Political Psychology

Political Psychology, Vol. xx, No. xx, 2015
doi: 10.1111/pops.12276

"Nobody Wants to Be an Outsider": From Diversity Management to Diversity Engagement

Caroline Howarth
London School of Economics

Eleni Andreouli
The Open University

This article develops an analysis of diversity in two ways. We start with a theoretical discussion of the ways in which diversity has been approached within psychology, showing the competing arguments that have been developed that connect diversity, community, and multiculturalism. We show that not only are there psychological consequences to contemporary experiences of increased diversity but also that fundamental psychological capacities—such as self-consciousness, identity, and dialogue—actually stem from the experience of diversity. This has important implications for diversity management policies. The second part of the article gives an empirical illustration of how diversity is experienced in schools across England drawing on 13 interviews with senior staff and 11 focus groups with pupils aged between 12 and 14 years old. We discuss three themes related to experiences of diversity: (1) from difference to diversity, (2) real and imagined mobility across communities, and (3) collaborative practices, projects, and knowledge. What the empirical examples show is that critically engaging with diversity can be a more productive project than practices which construct diversity in terms of distinct groups that need respect and tolerance. Hence we argue approaches that promote engaging with diversity rather than traditional diversity management are more in line with foundational psychological insights as well as empirical research findings.

KEY WORDS: diversity management, multiculturalism, community, schools, engagement

The question of "how to manage diversity so that it becomes a source of mutual enrichment rather than a factor of division and conflict" is of central concern for many governments and organizations such as the European Committee for Social Cohesion who posed this precise question in 2004. Since then, there has been an intensifying debate about diversity, how to manage it, and its consequences in social and political psychology and the social sciences as a whole. In this article, we examine this debate in two ways: (1) a theoretical discussion of (increasing) diversity and what it means for community from a psychological perspective and (2) an empirical illustration of the different ways in which diversity is experienced in school settings across England. Together, these support the argument that some approaches to diversity negate foundational psychological insights on the necessity of diversity as well as being unproductive in terms of encouraging positive social relations in diverse settings. The purpose of the first section is to discuss the relationship between diversity and community and to examine the impact of (increased) diversity on psychological processes such as identity. The

Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, and PO Box 378 Carlton South, 3053 Victoria, Australia

purpose of the second section is to develop and expand on these points through empirical examples. These examples highlight the risk of reifying difference, the importance of mobility, and the connection between diversity and solidarity. However, our aim is not to focus on one of these aspects, but rather to develop a comprehensive account of the significance of diversity in psychological theory as well as everyday practice.

Diversity, Multiculturalism, and Community: Current Debates and Controversies

Across social science research, policy discussions, and social debates, the fact that societies and communities are becoming more diverse in terms of culture and religion is accepted; however, for some this is seen as enriching (Gergen, 1991; Gilroy, 2004; Hermans, 2002; Howarth, 2001), but for others, this diversification is seen to be threatening community, social capital, and solidarity (Collier, 2013; Putnam, 2007). This is because of a "largely ideological representation that societies cannot manage cultural diversity due to assumed incompatibility between particular cultural groups" (Chryssochoou, 2014). With explicit calls for greater cohesion or integration as a stabilizing remedy to fragmentation, segregated communities, and extremism—cohesion or integration becomes the antidote to the threat of diversity, as we can see in a speech by British Prime Minister David Cameron in Munich in 2011:

> "Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream. We've failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong. We've even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run completely counter to our values."

In this speech, diversity is equated with a particular version of multiculturalism: a "state multiculturalism" that strengthens difference—different values, different forms of belonging, segregated communities. The danger then becomes that such difference produces segregation, or as the then Chair of the Commission of Racial Equality, Trevor Phillips put it "We are sleepwalking our way to segregation" (Phillips, 2005). Hence in promoting socially cohesive societies, positive intergroup relations, and secure national identities, multiculturalism is sometimes depicted as a "threat" to equality, participation, and citizenship (e.g., Huntington, 1996; Goodhart, 2004). Indeed even before the 2011 speech, Cameron (2007) had already described multiculturalism as "a deliberate weakening of our collective identity" (2007) and Gordon Brown (Cameron's predecessor) claimed that it had "pushed communities apart." Fears about diversity in general, and the depiction of multiculturalism as responsible for a divisive and dangerous type of diversity in particular, have been furthered by Europe's anxieties over immigration, the weakening of national identities, and the threat of global terrorism (Alexander, 2013; Taylor-Gooby & Waite, 2013). Most obviously, the ideological construction of the "Islam versus the West" dichotomy epitomizes such cultural incompatibility beliefs, famously discussed by Said (1978). For example, McGhee (2005) has analyzed cohesion policy in Britain and argued that attempts to "reestablish" cohesion stem from concerns over the assumed failed integration of Muslim communities. The PREVENT framework is also an example of how cohesion (particularly in Muslim communities) is seen as the "cure" against radicalization and terrorism in the United Kingdom (Thomas, 2010). In these ways, in both political discourse and media debates, diversity is commonly represented "as deviance and obstacle" (Marshall, Stenner, & Lee, 1999, p. 170; see also Horenczyk & Tatar, 2011), as it is often "supposed that societal cohesion will be threatened unless there is a hegemonic culture and the assimilation of all people under one cultural umbrella" (Chryssochoou, 2014).

The idea that multiculturalism has failed is not only evident in political rhetoric. It is also evident in some social research which supports this "diversity is bad for community" thesis. Most notably, political scientist Robert Putnam has argued that (1) diversity comes to destroy community as higher levels of racial and ethnic diversity correlate with lower levels of trust and (2) diversity leads members of different communities to "hunker down," distrust their neighbors and withdraw from community life and become more isolated. In Collier's controversial text "Exodus" (2013), he extends Putnam's argument to equate diversity and particularly increased immigration with social tension and unrest, construing the riots sparked by the death of Mark Duggan in the United Kingdom as a supposed link between diversity, unrest, and criminality. According to psychological research in the contact hypothesis tradition, contact between different groups *can* lead to distrust, prejudice, and conflict. When there are institutional pressures to collaborate on equal terms, supported by authority figures who also disconfirm negative beliefs about different groups (Allport, 1954), then contact between diverse social groups becomes more positive. Hence changing people's practices relating to diversity is more a matter of changing social norms and cultural conventions than changing individual attitudes (Baez, 2000; Howarth, 2006). However, even when this is the case and even when there is some change at the macro level in terms of mixing and increased contact between communities, often there remain more subtle but no less powerful forms of segregation and exclusion, as Durrheim and Dixon (2005) have shown in the South African context.

There is research that disconfirms Putnam's "hunkering down" hypothesis. Sturgis, Brunton-Smith, Read, and Allum (2011) and Stolle, Soroka, and Johnston (2008) have examined Putnam's claims and data in detail and found that it is deprivation and inequality that limit social trust, not cultural difference per se. As Stolle et al. (2008) point out:

> ... while diversity itself (without contact) may push interpersonal trust downwards, interaction and actual experiences with members of other social or racial groups can have counteracting positive effects. It is diversity without contact that is most problematic. (p. 61)

And thus in direct opposition to the argument that multiculturalism is a *cause* of dangerous forms of diversity, others argue that a kind of multiculturalism that promotes positive forms of contact and engagement with diversity is in fact the *solution* to the problems of mistrust, tension, and conflict between different communities and the means to preserve civic and national identities in a democratic polis (Moran, 2011). Joppke (2009), for instance, argues that multiculturalism should be seen as "a resource" in promoting equality, creativity, participation, and citizenship—and so "a virtue" for society. This approach to multiculturalism can, therefore, be seen as essential for societies today and for democracy in particular. As Alexander (2013) argues: "Only by making itself multicultural can Europe preserve its democratic values in the globalizing world that it confronts today" (p. 547).

There is therefore a deep tension between these approaches to diversity: on the one hand, diversity (cultural and religious diversity in particular) is seen to lead to tension and conflict; on the other, particular ways of engaging with diversity are seen to be the solution to such intergroup tensions. At the heart of this fundamental contradiction, we suggest, are different perspectives on the relationship between diversity and community. In unpacking this relationship, one question we need to ask is "does diversity threaten or foster community?"

Community through Diversity

In everyday discourse, diversity and community are often seen as polar opposites: diversity is about what makes groups different from one another; community is about what people have in common. As we saw above, commonality is seen as the basis for community building. In some research

on community, the emphasis is also on common identities, shared knowledge, and similar experiences (e.g., Howarth, 2001).

However, as Parekh (2000) argues, cultural diversity requires that we reconceptualize the nation as a "community of communities" whereby sharedness is born out of diversity not sameness. More recent work shows that communities are often born out of diverse groups coming together to exchange, debate, protest, and innovate; that is, there are shared projects that bring diverse interests and diverse stakeholders together (Howarth, Cornish, & Gillespie, 2015). For example, in a study on mixed-heritage identities in educational contexts, Howarth and colleagues (Howarth, 2001; Howarth, Wagner, Magnusson, & Sammut, 2014) found that a sense of community was built in dialogue and often contested debates about what defined the community between parents, teachers, community workers, and young people. Different views, competing identity-positions, and representations of difference were at the heart of claims to community. Cornish and colleagues have similarly found that it is the different stakeholders that come together to forge a common project and so institute some sense of community and also the possibilities for social change—from the different contexts of sex workers in India (Cornish, 2006) to the Occupy movement in London (Cornish, Montenegro, van Reisen, Zaka, & Sevitt, 2014). Failure to acknowledge that people are members of diverse groups demeans their status as individuals (Taylor, 1994) and diminishes the likelihood of their participation in society (Howarth, Andreouli, & Kessi). Indeed, when multicultural policies work to promote common identities and "shared values," as in the case of Britain, it can be described as a "cultural straightjacket . . . denying people the chance to cross cultural borders, borrow cultural influences, define and redefine themselves" (Phillips, 2009, p. 14). Conceptions of identity as choiceless, singular, and unchangeable can lead to tension and violence (Sen, 2006).

In sum, we have shown that communities are often made up of diverse identities coming together around a common concern or interest to debate and create a "future for us" (Bauer & Gaskell, 2008, p. 343). Hence it is not a question of (1) diversity *or* (2) commonality as the solid basis of communities. It is more a matter of commonalities *through* diversity: a forged perspective through the recognition of different views. This is not a question of diversity as a threat to community, but a matter of diversity as a means to build community. Solidarity can be built on the basis of recognition of diversity, not its denial (Tsirogianni & Andreouli, 2011). This is in fact one of the central contributions of early Social Psychology: We need a sense of difference or otherness in order to develop a sense of self or identity. We do not and cannot develop psychologically without others (Duveen, 2001; Farr, 1996; Jovchelovitch, 2007). That we are social beings in a very profound sense has been long established in psychology, with regards, for example, to cognitive development (Piaget, 1953; Vygotsky, 1978), emotional development (Bowlby, 1969), and development of the self (Mead, 1934). Without others, we do not develop the ability to recognize ourselves, to build relationships with others, to become self-conscious and agentic. As Charles Taylor (1994) put it: "my discovering my own identity doesn't mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others" (p. 34). Experiences of difference in social interactions thus enable us to turn back on ourselves, to view ourselves from the outside or as another would, and so develop self-consciousness and a sense of belonging to a social group. Self-consciousness is this ability to take the role of others with respect to oneself, and experiences of difference are central to this.

The Impact of Diversity on Psychological Processes

Social and political psychology show that we need to live in a community of others to develop a sense of self. We need a sense of difference or diversity to develop an identity or attachment to a community. Through dialogue and interaction across difference, we become self-conscious and develop what Mead (1934) called the "generalised other" which supports shared or community identities as well as particularized others which support individual identities, diverse positions, and unique

perspectives. Hence, while diversity is essential for the development of community and self, what happens when diversity as a social phenomenon changes itself?

In the globalized world in which we live and research, massive social and technological changes have expanded access to a wide range of "generalised others" thus altering "the backdrop against which identity is constructed" (Cerulo, 1997). How do we respond to this "*vertigo of unlimited multiplicity*" (Gergen, 1991), and what are the implications of this superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007) for communities, societies, and human relationships? Just as societies become more diverse, psychological research shows that so does identity, as the self becomes "populated" with multiple selves as the "enlarging complexity of society adds to the complexity of the self" (Hermans, 2002, p. 128; see also Bhatia & Ram, 2001). As we move from context to context and from one social encounter to another, our sense of community, commonality, and difference may change. We have a "positioning repertoire" on which to draw upon (Hermans, 2001a). For instance, young people with mixed heritage may feel more "English" or "white" when with a white parent, but more "black" and "different" when on the street under the racializing gaze of others (Howarth et al., 2013). Equally, migrants can adopt different strategies of acculturation in different domains of their life depending on the social relations that become salient or dominant in each domain (Andreouli, 2013). Our various identities are therefore interrelated in complex ways (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Identity is not a given resource that we draw upon in every situation; rather, identities are embedded in social contexts (Howarth et al., 2013). These contexts are increasingly diverse making our encounters with others more and more "intercultural."

Such complex cultural encounters in our increasingly diverse but also interconnected worlds create the need for a dialogical capacity: the capacity for dialogue across different perspectives, dialogue between self and other in contexts of diversity, and so the development of dialogical selves (Hermans, 2001b). What we see is the development of more transnational, cosmopolitan identities as "not only societies but people are multicultural" (Gutmann, 1993, p. 206). How does this happen? Are there social practices that support the successful management of diversity and the production of unproblematic "multicultural selves"? Moving away from insights from political theory and psychology, how is diversity experienced in the everyday? This is the focus of the empirical illustration below.

Empirical Analysis: How Do Schools Manage Diversity?

Following Putnam (2007), there is a need to examine the ways in which diversity is experienced, resisted, managed, and incorporated into the everyday social relations and knowledge practices in schools:

> "We need more opportunities for meaningful interaction across ethnic lines where Americans (new and old) work, learn, recreate and live. Community centres, athletic fields, and schools were among the most efficacious instruments for incorporating new immigrants a century ago, and we need to reinvest in such places and activities once again, enabling us all to become comfortable with diversity." (p. 164)

This is precisely what we examine in our research: how do schools manage diversity, and what are the consequences for their pupils? To address this general research question, we used purposive sampling (Flick, 2007). We aimed to achieve variety of views about and experiences of cultural diversity, and therefore, we selected schools from three different areas in the north (Yorkshire) and south (Sussex, London) of England. We selected schools that prided themselves on managing diversity well, making reference to this on their websites and highlighting examples of activities and any relevant awards. We worked with six schools in total: three schools in Yorkshire, two in London, and one in Sussex. In each school, we conducted two to three individual interviews with head teachers and staff with

responsibilities for diversity policies and practices (such as "cohesion" and "cultural awareness" activities) and teaching (such as religious education and citizenship education). We also ran one to two focus groups with pupils in each school to explore how they make sense of these policies and practices. We conducted a total of 13 interviews with staff and 11 focus groups with pupils. Each focus group consisted of pupils of the same year group (Year 8, 9, or 10) and age (12–14 years old depending on year group). In terms of gender, the focus groups in Yorkshire were girls only (1), boys only (1), and mixed (4); in Sussex, they were mixed; in London, the focus groups were with girls only. Ethnically, the focus groups reflected overall the ethnic composition of the local community that the school served. In Yorkshire, the pupils we talked to were mainly White British and Asian British. In London, they were mainly mixed, "White other," White British, and Black British. In Sussex, the pupils were all White British.

Both interviews and focus groups were semistructured and addressed the following topics: views about multiculturalism in general, views about cultural diversity in the school and the local community, and views about cultural diversity activities and practices in the school. We analyzed the data with the method of thematic analysis (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Braun & Clarke, 2006). Through thorough reading of the text and inductive and deductive (following the theoretical ideas outlined above) coding, we identified several key themes which describe participants' views on multiculturalism in the school and the community. One salient theme was diversity, i.e., the ways in which participants talked about diversity and its relationship with community, in both the school context and the context of their localities. In examining this diversity in further detail, we were particularly interested in (1) the ways in which diversity was talked about in terms of everyday experiences for the students, including the ways in which diversity is problematized and also (2) the ways in which it became a resource for community building (as per our theoretical discussion above) in these school contexts. In line with these considerations, we identified three subthemes that helped us examine in more detail the relationship between diversity and community:

1. from difference to diversity;
2. real and imagined mobility across communities; and
3. collaborative projects.

The first theme describes how students talked about how they engage with difference in their everyday lives and also highlights the ways in which the easy reification of difference is sometimes challenged. The second theme describes how cultural boundaries can be "crossed" through symbolic or actual movement across "different" cultures, again showing how ideas about community as commonality or stability are challenged. The third theme describes how collaborative practices and projects can facilitate the construction of community across difference. We discuss each of these in detail below.

From Difference to Diversity

The most evident way in which diversity was discussed in the data was as something to respect and celebrate. Different cultural traditions, foods, music, and dress were given as examples of the cultural diversity within schools and communities, and such commodities of diversity were seen as educational tools—to teach pupils about difference and also to respect and value those differences (see also Andreouli, Howarth, & Sonn, 2014). All schools in the study had some form of "cultural diversity" celebrations, as these pupils from Yorkshire discuss.

Extract 1: Celebrating Difference

Lina:	We've had a cultural day where like people wear their own clothes.
Interviewer:	Yeah, someone mentioned that to me already.

Lina:	No one did it though.
Amneet:	Because some people get embarrassed. I wouldn't come into school with Asian clothes.
Interviewer:	Why not?
Amneet:	Because that's embarrassing. I don't wear them that much anyway. I only wear them to temple and to a wedding. Otherwise I just wear my English clothes.
Interviewer:	Why do you think they want you to do come in your Asian clothes?
Amneet:	But they know that I'm Asian because they can look at my skin and tell. So it's like more intimidating.
Lina:	I think it's a bit scary that. Like when you're picking on people, "Oh, you have to come in your culture"; some people don't want to. . . Nobody wants to be an outsider. (Yorkshire, Year 10, 14 years old)

What was apparent across the data was that many pupils do not enjoy these activities, despite the good intentions of schools and individual staff. This is evident above in the talk of two close friends from Yorkshire, Amneet, a British Asian student, and Lina, a white British student. For Amneet, wearing her "own clothes" at school was seen to be inappropriate (as such dress is more for religious and formal events). Lina agreed that it would mark her as "not-English" or "an outsider." Amneet would in fact wear "English clothes" most of the time, and so this emphasis on cultural difference made her feel embarrassed and intimidated (or "picked on"). Such activities can be seen to establish and reify difference and position pupils in two clear camps: English and outsider; us and them. This limits the expression of more hybrid and contextualized identities despite the fact that some feel both English and Asian, narrows the representation of "Englishness," and so may support subtle forms of othering and discrimination. Hence there can be a real danger to "celebrating difference" in the school practices for managing diversity: in trying to promote respect for difference, they end up reifying difference and so maintaining intergroup boundaries (see Andreouli, Howarth, & Sonn, 2014). We can say that such practices may support the "political fiction of the unified group" (Brubaker, 2003, p. 554) and diversity as fixed difference between groups.

What was apparent across the schools was that diversity was often experienced in a much more fluid and mundane way. Pupils described how mixing with other cultures and religions was not something formally imposed by parents or teachers, but something that simply occurred naturally through the inclusive ethos of their schools. Interestingly, these more subtle and unspoken strategies for promoting positive intercultural relations seem more effective.

Extract 2: Mixing with Others

Adil:	Yeah, my parents didn't even mention about you should mix with others. I came to this school and I just started to mix myself.
Anna:	I feel proud as well. I feel proud to go to this school because we have like the assemblies about how many different like religions in like, cultures and stuff we have. . . (Yorkshire, Year 10, 14 years old)

In the extract above, Adil, a British Asian student, and Anna, a White British student, discuss how mixing with peers of different backgrounds can become a source of pride in relation to the school community. Living and learning in such "mixed" communities, means more than simply more contact with difference—or becoming familiar and at ease with cultural and religious diversity—it can mean

that pupils come to feel more "mixed" themselves and so incorporate a sense of diversity into their identity and parameters of esteem. That identity itself becomes more complex (Hermans, 2002) or multicultural (Gutmann, 1993) as is apparent in the next extract.

Extract 3: Mixed Identities

> Maiya: Oh, I think a lot of things makes us different like. Each of us have each got a different mix, first of all. Like we all have like different things that we come through, that like, we all eat different stuff. We wear different clothes, we look different and I think that and our environment, whatever like our environment is around us, that's what we like, show to people and some people because of like, if like, as myself, yeah, I have like a lot of different cultures, like lots of different countries in my mix, so if I'm around like part of my Cuban family, like I'll act like a different way than if I'm with someone who's probably German or something, because like they talk different languages even though I can't understand them. They talk different languages and it's like, they have different jobs they find things funny and eat different things and like, yeah. (London, Year 9, 13 years old)

Pupils such as Maiya, a mixed-heritage student, live diversity in such a way as to draw on multiple identities (stemming from diverse communities that they are affiliated with) as a matter of everyday practice. The extract shows that difference can be fixed (in the sense that difference is taken as a given) but also very effortlessly crossed ("if I'm around like part of my Cuban family like I'll act like a different way than if I'm with someone who's probably German"). Rather than diversity being constructed as many different cultural and religious communities, what we see is more of "a cosmopolitan outlook" (Beck, 2006; Gilroy, 2004) based on dialogical imagination which acknowledges the presence and legitimacy of alternative ways of thinking (Tsirogianni & Andreouli, 2011). Here diversity is not simply about the recognition, management, celebration, and so reification of difference, but rather diversity is approached as a process of engagement with "others." This entails an openness to diversity that is not a condition of "being tolerant" or "having respect" but rather a process of negotiating difference and similarity.

Real and Imagined Mobility across Communities

Close to this ability to engage with diversity openly was a sense of actual or, more often, symbolic movement from one locale to another, one culture or community to another—literally and also through family narratives, media discourses, and cultures of consumption. As well as physical movement between different communities (visiting family and having holidays in different countries, for example), there were examples of a sort of symbolic movement through different communities, imagining what life is like elsewhere and seeing life "here" from a distance (see extract 4 below). So instead of people being "in" one community, as if trapped, we should conceptualize them as "moving through" communities (Howarth, Cornish, & Gillespie, 2015). Such real and symbolic movement allows pupils to take the perspectives of others and so challenges binary constructions of "us and them" and undermines reified or essentalized versions of diversity, as we can see below.

Extract 4: Moving across Cultures

> Kevin: All of them are coming over here for a better life so –
> Louise: That's what I mean, my friend was talking about racism. Some white people talk like it's Asians. If I had a family and if I moved to

> Pakistan and my children's life and my life were going to be so much better, I would move over there if that would give me a better life for me and my children. So that's why people move over here. If you've got that opportunity, then take it because I would. (Yorkshire, Year 10, 14 years old)

In the extract above, Kevin and Louise, two White British students from Yorkshire, engage in a process of perspective taking towards Pakistani heritage communities. In the data, it was clear that pupils may (actually or symbolically) move from one culture to another in a geographic sense, and this allows them to position themselves in eyes and worlds of others—in quite a tangible way, as we see with Louise above. This promotes position exchange to occur which in turn enables perspective taking (Gillespie, 2012) and a solidarity that is based on diversity not sameness (Tsirogianni & Andreouli, 2011). Even more concretely, some pupils and teachers discussed the movement they make on a daily basis—from their home or neighborhood culture to that of the school, as the teacher from Yorkshire in the fifth extract outlines.

Extract 5: Moving Between Home and School Cultures

> Culture is organic. It's ethnicity or it's cultural heritage, but the culture these kids are in is the one that they're in now. And they are informed by their history and their family. But you know between half past eight and half past three this is the culture where we are now, you know, the culture of that dining room in thirty seconds. (Teacher, Yorkshire)

What is evident is that the pupils are not being positioned as "English" *or* "Asian," as we saw above (in the same school in fact); instead culture is seen as organic, influenced by history and family, but fundamentally in process and also contextually bound. Diversity within the confines of the school is experienced differently from diversity on the streets around their homes. However, such movement across cultures is not always easy. This is not a matter of whether cultures are (seen to be) incompatible as cultures are not given entities; rather, it is an issue of how representations and norms about cultural diversity mediate how people relate to one another. The teachers who took part in our study reported cases where values promoted at home were in conflict with values promoted in the school. This was particularly challenging when parents, for example, discouraged their children from mixing with children of different cultural backgrounds. Stigmatizing representations of difference and the dynamics of social relations in the local community can therefore make the work of schools particularly challenging. The extract below shows this disjuncture between life in the school and "real life" in the community.

Extract 6: Tensions Between Perspectives

> My worry is that they actually leave this school and they go out into what isn't a very cohesive culture outside the school. At times there is pockets—I don't like to use the word ghettos—but there is pockets of inward looking culture within the school, be it white, be it Asian, be it Afro Caribbean, be it Muslim, be it Christian, there is pockets of that and they go … the only time they do get an opportunity to really socialise and mix is within the grounds of this school so that's why we again we put on a lot of effort to try and get that going. (Teacher, Yorkshire)

"Symbolic mobility" makes pupils aware of differences of perspective and the inherent situatedness (or context-dependent nature) of those perspectives. We saw above that this type of mobility can

be an enriching process enabling children to recognize the legitimacy of different perspectives and create relations across difference. Following Hermans' view that the dialogical self entails a (dialogical) movement between different positions, being able to take the perspective of the other can be seen as equivalent to occupying multiple positions of identity. Just as we imagine familiar communities (Anderson, 1983), we also imagine different or "other" communities, in ways that sometimes promotes an openness towards diversity. However, mobility can also be a conflictual process where different perspectives are not easily accommodated (Andreouli, 2013; Bhatia & Ram, 2001). In our study, this proved to be very challenging in cases where dominant stigmatizing representations about cultural or racial "others" translated into very rigid intergroup boundaries in the local community (author references). In these cases, monological points of view (Sammut & Gaskell, 2010) create a barrier for dialogical encounters with others.

Collaborative Projects

As Crossley (1996) has argued, "the knowledge of the community is practical knowledge" (p. 94), and what we see from the data is that encouraging an openness towards diversity is a practical activity—that involves the pupils *doing* something, a collaborative activity and that involves the working together on projects involving peers, teachers, and parents and an activity that promotes new forms of knowledge—a more "democratic knowledge" in which everybody can potentially contribute.

Extract 7: Building Bonds in Social Activity

Abi:	The school, like they welcome people, like even on our mass when people were doing the dance, it's like it started off really small but like we didn't care. . .
Ashley:	There were like three people that were doing it.
Abi:	Yeah.
Ashley:	And then the next thing you know you just see everyone.
Abi:	Everyone from the whole school.
Ashley:	Just getting up and just going to join 'cause we're a community.
Interviewer:	What was that?
Abi:	It was mass.
Ashley:	It was a mass and they were singing.
Abi:	Don't Stop Believing.
Ashley:	Don't Stop Believing, and like it was only Steph, Abi and Claudia dancing and singing and whatever, and then all you just see is Natalie, and me and you and Miss and other people just getting up and going to join. That actually showed how we're actually a strong community, we like to help each other, we don't just watch someone and make fun of them. (London, Year 8, 12 years old).

So rather than the tangible displays of "displaying," "respecting," and "celebrating" difference we have discussed already, diversity here is experienced in a more subtle but also more tangible way. The discussion between two London students, Ashley, a student of South American heritage, and Abi, a student of mixed heritage, shows that spontaneous joint action can bring people together in "mundane" ways. This becomes possible when there is a safe and inclusive school community—as was the case in this London school. Other similar examples can be found in sports where teammates must lay differences aside and trust one another (Andreouli, Howarth, & Sonn, 2014). There is an

easiness or conviviality to this expression of diversity. Within classrooms, there were more explicit attempts to "build bonds" across cultural communities in ways that challenged reified or exclusive approaches towards diversity, as we see in the next extract.

Extract 8: Defining Community as a Shared Project

> It's not just to do with activities you see. It's to do with finding ways of teaching that enables pupils to—so you know, for example when it's remembrance on the 11th of November, now you see people would say once again that is important that they all remember this because it is important to recognize that how much sacrifice in Britain went on and that is true. But at the same time we do it from a much more multi effort, so we actually you know, we have stories from West Indian or Caribbean servicemen who came over to fight. We look at you know, Italy where there are huge number of graves of Indian fighters, of million volunteers who fought in India. So what we are saying is this is all your history [...] I think that is probably as important as all these events and the same in English, making sure that in terms of the books that they study that it embraces everybody's experience and so people—therefore it becomes shared experiences as well. (Head teacher, London)

In these activities, the focus is on shared experiences. Pupils are to "reimagine" the history of Britain in more inclusive ways than traditional curricula would do. As such, Britishness becomes a shared project. We can see this as a more "pluralistic reconstruction" of knowledge, identity, and community—where representations appear as collaborated actions (Elcheroth, Doise, & Reicher, 2011). In this way, community identities are mobilized around projects and not the fiction of essentalized differences, as others assert (Taylor-Gooby & Waite, 2013). Once again this focus on collaborative practices, projects, and knowledge requires a more open approach to diversity.

Conclusions

> "If categories relate to social forms, then taking categories for granted removes our choice over the type of world we live in. The reification of social categories is a raw road to tyranny. A healthy democracy depends on a continuous questioning of the terms of identity. (Reicher, 2004, p. 941)

Just as the reification of social categories is dangerous, so too is the conceptualization of diversity in terms of distinct and fairly fixed differences between cultural and religious groups. This was clear in the empirical examples given above. The expectation (from "ordinary" citizens, teachers, and politicians) that we need to be similar and share the same values and experiences to get along is not only based on a poor understanding of the social psychology of self, community, and intergroup relations, it may in fact lead to tension, fear of difference, and hostile politics. The assumption that communities must be made up of homogenous individuals fails to incorporate the interdependence of different perspectives in our complex societies (Howarth et al., 2015), and this may have several negative consequences. It may diminish our dialogical capacities and possibilities for intercultural exchange, strengthen representations of difference and stigmatizing ideologies, and so promote radically othered identities and hostile politics—at both the microcontexts of school classrooms as well the macrocontext of government policy and reactions to it.

This is in part because pressures for diverse groups to assimilate into normative practices often meet with intense resistance and a strengthening of separatist identity politics (Klandermans, 2014).

Wagner, Sen, Permanadeli, and Howarth (2012), for instance, have shown how the banning of the veil can lead to more entrenched, oppositional identities, feelings of social and political exclusion, and sometimes the desire for revenge and violence towards mainstream groups. Therefore, we need to examine how to engage with diversity as a process of negotiating difference *and* commonality as, psychologically speaking, community does not emerge and does not survive without the recognition of diversity. As others have pointed out, psychologically healthy communities require an open approach to diversity and one that welcomes contact with others; without this, communities suffer reduced trust (Sturgis et al, 2011), increased tension (Stolle et al., 2008), and a weak sense of identity and cohesion (Gimpel & Lay, 2008).

Hence it is important that we use political psychological research to challenge social policies that promote a narrow approach to managing diversity based on the assumption that communities and nations need to be relatively uniform and cohesive. This entails a more pragmatic version of multiculturalism as "multicultural identities are best advanced through a bottom-up organic process of interchange and accommodation at individual and community levels, rather than through more formal policies designed" (Taylor-Gooby & Waite, 2013, p. 3), where cultural diversity is managed by "various cultural practices through interaction, negotiation, and accommodation" (p. 9). We hope to have shown that engaging with diversity in this bottom-up organic process is not necessarily easy and effortless, but it is a struggle that many teachers, parents, and pupils are part of. What we need to do in trying to increase dialogue, reduce prejudice, and promote constructive social relations is to acknowledge that there will always be conflict and tension between groups but that this can be negotiated constructively. The key is the particular approach to diversity taken.

Our research in schools in the United Kingdom supports the claim that "failure to engage with diversity in a community sensitive way will result in ethnocentric psychological theory and practice which effectively reproduces diversity as deviance and obstacle" (Marshall et al., 1999, p. 170). In addressing diversity—in the realm of psychological theory, social research more generally, political debates, and policy development, the first challenge is to develop a version of diversity that is inclusive, collaborated, and open to change. Without this reflection and analysis, well-intentioned attempts to "manage diversity so that it becomes a source of mutual enrichment rather than a factor of division and conflict" (European Committee for Social Cohesion, 2004, p. 2) may well be counterproductive as they may end up implying that our diverse citizens are and may always be "outsiders."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Please note that this article was reviewed and accepted under the previous editorship of Alex Mintz and his editorial team. We are deeply grateful to the schools and pupils involved in this research who gave so generously of their time and their insight. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Caroline Howarth, London School of Economics, Houghton St., United Kingdom, WC2A 2AE. E-mail: c.s.howarth@lse.ac.uk

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. C. (2013). Struggling over the mode of incorporation: Backlash against multiculturalism in Europe. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *36* (4), 531–556.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

Andreouli, E. (2013). Identity and acculturation: The case of naturalised citizens in Britain. *Culture & Psychology*, *19*(2), 165–183. doi: 10.1177/1354067X13478984

Andreouli, E., Howarth, C., & Sonn, C. (2014). The role of schools in promoting inclusive communities in contexts of diversity. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *19*(1), 16–21. doi:10.1177/1359105313500257.

Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: An analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, *1*(3), 385–405.

Baez, B. (2000) Agency, structure and power: An inquiry into racism and resistance for education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *19*, 329–348.

Bauer, M. W., & Gaskell, G. (2008). Social representations theory: A progressive research programme for social psychology. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *38*(4), 335–353.

Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan vision*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Locating the dialogical self in the age of transnational migrations, border crossings and diasporas. *Culture & Psychology*, *7*(3), 297–309

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment. Attachment and loss: Loss*. (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Brown, G. (2007, January 13). We need a United Kingdom. *Daily Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/01/13/ngordon113.xml

Brubaker, R. (2003). Neither individualism or "groupism." *Ethnicities*, *3*(4), 553–557.

Cameron, D. (2011) PM's speech at Munich security conference. Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130109092234/http://number10.gov.uk/news/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference/.

Cerulo, K. (1997) Identity construction: New issues, new directions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*, 385–409.

Chryssochoou, X. (2014). Identity processes in culturally diverse societies: How cultural diversity is reflected in the self. In R. Jaspal & G. M. Breakwell (Eds.), *Identity process theory: Identity, social action and social change* (pp. 135–154). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Collier, P. (2013). *Exodus: How migration is changing our world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cornish, F. (2006). Empowerment to participate: A case study of Indian sex workers' participation in HIV prevention. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *16*, 301–315.

Cornish, F., Montenegro, C.R., van Reisen, K., Zaka, F., & Sevitt, J. (2014). Open-ended, porous and unpredictable: Community health action after Occupy. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *19*, 60–71.

Crossley, N. (1996) *Intersubjectivity: The fabric of social becoming*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. A. (2005). *Racial encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Duveen, G. (2001). Representations, identities, resistance. In K. Deaux & G. Philogène (Eds.), *Representations of the social* (pp. 257–270). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Elcheroth, G., Doise, W., & Reicher, S. (2011) On the knowledge of politics and the politics of knowledge: How a social representations approach helps us rethink the subject of political psychology. In *Political Psychology*, *32*, 729–758.

European Committee for Social Cohesion (2004). *A new strategy for social cohesion*. European Committee for Social Cohesion. http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/socialpolicies/socialcohesiondev/source/RevisedStrategy_en.pdf

Farr, R. (1996). *The roots of modern social psychology, 1872–1954*. London, UK: Blackwell.

Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage.

Gergen, K. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gillespie, A. (2012). Position exchange: The social development of agency. *New ideas in Psychology*, *30*, 32–46.

Gilroy, P. (2004). *After empire: melancholia or convivial culture?* London, UK: Routledge.

Gimpel, J., & Lay, J. C. (2008). Political socialisation and reactions to immigration-related diversity in rural America. *Rural Sociology*, *73*(2), 180–204.

Goodhart, D. (2004). Is Britain too diverse? *Prospect Magazine*. February edition.

Gutmann, A. (1993) The challenge of multiculturalism in political ethnics. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *22*(3), 171–206.

Hermans, H. J. M. (2001a). The construction of a personal positioning repertoire: Method and practice. *Culture & Psychology*, *7*(3), 323–365.

Hermans, H. J. M. (2001b). The dialogical self: Towards a theory of personal and cultural positioning. *Culture & Psychology*, *7*(3), 243–281.

Hermans, H. J. M. (2002). The dialogical self as a society of mind. *Theory & Psychology*, *12*(2), 147–160.

Howarth, C. (2001). Towards a social psychology of community. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour 31*(2): 223–238.

Howarth, C. (2006). How social representations of attitudes have informed attitude theories: The consensual and the reified. *Theory and Psychology*, *16* (5), 691–714.

Howarth, C., Andreouli, C., & Kessi, S. (2014) Social representations and the politics of participation. In T. Capelos, H. Dekker, C. Kinnvall, & P. Nesbitt-Larking (Eds.), *Political psychology in Europe and the world*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Howarth, C., Cornish, F., & Gillespie, A. (2015) Making community: Diversity, movement and interdependence In G. Sammut, E. Andreouli, G. Gaskell, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of social representations* (pp. 179–190). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Howarth, C., Wagner, W., Magnusson, N., & Sammut, G. (2013). "It's only other people who make me feel black": Acculturation, identity and agency in a multicultural community. *Political Psychology, 35*, 81–95.

Horenczyk, G., & Tatar, M. (2011). Schools' organizational views of diversity: Perceptions and approaches. In S. Vandeyar (Ed.), *Hyphenated selves: Immigrant identities within education contexts* (pp. 131–148). Amsterdam, Netherlands: SAVUSA Editorial.

Huntington, S. (1996). *The clash of civilisations and the remaking of world order*. New York, NY: Simon & Shuster.

Joppke, C. (2009). Limits of integration policy. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *35*(3), 453–472.

Jovchelovitch, S. (2007). *Knowledge in context. Representations, community and culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Klandermans, B. (2014). Identity politics and politicized identities: Identity processes and the dynamics of protest. *Political Psychology*, *35*(1), 1–22.

Marshall, H., Stenner P., & Lee, H. (1999) Young people's accounts of personal relationships in a multi-cultural east London environment: Questions of community, diversity and inequality. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *9*, 155–171.

McGhee, D. (2005). *Intolerant Britain? Hate, citizenship and difference*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Mead, G. H. (1934) *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Moran, A. (2011) Multiculturalism as nation-building in Australia: Inclusive national identity and the embrace of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *34*(12), 2153–2172.

Parekh, B. (2000). *The future of multi-ethnic Britain*. London, UK: Profile Books/The Runnymede Trust.

Phillips, A. (2009) *Multiculturalism without Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Phillips, T. (2005). "After 7/7: Sleepwalking to segregation." Speech to the Manchester Council for Community Relations, Commission for Racial Equality, London, 22 September 2005.

Piaget, J. (1953). *The origin of intelligence in the child.* London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Putnam, R. (2007). E pluribus unum. Diversity and community in the twenty-first century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *30*(1), 137–174.

Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance and change. *Political Psychology*, *25*(6), 921–945.

Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6*(2), 88–106.

Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the orient*. London, UK: Penguin.

Sammut, G., & Gaskell, G. (2010). Points of view, social positioning and intercultural relations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *40*(1), 47–64.

Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. London, UK: Penguin.

Stolle, D., Soroka, S., & Johnston, R. (2008) When does diversity erode trust? Neighbourhood diversity, interpersonal trust and the mediating effect of social interactions. *Political Studies*, *56*, 57–75.

Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., Read, S., & Allum, N. (2011). Does ethnic diversity erode trust? Putnam's "hunkering down" thesis reconsidered. *British Journal of Political Science*, *41*, 57–82.

Taylor, C. (1994). *The politics of recognition*. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taylor-Gooby, P. P., & Waite, E. (2013). Towards a more pragmatic multiculturalism? How the U.K. policy community sees the future of ethnic diversity policies. *Governance*, *27*, 267–289.

Thomas, P. (2010). Failed and friendless: The UK's "Preventing Violent Extremism" programme. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *12*, 442–458.

Tsirogianni, S., & Andreouli, E. (2011). Beyond social cohesion: The role of "fusion of horizons" in inter-group solidarities. *Papers on Social Representations*, *20*(1), 5.1–5.25.

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

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of the higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, W., Sen, R., Permanadeli, R., & Howarth, C. (2012). The veil and Muslim women's identity: Cultural pressures and resistance to stereotyping. *Culture & Psychology*, *18*(4), 521–541.