The constructivist variant seems to come close to a certain pedagogic skepticism, whereby it emphasizes the idea that the subject accepts only that which it can relate to previous knowledge, the rest being devoid of any interest. Thus, mixing traditional and new methods is desirable if one desires activating the student without specifically and clearly deciding the work position. The constructivists themselves believe that a „moderate constructivism” can be found in education. (H. Siebert, 2001).

To sum up all the aforementioned, it can be stated that, despite certain apparent inadequacies between the postulates of the postmodern paradigm and some of the characteristics of psycho-pedagogic constructivism, intercultural education is not only one of the major challenges of contemporary educational systems, but also a possible solution for the prevention of future major national or international crises.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barth, Fredrik (2005), L'identité pathane et sa préservation, *Labyrinthe*, 7/2000 [En ligne], mis en ligne le 05 avril 2005. URL: <http://labyrinthe.revues.org/index504.html>. Consulté le 21 mars 2010.
- Bârlogeanu, Lavinia (2002), *Antropologie sub semnul valorii. Deschideri spre artă și fenomenul educației*, Editura Trei, București (Anthropology under the Signs of Value. Openness towards Arts and the Phenomenon of Education).

- Bosche, Marc, *Management interculturel et apprentissage de l'interculturalité*, http://www.google.ro/books?hl=ro&lr=&id=RN0XqaQwiIC&oi=fnd&pg=PA9&dq=Management+interculturel+marc+bosche&ots=2iAEiwqZ0D&sig=_zFukd155IvTbrUvdx1zn0qnqo&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Management%20interculturel%20marc%20bosche&f=false.
- Hein, George, E. (1991), *Constructivist Learning Theory*, CECA (International Committee of Museum Educators) Conference, Jerusalem Israel, 15-22 October 1991, <http://www.exploratorium.edu/IFI/resources/constructivistlearning.html>.
- Joița, Elena (2002), *Educația cognitivă. Fundamente metodologice*, Editura Polirom, Seria Collegium. Științele educației, Iași (Cognitive Education. Methodological Fundamentals).
- Kerzil, Jennifer (2002), *L'éducation interculturelle en France: un ensemble de pratiques évolutives au service d'enjeux complexes*, Université de Picardie Jules Vernes, *Carrefours de l'éducation*, 2002/2 – nr. 14, <http://www.cairn.info/article.php>.
- Maxim, Andreia (1998), *Adolescența ca etapă în formarea conștiinței de sine și a identității eului*, disertație de masterat/studii aprofundate, Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai Cluj-Napoca, Facultatea de Științe Europene (Adolescence as a Stage in the Formation of Self-Consciousness and of the Identity of the Self).
- Ouellet, Fernand (2002), *L'éducation interculturelle et l'éducation à la citoyenneté. Quelques pistes pour s'orienter dans la diversité des conceptions*, *VEI Enjeux*, n° 129, juin 2002: http://74.6.239.67/search/cache?ei=UTF8&p=%C3%A9ducation+interculturelle+effets+pervers&rd=r1&fr=ush_mailc&u=documentation.reseauenfance.com/IMG/pdf/0140_interculturel_et_education_citoyennete.pdf&w=education+interculturelle+effets+effet+pervers&d=RYSYr_EUT47&icp=1&intl=fr&sig=TDA8.FhFbP_DnmV2T4YDbQ.
- Savater, Fernando (1997), *Curajul de a educa*, Editura Arc, Chișinău, 1997 (The Courage to Educate).
- Fine, Michelle, Weis, Lois, Powell, Linda C., Wong, L Mun (Eds.) (1997), *Off White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society*. New York: Routledge, apud Audrey Thompson.
- Stan, Emil (2004), *Pedagogie postmodernă*, Institutul European, Iași (Post-modern Pedagogy).
- Siebert, Horst (2001), *Pedagogie constructivistă*, Institutul European, Iași (Constructivist Pedagogy).
- Șimandan, Matei (2005), *Distincțiile conceptuale ale culturii*, *Scientific and Technical Bulletin. Social and Humanistic sciences* (XI), 7, Arad (Conceptual Distinctions of Culture).
- Teti, Andeea, Hynek, Nikola (2007), *Saving Identity from Postmodernism? Disciplining Constructivism and Governing the „International”*, Institute of European Studies and International Relations Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences, Comenius University, Bratislava, A Teti, N Hynek - 2007 – iesir.sk.