

## **Pluralism and Education: A Compatible Relation. Post-Commentary Notes**

*Vasiliki Kantzara*<sup>1</sup>

---

*Abstract.* The current issue of the journal is devoted to the complex issue of pluralism in education. Pluralism is a highly abstract concept employed mostly in political terms; it denotes commonly plurality of groups, cultural practices, ideas, or belief systems as well as citizenship rights of, for instance representation and freedom of speech. Education responds to the plurality of social groups by designing structures that initially incorporate all members of society. From secondary education onwards however education incorporates existing social hierarchy by hindering, selecting, and socialising the youth according to their social origins, broadly defined. Thus, education functions both in a pluralistic and in a selective manner. The text here comments on the articles in this volume by examining their contribution to further research on the topic of pluralism in schooling. Questions are furthermore raised regarding the ways homogeneity and heterogeneity is perceived and interpreted, as well as the ways which ‘problems’ are framed in education.

*Keywords:* Education, Pluralism, Diversity, Schooling.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Sociology, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, Athens, Greece. E-mail: [Vkantz@panteion.gr](mailto:Vkantz@panteion.gr).

## Introduction

In an era characterised by an extensive crisis at all social levels, it seems like a small luxury to devote a journal issue on pluralism. On second thought, however, among the effects of the on-going crisis in Europe are the gradual corrosion of pluralistic ideas and practices, and the denial or violation of citizenship rights to ‘minorities’, if these are not in the meantime brutally repressed by rapidly emerging and wide spreading neo-fascist ideologies and actions. In times like these, sociologists need to address issues of pluralism and democracy and support their claims to scientific knowledge with empirical evidence, as it is the case in this issue.

The collection of the articles in this volume of the *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education* brings to the fore the complex issue of pluralism in schools; and it is doing this by presenting research carried out by scholars in different countries. The text here aims at discussing common aspects underlying the collection of the articles and highlighting some of the questions that are raised for further research. For this purpose, I start in the section that follows with the concept of pluralism and move on to the way it has been related to education.

The concepts of pluralism and education that are employed throughout the text here are highly abstract in order to point to aspects that are common in many different social contexts. By pluralism I mean the recognition of multiple social groups and collectivities, the plurality of cultural ideas and practices as well as issues of (political) representation and forms of governance. Education as a concept points to the education system, its structure and teaching as well as to the educational titles it grants.

The text that follows should be better regarded as ‘work in progress’ expressing ideas and thoughts for further discussion and research. One of the issues in my view is not the question whether pluralism is applied in education, but the impossibility of education to solve problems that are mainly created by society. Such is the case, for instance with accepting and recognising cultural diversity first in society at large and consequently within schooling structures and practices. This is however a slightly different altogether discussion, which nonetheless shows the very close relationship of education as an institution to society as a whole.

### Pluralism and the Link to Education

Pluralism is commonly understood and employed as a political concept (Heywood, 2000); it refers to the recognition that society is composed by multiple or diverse social groups that may or may not occupy a different social position (in society) and perhaps have different interests (see McLennan, 1995). The acceptance of groups implies that they are almost equally valued and for this reason they ought to be represented in the adopted system of governing society, that is, the system of dividing, distributing and sharing social power. Social groups may have different ideas, ways of life and culture, and ideally all should be respected regardless of whether they form the majority or the minority in society.

Pluralism is an abstract concept denoting different processes that take place at different social spheres and societal levels (McLennan, 1995). The debate and discussion on pluralism is carried out in and from different disciplines and perspectives. Customarily, pluralism has been related to liberal democracy according to which, group plurality goes hand in hand with individual freedom and will (expressed nowadays as freedom of choice) that are of paramount importance in public life and ought to be safeguarded (see Dahl, 1982; Crowder, 2007; Moore, 2009). The quest however in society is to retain social cohesion and with this the current social equilibrium. One of the ways to do this is by dividing and distributing valuable resources (and the social power attributed to these) among its members, who make up the most important social groups that comprise society. In this way concentration of power in a few hands is being hindered and perhaps its abuse with all the consequences such a practice may imply.

Pluralism thus denotes the recognition that social life is comprised by groups that differ in significant aspects but ought to coexist for the common or collective good. Thus, rights of representation go hand in hand with certain freedoms, such as freedom of expression, or association. The social context facilitates the existence of multiple groups by guaranteeing conditions of unhindered functioning such as equity, justice and fairness. In a few words, though groups differ in various and important perhaps aspects, they should be treated nonetheless equally and valued equally as well. However, having or being of equal value does not render groups the same. Thus, '*different but equal*' is the motto of democracy and a democratic regime today.

The notion of pluralism is thus complex, for it refers to *normative beliefs* and *values* as well as to *structures* and *systems* set up in the Polity that apply this principle in practice. In addition, pluralism is employed at a *cognitive* and a *descriptive level* (McLennan, 1995). Cognitive means that individuals are aware of pluralism and accept it or not as an ideal. Descriptive level refers to employing the concept in a loose manner, when describing plurality of ideas or practices.

Furthermore, the functioning of pluralism presupposes equality and the working out of these concepts and values are to be found in policy measures that permit or facilitate access to social goods and services on an equal footing among members of society. Historically, the ‘translation’ and transference of the ideal of equity and pluralism in social practice meant the application of two principles that govern the functioning of most public institutions, namely *equal opportunities* and *meritocracy*.

*Pluralism has been closely related to education* when an education system was institutionalised during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries in Western Europe and America. Access to education was made available to almost all members of society and it was further closely linked with access to labour and to citizenship rights. Thus various groups comprising society could receive a common education that prepared them for societal participation. Extending formal education to include all members of society has been considered a radical move at the time, though it largely also meant setting up a “tremendous machine of social control” as historians of education argue (Reisner, 1930, p. 568). Socialisation, one of the most important functions of education means regulating which social norms and values are accepted and transferred and which rules individuals should obey by internalising thus social control (see Kantzara, 2009). Education is largely legitimising the status quo, while it also leaves space for acceptance of new and transformative ideas and patterns of behaviour or ways of life. The latter is part and parcel of the notion of education in its broader sense that also implies that its aims are not directly linked with any social group. It is a pluralism that refers to coexistence of different ideas, worldviews and ideologies together with the oral history including students’ resistance to restrictive regimes that is transferred from generation to generation within education.

One of the begging questions is, *what kind of social groups there are in society*. At that time, until well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, groups were defined in terms of their socio-economic status, which was loosely demarcated

depending on a combination of profession exercised, property owned and later level of education attained. However, ethnicity as well as religion also played a role, hidden or overt, sometimes these were incorporated in a profession and other times they stood as a separate category demarcating in a way a particular group. Much later gender of individuals was taken seriously into consideration, though not as an established group, but rather as a category, and appropriate schooling structures and inclusive strategies were set up not only for girls, but also for boys coming from lower socio-economic status.

It should be added though that while in sociology we talk about social groups these are not clear demarcated with definite borders, and the social foundation of their existence is not always clear. The names used for describing this process of *social grouping* are, *class* (a Marxian concept) or *status groups* (Weber's concept) or more modern terms are used, such as *stratum*, *section of society*, or *network* depending on the criterion used in order to depict this form of social classification. More certain is that such a classification system, which is applied both on individuals and groups alike, forms the basis of the social hierarchy, according to which access to social goods, as well as rewards, are divided in society (see also Kantzara, 2007). One of the problems, therefore newcomers face is that their acceptance goes through their classification (and allocation in the existing social hierarchy), in order to be socially integrated. Education has been historically used in order to integrate by 'assimilating' for instance migrants and other members of society, who do not belong to the dominant group, in terms of religion or ethnicity and/or a combination of both (see e.g. Burdette, 1942; Berbrier, 2004).

The right to education and 'education for all', as it was framed at the time of the institutionalisation of the education system, did not imply however that every child would get exactly the same education as every other. Except from the basics that were common to all (that is the 'elements' and therefore it was called elementary school), the rest of the education system reflected social stratification and it was structured accordingly. Institutionalising different tracks and levels of education managed to contain social stratification within schooling by following the main divide between technical-vocational and general education that is between lower and higher social classes. General education has been reserved for more bright students as it is well known, who mostly come from the privileged social classes (see also Kantzara, 2009). A long time

passed and more recently after the Second World War, the composition of the groups or rather the recognition has changed that social groups are not formed solely based on socio-economic status. In other words, not only class mattered but also national origin alongside gender, religious beliefs, race and ethnicity. If profession is added to the above mentioned list, then one may argue that groups have multiplied; though it only means that their existence is recognised, and so various groups became socially visible, and with this perhaps their citizenship rights.

Thus, in the relevant discourse other terms were employed instead of pluralism in order to describe newcomers and the multitude of social groups, such as multiculturalism and diversity (see also Taylor, 1996, 2004). The debate on diversity, in addition, also questioned the perceived monoculturalism within a nation-state and showcased the existence of cultural variety, exposing the extent of its suppression in order to construct a collective, national identity based on homogeneity rather than on heterogeneity. The debate continued further questioning inclusion or rather exclusion practices from social institutions, including education. Diversity in education has been employed as an explanatory concept when studying the reproduction of social inequalities within this institution.

In sum, pluralism is a complex notion, referring to various social processes; most commonly it refers to the plurality of social groups and the different cultural baggage these may have as well as to different ideas expressed in society. In education, social hierarchy is mirrored in various ways, which is a theme sociology of education has studied extensively. It suffices to say here that the first years of education are common to all members of society and differentiation begins from secondary education onward. Behind this differentiation expressed in diverse tracks (or other forms), one can find traces of current social hierarchy. Thus, education is largely contributing to sustaining current society and the dominant organisation of social relations, while facilitating to a degree societal change.

### **Discourse vs. social practice**

The articles in this thematic volume have a common starting point, that is, the explicit or implicit acceptance of pluralism as an ideal. In their work presented here, authors attempt to explore how schooling reacts or fail to do

so in relation to a diverse pupil population. Some of the articles point to problems associated with this diverse population, while others highlight differences in implementing the same policy measures. In general, the authors attempt to answer the question of how pluralism works within schools. The varied answers according to the subject studied does not show the limits of pluralism, as one may think, but the complexity of the issue under scrutiny.

The thematic issue starts with a dense and informative introduction written by *Maddalena Colombo*. The issue further includes eight contributions written by esteemed colleagues, who report for and from the different countries they live in (or come from). Three of the articles focus on issues related to students' social class origin, parents' school choice and the differentiated education provided (according to students' origin); two articles explore teachers' and principals' views on diversity; it follows an article referring to religious education in a globalised world; another article refers to the problem of implementing policy related to violence in schools; and last, an article refers to findings from an intercultural course taught at university level.

More particularly, the three contributions, exploring issues related to students' social class origin and its implication on education provided, are written respectively by (a) *Pedro Abrantes and Maria Luísa Quaresma*, (b) *Valeria Pandolfini*, and (c) *Triin Lauri*. Though the exact subject under study differs in these three articles, a common line is the divide between deprived and wealthy students and the concomitant divide in the education that is provided to student population. This divide continues, as it is currently linked with the pluralist claim of parent's right to choose the 'best school' for their offspring. This claim is supported by a liberal perspective and leads as the authors argue in reproducing inequity in relation to the quality of education attained. In addition, the schools that are addressed to the more wealthy families incorporate a more 'holistic' view on education and promote certain highly esteemed ideals and values: they organise many extra-curricular activities in which students cultivate both fine arts as well as their social engagement; the latter comprises the undertaking solidarity actions (or perhaps it is better to say philanthropy) to help less affluent families. In doing this, the basis of charisma and privilege are further obscured, as also the work of Bourdieu (1977) shows.

On the contrary, schools that are populated by pupils coming from lower status families do not possess the above mentioned educational

characteristics, as the scope of the education provided is more limited. The convincing argument posed by *Pandolfini* is that ‘the quasi-market of schooling has not led to quality improvement’ as it was planned or hoped. One of the reasons is related to the strategy some schools develop in order to attract pupils, whose parents come from highly valued social status; so some schools spend their energy in marketing strategies rather than in improving quality.

The articles show what it means at a level of schooling to keep up the divide based on class and socio-economic status, and that if organised society offers no compensation to the right of parents to select schools then we simply end up reproducing the same society we would like to ameliorate. These issues form a line of work worth exploring further questioning the conditions under which socially deprived children may not receive a ‘deprived’ education.

Furthermore, two of the articles in this volume deal with the ways teachers and principals respectively view and manage diversity at school. The first one is written by *Maddalena Colombo* actually highlights the awkwardness of teachers in handling diversity of their students. Diversity is being defined in cultural terms and refers to migrant students. In my view, teachers request a ‘manual’ as it were, in order to know how to deal with the ‘different’ students; it seems that this manual should contain something like ‘recipes’ I would argue, echoing Schutz’s approach. Schutz (1970) argues that the taken for granted nature of everyday life (the natural attitude) is achieved, for individuals have a recipe at hand to handle things. In addition, it may be that at level of discourse, diversity is accepted, but at the bottom line, involved teachers do not know how to define it and therefore to react in an accepted and appropriate manner. The other article written by *Evi Markou* shows the influence principals may have on the functioning of the school, which depends on the way they interpret their role. Both articles pose the problem of interpretation and conception of issues regarding diversity in every day school life. It is worth studying further and in various contexts how key individuals but also how students conceive their role and under what condition these conceptions may change. Further, it is important to ask how dominant interpretations are consolidated and under what conditions these may be challenged.

An article written by *Valeria Fabretti* refers to religious pluralism. The article touches upon the issue of incommensurability: no belief system could be compared with another and therefore none should have a

monopoly, but all are of equal value, more or less. The article shows that segregation of schools is not always an appropriate solution, but rather the teaching of the various religious belief systems. It is significant in a globalised world to study further how this context influences the teaching of traditional subjects, as it is the case posed by this article.

The next subject is educational policy on violence and the article is written by *João Sebastião, Joana Campos, Sara Merlini, Mafalda Chambino*. In this contribution, two important points are made: the first relates to associating violence at schools almost exclusively with low socio-economic status; the second is the mediated nature of policy implementation by actors' understanding, conceptions and interests. Both aspects are very interesting in pursuing further and analysing the effects as well as conditions under which views are modified.

The final contribution I would like to discuss seems to provide an answer to problems associated with cultural pluralism, and that is 'intercultural' training. The article is written by *Bernadette Brereton, Mairéad McKiernan*, and *Vicky Leahy* reports on the findings of a course on 'intercultural competence' at university level. Such a course contributes to understanding other cultures, while increasing students' competence in relating with others and minimalizing in a certain aspect negative stereotyping. It also worth pursuing this topic further and do comparative research.

It is worth mentioning, in passing, the trend that education itself has adopted education (that is setting up courses) to tackle most of the problems encountered in order to promote understanding and tolerance, integral values of any form of pluralism. The articles selected for this issue offer many insights, much more that I could possibly discuss here and this is the added value of this journal issue.

### **An Attempt to Synthesis: Et Pluribus Unum ('one from many')**

Education is an institution that regulates and facilitates social participation of young members of society and guarantees to a certain extent societal preservation in the future. Education largely functions on the two aforementioned principles of *equal opportunities* and *meritocracy* that have permitted organised society to set up a socially accepted system that regulates access to educational institutions, a system of evaluating student's

school performance and a system of providing educational titles that are socially 'useful' and valuable. Educational titles are 'useful', for they promise access to labour and the higher ones promise access to position that form the higher echelons of the social hierarchy. Education has set up a selective mechanism that has convinced the public of its social neutrality and impartiality, as it is almost obvious even to the naked eye, that education has no vested interest to favour any particular group over another. It succeeds in doing this by treating all pupils as individuals trying, thus, to strip away any references to their social origins. The question is, *Does education manage to achieve social impartiality and neutrality?*

The answer is both negative and positive. Education has no vested interest to be associated with promoting only particular and not collective values. On the other hand, it is well known by research in sociology of education that students' social origins is becoming apparent to teachers through language used, level of cultural capital attained prior to school enrolment and other characteristics, as the very well-known work of Bourdieu and that of Bernstein shows. Social origin broadly defined is employed by teachers as an indicator and as explaining individual student school performance, which then is being graded accordingly. Thus, in some cases pluralism, loosely defined, is seen not in a positive light as cultural variation but rather as a problem to be dealt with, especially if students' school performance is, for instance, below 'average'. The framing of the issue matters a lot, for it points to cause and effect, and often diversity and variation of students' social origin or gender is seen as creating 'the problem'. The same framing is been used to judge quality of education provided that is interlinked with wealth and poverty. It does not go far to argue that people want to associate other people of similar status and/or higher but not of lower status than themselves. Thus, in common perception difference and diversity is been linked with the existence of 'problems', as though diversity creates them instead of being the result of processes that are not evident at first sight.

The collection of the articles in this volume attempts to open up the debate from a pluralist point of view and incorporate discussion on diversity and the ways in/by which the right to education or 'education for all' is applied to schooling and/or is translated into schooling practices that are fair and do justice to all students, cultivating to the full their intellect and other competences. This task seems too much for education to complete successfully, though it is not the one to take full responsibility for

this. The French sociologist Alain Touraine argues that the problem that lies at the foundation of education is ‘particularism’. Touraine (2000) distinguishes three principles upon which education functions: one of them is the making of particularism, that is different groups and/or individuals a common subject in educational terms, teaching them reason and knowledge (2000, p. 266-7). The second principle has been educating the youth according to an ideal (*paideia* in Greek, *Bildung* in German) and the third one is the attempt to “free children from tradition” (Touraine, 2000, p. 267-8); it means to elevate students from their origins, so that they are part of something that supersedes them, and here Touraine does not mean the nation, but the classical notion of education which was interlinked with ‘*a sense of truth, beauty and goodness*’ (emphasis added, *ibidem*, p. 267). In a few words, education has been about culture and morality and not about learning social roles, though this notion of classical education, as he shows further in the aforementioned publication was not without problems.

Furthermore, Taylor (1994) employs the well-known term ‘politics of recognition’ to understand social processes of differentiation and the politics of multiculturalist movements. To put it a bit differently, education attempts to create homogenous subjects, speaking in educational terms, while multiculturalist movements pose the problem of being socially recognised and this means not be undermined, disregarded or undervalued. In doing this movements and collectivities valorise their difference. To make things more complex, emancipation of social groups arises from the awareness of their differing position in society and supported by an ideology or actions that sometimes aim to ‘overthrow’ capitalism or patriarchy or any other majority, privileged groups, class or stratum, while achieving emancipation of its members. Thus, *difference* is seen both in a negative light, as something that causes problems and in a positive light, as an element that is enriching society; which of these views prevail depends on the side one takes and the framing of the issue at hand. On the whole, in the dominant discourse, the framing of the differences among individuals is associated with ‘social’ problems; it seems then as though these ‘different’ individuals cause the problems (e.g. criminality, or violent school behaviour), instead of the other way around: their behaviour is the answer to the invisible mechanisms of selection, rejection, social exclusion and systemic or symbolic violence.

In addition, until here I talked about groups as though these occupy the same social position. This is not of course the case, social hierarchy is made

out of groups, strata, and classes that intersect, coexist, and interact, while competing for securing access to or control over valuable social resources. The functioning of institutions reproduces on the whole, with slight exceptions, the dominant organisation of social relations. The ways this is accomplished is the focus of study in various disciplines. Here it suffices to say that it is not a coincidence that pluralism is considered a concept that fits better a liberal conception of democracy, for it lacks consideration of the dynamics of power relations.

Education thus has to reconcile the *existing particularism* in society, accept *politics of recognition*, reproduce the current *status quo*, (that is a hierarchical society with uneven life chances), while *promoting equity*. It seems a difficult, if not impossible task. The issue is further complicated because from its inception education is functioning on two, if not antithetical then partly incompatible functions: one to sustain society for the next generations and the second to permit minor social changes. The first may denote that education replicates or reproduces existing structures that are however moulded with inequality. The second function may permit societal change, for society has to be renewed in order to survive, literally and metaphorically. As I have written elsewhere, education preserves culture and what is valued from previous generations in order to transfer it to the next generations (Kantzara, 2008). In accomplishing this mission, education acts in a conservative manner, but at the same time it is endowed with progressive ideals and liberating or emancipatory potentials. Balancing between these two antithetical poles, if I am permitted a metaphor, education manages to walk down the corridor between classes and sustain itself pretending that it has nothing to do with them.

Returning to the issue at hand, in general terms there are three issues to distinguish here that at the same time could be formulated at an individual and group level: access to education, facilitating studying and completing one's study. These aspects of education call for state regulation and government intervention whose educational policy sets up the formal framework so that schools could function according to social ideals and norms and prepare young people for their future place in society. This is all well said but here the problems start. The problem to my view is not whether pluralism is not applied in education but the unsaid character and undefined nature of diversity, which is also better so, because if it is associated with violence and social problems then it becomes the lens through which next generation of teachers 'see' and judge their students.

Thus, in my view, a broad definition of diversity is needed that is linked with positive outcomes to society.

Collins (1979) defines educational titles as a 'currency', for these can be cashed or used for something else. The importance of education for many depends on this, for others on the educational ideals, *paideia* or *Bildung* that have as a purpose to cultivate the individual and elevate it from an atom to something more complex and more enduring, that is actually society itself. Unfortunately this kind of education provided is not reserved for every member of society. What is of value is reserved for those members who are thought of being of higher value, either because of their social origin or because of their extraordinary achievements. This is the case as it is documented by three articles in this volume.

The problem lies when new groups come to the fore and ask for access to education and fair treatment. It is interesting to note here that teachers in the article of *Colombo* in this issue feel awkward in not knowing how to deal with diverse pupils. Education reacts to this by organising the so-called intercultural training (see article in this volume by *Brereton*, et al.). While the division between wealthy and not wealthy remains again intact, because liberal democracy enters the arena by providing the possibility for parents to select schools. In the name of pluralism, many schools compete as though education functions in free market conditions to attract students, and parents' choice. The problem however of violence and other kind of tensions or conflicts show that differences are not so much ontological, but of another, social, kind (see article in this issue by *Sebastião* et al).

If the discussion till recently has been the right to access to education and the inequalities associated with it, today the debate and the focus is 'management' of diversity, as *Colombo* mentions in her introduction, and guaranteeing adequate school performance, so that students could successfully complete their studies. The way problems are framed shows that these are associated with defining homogeneity among individuals and heterogeneity or difference. Homogeneity elevates individuals or groups placing them at an equal level guaranteeing equal footing; heterogeneity or difference places individuals on a difference scale; consequently it is examined how much different these are or to what degree, making up a second social hierarchy within the existing one. These aspects just mentioned are behind the heterogeneity-homogeneity debate which are not so apparent, because social rewards come naturally to those who earn this

right, since antiquity, but the mechanisms behind their success is the study focus of, among other disciplines, sociology.

### Concluding Remarks

The collection of the articles in this volume attempts to shed light on different processes related to a pluralist education. In addition the work presented here shows that accepting diversity and multiculturalism has still a long way to go. The most important social divides in our society are related to class origin and ethnicity. The framing of the 'problems' is done in such a way as to disguise the workings of society and of the education system. If sociologists do not look behind the veil of social facts then soon diversity and pluralism will only be seen in negative terms. It seems further that quality of education matters, only when it refers to higher social class origin of students.

The added value of the articles in this volume is that they indicate explicitly or implicitly the importance of democracy and pluralism within schools, so that schooling is open to all students in terms both of access and successful study completion. The articles indicate the existing divide within the education system in qualitative terms that reflects or 'corresponds' to the class divide in society as I just mentioned above. It seems as though, this is the most important divide in society, following gender, even after the coming of age of diversity and its acceptance.

To my view, the volume indicates the importance of operationalizing pluralism and diversity and their contribution to society's sustenance. In doing so, the current monolithic perhaps idea of homogeneity could be meaningfully deconstructed: homogeneity is classification on basis of many 'common' elements rather than exactly the 'same'. For instance, when talking about a homogenous national identity a good practice would be to explore how many different groups make up this so-called homogenous identity. Moreover, schooling takes place today in a globalised world (see also Banks, 2008) and this context brings certain changes with it, some more and other less favourable. Teaching on basis of a common educational ideal, a sort of new *Bildung* may be a fruitful idea; what this might be, Morin's work indicates the answer. Talking about the education of the future, Morin (2000) argues that education could contribute to sustaining society by teaching the common elements among people, those

that unite them, as for example a common future (or fate) on the planet earth; at the same time, education needs to depart from dominant paradigms and teach students to think in a complex manner. Complexity makes analytic connections not apparent at first sight, which facilitates deeper understanding of issues and problems possible in such a way that solutions may become apparent as well.

Last but not least, the issue in my opinion is not to explain the lack of pluralism in schools, but rather to explain the omnipotence of competition; competition that is being expressed between pupils as well as between schools. Education is a valuable resource helping new members of society to be prepared adequately for their meaningful societal participation later as adults. Taking into consideration existing power relations among different segments or groups in society could explain much of the ‘problems’ in education. At the same time, a common educational ideal needs perhaps to be redefined, so that it is available and literally inclusive to all members of society.

#### References

- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, Group Identity, and Citizenship Education in a Global Age. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 3, 129-139.
- Berbrier, M. (2004). Assimilation and Pluralism as Cultural Tools. *Sociological Forum*, 19, 1, 29-61.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (2000 [1977]). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Burdette, F. L. (1942). Education for Citizenship. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 6, 2, 269-279.
- Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society. An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- Crowder, G. (2007). Two Concepts of Liberal Pluralism. *Political Theory*, 35, 2, 121-146.
- Dahl, R. A. (1982). *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy. Autonomy vs. Control*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Heywood, A. (2000). *Key Concepts in Politics*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kantzara, V. (2007). Status. In G. Ritzer (ed.), *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology* (pp. 4749-4753). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kantzara, V. (2008). *Ekpaideysi kai koinonia. Kritiki diereynisi ton koinonikon leitourgion tis ekpaideysis* (Education and Society. A Critical Exploration of Social Functions of Education). Athens: Polytropon.
- Kantzara, V. (2009). Education, Social Functions of. In Ritzer G. (ed.) *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Blackwell Reference Online, 03/3/09, pp. 8, ([www.sociologyencyclopedia.com](http://www.sociologyencyclopedia.com)).
- McLennan, G. (1995). *Pluralism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Moore, M. J. (2009). Pluralism, Relativism, and Liberalism. *Political Research Quarterly*, 62 (2), 244-256.
- Edgar Morin (2000). *Les Sept savoirs nécessaires à l'éducation du futur*. Paris: Seuil.
- Schutz, A. (1970). *On Phenomenology and Social Relations*, (ed. A.R. Wagner). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Taylor, Ch. (1996). Varieties of Multiculturalism, Master Class, University of Amsterdam, 15/5 Amsterdam.
- Taylor, C., Appiah, A.K., Habermas J., Rockefeller S.C., Walzer, M. & Wolf, S. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Touraine, A. (2000). *Can We Live Together? Equality and Difference*. Cambridge: Polity Press.