Promising Practices and New Directions in Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism Programming

A Scoping Review

Date: 13/November/2008

Prepared For:

Meharoona Ghani, Director and Tracy Wideman,
Multiculturalism & Inclusive Communities Branch,
Ministry of Attorney General

Prepared By:

Alisa Harrison, PhD., Senior Researcher,
Nicole Lindsay, MA, Researcher,
Knowledge and Information Services,
Office of the Chief Information Officer,
Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services

With Contributions From:

Joseph Manning, Researcher,
Knowledge and Information Services,
Office of the Chief Information Officer,
Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services

BRITISH COLUMBIA
The Best Place on Earth

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THIS AND OTHER SCOPING REVIEWS, CONTACT:

DAWN NICKEL, PHD., DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH SERVICES,
KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION SERVICES, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER,
MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND CITIZENS' SERVICES
PHONE: (250) 356-0378
E-MAIL: DAWN.NICKEL@GOV.BC.CA

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

ABSTRACT I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY II

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Issue 1

1.2 Scope 2

2 BACKGROUND 3

2.1 Anti-racism and multiculturalism in Canada 3

2.2 Anti-racism and multiculturalism in the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand 4

3 LITERATURE REVIEW 8

4 DISCUSSION 14

4.1 Issues 15

4.1.1 Understanding anti-racism and multiculturalism 15

4.1.2 Anti-racism and multiculturalism programming 18

4.1.3 Bureaucratic and community-based approaches 20

4.1.4 Social Inclusion and exclusion 21

4.1.5 Assessing success of programs 22

4.2 Promising Practices 24

4.2.1 Community partnerships and capacity-building 24

4.2.2 Recognizing intersectional identities 26

4.2.3 Creating accessible programming 28

4.2.4 Promoting awareness 28

4.2.5 Engaging youth 30

4.2.6 Focus on arts and sports 31

4.2.7 Media interventions 32

4.2.8 Setting clear targets and measuring success 33

4.3 New Directions in Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism Programming 33

4.3.1 Problematizing multiculturalism 34

4.3.2 Pursuing transculturalism 35
4.3.3 Promoting social inclusion and full participation 35

CONCLUSION 37

WORKS CONSULTED 39

ABSTRACT

This scoping review summarizes key findings relating to promising practices and new directions in anti-racism and multiculturalism programming. Based on a cross-jursdictional review of academic and government literature discussing a variety of anti-racism and multiculturalism policies, programs and strategies in Canada, the U.K., Australia and New Zealand, this document presents a set of eight promising practices and three new directions that may be used to evaluate and inform future anti-racism and multiculturalism programming.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Given the multi-ethnic and multicultural populations characteristic of modern nations like Canada, the U.K., Australia and New Zealand, anti-racism and multiculturalism are priority policy areas for all levels of government in each of these four jurisdictions. However, despite considerable public policy attention and commitment to anti-racism and multiculturalism, racialized groups in all four nations continue to experience inequities and discrimination in many facets of social life.

In order to determine the most promising directions for developing public policy and programming that addressed the persistent social problems associated with social inequities and discrimination, this scoping review consulted a broad cross section of government and academic literature from Canada, the U.K., Australia and New Zealand.

The literature review reveals a wide spectrum of perspectives on anti-racism and multiculturalism policy and programming, ranging from celebratory to highly critical. Some commentators feel that previous approaches to anti-racism and multiculturalism programming are too limited, ignoring the broader historical and systemic sources of racism and discrimination. Others seek to create frameworks and strategies that help policy-makers and program developers address the root causes or everyday impacts of racism and discrimination. Taken together, the literature suggests no consistent, universal approach to addressing racism and discrimination through public policy or programming. Indeed, many analysts and commentators disagree on how to interpret the concepts of anti-racism and multiculturalism, let alone how to implement sound policies based on these concepts.

Further findings indicate that, as policy-driving concepts, anti-racism and multiculturalism raise complex issues. These issues appeared in various forms in all levels of community, government and academic literature. Issues complicating analysis of existing anti-racism and multiculturalism include the complex social, political and historical context of anti-racism and multiculturalism as concepts guiding government policy and programming; the wide range and breadth of actual anti-racism and multiculturalism programming; issues raised by bureaucratic approaches to anti-racism and multiculturalism programming; the emerging concepts of social inclusion and exclusion; and the difficulty with assessing the effectiveness and impact of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming.

However, despite the complexities and challenges presented by the above issues, this scoping review identifies a series of promising practices in the design and delivery of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming. These promising practices include: community partnerships and capacity-building; recognizing intersectional identities; creating accessible programming; promoting awareness through special events, recognition and cultural education; engaging youth; a focus on arts and sports; media interventions; and setting clear targets and measuring success.

This scoping review further outlines new directions in multiculturalism and anti-racism programming as identified primarily in academic literature. Few concrete examples of programs employing these strategies are documented in current literature, leaving this to be relatively uncharted territory for anti-racism and multiculturalism programming. However, these new directions also represent an opportunity to build on proven and promising practices by using critical approaches that problematize the concept of multiculturalism in the interests of pursuing new approaches to promote social inclusion and full participation of all members of society.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 ISSUE

As a society made up of a wide variety of different cultural groups, the majority of them either descendants of immigrants or more recent immigrants, Canada has made a strong public commitment to promoting diversity and multiculturalism. Indeed, since the first official Canadian multiculturalism policy in 1971 enshrined pluralism and diversity as "the very essence of Canadian identity" (Canada House of Commons, 1971, quoted in Wood and Gilbert, 2005, p. 860), multiculturalism has become both a social ideal and an organizing vision for Canadian public policy at all levels.

Despite this public commitment to multicultural diversity, however, problems with inequality, racism, discrimination and social exclusion persist in Canadian society at rates not dissimilar from other parts of the world. Recognizing the long-term detrimental social impact of inequality, racism, discrimination and social exclusion, government policy and programming aims to address and ameliorate these problems through a variety of approaches to foster awareness of and appreciation for cultural difference, educate both majority and minority groups about the effects of racism and strategies for its elimination, and re-structure public institutions to be more inclusive and diverse (Garcea, 2006; Kunz & Sykes, 2007).

After holding a series of roundtable discussions focused on both historic and new tensions presenting barriers to the realization of anti-racism and multiculturalism policy goals, the Government of Canada published "From Mosaic to Harmony: Multicultural Canada in the 21st Century" (Kunz & Sykes, 2007). One of the central conclusions of the roundtables was that, although Canada's policies are in principle very strong, there have been problems in "translating policy goals into reality" (p. 8). These problems point to a "central disconnect", both in understanding the specific goals of multiculturalism policy, and in identifying effective strategies to create real "on the ground" change in the everyday realities of Canadian citizens.

This disconnect might be partially explained by the difficulty in both implementing and assessing multiculturalism and anti-racism programming. As a relatively new and evolving field of social action aimed to address deep-seated and long-standing injustices and inequities, anti-racism and multiculturalism work remains under-studied in the academic literature. Further, the long-term nature of social and cultural change means that the effects of programs implemented today may only be visible in years to come.

Despite these challenges, evidence-informed anti-racism and multiculturalism program development remains an important goal for government and community organizations. Evidence showing what is currently working and what should be considered in future program development can be found by reviewing commonly-cited promising practices from ongoing anti-

racism and multiculturalism programming, and by considering emerging new directions in academic and evaluative frameworks for action.

1.2 SCOPE

This scoping review provides an overview of recent literature about multiculturalism and anti-racism programming in Canada, the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand. In conducting this cross-jurisdictional comparative review, the researchers sought to identify promising practices in the delivery of multiculturalism and anti-racism programs. Academic research both supports and problematizes many of these practices. It should be noted, however, that no comprehensive assessment of multicultural and/or anti-racism programming in any of the three jurisdictions was found in the literature review. Indeed, some authors writing about multicultural and anti-racism programming pointed out that a lack of evaluative criteria for such programs causes significant difficulty in assessing their effectiveness.

Based on the limitations of available research, this scoping review provides a broad overview of select programs and approaches identified by government, community and academic sources. This overview addresses elements of programs commonly cited as effective or promising, and it also points towards new directions in developing evidence-informed and effective anti-racism and multicultural programming.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 ANTI-RACISM AND MULTICULTURALISM IN CANADA

Although only enshrined in policy since the 1970s, Canada's national identity as a multicultural society has evolved through 300 years of immigration and settlement on land previously inhabited by an already diverse population of First Nations peoples. Over the past few decades, the intersection of increased waves of immigration from non-European countries and a greater understanding of the effects of colonization on First Nations peoples has increased public pressure on the Canadian government to confront and ameliorate the legacies of a violent and exclusionary history of early nation-building policies. Indeed, despite this historical legacy and the on-going barriers to equal participation faced by minority groups in Canada (Levine-Rasky, 2006), the multicultural ethos remains a core element of Canadian national identity. Garcea (2006) defines this ethos as one "which values not only the preservation and perpetuation of various cultures, but also cross-cultural understanding and harmonious cultural coexistence" (p. 1).

Demographically, Canada is becoming increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural as both high immigration and birth rates increase the populations of minority communities (Dib, 2006). According to projections made by Statistics Canada, visible minorities will constitute about 20 percent of Canada's population by 2017 (Belkhodja et al., 2006). Based on both the aging demographic and declining birth rates of majority (European descended) Canadians, Dib (2006) points out that immigration will constitute the sole source of net labour-force growth by 2011, and of overall population growth by 2025. Further, Statistics Canada projects that some 90% of these immigrants will join current minority groups from Asia, Africa and Latin America (cited in Dib, 2006).

Despite the widespread recognition of the importance of immigration in maintaining Canada's growth economy, many have pointed out the challenges in creating public policy that addresses and ameliorates the social, cultural and economic inequalities faced by disproportionate numbers of minority and immigrant individuals. Dib (2006) points out that immigrants in the past two decades "are experiencing rising problems with racism, the acceptance of academic credentials, language, and cultural adaptation" (p. 148). Statistics Canada's (2003) *Ethnic Diversity Survey* reported that a higher proportion (20%) of respondents identifying as visible minorities experienced exclusion and/or discrimination, compared with 5% of respondents who did not identify as visible minorities (Statistics Canada, 2003, pp. 17-21). Belkhodja et al. (2006) point out that "rates of poverty among recent immigrants have risen, and unemployment, underemployment, and wage gaps are evident for some communities" (p. ii). Further, the parameters of existing multiculturalism policies and programs are limited in addressing intersectional identities encompassing multiple facets of gender, race, religion, language, sexual orientation, ethnicity and age (Belkhodja et al., 2006).

Based on these challenging trends, many analysts point out that ongoing, constructive dialogue between all levels of government and community organization is required in order to develop multiculturalism and anti-racism policy and practice that can address the needs of Canada's diverse population (Belkhodja et al., 2006; Garcea, 2006; Icart et al., 2005). Such a dialogue "must be reinforced with solid research and the sharing of past practices, both good and bad" (Belkhodja et al., 2006, p. iv). However, as Garcea (2006) comments, and as this scoping review confirms, more research is required to both document the range of actual programs and practices in place, and to determine the effectiveness of these programs and practices in eliminating barriers to the full participation of all ethnic and cultural groups in a respectful and inclusive Canadian society.

2.2 ANTI-RACISM AND MULTICULTURALISM IN THE U.K., AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND

In the United Kingdom, multiculturalism and anti-racism have been "under siege", both conceptually and as a basis for programming, since at least the 1980s (Short, 1999, p. 52; see also Dadzie, 1997, p. iii; Bonnett & Carrington, 1996, p. 275). Attacks have come from mainstream sources on both the political left and right; the literature shows that many in British society oppose multiculturalism and anti-racism, albeit for very different reasons.

In relatively recent years, the U.K. government's opposition was expressed in no uncertain terms in the Burnage Report (1989), which concluded that anti-racism policies "alienated" whites by focusing ameliorative attention on people of colour (Bonnett & Carrington, 1996, p. 277). This point of view altered somewhat in 1999 when an inquiry into the murder of a black teenager, Stephen Lawrence, led to the publication of the McPherson Report. The McPherson Report was a comprehensive statement on British race relations that reopened anti-racism as a legitimate focus for government programming. Among other things, the McPherson Report placed the onus of defining a racist incident with the victim (RIMAP, 2006, p. 5), and it also led British authorities to define institutional racism as a primary area of concern.

However, government attention to anti-racism and multiculturalism after 1999 was somewhat short lived. In 2001, a summer of racially-motivated disturbances in northern England combined with the international effects of the 9/11 attacks in the United States led to another government examination of racism's impact on British society and what might be done to reduce widespread discrimination, exclusion and violence. The Cantle Report (2002) redefined British approaches by altering the terms of the debate. Anti-racism and multiculturalism were perceived as divisive, and the report supplanted both these terms as well as the government's recent turn to focus on institutional racism with the newer notion of "Community Cohesion" (Kundnani, 2002).

Government approaches under the banner of Community Cohesion have been "race neutra[l]," and thus avoided the more controversial and confrontational aspects of anti-racism and multiculturalism (MacLeavy, 2008, p. 554). Policy literature on Community Cohesion

downgrades the significance of race as a category determining life chances, and instead considers the impact of racism in primarily indirect ways (MacLeavy, 2008, pps. 552-4). Scholarly assessments suggest a heated debated over the relative costs and benefits of Community Cohesion, anti-racism and multiculturalism as motors of government policy (see especially MacLeavy, 2008; Thomas, 2007; and De Lima, 2003).

What is overwhelmingly clear, however, is that no existing approach has been able to eradicate racism in the U.K. or even necessarily mitigate its effects in people's daily lives (see, for instance, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2005). Despite numerous programmatic attempts to counter racism—directly or indirectly—the problem persists as strongly as ever and government bodies throughout the United Kingdom, at all levels, continue to work to develop alternate policies and strategies that will "stamp out racism, in all its manifestations" (A Racial Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland, 2005, p. 4). There are numerous government programmes focusing on issues of equity in various contexts, from housing to labour market attachment to countering hate crimes to education and beyond. When combined with community-based programming, much of which receives government funding and support, the list of existing programmes becomes almost untenably long. However, even with such a large pool of programming to consider, the evidence shows more about the ways in which racism remains entrenched in U.K. society and less about new directions for programming that might fundamentally alter unjust power relationships, thus providing real and lasting solutions.

Similar to the Canadian context described above, multiculturalism policy in Australia has a long history dating back to the 1970s, when the Galbally Report instituted a political commitment to multiculturalism as "benfit[ting] all Australians" (Galbally, 1978, in Joppke, 2004, p. 244). A second key document published in 1982, *Multiculturalism for All Australians: Our Developing Nationhood* framed multiculturalism in a similar fashion to the Canadian example: as a core feature of national identity and nation-building. However, as Joppke (2005) notes, this conception of multiculturalism as a core aspect of Australian national identity has been scaled back considerably since the 1980s, with a reframing of the debate towards the economic benefits of attracting skilled immigrants. In 1989, the Australian government published another policy document focused on multiculturalism, *The National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia*. This document signalled a further retreat from multiculturalism, with the formulation of Australian heritage as primarily British and secondarily multicultural. Marking a return to multicultural policy in the 1990s, the government of John Howard—who, according to Joppke (2005) "had earlier made himself a name as a fierce critic of multiculturalism" (p. 247)—revived a more utilitarian version of multicultural government policy focused on the needs of a globalizing economy.

However, despite this long history, multiculturalism policy in Australia has seen limited success in combating racism. Paradies (2005) cites a long list of studies showing that racism (particularly against Indigenous Australians) still permeates Australian society in the political domain, the health system, academia, sport, the law and justice systems, and civil society as a whole (p. 2). In

their review of anti-racism and multiculturalism strategies in Australia, Pedersen, Walker and Wise (2005) point out that, not only is the evidence mixed on the success of strategies and programs, but failures may also be under-reported.

Despite these critical reports, many find reason for optimism that trends are changing, particularly in regards to the attitudes of Australian youth. A 2006 study carried out by the Special Broadcasting Service Corporation (SBS) in New South Wales (Ang et al., 2006) showed that "young people tend to be more comfortable with cultural difference than previous generations and cite their own diverse networks of friends as one of the reasons for this" (p. 5). However, the report also concluded that many youth still experience racism in their daily lives, leading to a sense of exclusion from mainstream society and cynicism with regards to media representations of racialized groups (Ang et al., 2006). An earlier study, also carried out by SBS (Ang et al. 2002), showed that while most of the Australians surveyed supported immigration for economic reasons, they tended to ambivalent about the value of cultural diversity and non-assimilationist multiculturalism in Australia (p. 22).

Biculturalism has been a guiding concept in New Zealand's state policy since 1975, when the guarantee of Maori sovereignty led to the creation of a second, distinctly Maori stream of policy for the provision of public services (Moss, 2005). Despite differing balance of power and privilege between the two main cultural groups in New Zealand, the *Maori* (indigenous) and *Pakeha* (settler) cultures have coexisted since first contact in the 18th century. Significantly, the history of colonial contact in New Zealand was not marked by the same level of violence as existed in early American, Canadian and Australian colonization (Moss, 2005).

New Zealand's biculturalism has been defined as "a multicultural ideal" between two "charter groups," with cultures seen as both conflicting and valid (Moss, 2005). Thus, the policy outcomes of biculturalism stress both distinctiveness and coexistence. For example, in *The Heart of the Nation: A Cultural Strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand* (2000), a central outcome of the proposed cultural strategy was to create an "equitable and effective public cultural infrastructure" that empowered the Maori culture, supporting it "as a unique part of our New Zealand culture and heritage which benefits all New Zealanders, [recognizing] that Maori will continue to develop their culture and heritage, and this will contribute to the evolving national cultural identity" (Heart of the Nation Strategic Working Group, 2000, xiii).

Despite this strong commitment to biculturalism, however, some question whether it is an appropriate policy for the future of a nation becoming increasingly multicultural. Of New Zealand's 28% non-white population, almost half are Asian or ethnically mixed (Moss, 2005). An interesting example of one response to this comes from the *Te Papa* Museum, where biculturalism is expressed as a coexistence of two inherently diverse groups: "*tangata whenua* (people of the land: diverse because of tribal distinctions) and *tangata tiriti* (people who arrived because of the [1840 Treaty of Waitangi])" (Moss, 2005, p. 192).

It is also worth noting that New Zealand's commitment to biculturalism has not prevented significant inequalities between white majorities and non-white minorities from persisting in everything from educational attainment and income to overall social and economic status (Moss, 2005). This reality clearly has an historical context: as Ward and Masgoret (2008) point out, the distinctly white European-focused immigration policies practiced officially until 1945 resulted in "one of the most ethnically homogenous societies of European settlement" by the end of World War II (p. 228). It was only in 1991 that active recruitment of skilled immigrants began, leading to a 240% increase in Asian (Chinese and Indian) immigration between 1998 and 2008 (Ward and Masgoret, 2008).

It might be expected that such a sharp increase in immigration in a short period of time could create social "growing pains," but Ward and Masgoret's (2008) research demonstrated that, in fact, New Zealanders have largely positive attitudes toward immigrants and the idea of a multicultural society. One possible explanation is that "the evolution of biculturalism has laid the foundation for the extension to multiculturalism" (p. 241).

3 LITERATURE REVIEW

Research undertaken in this scoping review revealed a range of literature on a variety of issues relating to anti-racism and multiculturalism from both government and academic sources in four jurisdictions: Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand. However, research using web-based and academic search engines resulted in very little information showing evidence-based assessments of actual government initiatives in any of the four jurisdictions considered. Instead, this research resulted in a rather piecemeal collection of documents focused on attitudes towards immigration, anti-racism and multiculturalism (Ang et al., 2002 and 2006; Dunn, 2003; Ward and Masgoret, 2008;), documents critiquing anti-racism and multiculturalism government strategy and policy (Belkodja et al., 2006; Dib, 2006; Levine-Rasky, 2006; Moss, 2005; Joppke, 2004; Paradies, 2005 Pedersen et al., 2005;), documents describing anti-racism and multiculturalism public policy and strategy (Dreher, 2006; Garcea, 2006; Heart of the Nation Strategic Working Group, 2000; Larin, 2004; Upham & Martin, 2004), and documents recommending strategies or frameworks for action (Affiliation of Multicultural Societies and Service Agencies of BC, 2001; Alternative Planning Group, n.d.; Cooper, 2006; Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003; Icart et al., 2005). The discussion below highlights some key documents and themes running throughout the literature review.

Garcea (2006) conducts a comparative analysis of Canada's provincial multiculturalism policies from 1974-2004. Based on this comprehensive content analysis, Garcea (2006) concludes that multiculturalism polices have been prevalent across the provinces, and they have been shaped by much of the same forces shaping policy at the national level, including ethnic revival, minority rights, cultural cosmopolitanism, and political rationality based on these trends. Further, although provincial policies have differed in their nature, scope and their "provisions regarding organizational mechanisms devoted to multiculturalism," they have striking similarities "in terms of their provisions regarding their purposes, their policy goals, and the conferral of rights or benefits" (Garcea, 2006, p. 15). These findings are confirmed by the Knowledge and Information Services cross-jurisdictional review of provincial multiculturalism policies (in progress, November 2008).

Garcea (2006) further concludes that "provincial governments must begin to collaborate with other orders of government in producing a pan-Canadian policy framework designed to strengthen multicultural ethos and advance the goals of multiculturalism" (p. 16). Such collaboration must include representatives from municipal governments, where policies are most often enacted, and representatives from minority communities, including Aboriginal leaders and regional cultural and sub-cultural groups (pp. 16-17). Finally, future research should focus on areas currently under-represented in academic and government literature, including the factors that influence government decision-making regarding multiculturalism policy-making, specific details about the multiculturalism programs and projects for each province, the amount of funding allocated for such programs, and "the nature and adequacy of the organizational

mechanisms devoted to advancing the goals of multiculturalism" (Garcea, 2006, p. 17). To date, the research outlined above has not been published.

However, several documents found in the research on Canadian anti-racism and multiculturalism policy and programming outlined strategies for action on anti-racism and social inclusion. These documents were largely aimed towards municipalities as the primary agent of policy development and program delivery. The newest of these documents focused on the concept of "social inclusion," which, as discussed below, has been thoroughly criticized by many U.K. theorists (for more discussion, see sections 4.1.4 and 4.3.3 in this report). Clutterbuck and Novick (2003) presented a comprehensive overview of the concept of social inclusion in a report prepared for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and The Laidlaw Foundation titled *Building Inclusive Communities: Cross-Canada Perspectives and Challenges*.

The Clutterbuck and Novick (2003) report introduced a social inclusion framework aimed to help municipalities build inclusive and supportive communities. Social inclusion, a concept that originated in Europe in the 1960s, but has since "gained momentum in the last several years as a useful construct for public policy analysis and development" (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 4) is described as follows:

> Social inclusion gets at the heart of what it means to be human: belonging, acceptance and recognition. Social exclusion, at the other extreme, is what is done to those who are vulnerable, considered "disposable" or inferior, or, even less that human (e.g. through de-valuation, incarceration, institutionalization, ghetto-ization). Social inclusion and exclusion, as both processes and outcomes, are at opposite ends of the spectrum …. Social inclusion is not just about the periphery versus the centre; it is about participating as a valued member of society. Inclusion make the link between the well being of children, out common humanity, and the social, economic, political and cultural conditions that must exist in a just and compassionate society. (Frieler, 2001, in Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 4)

Policies that promote social inclusion are defined as those that:

> reduce economic, social and cultural inequities within the populations (e.g. economic disparities, racism, age or gender discrimination, etc) … recognize, value, and support the contributions of all community members to the economic, social and cultural life of a society, [and] are grounded in shared values/principles and common commitments while respecting and accommodating appropriated the diversities within a society (i.e. mutual accommodation). (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 5)

Conclusions based on the 11 community "soundings" conducted for the report indicate that "voices" and "values" represent the social infrastructure of communities, and that these need to be strengthened through public platforms "which reach out and amplify the voices of diversity and mutual responsibility in settlements and communities across Canada" (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 29). Although community and civic leaders participating in the soundings revealed a strong shared desire to create more inclusive communities, this desire was frustrated by "the impacts of deficient support systems and depleted living standards on civic capacities for inclusion" (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 29). The researchers concluded that this frustration revealed "an emerging fault line in Canadian federalism":

> Civic leaders, advocates, and social professionals in major urban regions across Canada want direct federal contributions to strengthen the social infrastructures of their communities. On the whole, there is less confidence and credibility of provinces as exclusively mandated voices of municipalities and their priorities. Civic communities share concerns and commitments that frequently cut across provincial jurisdictions, and can help create a sense of social unity across Canada if they are recognized and supported as authentic national voices. (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 31)

Addressing this problem involves broader and deeper initiatives that reach to the socioeconomic barriers to full participation, including: "affordable housing and public transit, strengthening services and programs from immigrants and refugees, recognizing recreation as an essential urban amenity for health promotion and civic cohesion, facilitating the transitions of urban aboriginal peoples to urban life, and developing effective preventative approaches to community safety and security" (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 32). The researchers further concluded that social infrastructure development of urban communities is "a new frontier of federal responsibility" which is "too vital to be left to the discretion of provinces" (Clutterbuck and Novick, 2003, p. 32).

Pathways to Change: Facilitating the full participation of diversity groups in Canadian society (Cooper, 2006), published by the Alberta Ministry of Community Development, Human Rights and Citizenship, and the Department of Canadian Heritage, Alberta District, used the concept of "full civic engagement" to refer to programs that aimed to "reduce individual, institutional, and systemic discrimination and racism in order to facilitate the full participation of individuals in all aspects of society" (p. 1). The stated goal of the document was to "help organizations to clarify the desired outcomes of their projects, situate their projects along the pathways to change, and identify ways to demonstrate the changes which result from these projects" (Cooper, 2006, p. 1). In doing so, the document presented the Pathways to Change Model, which outlined the following five strategies in moving towards full civic engagement:

- Strategy 1: Community capacity building and mobilization – including leadership development, partnerships and collaboration

- Strategy 2: Formal and informal civic participation – including participation in community groups/boards, membership in political and cultural organization

- Strategy 3: Public education and awareness – aimed to change public attitudes and misconceptions on both individual and institutional levels

- Strategy 4: Local institutional change – including police forces, educational institutions, and other public organizations

- Strategy 5: Public policy and institutional change – based on participation in policy-making processes

The Alternative Planning Group (APG) and Community Social Planning Council of Toronto present another "toolkit" based on the concept of social inclusion. This document, *Driving Social Inclusion: Turning on a Paradigm* (n.d.) is based on the outcomes of a series of round-table discussions and focus groups with members of four different racialized communities. The goal of the APG research was to "explore how the concept of social inclusion and the intersections of the social determinants of health affect racialized communities" (2).

Based on the outcomes of the focus groups, researchers concluded that the implications of social inclusion were much more significant than anticipated at the beginning of the research. As a result, the researchers concluded that "political change is needed at all levels" (APG, n.d., 11). Key issues identified by participants in focus groups related to education, employment, access to services, language and policing.

In all groups, however, power imbalance was cited as a crucial issue: "All of the concerns raised in the focus groups—both those raised by specific groups and those shared across groups—reflect the existence of power differentials, which inhibit them from raising and effectively negotiating for change" (APG, n.d., p. 12). Thus, the researchers conclude that dialogue is key to understanding and addressing social inclusion. They suggest that "there must be a process for the discussion that provides adequate opportunity to the excluded to come to a 'place' where they can openly and clearly express their concerns, issues, and make recommendations" (APG, n.d., 12).

The alternative model for social inclusion developed in response to the focus group results is process-oriented and dialogic. The minimum conditions for success as identified by the report include the individual and community capacity to mobilize (through education or support), participate, identify barriers to inclusion, prescribe and implement specific measures to overcome barriers, and to negotiate across diversity and difference (APG, n.d., 14). The model is

based on a process in which excluded individuals and communities are empowered to collaborate with other community groups and organizations in identifying both sources of exclusion and the best methods for addressing inclusion and social equity, and through a process of negotiated change, create an alternative social reality based on inclusion.

There is a wealth of government and activist literature on anti-racism and multiculturalism programming in the United Kingdom, and comparatively little academic scholarship (Lentin, 2008, p. 313). The literature that exists discusses with some frequency the need to isolate best practice in approaches to anti-racism and multiculturalism, but few articles indicate what best practices actually are (see, for example, Winkler, 2007). In other words, commentators from a range of sectors agree that identifying best practices is important but no one has yet been able to offer a definitive list of any sort.

Drawing evidence-informed conclusions about best practices is therefore a thorny task, given the scope and content of available literature; a lack of any over-arching evaluative studies of existing programming; and how difficult it is to arrive at a consensus on the definition of either anti-racism or multiculturalism in the first place. In addition, as both concepts and motors of government policy and community action, anti-racism and multiculturalism change across time and place—they are deployed by a variety of people and groups to mean wildly different things in varying contexts, and for this and other reasons assessing success and failure is particularly difficult.

Moreover, there seems to be a tendency in the popular media and among government commentators to either vilify or celebrate anti-racism and multiculturalism *a priori*, without attention to the specific impact of either concept on actual programming and people's lives. The debate becomes a question of whether or not anti-racism and multiculturalism should *be* at all, instead of what forms they should take, how they should be defined, their impact and implications.

Academic analyses acknowledge the problem of variation and interpretation much more readily than commentary by government or community groups. Academics are also much more likely to consider the complexity of anti-racism and multiculturalism as concepts, and to criticize the stance of existing programming. Academic critiques usually rest on the claim that government and community groups often rely on simplistic definitions of anti-racism, which, at best, underestimate the scope of the battle against racism, and at worst, depoliticize anti-racism by turning it into a celebration of diversity instead of an opposition to inequitable power relationships (Lentin, 2008; Bonnett & Carrington, 1996; Gillborn, 2006; Green & Sonn, 2005; Burtonwood, 2002; MacLeavy, 2008; Essed, 2001; Thomas, 2007). One of the most frequent charges is that a shift toward a discourse of multiculturalism has cast a premature shadow over

anti-racism, suggesting that anti-racism is no longer (if it ever was) relevant. (See, for example, Green & Sonn, 2005, p. 479.)

Academic analyses of anti-racist activity are theoretically complex. However, they seem to speak past rather than to the government and community groups whose work often forms the core of their evidence. Conversely, government and community commentary offers many ideas for programming and promotes all measure of structures for implementing new ideas, but these recommendations are usually generated by concepts and positions that are theoretically naïve.

It seems, therefore, that a "promising practice" would involve meshing the two perspectives by supporting critical anti-racism and multiculturalism programming (Thomas, 2007, p. 450). There are undoubtedly political obstacles that anyone attempting such a project will face as it is likely to ask for both radical and systemic change; nonetheless, it seems clear that cutting-edge work will need to confront these obstacles head-on, even if they prove insurmountable. Reproducing the same old problems and staying within identified, existing constraints is unlikely to be any more fruitful.

4 DISCUSSION

The following discussion outlines the central issues relating to anti-racism and multiculturalism policy and programming, identifies promising practices highlighted in the literature, and suggests new directions based on critical and evaluative approaches to anti-racism and multiculturalism policy and programming. While the literature presents an enormous variety of strategies, approaches, and suggestions, what follows is a brief sampling of the primary findings from a time-limited literature review.

Section 4.1 raises a number of issues that frequently arose in the literature. These include the importance of understanding the complex social, political and historical context of anti-racism and multiculturalism as concepts guiding government policy and programming; the wide range and breadth of actual anti-racism and multiculturalism programming; issues raised by bureaucratic approaches to anti-racism and multiculturalism programming; the concepts of social inclusion and exclusion; and the difficulty with assessing the effectiveness and impact of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming.

Despite the complexities and challenges presented by the issues, however, the literature reviewed did reveal some promising practices in the design and delivery of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming. Section 4.2 discusses these promising practices, providing examples of select programs where applicable. The promising practices highlighted in this section include eight primary strategies:

- Community partnerships and capacity-building;
- Recognizing intersectional identities;
- Creating accessible programming;
- Promoting awareness through special events, recognition and cultural education;
- Engaging youth;
- A focus on arts and sports;
- Media interventions; and
- Setting clear targets and measuring success.

Section 4.3 outlines new directions in multiculturalism and anti-racism programming that build on past successes and attempt to address shortcomings noted in the literature. It should be noted

that these new directions are just emerging in the academic and critical literature and, as such, few concrete examples of programs employing these strategies are documented in current literature. Indeed, this is largely uncharted territory for anti-racism and multiculturalism programming, and as result, represents a great opportunity to build on the best of promising practices outlined below by re-energizing them with the cutting-edge and critical approaches of problematizing multiculturalism, pursuing transculturalism, and promoting social inclusion and full participation

4.1 ISSUES

4.1.1 Understanding anti-racism and multiculturalism

It is crucial to understand the institutional, historical and individual sources of racism in order to oppose it effectively. Racism is the product of unequal power relationships at the base of Western industrial social, political and economic practice. Much academic literature suggests that hierarchical relationships of domination and subordination—which, historically, have been based on socially constructed categories including race, gender, sexuality and class—are necessary for Western liberal democracies to function. Racism is thus a systemic problem; it is not merely a moral or emotional problem or "a matter of subjective belief" (Essed, 2001, p. 496) that can be eradicated by changing individual people's attitudes, although individual attitudinal change may be one component of anti-racism work. The depth of racism's roots in Western systems means that racism cannot be easily overcome.

REWIND, a programme offered by the Sunderland ARCH partnership in Sunderland, England, focuses on uncovering racism's origins. It has been identified as a good practice: It is "racism awareness work with a difference. The work is based on exposing myths that have been created around issues of "race" and racism using factual and practical evidence to expose these myths" (Sunderland Partnership, n.p.). REWIND offers free anti-racism training to professionals and youth, which can be done on site at youth projects using a variety of media. Its three one-hour modules are based on the following themes: "Why we need to do this work; Deconstructing 'race;' and How prejudices are formed/what we do next?" Participants have stated that the training "Provided good info on the origins of racism," "It made you think about your ancestors and how/why you look like you do," and "It helps you get into reality and realize that we need to do something to stop racism happening" (Sunderland Partnership, 2007, n.p.).

Theorists have criticized the concepts of anti-racism and multiculturalism on a variety of levels. Paradies (2005) points out that any consideration of anti-racism policy or programming requires an acknowledgement of the social characteristics of racialization, as "embodied through attitudes, beliefs, behaviours, laws, norms, and practices that either reinforce or counteract power asymmetries" (p. 3). Thus, the effects of anti-racism policy need to be critically analyzed with attention to their effectiveness in reducing power imbalances between socially-constructed categories of people. One crucial question with regards to anti-racism programming is whether to

address the social constructions (ie., attitudes, beliefs, norms, etc.) that contribute to group differentiation, or whether to address the power imbalances that result from group differentiation. This question is fraught with complexity, and many analysts have concluded that the focus should be on the "actual effects" of policies and programs. As Paradies, (2005) points out:

> many forms of racism operate under the guise of anti-racism as a form of legitimation and some racism does not result in disadvantage (reduced power) for subordinate racial groups (Anthias & Lloyd, 2002). Furthermore, anti-racist approaches may produce racist outcomes despite the best of intentions for instance, attempts to help the targets of racism may be undertaken in ways that are paternalistic and hence disempowering and, by definition, racist. (Paradies, 2005, p. 4)

Further, approaches to anti-racism need to account for the intersectional ways in which individuals relate to both race and oppression: "people are differently placed in relation to racism depending on their particular context and, furthermore, types of oppression are not mutually exclusive and are both fluid and flexible over time and space" (Paradies, 2005, p. 4). Recognizing this reality, Paradies (2005) suggests that "anti-racism needs to be undertaken alongside efforts to combat (hetero-)sexism, classism, nationalism, and other forms of oppression, together with an understanding of the complexity of oppressor/oppressed subject positions" (p. 4). Although a discussion of the actual implications of this intersectionality to anti-racism programming and policy-making is beyond the scope of Paradies' (2005) paper, we come back to this issue in section 4.2.2. The results of this Scoping Review suggest that there is a gap in the literature concerning both the outcomes of current anti-racism programming and the implications of new research on anti-racism and intersectionality for future government policymaking and program development. More research is needed in this area.

The literature also identifies a tension between two primary approaches to anti-racism policy and programming. On the one hand, assimilation-focused approaches deem racialization to be a source of inequality and seek to eliminate group differentiation through assimilation, either by racialized groups conforming to the majority social group, or by a transformative process that creates a "new" social context in which racial markers do not correspond to social grouping and differentiation. On the other hand, equality-focused approaches to anti-racism do not seek to do away with group differentiation; rather, they focus on "equalized power relations" through notions of pluralism (Paradies, 2005, pp. 4-5). Both theoretical approaches have weaknesses, although most theorists and policy-makers recognize that both similarities and differences between racial groups exist and must be acknowledged. Resulting policy and program approaches most often take a stance embodying the value of "equality within difference" (Paradies, 2005, p. 5).

Another problem when defining anti-racism is the tendency among "dominant cultures" to "recognize racism in only its extreme forms." Missing the ubiquity and systemic nature of

racism—the ways in which it is built into political, social and economic systems and expressed in mundane, everyday life—often leads to the belief that anti-racism should address primarily extreme forms of discrimination, such as far-right or fascist movements (Essed, 2001, p. 495).

Countering the claim from the right that anti-racism is the province of radical leftist special interest groups intent on destroying the fabric of Western civilization, some British theorists argue that there is "no body of thought called anti-racism, no orthodoxy or dogma, no manual of strategy and tactics, no demonology. What there [is] in society [is] racism, in every walk of life, and it [has] to be combated—in every conceivable way" (Sivanandan, qtd. in Gillborn, 2006, p. 13). Anti-racism's flexibility is both a pro and a con. On the one hand, it is vague and therefore easily misunderstood and targeted by those who perceive it as a threat. On the other hand, its flexibility is crucial because racism takes so many different forms. Gillborn (2006) proposes, "The absence of an anti-racist orthodoxy can be a source of strength" (p. 13) because it allows adaptation and innovation in a variety of contexts.

Philomena Essed (2001) suggests that opposition to anti-racism may come from the "polarizing pre-suppositions of the notion of 'anti'. The negative connotation attached to the idea of 'anti' is problematic when you seek to mobilize people towards progressive goals such as equity, mutual human respect, human rights, or accepting diversity" (p. 496).

According to some theorists, anti-racism has become almost entirely overshadowed by the notion of multiculturalism. Lentin (2005) notes that as an organizing concept, culture began to supplant race after the Holocaust:

> Racial categorizations were replaced by cultural distinctions as a means of explaining human difference. Whereas "race" was seen as irrevocably invoking the superiority of some human groups over others, culture was assumed by anti-racist scholars on both sides of the Atlantic to imply a positive celebration of difference while allowing for the possibility of progress among groups once considered "primitive." (p. 379)

A British representative of the Campaign against Racism and Fascism highlighted the conceptual tension between anti-racism and multiculturalism, saying "I don't think we got any money from the European Union at all…what was funded was not anti-racist work. It was cultural work, multicultural work. The best way to get funding was multicultural work, not stuff that was going to be critical of state institutions" (quoted in Lentin, 2005, p. 395). Individual components of "other" cultures, such as food, language or art, are often marketed to consumers as opportunities to engage with the diversity in their communities. Bonnett & Carrington (1996) refer to this activity as "commercial anti-racism," which they worry will "reorientate the [anti-racism] 'movement' away from political engagement and towards individualistic, consciousness-raising, race equality strategies" (p. 283).

While sharing cultural components can be a useful part of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming, sharing is often presented as a strategy all its own, as an expression of anti-racism and multiculturalism in and of itself. One result of "arguing for multiculturalism [or anti-racism] as a broad acceptance and incorporation of the *cultural* aspects of Black and minority ethnic communities, [is that] such communities can be reduced to stereotypical surface *images* and *symbols* of their 'cultures'" (Turney, *et al*., 2002). Hattam & Atkinson (2006) claim that multiculturalism, in the sense of learning about and experiencing aspects of other cultures, "essentialize[s] and ref[ies] cultures—they are taken as given—rather than analyze[d]…as historical and political constructs open to ongoing transformations" (p. 695).

Such common expressions of multiculturalism tend to create and reinforce stereotypical images of minority communities, and also suggest that achieving a multicultural society is a simple matter of sharing experiences. As Lentin (2008) explains:

> It is easier … to promote diversity than it is to oppose racism, especially if that racism is the racism of the state itself. The state and the European institutions' cooptation of anti-racism come with large grants to carry out projects to promote intercultural understanding and facilitate conflict resolution in schools, workplaces and among individuals. The "bad apples philosophy" explains systematic discrimination and is seen as surmountable by an increased level of intercultural knowledge. (p. 326)

In other words, programmers miss the mark when anti-racism and multiculturalism become politically disengaged, separated from the need to address fundamental power inequities and focused instead on individual or community experiences of diversity. This is one reason why diversity training programmes, while well-intentioned, may be insufficient or even counterproductive: the tendency is for diversity training to imply that whites need to learn about people of colour and fit them into a normative framework, thus reinforcing inequitable, racialized power dynamics (Turney, *et al*., 2002).

4.1.2 Anti-racism and multiculturalism programming

Programming exists at all levels of community and government organization, but its efficacy is hard to assess. In the U.K. context, since the Race Relations (Amendment) Act of 2000, government has generated considerable legislation requiring public bodies to combat racism, particularly at the institutional level. Yet despite policy changes, life on the ground does not necessarily look different for people at risk of becoming either racism's victims or perpetrators (Gillborn, 2006, p. 16). Whereas government has spoken frequently about the need to attack racism, the policies that have been developed are not always sufficient and their implementation has often been flawed. In terms of educational policy, for example, "the rhetoric of anti-racism … now features in a kind of 'official' or rhetorical multiculturalism in many policy pronouncements … [yet] it appears that schools have a long way to go before they even comply with the basics of existing race equality legislation." Indeed, good intentions have not necessarily

resulted in innovation: "Anti-racism has not failed—in most cases, it simply has not been tried yet" (Gillborn, 2006, p. 17).

Gillborn (2006) insists that while the dynamism and flexibility of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming are part of what makes the field exciting, programmers tend to lack a systematic approach. While he cautions against adopting a one-size-fits-all set of rules for practice, he urges clarification of goals and frameworks that might "counter the use of anti-racism as an empty rhetorical device…evacuated of all critical content" (pps. 13-14).

Paradies (2005) identifies a number of different types of anti-racism strategies employed by government and community programming in Australia. Strategies aimed at subordinate racial groups are loosely grouped under the category of "arm(or)ing against racism" (Paradies, 2005, p. 6). Such strategies take a social-psychological approach based on research that shows that "a worldview resonant with one's racial/cultural group, strong racial identity, and awareness of racism and bicultural adaptation can furnish the racism-resistant armor needed to build positive well-being" (Paradies, 2005, p. 6). Thus, these approaches most often focus on supporting subordinate groups to more effectively cope with the effects of racism through identifying and acknowledging racism, cultivating strong group identity and coping skills, and understanding the sources of racism as an objective historical fact (Paradies, 2005).

Other anti-racism strategies focus on eliminating racism on four levels of intervention: cognitive, individual, interpersonal, and societal (Duckitt, 2001, cited in Paradies, 2005). Strategies at the cognitive level address social de-categorization (ie., elimination of race-based misconceptions) and re-categorization (ie., building shared identity) based on inter-group contact and relationship-building. This process is supported by strategies aimed at the individual level which directly address stereotypes, attitudes and behaviours through education and experience. These strategies might include awareness and education campaigns aimed to correct common misconceptions about racialized groups, or more individually-focused counselling strategies aimed toward highly racist individuals (Paradies, 2005, 8-9).

Interpersonal strategies aim to reduce racism by both changing social influence and creating positive intergroup contact. Media campaigns with implicit anti-racist messages have been shown to have positive social influence, particularly when coupled with "high-profile individuals as role models of anti-racist behaviours" (Pedersen et al., in press; and Sanson et al., 1998; cited in Paradies, 2005). Paradies (2005) points out that critical "multicultural curricula that explicitly teach about the history and culture of subordinate racial groups, and emphasize the value of diversity, are also effective in fostering anti-racist norms and values in society" (p. 10). However, crucial in this education is a recognition of the "complex, contradictory and contentious nature of oppressive and liberatory power relations" (p. 10). Paradies (2005) points out that overly dogmatic or "politically correct" approaches to anti-racism education could risk eliciting backlash effects "that both alienate those with a more nuanced and critical approach to anti-racism and provide an easy target for the New Right and others who wish to portray anti-

racism activism as 'extreme,' out of touch with reality, and infringing on freedom of expression and belief" (p. 11).

A second interpersonal-level approach is based on the "contact hypothesis" first introduced by Gordon Allport in 1954 (Paradies, 2005). Research confirms Allport's suggestion that intergroup contact under four essential conditions will lead to reduced racism. These four conditions are: (1) equal status, (2) superordinate goals, (3) no competition, and (4) institutional sanction of the contact (Allport, 1954 in Paradies, 2005, p. 11). Paradies (2005) cites the "Jigsaw Classroom" program as one that has been proven to reduce racism in the classroom, but notes that despite the overwhelming evidence of their effectiveness, "there has, as yet, been little implementation of these types of programs" (p. 11).

At the societal level, the primary intervention identified by Paradies (2005) is mandated equality of representation through anti-discrimination legislation and affirmative action policies. Paradies also raises a series of other policy recommendations aimed at the Australian government, including age-appropriate school curriculum focusing on anti-racism, intercultural understanding, and conflict resolution supported by parent education; diversity and anti-racism training for employees of the Australian public service and law enforcement; development and support of anti-racism policy guidelines for the media; and government-supported monitoring and promotion of anti-racism in civil society, including data collection and policy-development guidelines.

In short, the wide range of programming at all levels of community and government organization make broad assessments of program effectiveness virtually impossible without first creating an inventory of the types of programming offered, by whom, and in what social and political context. For this reason, this scoping review highlights those "promising practices" identified in the literature, acknowledging that this represents only a select sampling of the actual spectrum of on-the-ground programming.

4.1.3 Bureaucratic and community-based approaches

Much of the more critical literature points out that anti-racism and multiculturalism run the risk of becoming mere policy statements rather than vital solutions to major social, political and economic problems (Lentin, 2005, p. 395; Gillborn, 2006, p. 14; Lentin, 2008, p. 312). Government attention to anti-racism and multiculturalism programming is critical; at the same time, some observers cite government's tendency to co-opt radical politics in a way that might make them more widely palatable, but, problematically, divorces them from their original context.

Entrenching anti-racism and multiculturalism programming within government channels threatens "to remove anti-racism's critical content and reduce it to a reformist level where it is at best a palliative to make a divisive system seem a little less exclusionary, and at worst, an empty phrase to be mouthed by policymakers content that their plans an be enforced unchanged on a

relatively docile audience" (Gillborn, 2006, p. 19). Alana Lentin (2008) argues that in Britain and Europe,

> anti-racism has been coopted by states and "race relations industries". In this arena, anti-racism appears to lose its contestatory function… As a result, the struggle is often between the anti-racist groups "on the ground" and the very states which have passed laws against racial discrimination. That struggle is not only against the institutionalized racism of the state, but also for the freedom of organizations in civil society to determine the terms of the anti-racist agenda: something which has been denied consistently as a result of co-optation and funding priorities (p. 312).

Some critics consider official anti-racism and multiculturalism programming "hegemonic," determined by government to effect only minimal, "superficial changes" (Turney, *et al*., 2002). Government marshals evidence of surface-level shifts—greater acknowledgement of diverse cultures, for instance, or elevated positive attention in limited to context to particular minority groups—as a stand-in for systemic change that might truly equalize society. Hegemonic anti-racism, according to Lentin (2008), is "the 'anti-racism of the powerful'," in that it bases its argument on notions of shared "national identity and public culture" (p. 317). These ideas, on which government anti-racism tends to rely, may be deployed to unite people (i.e. *we are all British citizens*), but ironically they also draw a divisive line between "us" and "them" by assuming a consensus on national identity. Purportedly unifying concepts, therefore, can actually facilitate processes of "othering" that encourage rather than dispel the ongoing formation of racism.

In addition, but no less significant, government initiatives are not necessarily going to speak to those most at risk of racism, whether as targets or as perpetrators of racist abuses. There is a considerable element within the general population that is suspicious of government and might resist programming that appears to be imposed by "the system" (Crawford, 2002).

4.1.4 Social Inclusion and exclusion

Although the Canadian literature consulted in this scoping review was highly celebratory about social inclusion as a policy-guiding concept (see section 3 for an overview), the U.K. literature consulted took a far more critical perspective. In the U.K., the literature indicated that there was a tendency in various jurisdictions that adopted social policies based on social inclusion and community cohesion to shift toward a position of so-called "race neutrality," which focused on "evidenced need, on a thematic basis, rather than particular communities" (Home Office, 2001, p. 40). In Scotland, recent government policy, perhaps unintentionally, downplays race and the impact of racism. As Philomena De Lima (2003) explains, "There is a gap between the broad [policy] statements on race, discrimination and recognizing diversity and the mainstreaming of race throughout the documents on social justice" (p. 656).

One reason for this gap is the Scottish Executive's adoption of social inclusion/exclusion as a guideline for public policy and a way of fulfilling the promise of Community Cohesion, the notion that has dominated U.K. social policy since 2002. Scotland followed the lead of other European nations in the 1990s that had adopted the inclusion/exclusion dyad in lieu of the term "poverty," and that sought to use this approach to integrate "those considered the least privileged into 'mainstream' society." In 1997, England established a Social Exclusion Unit; Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland followed shortly thereafter. Scotland ultimately developed the Scottish Social Inclusion Network (SSIN), a mixture of organizers, government officials, and community representatives intended to bring the concept of social justice through inclusion to Scottish society. Thus, "the term 'social inclusion' has come to refer to the EU purpose of achieving economic and social cohesion" (De Lima, 2003, p. 655).

Some of the literature consulted indicated that social inclusion tends to essentialize, based on a vague notion of common national identity: "The implicit assumption that underpins [Scottish policy] is that all groups experience life in the same way" (De Lima, 2003, p. 658). Race does "not appear to be embedded" in government policies, and social inclusion emphasises the benefits of integration—folding "others" into a poorly-defined cultural majority—rather than bringing into cooperation and dialogue a variety of diverse populations (De Lima, 2003, p. 658 and p. 661). Instead of referring to inclusion in a diverse society, social inclusion in this context implies "assimilation within a narrow interpretation of *normality*" (665).

Social inclusion—and the ideas about community cohesion that followed—came from the sense that there were too many divisions in British society, and that people needed more shared values around which to coalesce (Citizens Advice Bureau, 2002, p. 1). This may indeed be the case, but moving to social inclusion or community cohesion without also attending to the source of the divisions may have been short sighted. The impact of social inclusion in Scotland suggests that effective programming should deal explicitly with race and racism as ongoing concerns at every level of society, not to be subordinated to other issues, however closely related.[1]

4.1.5 Assessing success of programs

Great difficulties arise when considering how to assess the impact of anti-racism and multiculturalism policies and program. These difficulties raise a series of methodological questions, not least of which is the lack of universally, agreed-upon indicators. David Gilborn

[1] For evidence of social inclusion policies in action in Scotland, see http://www.scottish.parliament.U.K./business/committees/historic/equal/reports-02/eor02-03-04.htm, accessed November 10, 2008.

(quoted in Short, 1999) thus cautions, "Given our current state of knowledge, it is difficult to arrive at any secure judgment about the overall success or failure of antiracism….we simply know too little about what constitutes good antiracist practice" (p. 52).

Despite these problems, attempts have been made to provide frameworks for evaluation. In 2005, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Coalition of Cities against racism published a report, *Indicators for evaluating municipal policies aimed at fighting racism and discrimination*, which was an exploratory study based on the examination of "municipal policies on ethnocultural diversity management and on fighting racism and discrimination, the tools for evaluating these policies, and their indicators" (UNESCO, 2005, p. 4). Recognizing the difficulty in assessing policies and programs that seek to address disparities affecting minority groups that are the result of "historical processes, economic structures and global policies that far exceed a city or local government's realm of action and responsibility" (UNESCO, 2005, p. 5), the report nonetheless outlined two levels of indicators.

The first level of indicators focused on evaluation of the anti-racism and anti-discrimination *means* implemented by municipalities, focusing on such institutional program and policies as ombudsman offices, complaints-handling, equal opportunity employment, and diversity training for public employees. The second level of indicators focused on socio-economic *outcomes* in municipalities, measured by level of poverty, educational attainment, residential segregation and civic participation (UNESCO, 2005).

It is crucial, however, to be realistic about the length of time required to see "results" from anti-racism and multiculturalism programming. The indicators noted above are obviously only relevant based on longitudinal data, and even given the availability of such data, causality is difficult to determine. Further, while some programming may address important short-term community needs (e.g. in response to crisis), the problem of racism is entrenched and requires sustained effort to find real solutions. The UNESCO report (2005) concludes that:

> Ultimately, the best indication of the effectiveness of anti-racist policies is the reduction of inequality and discrimination in the relevant territory. Such inequality stems from global factors over which city authorities have little direct control. They can only cushion their effects …. In other words, analysis of the resources mobilized by municipal policies and of indicators of their administrative efficiency should not disguise the final goal—reduction of inequality on the ground—which can be reached only by constant and sustained effort. (UNESCO, 2005, p. 71)

4.2 PROMISING PRACTICES

4.2.1 Community partnerships and capacity-building

The literature focusing on effective programming suggests that both targets of racism and potential perpetrators should be involved in the development of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming (NAAR, 2008; Dadzie, 1997). In projects where potential perpetrators took "an active part in negotiating ground rules," organizers have seen "greater involvement" in program activities, and also "higher levels of tolerance and group cooperation" (Dadzie, 1997, p. 69). As Hattam & Atkinson (2006) put it, dialogue about racism "needs to engage with all sides. This is one of the major challenges for any anti-racism pedagogy" (p. 688).

Dreher (2006) confirms this view, pointing out that community anti-racism strategies developed in New South Wales after September 11, 2001, were largely undertaken by volunteers from communities affected by racism and discrimination. While this was a strength of the programs developed in that community-based mobilization both highlighted and developed the agency of affected communities, the drawback was that it taxed the limited human resources of these communities. Dreher's report concludes that, while the strategies employed by communities were effective in addressing racism and opening dialogue, these strategies were limited to a focus on individual attitudes and responsibilities. In order to combat the widespread, systemic racism that gives rise to individual acts of racism and discrimination, communities need government support in long-term planning and capacity-building (Dreher, 2006).

The U.K. literature confirms the suggestion that anti-racism needs to build bridges between communities usually identified as victims and those as perpetrators (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 13; Crawford, 2002). Thomas (2007) suggests that some of the animosity between the two groups is less the result of racial conflict and more the product resentment among whites of typical anti-racism and multiculturalism approaches. In a study of youth workers in Oldham, he found that "much … anti-racist work, as it has been understood and operationalised by youth workers, has been counter-productive with White working-class young people, leading to a 'White backlash' whereby White working-class young people felt that they were the neglected victims as anti-racism privileged the needs and experiences of ethnic minorities" (p. 438).

Addressing potential perpetrators' sense of injustice is complicated and runs the risk of "pandering to racist views" and deflecting attention away from the targets of white supremacy. Organizers in the Bede Detached Anti-Racism Youth Work project in Bermondsey, England, however, were more effective when they acknowledged the "sense of injustice" that white working-class youth felt when they were told to refrain from racist speech and behaviour (Dadzie, 1997, p. 38). By "listen[ing] to the young people without immediately condemning them," organizers were able to help white youth examine the sources of their anger and resentment, and deconstruct their racism so that it no longer had the same power in their lives

(Dadzie, 1997, p. 40). In turn, the youth were more likely to trust the anti-racism workers as individuals, internalize their message, and engage positively with anti-racism in their own lives.

Many population groups mistrust formal structures, organizations, and government programming. Popular suspicion of authority can be countered with a "community development approach" so that communities can develop their own programs, tailored specifically to their needs (Crawford, 2002; Sachdev, 2002).

Building community partnerships is critical. One prominent historical example of the efficacy of community partnerships is the civil rights movement in the United States (Payne, 1995). Successful organizers paved the way for sweeping legislative change and fundamentally altered people's day-to-day lives because they attended to the full spectrum of a community's needs. They recognized that people needed practical and emotional assistance on a range of fronts in order to become active against racism. For example, people who were consumed by a daily struggle for subsistence and who faced threats of violence if they "stepped out of line" were less likely to become politically mobilized or to feel the personal empowerment necessary to make changes in their own lives, so organizers built anti-poverty activities into their anti-racism programming; offered opportunities for both civic and academic education; provided physical protection, and so on (Payne, 1995).

This holistic approach is reflected in numerous subsequent movements and community projects. Workers in the Bede project, for example, demonstrated a "willingness to address all aspects of young people's experience was important, since their racism could not be separated from the many other problems they were facing" (Dadzie, 1997, p. 33). Dadzie (1997), who was hired to assess the Bede project's impact, concludes that a holistic approach was one of the key reasons for its success.

Strong anti-racism and multiculturalism programming also requires qualified staff members who can facilitate the transfer of complex and often sensitive information in order to build partnerships between community, government and other organizations responsible for delivering services. While many programmes rely on volunteers—and using volunteers is a crucial strategy in building partnerships as it allows direct engagement with interested individuals—organizations also need to recognize the difficult and sometimes dangerous nature of doing anti-racism work, and to offer adequate compensation and protection for employees, as well as opportunities for further training (Dadzie, 1997; Dreher, 2006).

The quality of staff members can make the difference between an effective project and one that languishes despite good intentions. Literature consulted for this scoping review reflects at least two crucial roles staff can fill: role models and challengers.

Staffing projects with people of colour provides positive role models for other people of colour, and is also an opportunity to break down racist stereotypes that others might hold. In the Bede

project, white youths' "encounters with skilled, professional black workers in a position of authority were highly influential, particularly for those who perceptions of black people were based on hearsay rather than first-hand experience" (Dadzie, 1997, p. 53). One youth worker in particular, Santi, was "respected and well-liked," which resulted in white youth "'polic[ing]' their own conversations to ensure that nothing racist was said in his presence." A pitfall of the role-modeling approach is that staff members might sometimes feel conflicted about being labelled according to racial identity. Santi, for example, found himself under "unspoken pressure to demonstrate through … practice that [he was] in some way representative of [his racial] community." While he recognized the particularly effective role he could play as a black authority figure with white youth, he also wanted more emphasis on the fact that, first and foremost, he was a member of a youth work team, hired because of his professional qualifications for the job, not his race (Dadzie, 1997, p. 54).

Staff members in any anti-racism project need to be prepared to facilitate the exchange of sensitive and politically charged information. Popular wisdom often holds that leaders in group learning environments should maintain a neutral stance in order to retain as many participants as possible and/or to allow participants to draw their own conclusions using information provided. This is not necessarily the case in anti-racism work, however; the information being communicated is not value-free and staff members need to be adequately prepared to challenge those who try to defend racism or resist an anti-racist or multicultural message. In his study of Holocaust education in Britain, Burtonwood (2002) asserts that teachers should not attempt to appear neutral in their attitudes since "neutrality could appear to pupils as indifference." Instead, teachers should voice "abhorrence…while also being prepared to allow pupils to express their feelings even where this includes expressions of anti-Semitic feeling." The justification for this is that such mediated encounters in an anti-racist educational setting "may be the only occasion on which these views can be properly challenged" (p. 74).

4.2.2 Recognizing intersectional identities

In particular, many commentators recommend establishing programs that specifically serve women. Women of colour often require targeted programming that accounts for their combined experience of patriarchy and white supremacy, as well as other potential challenges including religious intolerance and community conventions (because of religious or cultural practice) that might prevent their involvement with typical Western activities. The website What Works for Women[2] includes a long list of examples of best practice for black and minority ethnic women and girls. Much of this programming centres around sport and physical activity, which have been

[2] See http://www.whatworksforwomen.org.U.K./, accessed November 10, 2008.

particularly successful means of empowering women to counter racism and become leaders in their own communities.

In addition to assisting women of colour, the U.K. literature suggests that some effort also needs to be made by anti-racism programmers to insulate white women from the dangers of stepping outside the boundaries of white supremacy. Young women face particular challenges when trying to resist pressure to engage in racist activities. White supremacy's keystone is the notion that white men have the right and the duty to protect white women from men of colour. When white women voluntarily cross colour lines in any capacity, white supremacists typically respond by labelling that movement as sexual impropriety, even if no sexual contact has taken place. The working-class white women in the Bede project, for instance, expressed concerned about being labelled "nigger-lovers" if they stood up against racism (Dadzie, 1997, p. 58). Being labelled in this way might make them targets of white men's anger: indeed, white men did attack the community center where the project was based on a night when it was hosting a women-only event (Dadzie, 1997, pgs. 59-64). White women were justifiably concerned about losing whatever limited protection their femininity offered them from the abuses of patriarchy, and while anti-racism and multiculturalism projects should not pander to anyone's resistance to change, they seem to be more effective when they acknowledge and deal directly with all participants' vulnerabilities.

In the United Kingdom, much "multicultural and antiracist education has tended to neglect anti-Semitism and the Holocaust" (Burtonwood, 2002, p. 71). However, since 2006, Britain has taken the lead internationally in focusing government energy and financing on countering anti-Semitism through a series of measures including renewed attention to legal structures; creating anti-racism school curricula that includes explicit considerations of anti-Semitism; promoting Holocaust remembrance activities; encouraging interfaith and interethnic respect; and combating hate crimes in the media (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, Annex 1).

The publication of Great Britain's *All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into Antisemitism Report* (2006) resulted in the formation of the Inter-Departmental Working Group on Antisemitism, a unique partnership that "brings together the Jewish Community and Government departments to ensure that commitments made in our original response are taken forward. The Working Group has been hailed across Europe and the United States as a model of best practice" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 5). The areas that the Working Group has stated require the most intense attention are monitoring and addressing anti-Semitism on the Internet and university campuses, and dealing with hate crimes and prosecutions.

Attention to anti-Semitism may be the key lens through which the British government has focused on the issue of hate crimes, which it defines as crimes committed against a victim "because of their race, faith, sexual orientation, disability or transgender status" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 7). Government established the Race for

Justice agenda in 2003—inspired in part by the Stephen Lawrence inquiry—in order to examine the ways in which hate crimes are prosecuted, and the Race for Justice Declaration, "a cross-governmental strategy which aims to combat all forms of hate crime," and "provides organizations and individuals with the opportunity to make a commitment to condemn all forms of hate crime by signing up to meet the standards outlined in the Declaration" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 8). In addition, the government is funding a London-based think-tank, the European Institute for the Study of Contemporary Antisemitism (EISCA), "to undertake an in-depth analysis of the key themes of anti-Semitic discourse" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 12).

4.2.3 Creating accessible programming

In a study of community programs in Northern Ireland, International Conflict Research (INCORE) states that successful programs require a convenient and accessible physical location (Lewis, 2007, p. 13). The Monitoring Group, an anti-racism organization operating in Britain since 1979, has developed at least two projects that speak to the need for accessibility. It founded a Rural Racism Project to provide services to people in rural areas, whose struggles against racism are often overlooked or forgotten and who are less likely to have access to urban-based anti-racism resources. In addition, its Freephone Helpline, which receives approximately 300 calls each month, is available 24 hours per day, every day of the year to provide assistance to victims of racist crime (Monitoring Group, 2008). Not only is it relatively easy to use the phone as a means of contacting the organization, but phone lines like this one fulfil a recommendation of the Stephen Lawrence inquiry that government offer alternatives to the police for reporting hate crimes and racist incidents (Stop Hate U.K., 2008).

4.2.4 Promoting awareness

In their study of New Zealanders' attitudes toward immigrants and multiculturalism, Ward and Masgoret (2008) found that an increased level of previous intercultural contact correlated with more positive attitudes toward immigrants. However, they are also careful to point out that, in order for it to have positive effects, such contact must occur under favourable circumstances that facilitate intimate, cooperative, and equal status interaction with shared goals. They suggest that "facilitating and improving this type of interaction in context where culturally diverse groups routinely meet will lead to a range of positive outcomes, including support for current immigration policy" (Ward and Masgoret, 2008, p. 243).

Ward and Margoset (2008) also point out that both schools and the workplace are important contexts for cultural awareness and education activities to take place. Ho, Holmes and Cooper (2004, cited in Ward and Masgoret, 2008) suggest that curriculum changes need to take place to

promote and educate about multiculturalism, and research by Mak et al. (1999, cited in Ward and Masgoret, 2008) demonstrates positive outcomes for programs such as ExcelL (Intercultural Skills Program[3]), which focuses on building intercultural communication skills. Likewise, workplace-based diversity training programs have been shown to have positive outcomes. One example cited by Ward and Margoset (2008) is the New Zealand Office of Ethnic Affairs' intercultural training programs for government departments[4].

Britain's All Party Inquiry into Antisemitism recognized building community through interfaith "activity and action" to be a vital practice. Its follow-up report explains, "We want to harness the energy and practical contribution that faith communities bring to our society, whilst assessing the tensions and rubbing points created by faith, both within and across faith groups, and across wider communities" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 25). A Faith Communities Consultative Council (FCCC) was struck to develop an interfaith framework, which involves all levels of government in cooperation with communities.

The literature also shows that cultural awareness can be effectively promoted through experiential learning. Experiential learning sometimes enables the formation of empathy, which can be crucial to combating racism and promoting multiculturalism on an individual or community level. In this regard, anti-racism programmers may benefit from using practices developed in the context of Holocaust education. In the popular Lessons from Auschwitz programme, for example, Britain's Holocaust Education Trust (HET) takes 6000 6th-form students to Auschwitz-Birkenau in Poland each year. Students engage directly and powerfully with the material artefacts of a European genocide. The head teacher of one participating school explains,

> There can be no better way to educate our pupils than to take them on a visit to Auschwitz-Birkenau and let their experience touch other pupils on their return to school. We are grateful to the Holocaust Educational Trust for co-ordinating the visit and giving our students the opportunity to not only learn from, but act on, the lessons that the Holocaust taught us all—the importance of fighting racism and antisemitism today. (HET, 2008)

According to the Chief Executive of HET,

---

[3] For more information, see http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/courses/excell.aspx, accessed November 7, 2008.

[4] For more information on this program, see: http://www.dia.govt.nz/oeawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Resources-Intercultural-Awareness-Resources-Intercultural-Awareness-and-Communication-IAC-Training-Programme?OpenDocument, accessed, Nov. 7, 2008.

> HET's Lessons from Auschwitz Course is such a vital part of our work exactly because it gives students the chance to understand more the dangers and potential effects of prejudice and racism today. The course encourages them to act on what they see and learn and the inspiring work they do in their local areas demonstrates the importance of the visit. With the support of recent Treasury funding, we look forward to expanding the programme from next year as we prepare to take two students from every secondary school in the U.K. on this life changing experience (HET, 2008).

Experiential programming does not have to place students in the physical environment of former death camps to have an impact. Burtonwood (2002) identifies domestic programming around the annual Holocaust Memorial Day, inaugurated in Great Britain in January 2001, as an "interesting example of good practice" in anti-racism (p. 71). Taking care not to encourage over-identification with either victims or perpetrators, students are urged through a variety of carefully constructed exercises to understand the similarity between themselves and the participants in incidents from the history of the genocide in order to prevent them from becoming passive bystanders should they confront similar situations of racist abuse in their own lives. In particular, schools have developed a "micro-history" curriculum, which teaches about the Holocaust through a focus on named individuals, whether through survivors telling students their own stories or assigning autobiographical literature for students to read. Focusing on individual stories counters the enormity of the genocide. Without reducing its political significance or minimizing the horror involved, this approach allows students to consider targeted Jews as real, individual people with whom they might empathize (Burtonwood, 2002, pgs. 73-4). However, it is important to note that role-playing is not recommended as this poses too much of a risk of traumatizing and thus being counterproductive for participants (Burtonwood, 2002, p. 79).

4.2.5 Engaging youth

A large number of anti-racism programmes in the U.K. target youth as primary beneficiaries of services. Much of the literature on anti-racism and multiculturalism programming consulted for this scoping review cites work being done with youth as its primary data base. It is certainly common practice to concentrate on youth, and it appears to be a sound choice given their high potential for change over time as individuals and in terms of what they might accomplish systemically through future political engagement.

The U.K. government expressed a direct commitment to anti-racism and youth in its Race Relations (Amendment) Act (2000), which requires anti-racism programming in school curricula, showing "due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups" (quoted in Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 37). The Scottish

Executive and Department of Education in Northern Ireland have both recently stepped up their curricular activities in response, focused around the concept of citizenship education.

One non-governmental programme that has generated especially positive feedback from youth and educators is www.britkid.org, a web-based anti-racism initiative that started in Britain but has recently been reproduced as Eurokid, a project aimed toward youth in the European Union (Gaine, *et al.*, 2003, p. 322). The animated website is designed around nine young teenage characters through which users explore facets of racism in an ethnically diverse society.

4.2.6 Focus on arts and sports

According to the literature cited in this scoping review, programs focusing on sports or the arts were frequently cited as examples of effective programming. Artistic explorations of racism and anti-racism benefit both creators and audiences—creators learn from the experience of producing artistic representations, and audiences are pushed to consider these problems from a range of innovative perspectives. Art projects are sponsored by such venerable U.K. anti-racism charities as the Runnymede Trust (http://www.runnymedetrust.org/) and the Monitoring Group, which has supported photography, videography and other visual art installations (http://www.monitoring-group.co.U.K./history/). The European Youth Week 2007 also defined arts-based approaches to anti-racism as a best practice (European Commission, 2007).

Using sport and physical activity is a common approach to anti-racism programming, especially programming targeting youth. The Bede project, for instance, secured free access for participants to activities such as football and motorbike scrambling, and these proved to be keystones of the project's work. Sport and physical activities offered programmers opportunities to encourage cooperation, trust and self-reliance in participants, all of which enabled more effective communication of their anti-racism message. These activities were also used as "carrots" as youth were required to set and agree to uphold ground rules around anti-racist behaviour in order to be allowed to participate. Since the youth often had a say in choosing the activities, and they were ones that were extremely attractive and often otherwise inaccessible, they were an effective tool to persuade youth to experiment with new methods of communication and comportment. As well, they allowed youth and programmers to spend more time together—often in environments of some risk—where they could develop deeper relationships that allowed them to delve into the complexities of racism and its effects (Dadzie, 1997).

In addition to programmes such as Bede, which use sport as one plank in a larger anti-racism strategy, there are numerous anti-racism initiatives in the United Kingdom designed specifically around sport, many of which have been identified as best practices. Football Unites Racism Divides (FURD) is possibly the most widely-recognized and influential. Sport England has identified this project as a best practice in anti-racism programming. It began in 1995 when Sheffield United fans expressed concerns about "racist chanting on the terraces" (Sport England, 2008). In the last thirteen years, FURD has developed into a complex national organization, and has also expanded to support the Football Against Racism in Europe network, "a loose coalition

of anti-racist groups that each year organizes the Action Week—Europe's largest anti-racist event." Overall, FURD works to ensure "everyone who watches and plays football can do so in an environment free of racial harassment." It uses the "magnetic power of football to deliver anti-racist education and youth work," and offers programmes that include football coaching; assisting young people to create their own teams; organizing regular tournaments and leagues that bring together isolated communities such as refugees and black and minority ethnic cultures; and Streetkick, a portable football "field" that can be set up "in the heart of urban neighborhoods to involve 'hard to get' young people" (FURD, 2008).

Show Racism the Red Card is another anti-racism strategy identified as a good practice by the community-government partnership in northeast England, Sunderland ARCH. It "uses the popularity and impact of football to challenge and raise awareness of racism and prejudice in society and has subsequently proved to be one of the most successful, innovative and positive programmes the Sunderland Partnership and Sunderland City Council has ever been involved with." Led by former professional football players, it offers anti-racism workshops for youth. After setting a precedent for success in Sunderland, this "best practice" became "the basis for similar projects across the country" (Sunderland Partnership, 2007).

The Racial Equality Standard for Professional Football Clubs, Let's Kick Racism Out of Football, is widely recognized as a good practice. It sets clear standards of practice with categories allowing football clubs to track their progress and demonstrate accountability. Kick It Out provides "guidance and support for all professional clubs…working on the Racial Equality Standard" through a Development Officer. The "Good Practice Guide" accompanies the Standard to "help support clubs through the process" (Racial Equality Standard for Professional Football Clubs, 2008).

Sport Against Racism Ireland (SARI) was established in 1997 "to support cultural integration and social inclusion in Ireland by using sport as a medium to combat racism, sectarianism, xenophobia, homophobia and other forms of discrimination." It has been "the leading NGO at the forefront of promoting cultural integration and social inclusion through sport." SARI began as a volunteer-based organization and "has involved into an internationally respected agent for social change, governed by a board of directors and chief executive charged with driving a dynamic three-year strategy" (SARI, 2008).

4.2.7 Media interventions

The content of Britkid (and Eurokid) is aimed at youth, as is its delivery method: an Internet site. The Internet offers rich possibilities for communicating messages about anti-racism and multiculturalism to a broad audience. It is highly accessible, particularly as more public facilities (schools, libraries, community centres and so on) provide computer terminals free of charge, and it is also relatively private. A person who might experience negative peer pressure for becoming involved in a "real life" anti-racism program may be able to explore new perspectives and gain new insight into anti-racism and multiculturalism on an individual basis through engagement

with Web-based sources. The follow-up report to Britain's All Party Inquiry into Antisemitism also notes that since the Internet is a key place where racist activity occurs—via a host of neo-fascist and far-right websites, as well as in more subtle locations—it also needs to be a primary place where it is opposed (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008).

One result of Great Britain's All Party Inquiry into Antisemitism was a frank discussion between government, and representatives of the Jewish community and the media about the transmission of anti-Semitic ideas. "Positive outcomes" of this discussion included an agreement to fund the Society of Editors to produce "a guide for the media on the role and responsibility of moderators." Advocates in government and Jewish communities stress the importance of such a guide "in light of recent events where reputable newspapers allowed the publication of blatantly anti-Semitic comments" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 15). In addition, government will investigate and gather evidence of "the extent of anti-Semitism" on the Internet. It has created an Internet hate crime working party and begun to establish guidance for "practitioners and victims" in order to report and confront Internet hate crime, stressing a "hope to clarify this with good practice guidance for the range of service providers affected" (Minister of State for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 16).

4.2.8 Setting clear targets and measuring success

Even if no universal measures of success in anti-racism and multiculturalism programming can be determined, it seems clear that at the very least individual projects require specific targets or benchmarks of accomplishment and methods of determining whether or not that specific project is meeting them.

International Conflict Research (INCORE), a research group based in Ulster, notes that many organizations do not "formally measure or document" their impact in communities they are meant to serve, and as a result they miss an important opportunity to demonstrate their value to the broader society (Lewis, 2007, p. 14). While it is especially difficult for anti-racism and multiculturalism programmers to measure success because their work is long-term and often has what INCORE calls "intangible outcomes," a possible starting point for assessment might be "to produce brief case studies of programmes that seem to have been beneficial to participants (Lewis, 2007, p. 15).

4.3 New Directions in Multiculturalism and Anti-Racism Programming

Much of the literature reviewed in this report indicated that anti-racism and multiculturalism need to become consistent lenses through which government and communities view their context. As long as they remain "special interests," applied in limited ways to isolated projects, they are unlikely to have their intended effect of eradicating racism. Policies such as social

inclusion and community cohesion might benefit from efforts to re-integrate a specific focus on anti-racism into their agenda.

4.3.1 Problematizing multiculturalism

There is a significant difference between promoting diversity—often in the guise of multiculturalism—and actively opposing racism. The two can certainly be constituents of one another, but anti-racism tends to be de-politicized or oversimplified when it is framed primarily as a "celebration of diversity" or an effort to "spread awareness." For maximum impact, endeavours in anti-racism and multiculturalism need to be understood as concerted opposition to inequitable power relationships.

As precious as the concepts of diversity and multiculturalism may be to dominant social groups, programmers are likely to benefit from taking a hard look at whether or not they have had a real ameliorative effect on the lives of people most at risk, and from what sources the terms originate. In Canada, Kogila Adam Moodley notes the real limitations of multicultural policies: "The Canadian mosaic was elevated to a national consensus and official ideology while *de facto* membership in the charter cultures continued to determine life chances" (quoted in Bonnett & Carrington, 1996, p. 279). British critics including Yasmin Alibhai-Brown (2000) and Arun Kundnani (2002) suggest that multiculturalism is an outdated notion that has failed at transforming British society. Instead of relying on multiculturalism, Alibhai-Brown calls on the U.K. to define a new concept that allows respect for various peoples and groups within the region at the same time as it also describes and encourages a common identity and shared values. Defining common ground, however, is made difficult by inherent racial inequity.

Without downplaying the potential benefits for individuals of shared experience or the value in emphasizing evidence of cultural variation (i.e. "diversity"), in contexts such as the U.K. or Canada, it is also crucial to remember the dominant power of whiteness. Communities that perceive themselves to boast a high level of "intercultural understanding" risk falling into the trap of believing themselves "colour-blind" and writing off, prematurely, the systemic problems that likely remain. Professions of colour-blindness tend to come from people who have not been racialized; it seems to require the privilege of whiteness to claim "not to 'see' race" (Turney, et al., 2002). According to Lentin (2005), "People targeted by racism generally see through the idea that recognizing cultural differences, providing for them and encouraging others to learn about them will bring an end to discrimination" (p. 395). In fact, reading intercultural sharing as evidence of equality may actually work to "reaffir[m] ideas of the 'normal', i.e. the universalism of whiteness" (Turney, *et al*., 2002), and thus ironically promote rather than chip away at racism.

Critics working to build an Anti-Racist Toolkit at the University of Leeds (itself a response to government attention to the problem of institutionalized racism) argue that to be effective, anti-racism needs to be promoted hand-in-hand with the idea of racial equality so that society "is required to actively address all manifestations of racist activity rather than establishing a broad framework of 'equality' and assuming that once that that is in place, equal access for all groups

will follow … An anti-racist strategy incorporates the principles of race equality but moves beyond that principle in a much stronger way" (Turney, et al., 2002).

4.3.2 Pursuing transculturalism

Transculturalism may offer an opportunity to value practices associated with various social groups while at the same time challenging the conventional terms of debate and restructuring the power relationships that cause racism.

Multiculturalism is based on a notion beneficial to those in power, which is that cultures exist in and of themselves, outside any social or political context, i.e. there is something authentically "British" or "African American" or "Canadian" not constructed by context. The idea that culture is natural fixes it across time and place. It implies that there are clear, immutable boundaries between "us" and "them," and therefore upholds status quo power relationships with tautological arguments based on a skewed sense of tradition and history: *white people are dominant in British society because authentic Britons have always been white*, and so on (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1996).

Transculturalism, by contrast, deconstructs culture without obliterating its benefits, and thus offers a key avenue for new approaches to anti-racism. Transculturalism situates culture in social, political and historical context. Whereas multiculturalism claims to include all cultures in a framework that preserves the assumed (and, in a hegemonic model, required) "cultural authenticity" of each one, transculturalism offers "possibilities [for] impacting dominant and suppressed social norms, to open them up for transformability where necessary, to have the values of the society impacted and shaped by all." Using a transcultural model, people's distinct customs and practices may be maintained, but with the intention of transforming society from all directions rather than preserving a structure dominated by a powerful few (Essed, 2001, p. 506). Moreover, because transculturalism may help to fundamentally alter structures of power, it may then also facilitate building much sought-after "common values and purposes that 'transcend the margins of particular cultures" (Essed, 2001, p. 500).

4.3.3 Promoting social inclusion and full participation

While many critics in the U.K. decry social inclusion and Community Cohesion as counterproductive to anti-racism, at least one study suggests that it is both innovative and appealing to people "on the ground." In his study of anti-racism programming in Oldham in 2005 and 2006, Thomas (2007) argues that youth workers appreciate the clarity offered by policies such as Community Cohesion, which counter what they perceive as the segregation encouraged by previous approaches. Using experiential activities, usually centered on sport or the arts, programmers in Oldham used the notion of Community Cohesion to encourage dialogue and cooperation across racial lines.

Critics dislike Community Cohesion because they believe that it prematurely collapses the category of race, asserting that it is no longer relevant, before taking the political and cultural steps to actually decrease its relevance by eradicating racism and its impact. Youth workers, however, argue that programmes emphasizing difference based on race that draw attention to the racism rampant in British society—albeit in an attempt to create safe spaces for "othered" population groups—divide and only add fuel to the fire of white resentment of minorities: "There has been evidence," he explains, that such approaches, "[have] been counter-productive with White working-class young people, leading to a 'White backlash' whereby White working-class young people felt that they were the neglected victims as anti-racism privileged the needs and experiences of ethnic minorities" (p. 438).

While critics view Community Cohesion as a "worrying retreat from the acceptance of the reality of structural racism contained in the 2000 Race Relations (Amendment) Act," workers in Thomas' study suggest that it offers a fundamental shift in anti-racism and multiculturalism strategies away from didactic approaches that separate victims and perpetrators and imply that the former need special accommodation because of the threat posed by the latter (p. 440). Thomas concludes that it has the potential to identify "constructive directions forwards, with its acknowledgment both of the importance of social and cultural conditioning, and the possibility of individual change. It also emphasizes how successful integration or 'cohesion' needs to be based on 'safe' spaces for contact and negotiation" (pgs. 450-451). Community cohesion, at least in the context of Oldham's youth workers, does not abandon the idea that particular groups need a certain level of protection from discrimination; however, it does emphasize that protection need not be insulation or isolation, nor appear punitive toward dominant population groups.

CONCLUSION

As indicated in the discussion above, there are no clear or easy answers to the complex problems raised by racism and discrimination in contemporary society. Indeed, many of the authors cited above emphasize that the historical and systemic nature of the problems require long-term, critical, and reflexive approaches that interrogate and expose the sources of racism and discrimination while simultaneously building the capacity for individuals and communities to heal from damage done and prevent further damage from occurring.

Given the increasingly multi-ethic and multicultural nature of modern, immigration-reliant nations like Canada, the U.K., Australia and New Zealand, the promotion of anti-racism and multiculturalism will remain a priority policy area for all levels of government. However, many critics point out that old approaches are not sufficient to meet the challenges of new problems, or, for that matter, to resolve persistent old problems that have not been adequately addressed by past policy or practice.

However, based on a broad cross section of government policy and academic literature from the four jurisdictions under review, some anti-racism and multiculturalism practices have shown significant promise. This scoping review identified eight promising practices in the design and implementation of anti-racism and multiculturalism programming.

First, many commentators identified community partnerships and capacity-building as being crucial to the development of long-term, sustainable anti-racism and multiculturalism programming. Partnerships need to include both affected communities and perpetrators, being sensitive to the needs and vulnerabilities in each group. Involvement from a variety of levels of government is important, and efforts need to be coordinated across government and community levels. Financial and human resources are both crucial ingredients in capacity-building at the community level, and government plays a role in developing and supporting these resources.

Second, program design and delivery must take into account the complex realities of intersectional identities, including those who experience discrimination on a variety of axes – including gender, ability, age, class, and sexual preference. Third, programming must be accessible and appropriate for target communities. Creating a safe and welcoming space is important for many communities who lack such a space in the public realm, and accessibility is an important factor for rural communities.

Fourth, promoting awareness through special events, recognition and cultural education can be an effective way to build trusting relationships between social groups, but care must be taken in design and delivery of programs to avoid backlash. Fifth, engaging youth is an important way to build capacity for the future, particularly in creating role models. Sixth, focusing on arts and sports helps break down racial barriers, building relationships and countering discrimination.

Seventh, media interventions are crucial in countering the negative images and misconceptions that often lead to racist and discriminatory attitudes. Finally, setting clear targets and measuring success is necessary for the ongoing development of anti-racism and multiculturalism policy and programming.

Despite the wide spectrum of perspectives on anti-racism and multiculturalism policy and programming which range from celebratory to highly critical, three new directions emerge as being highly promising in the development of critical and reflexive programming for the future. First, policy makers and program developers should look to problematizing received notions of multiculturalism that downplay power differentials and injustices rooted in historical and structural racism. One way to do this is to adopt transculturalism as a policy-driving concept that both values cultural difference and challenges the conventional terms of debate, allowing for reflexivity and awareness of the dynamics of power and equality that cut across cultures. Finally, although they also need to be problematized, the concepts of social inclusion and full participation (known in the U.K. as "community cohesion") show promise as guiding principles for the development of policy and practice that can foster both diversity and equality in multicultural and multiethnic societies.

WORKS CONSULTED

Alibhai-Brown, Yasmin. (2000). After Multiculturalism. Daily Telegraph, May 23. Retrieved from http://fpc.org.uk/publications/after-multiculture.

Ang, I., Brand, J., Noble, G., Sternberg, J. (2006). *Connecting Diversity: Paradoxes of Multicultural Australia.* Artarmon NSW: Special Broadcasting Service Corporation. Retrieved from http://epublications.bond.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1020&context=hss_pubs,

Arbour, Louise. (2007). Looking Beyond Durban: The Signficiance of Racial Discriination on the International Human Rights Agenda. *UN Chronicle* (3), pgs 4-6. Retrieved from www.un.org/chronicle.

Belkhodja, C., Biles, J., Donaldson, I., and Hyndman, J. (2006). Introduction: Multicultural Futures? Challenges and Solutions. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 38 (3), pp. i-v.

Bonnett, Alastair and Bruce Carrington. (1996). Constructions of Anti-racist Education in Britain and Canada. *Comparative Education* Vo. 32 (3), pgs 271-288.

Britkid. (2008). Website. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from www.britkid.org.

Burtonwood, Neil. (2002). Holocaust Memorial Day in schools—context, process and content: a review of research into Holocaust education. *Educational Research* Vol. 44 (Spring), pgs 69-82.

Canadian Race Relations Foundation. (2005). *Award of Excellence: 2005 Best Practices Reader*. Retrieved from http://www.crr.ca/divers-files/en/bestprac/bp_Reader2005.pdf

Citizens Advice Bureau and Commission for Racial Equality. (2002). Community Cohesion: Our Responsibility. Retrieved from http://83.137.212.42/sitearchive/cre/downloads/cohesion.pdf.

Clutterbuck P. and Novick, M. (2003). *Building Inclusive Communities: Cross-Canada Perspectives and Challenges*. Report prepared for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and The Laidlaw Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.inclusivecities.ca/pdf/inclusive.pdf

Cooper, M. (2006). *Pathways to change: Facilitating the full participation of diversity groups in Canadian society, Background document.* Alberta Community Development, Human Rights and Citizenship; and Department of Canadian Heritage, Alberta district. Retrieved from http://www.tprc.alberta.ca/educationfund/priorities/docs/P2CTOOL.pdf

Crawford, Vanessa. (2002). Appendix 17: Anti Racist Strategy and Action Plan, Brighton and Hove Youth Support Service. Retrieved from http://peace.brighton-hove.gov.uk/Intranet/CommitteeMat.NSF/0/586D9B683E7444E480256D390043986B/$File/Item+14+Appendix+17+-+Antiracist+strategy.doc.

Dadzie, Stella. (1997). *Blood, Sweat and Tears: A Report of the Bede Anti-Racist Detached Youth Work Project*. Youth Work Press. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED425209&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED425209

De Lima, Philomena. (2003). Beyond Place: ethnicity/race in the debate on social exclusion/inclusion in Scotland. *Policy Futures in Education* Vol. 1 (4), pgs 653-667.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. (2000). New Deal for Communities Race Equality Guidance. Retrieved from http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=366.

Dib, K. (2006). Canada's 150th Anniversary Multiculturalism and Diversity: Vehicles for Sustainable Socio-Economic Progress. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 38 (3), pp. 143-159.

Essed, Philomena. (2001). Multi-identifications and Transformations: Reaching Beyond Racial and Ethnic Reductionisms. *Social Identities* Vol. 7 (4), pgs 493-506.

European Commission. (2007). European Best Practice Projects, European Youth Week 2007. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/youth/pdf/doc417_en.pdf.

Flower, T. (2001). *Long-Term Anti-Racism Strategies: A Guide to Developing Effective Community Projects.* Affiliation of Multicultural Societies and Service Agencies of BC (AMSSA). Retrieved from http://www.evaluationtoolsforracialequity.org/evaluation/tool/doc/ltars.pdf

Football Unites Racism Divides (FURD). (2008). Website. Retrieved November 8, 2008, from http://www.furd.org/default.asp?intPageID=1.

Gaine, Chris, Camila Hallgren, Servando Perez Dominguez, Joana Salazar Noguera, Gaby Weiner. (2003). "Eurokid": an innovative pedagogical approach to developing intercultural and anti-racist education on the Web. *Intercultural Education* Vol. 14 (Sept.), pgs 317-327.

Garcea, J. (2006). Provincial Multiculturalism Policies in Canada, 1974-2004: A Content Analysis. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 38 (3), pp. 1-20.

Gillborn, David. (2006). Critical Race Theory and Education: Racism and anti-racism in educational theory and praxis. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* Vol. 27 (March), pgs 11-32.

Green, Meredith J. and Christopher C. Sonn. (2005). Examining Discourses of Whiteness and the Potential for Reconciliation. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* Vol. 15, pgs 478-492.

Hattam, Robert and Stephen Atkinson. (2006). Reconciliation as a Frame for Rethinking Racism in Australia. *Social Identities* Vol. 12 (6), pgs 683-700.

Heart of the Nation Strategic Working Group. (2000). *The Heart of the Nation: A Cultural Strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand.* Retrieved from http://www.mcdermottmiller.co.nz/projects/hotnation/hotn_summary.pdf

Hobsbawn, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds. (1996). *The Invention of Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holocaust Educational Trust. (2008). Website. Retrieved November 11, 2008, from http://www.het.org.uk/content.php?page_id=62.

Home Office. (2001). Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team Chaired by Ted Cantle. Retrieved from http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/independentreviewteam.pdf.

Icart, J., Labelle, M., Antonius, R. (2005). *Indicators for evaluating municipal policies aimed at fighting racism and discrimination*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001496/149624e.pdf

Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (2005). Anti-racist laws "have failed to remove the roots of everyday racism." Retrieved from http://www.jrf.org.uk/pressroom/releases/081105.asp

Kundnani, Arun. (2002). The death of multiculturalism. Institute for Race Relations. Retrieved from http://www.irr.org.uk/2002/april/ak000001.html

Kunz, J. and Sykes, S. (2007). *Multicultural Canada in the 21st Century: Harnessing Opportunities and Managing Pressures.* Government of Canada, Policy Research Initiative. http://www.policyresearch.gc.ca/doclib/SP_div_Mosaic_%20e.pdf

Larin, S. (2004). *Municipal Anti-Racism and Diversity Programs in Canada*. The Laurier Institution, Vancouver. Retrieved from http://www.diversityvancouver.ca/pdf/municipal_diversity_programs_report.pdf

Lentin, Alana. (2004). Multiculturalism or Anti-racism? Retrieved from www.alanlentin.net.

Lentin, Alana. (2005). Replacing 'race', historicizing 'culture' in multiculturalism. *Patterns of Prejudice* Vol. 39 (4), pgs 379-395.

Lentin, Alana. (2008). After anti-racism? *European Journal of Cultural Studies* Vol. 11 (3), pgs 511-551.

Lentin, Alana. (2006). Anti-racism in Ireland. Retrieved from www.alanalentin.net.

Levine-Rasky, C. (2006). Discontinuities of Multiculturalism. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 38 (3), pp. 87-104.

Lewis, Helen. (2007). Community Capacity to Address Racism and Intolerance in Northern Ireland. International Conflict Research (INCORE). Retrieved from http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/policy/lilp/CommunityCapacityreportfinal.pdf.

MacLeavy, Julie. Managing Diversity? "Community Cohesion" and its Limits in Neoliberal Urban Policy. *Geography Compass* Vol. 2, pgs 538-558.

Minister of State for Communities and Local Government. (2008). All-Party Inquiry into Antisemitism: Government Response, One year on Progress Report. Retrieved from http://www.official-documents.gov.uk/document/cm73/7381/7381.pdf.

Monitoring Group. (2008). Website. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from http://www.monitoring-group.co.uk/.

Moss, L. (2005). Biculturalism and Cultural Diversity. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11(2), pp. 187-187.

National Assembly Against Racism (NAAR). (2008). Website. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from http://www.naar.org.uk/contact/aboutNAAR.asp.

Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister. (2005). A Racial Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland, 2005-2010. http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/race-equality-strategy.pdf.

Payne, Charles. (1995). *I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Racial Equality Standard for Professional Football Clubs. Racism: Let's Kick It out of Football. (2008). Website. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from www.kickitout.org.

Racial Incident Multi Agency Panel Angus (RIMAP). (2005). Policy Statement and Working Practices. http://www.angus.gov.uk/bestvalue/consultation/objectives/PSand%20WPdraft.pdf.

Racial Incident Multi Agency Panel Angus (RIMAP). (2006). Annual Report 2005-06. Retrieved from http://www.angus.gov.uk/ac/documents/RIMAPAnnualReport0506.pdf.

Runnymede Trust. (2004). Briefing Paper, Realizing the Vision: Progress and Further Challenges. http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/RealisingTheVision.pdf.

Runnymede Trust. (2008). Website. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from www.runnymedetrust.org.

Sachdev, Darshan. (2002). Are We Listening Yet? Working with minority ethnic communities—some models of practice—Summary. Retrieved from http://www.barnardos.org.uk/resources.

Scott Porter Research and Marketing, Ltd. (2001). Sport and Ethnic Minority Communities: Aiming at Social Inclusion. Research report no. 78. Retrieved from www.**sports**cotland.org.uk/pages/download.aspx?id=%7BBF196946-5B05-4EF4-B61C-C7993841B7A8%7D.

Short, Geoffrey. (1999). Antiracist Education and Moral Behavior: lessons learned from the Holocaust. *Journal of Moral Education* Vo. 28 (1), pgs 49-62.

Sport Against Racism Ireland (SARI). (2008). Website. Retrieved November 8, 2008, from http://www.sari.ie/sarisite/index.php.

Sport England. (2008). Best practice in sport equity. Retrieved from http://www.sportengland.org/equality_best_practice.htm.

Statistics Canada. (2003). *Diversity Survey: portrait of a multicultural society*. Ottawa: Government of Canada. http://dsp-psd.tpsgc.gc.ca/Collection/Statcan/89-593-X/89-593-XIE2003001.pdf, accessed Nov. 6, 2008.

Stop Hate UK. (2008). Website. Retrieved November 11, 2008, from http://www.stophateuk.org/.

Sunderland Partnership. (2007). Good practice. Retrieved from http://www.sunderland-arch.org.uk/practics.asp.

Thomas, Paul. (2007). Moving on from "Anti-Racism"? Understanding of "Community Cohesion" held by Youth Workers. *Journal of Social Policy* Vol. 36 (3), pgs 435-455.

Turney, Laura, Ian Law and Debbie Phillips. (2002). Institutional Racism in Higher Education Toolkit Project: Building the Anti-Racist HEI. Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/cers/toolkit/toolkit.htm.

Voice East Midlands. (2006). Project Review and Evaluation: East Midlands Black and Minority Ethnic Sports Programme. Retrieved from http://www.voice-em.org.uk/documents/Regional_BME_Sports_Project___Review___Evaluation.doc.

Ward, C. and Masgoret, A. (2008). Attitudes Toward Immigrants, Immigration, and Multiculturalism in New Zealand: A Social Psychological Analysis. *International Migration Review* 42(1), pp. 227-248.

Winkler, Beate. (2007). Looking forward to the Future: Europe's Societies are Undergoing Change. *UN Chronicle* (3), pgs 31-33. Retrieved from www.un.org/chronicle.

Wood, P. and Gilbert, L. (2005). Multiculturalism in Canada: Accidental Discourse, Alternative Vision, Urban Practice. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Vol. 29.3, Sept. 2005, pp. 679-91.