

Centro de Estudos Sociais, Portugal

WP4 Summary Report

Cross-national comparative/contrastive analysis

WP4 aimed to compare and contrast findings contained in national reports on official documents collected within WP3.

The objectives of the present work package include

- to map the converging and diverging aspects between national documents with regard to intercultural education;
- to detect the gaps in the documents above with regard to intercultural education;
- to identify main guidelines for classroom activities and for the implementation of projects in this area;
- to identify the needs for teacher development programmes.

In order to achieve these goals, partners agreed on the methodology to be applied. Three levels of analysis were agreed upon: chronological analysis, conceptual analysis and strategies/tools analysis. The Portuguese team decided to work on the conceptual analysis, of which we give a short account.

In order to develop this work, a list of concepts were extracted from the previous WP2 and WP3 reports and corresponding documents: those concepts indicated in guidelines for WP3 (namely Identity, Multi-/Inter-cultural, Diversity, Democracy, National(ism), Patriotism, (In)Equality, Peace, Justice, Race/ism, Ethnicity, Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, (In)Tolerance, Responsibility(ies), Rights, Duties, etc.), as well as the most frequently recurring concepts in national reports, which seemed relevant to an analysis of the intercultural dimension in education.

The most frequently recurring concepts in each national report and documents turned out to be:

a) Denmark

Democracy, Intercultural/International, Freedom, (In)equality and Participation;

b) Portugal

Integration, Solidarity, Difference, Democracy, Respect and Diversity;

c) Spain

Democracy, Critical Spirit, (In)equality, Pluralism, (In)tolerance and Solidarity.

d) UK

Democracy, Participation, Respect, International; Freedom, Critical

Many of these recurring concepts are related to citizenship and intercultural relations, mainly 'Respect', 'Difference', 'Diversity', 'Pluralism', 'Solidarity', '(In)equality', '(In)tolerance' and 'Intercultural'. Denmark is the only country where 'Intercultural' (and 'International' as synonym) is a top recurring

concept. However, we believe that by contrasting the four lists of concepts, in spite of the presence of the ‘Intercultural’ concept, the most popular concepts in the analysed Danish documents and the British documents are more focused on **democratic citizenship** (e.g. ‘Democracy’, ‘Freedom’, and ‘Participation’), while, in spite of being implicit, concepts in the examined Spanish and, especially, Portuguese documents are more closely related to **intercultural citizenship** (e.g. ‘Integration’, ‘Difference’, ‘Respect’, ‘Diversity’, ‘Pluralism’, ‘Critical Spirit’ and ‘(In)tolerance’).

Despite the fact that the above-mentioned concepts are the most recurrent, the WP4 report considered them among other concepts within ethnic, cultural, and political dimensions. The attribution of a concept to one of the dimensions was agreed at the Portuguese team meeting in November, 2005, as follows:

Ethnic dimension:	Political dimension	Cultural dimension
Nationalism	Democracy	Identity
Xenophobia	(In)Equality	Multicultural
(In)Tolerance	Justice	Intercultural
Race/ism	Responsibility/ies	Ethnicity
Discrimination	Rights/Duties	Diversity
Exclusion	Peace	International(isation)
Integration	Freedom	Difference
Patriotism	Empowerment	Pluralism
Islamophobia	Universalism	Critical spirit
Anti-semitism	Humanism	
	Solidarity	
	Respect	
	Participation	

a) Ethnic dimension

A striking contrast can be observed in distribution of the concepts within the dimension between the participant countries’ education policies. Thus, whereas the Portuguese policies seem to highlight ethnic

dimension of citizenship education, since ‘integration’ is the top recurrent concept in the Portuguese documents, only minimal presence of this dimension in the analysed Danish documents should be noted. This fact becomes even more significant if one is to consider that ‘integration’ does not appear in the Danish documents at all. Furthermore, while **Britain and Denmark are concerned about negative implications of ethnic differences (exclusion/discrimination)**, Portugal and Spain seem to invest into an inclusive tendency, towards integration and access to participation for ethnically different populations. However, the Spanish and Portuguese policies take somewhat different paths: **Spain seems to focus more on the moral issues (solidarity, tolerance), whereas Portugal appears to stress the identity issues.** Indeed, throughout the countries, the scopes of ‘nation(alism)’, ‘tolerance’ and ‘integration’ constitute the most contested areas within this dimension. That is, whereas the examined Spanish and Danish documents try to avoid the talk of national identity, stressing the importance of distinguishing between ‘nation’ and ‘nationalism’, the same concept (‘nation’) in the British and Portuguese documents is discussed in terms of the national identity construction. In this process, **the British policies emphasise its complexity in the diverse society, and the Portuguese policies point to humanism and solidarity as possible solutions.**

‘Tolerance’ represents another debated concept, in spite of the fact that its orientation is commonly interpreted as being directed towards the Other (who is specified in the British and Portuguese texts to belong to minorities). On the one hand, majorities in Britain are to tolerate minorities in order to create the common citizenship; minorities, in their turn, are not asked to tolerate majorities. On the other hand, Spain and Portugal seek to construct a dialogue between different cultures, which will be based on tolerance and solidarity.

As for ‘integration’, if we are to compare its meaning in the national policies of the participant countries, it emerges as a matter of heated discussion among them. A range of interpretations goes from the attested lack of acknowledgement within the Danish educational guidelines to its utmost importance for the Portuguese education. According to the analysed British educational guidelines, integration seems to be restricted to minorities implying a greater effort on their part, whereas in Portugal and Spain its scope goes beyond immigrants and members of minorities, since lifelong learning is the central aspect of their national systems of education. **Integration thus becomes the main aim of education in Portugal, being equivalent to education for all.**

Some concepts within the ethnic dimension appear to be ‘uncomfortable’ in the national educational policies. For example, ‘patriotism’, ‘islamophobia’ and ‘anti-Semitism’ are controversial to the extent of being excluded from the curricula in most of the participant countries. This is probably due to the fact that, as they represent particular forms of xenophobia and discrimination, islamophobia and anti-Semitism

may be dealt with when discussing these issues with students. It would seem impossible in the Danish case, though, as these thematic areas are not present in the curricula at all. As for ‘patriotism’, its meaning appears to be somewhat compromised in the context of a diverse society, that is, if “common citizenship” is yet to be constructed, what is there to be patriotic about, what constitutes the binding reference?

b) Political dimension

Educational policies of the participant countries appear to converge in this dimension, if one is to consider the amount of emphasis placed on certain concepts (‘democracy’, ‘participation’, ‘freedom’, and ‘respect’). However, if one takes a closer look at the interpretations of the same concepts, there is a clear divide in the national orientations. Thus, whereas Spanish, British and Danish policies are geared towards democratic citizenship, **‘democracy’ may mean different things within each country’ documents**. Spain, Britain and Portugal highlight the importance of ‘participation’ in democracy; Danish policies consider democracy as a basic community culture, which includes participation, responsibility and freedom. Besides, **the examined Danish and British guidelines differ from Spanish and Portuguese ones in that they stress political participation, participation in institutions. Portuguese and Spanish policies, though, accentuate the dialogue between different points of view, which include those originating in differing cultures (as in the Portuguese case).**

This point is confirmed by the apparent contrast between the strong presence of ‘empowerment’ in the Danish and British documents and its absence in the Portuguese and Spanish reports. Empowerment is educated through the active and informed participation in the democratic society, which is encapsulated in the notion of “political literacy”, central to the British curriculum guidelines. Dialogue in the Spanish and Portuguese model of democratic participation seems to be based on a different type of values, namely on European values of humanism and universally shared human rights, which are either absent or barely considered within the Danish and British curricula.

Given the main aim of bringing up engaged citizens in order to secure democracy (QCA, 1998), **‘participation’ receives greater attention in the British guidelines**. Compared to other project participant countries, it means **not only being civically involved** (for example, in volunteering activities, as in the Spanish case), **but also includes being knowledgeable of the possible spheres of intervention**, which are not restricted to students’ community and school (as it is in the case of the other participants) but may encompass the UK, Europe and the world. Furthermore, while other countries focus on the parental and students’ participation in the school and community activities, the British policies remind that community members should also have their say in schools.

Particularly interesting division can be observed in the interpretations of the concepts ‘peace’ and ‘respect’.

National educational policies of the four countries aim at peaceful intercultural relations, even though the means of achieving the peace are different. Thus, while in the Portuguese and Spanish cases it implies the process of constructing plurality and mutual understanding, through solidarity and respect of cultural, linguistic and religious differences, in the British and Danish cases newly educated citizens are to rely on the rule of law, thus reinforcing their skills of political debate and negotiation, and to turn to the authorities. Moreover, the interpretation of the concept 'respect' in some of the participant countries' guidelines, perhaps unwillingly, further divides minorities and majorities: whereas in Denmark and Britain immigrants and ethnic minorities are expected to respect the law and justice (created by the powerful majority), in Spain and Portugal it is the culture and identity of immigrants and minorities that should be respected, in order to arrive to mutual understanding. This fact is somewhat contradicted by the emphasis on equal participation in the diverse societies of the four countries, especially by the absence of 'inequality' as a concept within the Danish curriculum.

c) Cultural dimension

Just like in the previous group of concepts, there is a visible difference between the national interpretations of the key terms within this dimension. First, when discussing questions of identity, **the Spanish and Portuguese documents talk openly about national Portuguese and Spanish identity, individual and collective, focusing on its multicultural and multilingual nature. The analysed British and Danish documents also view 'identity' as multicultural, but they do not mention 'national identity', stressing changeability of every kind of identity.** Furthermore, **the British policies point out that the British national identity needs to evolve towards a more inclusive of the country's cultural, linguistic and religious diversity. Citizenship education through active engagement represents a means of construction of this type of identity.**

However, the process of identity construction in a multicultural society (which is considered to be the characteristic of the national societies in the UK, Denmark and Spain) is presented as problematic though a potentially enriching experience. Even though Portugal and Denmark in their educational policies stress the right to be different, those differences can be reconciled in various ways: in Denmark, pupils are given the opportunity to 'experience diversity' and 'raise their cultural awareness' in order to empower minorities, provide an equal participation; Portuguese policies use differentiated pedagogy and promote intercultural education in order to construct a dialogue, respect differences and integrate ethnic minorities and immigrants into the society. On the face of it, those methods appear to pursue similar objectives, but a closer look reveals that the emphasis is placed differently by the national policies. **In Denmark, a greater attention is assigned to acquiring intercultural competencies within the Languages, History and Civics curricula. In Portugal, a cross-curricular approach is taken, complemented with specific**

educational projects, oriented towards creating a more inclusive democratic school.

According to the Spanish team report, the question of differences as such is not foregrounded within the school curricula, being to some extent compensated by reflecting on ‘ethnicity’ and ‘diversity’. The British team report criticises the documents issued by the national curriculum authorities for presenting differences in such a way that their enriching potential is outweighed by the connection with problems, conflicts and difficulties. Furthermore, **the British policies diverge from the Portuguese and Spanish policies: whereas in the latter differences are mediated by establishing an intercultural dialogue, in the former they are to be mediated politically, by way of negotiations, political debate and legal proceedings.**

Another particularly interesting divergence is observed in the interpretation of the term ‘**intercultural**’. **The term is not discussed in the analysed British documents, and according to the British report, indeed is not familiar to the local curriculum authorities. In the Spanish case, it is presented as a characteristic of communication within the European landscape. The Portuguese documents examine it through the prism of multicultural education, promoted by exchange programmes, as well as aiming at integration of ethnic minorities and immigrants. In the Danish case, ‘intercultural’ is one of the most recurrent concepts and is often used interchangeably with ‘international’.** Intercultural competence is something that students and teachers should have in order to compete successfully at an international level, and it is acquired through participating in international exchange programmes. Given the fact that the British policies also foster active international engagement of students, and that neither the Spanish nor Portuguese documents mention it, one can conclude that the educational policies in Denmark and Britain diverge from those in Portugal in Spain by their international rather than intercultural orientation. Two questions arise from these conclusions:

- 1) Given the British and Danish context, does the scope of ‘intercultural’ lie outside the country, while ‘multicultural’ applies to the national situation?
- 2) In the Portuguese and Spanish context, is the scope of ‘intercultural’ broader, and includes both the national situation and relations outside the country, implying the relations between the groups of different cultures? ‘Multicultural’ then would appear to state the existence of diversity.

Answers to these questions may emerge from the analysis at later stages of the research, in the course of the empirical study, especially in the course of teacher interviews.

A path towards common citizenship involves, for the policies of the most participant countries, developing critical attitude. However, the target of critical reflection varies from country to country, that is, whereas British pupils are expected to interpret critically every evidence they come across, students in Spain and Portugal are to assess critically one’s own culture as well. The apparent divide between the critical attitude

towards information and knowledge vs. towards one's own values seems to be a clear indication that education in Spain and Portugal is meant to be inclusive, where there is a dialogue of values and cultures.

d) Overall conclusions

The final section of the conclusions draws a line on the analysis, bearing in mind the conclusions from the previous sections while focusing on the contrast between the strongest components and absent ones, both within and across the national policies in education. The layout of the table below will help to consider the most prominent aspects within each country's national policy, as well as to compare the use of the certain concept across the countries. Moreover, its graphic presentation will allow us to see which dimensions are emphasised, again within and across the countries. It should be noted that the following table focuses more on the division between the most frequent vs. absent concepts, given that the more detailed analysis was attempted in the previous sections.

The table below will use the following graphic conventions, based on the distribution range:

0	absent
	present
	6 th recurrent
	5 th recurrent
	4 th recurrent
	3 rd recurrent
	2 nd recurrent
	Top recurrent

OVERALL PICTURE (most recurrent vs. absent concepts in documents)					
		Denmark	Britain	Spain	Portugal
Ethnic dimension	Integration	0			
	Tolerance				
Cultural dimension	International (intercultural)			0	0
	Difference			0	
	Diversity				
	Critical Spirit	0			
	Pluralism	0			
	Political dimension	Democracy			
Freedom					
Equality					
Participation					
Solidarity		0			
Respect					

First of all, of the four participant countries, **the UK appears to take the most pronounced political stand in citizenship education, whereas Spain and Portugal apply a more varied approach**, using concepts from all the dimensions. At the same time, **Portugal's interests in education seem to be the**

least political of all. Neither Denmark nor Britain emphasises ethnic dimension, despite the fact that it is present in the official guidelines of these countries.

Second, **neither Spanish nor Portuguese policies appear to be oriented towards international level of interaction, they rather concern intercultural relations inside the country, community, or school.** This is confirmed by the fact that integration and solidarity are clearly in focus of the Portuguese educational policies. In contrast, neither British nor Danish policies consider solidarity as the basis for the construction of intercultural dialogue or active citizenship. The great amount of participation in Britain and Denmark has to do with political involvement at different levels. Therefore, as it was stated above, the balance in intercultural relationships in those countries is often reached by reinforcement of the rule of law and respect for official authorities and political institutions.

Overall, it seems that **the national educational policies of Spain, Portugal and Britain are geared towards constructing a more inclusive model of citizenship**, based on plurality and critical attitude towards diversity. However, **the policies choose different means of achieving the common goal: whereas Britain's path goes through participation, Spanish and Portuguese – through understanding.**