_____

Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe's Future

_____

**CHIEF (Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe's Future)
Grant agreement no: 770464**

**WP: 1 Theoretical Design & Policy Review
Deliverable: 1.4 Cross-national Comparison of Educational Policies and
Curricula**

Authors	Eleni Stamou, Gary Fooks, Elina Marmer, Tina Zurabishvili		
Editors	Gary Fooks		
Version	1.0		
Date	10th May 2019		
Work Package	Theoretical Design & Policy Review		
Deliverable	1.4		
Dissemination level	Public		
WP Leaders	Eleni Stamou, Gary Fooks, Elina Marmer, Tina Zurabishvili		
Deliverable Date	10th May 2019		
Document history			
Version	Date	Comments	Modified by

Contents

1. Introduction

The aim of this report is to enhance understandings of cultural literacy in formal educational settings by providing a comparative overview of approaches and implementations across the nine CHIEF countries (including Germany, UK, Spain, Latvia, Slovakia, Croatia, Georgia, Turkey and India). To this end, the report brings together the current, dominant approaches to cultural literacy and issues arising from their implementation. The report builds on the findings of the national cultural/educational policy reviews and sets them alongside the findings of the national curriculum reviews, to build a comparative overview of the interconnections between the policy frameworks and curriculum guidelines within and across the nine different countries.

The findings are organised under six sections, representing the main thematic categories identified in the policy and curriculum reports. These include the discussion of cultural literacy as a concept and the alternative terms used in meeting related objectives as well as the themes of cultural heritage, national culture and identities, Europe, language, religion and history, post-socialism, and post-imperialism.

2. Method

The report builds on the research findings of the reviews produced as part of Work Packages (WP) 1 and 2. The former included a systematic review of 194 policy documents across the nine CHIEF countries (D.1.2). The reviews of the secondary education curricula covered a total of 107 documents (D.2.1). Drawing on the research findings of WP1 and WP2 a thematic synthesis (Thomas and Harden, 2008) was carried out to identify and discuss key messages of policy contexts and curriculum guidelines and their interconnections across the nine CHIEF countries.

The findings of the policy reports and the curriculum analyses indicate the significance of the contextual conditions in education policy developments and the formation of curriculum guidelines. The socio-economic and political contexts vary greatly across the nine CHIEF countries, with different forces shaping developments in cultural literacy education. In order to achieve the objectives of this report while also embracing the diversity of the country experiences, a thematic synthesis was carried out following the steps outlined by Thomas and Harden (2008).

We initially conducted free coding of the reported findings in NVIVO. The three researchers involved in this stage, carried-out open coding of the policy and curricula reports of three selected countries. They then exchanged, cross checked and discussed the codes to develop a coding frame (please see Appendix 1).

This coding frame was used to code the policy and curricula reviews of the six remaining countries in successive stages. Upon completing the coding of each country report, the researchers discussed issues emerging from the use of the coding frame and reflected on its effectiveness. On this basis, certain codes were further elaborated based on researchers feedback and observations. Rather than being used rigidly, the coding frame was used flexibly and reflectively, allowing space for feedback and further modification. Upon the completion of the coding process, similar codes were grouped into descriptive themes. These descriptive themes were further merged, based on the proximity of their content to inform the structure of the report (leading to the generation of analytical themes beyond the descriptive themes).

One of the main challenges, which occurred during the coding process, was related to the diversity of the content of country reports. This was exacerbated by the inductive research approach followed in the review, analysis and reporting of policies and curricula. As a result, some themes (and respective codes) were particularly relevant for some countries more than others. In turn some of the codes generated significantly more rich content in some country-cases than others. To limit this effect, the researchers remained in communication throughout the coding process to discuss instances where codes would have limited relevance for certain countries and significant relevance for others. After consultation, the research team agreed that this variation would inevitably be reflected in the present report, therefore indicating the diversity among the CHIEF countries' contexts, histories and current developments, as well as doing justice in depicting the various trends in cultural literacy education.

3. Findings

3.1 'Cultural Literacy' - Cultural Literacy Education

Across all the Chief countries, the findings of the policy and the curriculum reviews indicate that 'cultural literacy' is neither a well-established, nor a coherently and systematically used term, as such. One exception is identified in the Latvian culturology curriculum, which explicitly promotes cultural literacy by focussing on "various cultural theory issues related to the understanding of the concept of culture, its importance in society, as well as the emergence, functioning and interaction of different cultures in the world" (D.2.1 Latvia). The approach to the concept in Catalonia is more typical. As reported by the Catalan National policy review, cultural literacy is not used explicitly in Catalan or Spanish.

Instead, in Catalonia and other CHIEF countries, issues related to the provision of cultural literacy education fall into the remit of policy objectives and curriculum guidance regarding intercultural or multicultural education, history education, human rights and civic education, language policy and religious education. In the following section we provide a comparative overview of the various pedagogic terms and approaches deployed in policy documents to refer to the provision of cultural literacy in the nine Chief countries. We discuss these by paying specific attention to the objectives and the conceptualisation of cultural literacy underpinning them, whenever these are available.

Cultural education has experienced a boom in Germany, which is strongly reflected in the policy documents. It was conceived as a key remedy to improve Germany's overall low performance in the OECD international comparative tests (PISA). Cultural education is considered important for "the emotional and social development of young people", a "key component of general efforts to integrate communal responsibility into all aspects of education", to "promote social cohesion by conveying traditions, knowledge and values", to "enable an active and responsible participation in a democratic and diverse society" and finally to "foster equal opportunities of the marginalized groups". Cultural education is foremost understood to increase societal as well as cultural participation of all. Formal education however, does not seem to have picked up that message, at least not in the Hamburg city-state. Here, cultural literacy is conceptualized only in (non-mandatory) Ancient Language (Latin, Greek) curricula and defined as the "ability to reflect on one's own cosmos of experiences by the means of communicating with history" (cited in D.2.1 Germany).

In other countries, intercultural education is often described as a framework within which cultural literacy educational objectives are met. In Croatia, existing policies regarding intercultural education mainly focus on ethnic minority populations and centre on language learning. In the revised Croatian curriculum, the scope of inter-culturalism is wider, with the establishment of intercultural competence as a key educational objective. This emphasis is underpinned by an understanding of Croatian culture 'as a result of complex interactions between majority and minority cultures, religions, traditions, and behavioural patterns' (D.2.1) and highlights the role of schools in building-up pupils' cross-cultural knowledge and communication skills. The Catalan documents, although clearly Euro-centric, stress the understanding of multiculturalism as a wealth of societies, and highlight the importance of pupils overcoming stereotypes and prejudices (D.2.1). In the policy documents, "educational discourse combines the affirmation of national identity with respect for cultural diversity" (D.1.2). Community cohesion is cited as one of the important goals for developing such respect.

In the context of intercultural education, Hamburg (German) curricula conceptualize culture in a fluid, pluralistic and more inclusive way: societies are considered to consist of "a plurality of constantly changing cultures […] determined by the social milieu, the geographic region, gender, generation, belief, sexual orientation etc." (Cited in D.2.1 Germany). Multiple belonging is acknowledged as the way individuals "contribute different facets of their cultural imprint to different situations". The Hamburg report notes critically that this promising definition stands alone and is not incorporated anywhere else in the curricula. Instead, intercultural education emphasizes difference and comparisons, often manifesting rigid boundaries and exclusion.

While the issue of cultural diversity is present in the Georgian National curriculum, the focus is less on the potential of inter-culturalism for community cohesion and more on the goal of developing tolerance and respect towards 'others': "fostering tolerance and respect for human dignity and human rights are highlighted several times in the aims and objectives of teaching social sciences" (D.2.1). The latter, though, is in contrast with a number of research findings indicating the "existence of practices within schooling which are likely to cement, rather than challenge, intolerant attitudes towards [minority] groups" in Georgia (D.1.2). Primary school teachers in particular, demonstrated "a limited understanding of multicultural education and its goals. A recent study on cultural education in Georgian schools confirmed these findings, concluding "that the role of school in intercultural education was relatively weak, with a limited number of in class and extracurricular activities aimed at improving intercultural knowledge and the sensitivity of students" (D.1.2).

In contrast to the cases discussed above, cultural literacy education in the UK is underscored by national expressions of culture, and references to intercultural learning in policy are, by and large, focused on achieving community cohesion rather than aiming at fostering pupils' global viewpoints. Indian cultural policy seems to go even further, with the State positioning "itself as a sort of guardian of a hegemonic Indian culture" (D.1.2). This "revival of cultural nationalism" clearly ignores the extremely rich, multicultural Indian context and such an approach leaves no room for interculturalism. Indian curricula on the other hand reflects a "constant tension" by being framed within "the spirit of patriotism and nationalism", and at the same time teaching students "how India is diverse yet unified" (D.2.1).

In Turkish and German curricula, intercultural competence is sometimes also interpreted as a means of increasing the marketability of students in a globalised world. Cultural education in Latvia is strongly oriented towards fostering a "creative society", and is linked to economic development (D.1.2).

Global education is also identified as a platform for developing an in-depth understanding of diversity, conflict and inequality. In the Slovakian context, the objectives of cultural literacy development are mainly achieved through the provision of Global Education and, to some extent, through Human Rights education. In the case of Global Education, emphasis is placed on battling stereotypes as well as on achieving positive change at national and global scale. Learning aims include the cultivation of cultural communication, tolerance and respect towards difference. The national strategy for Global education was formed collaboratively by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs. By contrast, Turkish curricula interpret Global Education in neo-liberal terms to promote technological skills and improve students' competitiveness in the global world. The report observes that the discourse has been "instrumentalised in terms of developing humans as economic resources for economic investment", "rather than rendering a social and cultural uplift in Turkey's educational context" (D.2.1 Turkey).

Human rights education, on the other hand, is predominantly underpinned by legally based approaches to cultural diversity and is focused on developing awareness and fostering respect. In Slovakia, human rights education is described in policy documents as a route to driving forward positive change by offering guidance on 'a mix of diverse ideas, convictions, values and attitudes in a modern multicultural society' (D.1.2). The provision of civic education is discussed in policy as complementing intercultural or multicultural education by fostering democratic values and attitudes and via the encouragement of active participation.

3.2 Cultural Heritage–National Culture and identity

The absence or invisibility of the term 'cultural literacy' from the policy vocabulary and the design of educational programmes does not signify an absence of policy interest in the issues that are commonly encompassed within cultural literacy education. It became apparent that alternative working concepts, such as intercultural and multicultural education, human rights education, global education etc., as well as respective policy foci and a range of educational initiatives stemming from these, are implemented across the CHIEF countries. In this respect, cultural literacy is identifiable and put into educational practice 'by proxy'. In order to further unpack this, surrogate conceptualization and operationalization of cultural literacy, we look into the approach to culture, cultural heritage and identity, as these are constructed and deployed in education policy and discourse and within the school curricula.

Across all the curricula reviewed, only the Spanish/Catalan curriculum provides an explicit definition of the concept of 'cultural heritage': "Cultural heritage is a

collective heritage and a valuable resource that extends from the past to the future, building relations between the different generations and helping to configure identities. In addition, it is as an anchor for memory. Every element that becomes a cultural heritage must turn into a profitable economic resource in order to be able to guarantee its conservation, preservation, and dissemination and to foster the economic development of the area" (D.2.1). According to a previous CHIEF report, in Spain, "[c]ultural heritage is understood as a dynamic concept which is not solely relevant for the historical past, and in which pupils should learn "to value the cultural heritage as an inheritance received from the past, to defend its preservation, and to encourage future generations to make it their own." It is also mentioned that it can help strengthen the culture and values of democratic citizenship, promote the role of cohesion and consensus in the construction of identity, and be used as an instrument for cultural renewal" (D.2.1).

In the rest of the countries, cultural heritage is very often discussed in conjunction with national heritage and highlighted as a platform for the preservation, protection or reproduction of national culture. Depending on each country's historical background and socio-economic context, the links between cultural heritage and national culture and identity may take different forms, with India, and its complex national/caste system, representing a highly specific case. In the case of Croatia, these links echo traceable remnants from the period when the Croatian state was not independent and the quest for establishing a common Croat identity through education was particularly pronounced. In some cases the links between cultural heritage and national culture, have been set alongside - and have thus been undermined - by definitions of Croatian culture with references to Europe and policy concerns regarding multi-culturalism. Interestingly the approach to national culture is much more open and less connected to the nation-state in the Croatian curriculum compared to how the issue is discussed in policy documents. The introduction of intercultural competency as an educational objective is accompanied by goals for establishing an understanding of 'Croatian culture as a result of complex interactions between majority and minority cultures, religions, traditions, and behavioural patterns' (D.2.1). However, the revised Croatian curriculum, which takes a significantly wider approach to cultural literacy than its predecessor, nonetheless highlights that the predominant aim of education is 'the preservation of the Croatian national identity, cultural heritage and the promotion of the Croatian language' (ibid.).

A close relation between cultural heritage and national culture is also identifiable in the case of Georgia, with scatter evidence of a more pluralistic approach to cultural heritage. A stated aim of the Georgian National curriculum is to provide a very balanced knowledge of Georgian and European/World cultural heritage. Moreover

in art classes most of the visual materials discussed are foreign works (D.2.1). However, the art curriculum encourages pupils to think about their responsibilities in protecting, primarily, Georgia's cultural heritage – and, notably, "cultural heritage" is understood rather narrowly, "as a cumulative collection of art objects" (D.2.1).

Similar instances of tension between national and global foci in the approach to cultural heritage are identified in Slovakia and Latvia. In Slovakia, this ambiguity is flagged up and discussed as generative of two opposite directions, which run through government policy: one foregrounding the global aspects of culture and identity and another prioritising their national aspects. It is argued that, 'the former transgresses the local, regional, and ethnic majoritarian approach to teaching culture, whereas the latter reduces culture to Slovak ethnicity' (D.1.2).

Ambiguity and contradictions are also identified and discussed in the case of Latvia. "Latvian culture" is officially understood as "the foundation for the unification of peoples living in Latvia". Though "Latvian culture" is often presented as constituted by historically diverse and multilingual population, the ultimate link between "Latvian culture" and the Latvian language contradicts this pluralistic notion.

In other countries, cultural heritage is more overtly or explicitly connected to national heritage. In the UK, a return to national heritage in the school curriculum is distinctive, as it mostly relates to the nationalist accent of current policy and involves a process of redefining and establishing a strong sense of British identity. These objectives occur in the context of the 'securitization' of education, which is reflected in the spillover of wider, counter-extremism strategies into the field of education policy and governance. Articulations of nationalism are evident in Turkish policy and curricula, regarding cultural heritage. In particular, culture and cultural heritage are increasingly addressed within the framework of nationalistic ideals, whereby "an Islamist tone is evident". In the case of India, references to a glorious past are there to generate national pride amongst pupils; there is, on the other hand, no specific interest to the European culture/history in the Indian curriculum (D.2.1).

Reflecting the wider historical and socio-political conditions, in the Catalan curriculum, cultural heritage is predominantly constructed to highlight local history. According to the analysis of the Catalan curriculum, "[e]xplicit references to Europe as a cultural reference and to its cultural heritage are not very abundant in comparison with the weight given to local history and cultural heritage in the curriculum" (D.2.1).

Emerging constructions of cultural heritage draw on different conceptualizations of culture. An elitist approach to culture becomes evident in the German policy documents which emphasize "high culture" as one major aspect of cultural heritage, e.g. the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation and its institutions promoting "high culture" art, architecture, literature, music etc., which is contrasted

with the notion of "mass culture", understood as a non-professional, volunteer activity. This prioritization of "high culture" is also evident in German curricula. In the UK, there is also evidence of an implicit division between high and low culture underlying the revised secondary education curriculum, with an emphasis on Shakespeare and romantic poetry as markers of high culture. Statements on education policy goals highlight the need for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds to acquire this form of culture.

Another dominant approach to culture, which emerged through the policy and curricula reviews of the CHIEF countries, is one deploying an economic perspective. In Croatia, key policy actors and documents have emphasized 'the economic potential of cultural heritage' in an endeavor to ring-fence the sector of public cultural education and learning, against fiscal contraction. This also reflects efforts to reverse what appears to be an increasing perception that culture constitutes an expenditure, rather than investment, within government. Additionally, in the Croatian policy context, a 'responsible use' of cultural heritage is discussed in relation to strategies for sustainable growth and development.

Elements of an economic approach to culture can be identified in the case of the UK as well as in Slovakia. In UK policy, there is strong evidence that culture is predominantly elevated for, and appraised in terms of, its instrumental value. This approach highlights the potential contribution of culture to the national economy and is concerned with developing skills in young people who can generate culturally-related economic value. Notwithstanding this, in the revised school curricula, there is a parallel trend towards romanticizing culture while putting forward normative, values-based approaches as well as hinting on divisions between high and low culture. In the case of Slovakia, education policy emphasizes the economic benefits in improving young people's cultural skills and individual creativity. In this context, particular attention is given to young people's entrepreneurial skills, the absence of which is regarded as limiting the market potential of creative professionals. Equally, in Latvian policy, culture is often conceived as a resource to develop creativity, which is closely linked to concepts of productivity, human capital and economic development.

3.3 Europe

There are different approaches both within policy and curricula on how Europe and European culture are conceptualized. Educational programmes in all countries cover issues related to the history of the European Union and its current structure and/or functions, although the depth and breadth in which this topic is studied depends on the age of students and the type of educational institutions. Beyond learning about the EU as an institution, the approach to 'Europe' underpinning policy and curricula varies

according to socio-economic context and history, which mediate formal accounts and dominant representations of Europe and European culture. In some cases, the European dimension of education is mostly absent, while in other cases, Europe appears to be a frame of reference for emerging notions of belonging, although considerably underplayed compared to national references.

First, the symbolic and cultural proximity or distance, between the CHIEF countries and Europe in the broad sense, is constructed differently throughout policy and curricula. Catalan documents, among others, offer a so called "ordered framework that goes from the smaller to the bigger areas: Catalonia, Spain, Europe and the world" (D.2.1). Notably though, "[e]xplicit references to Europe as a cultural reference and to its cultural heritage are not very abundant in comparison with the weight given to local history and cultural heritage in the curriculum" (ibid). Prioritization of Catalan and, then, Spanish culture should, however, come as no surprise as this is in line with direct requirements of the Spanish Constitution. The pupils are thus expected to learn to "value their own cultural expressions, to promote the construction of personal identity in a global and diverse world, and to value the cultural manifestations of Catalan identity in the framework of a global and interrelated world." At the same time, while undoubtedly focusing primarily on Catalan culture, identity etc., the documents explicitly and repeatedly emphasize that Catalonia and Spain are "a part of Europe and the world, hence, they are part of the European heritage" (D.2.1). As CHIEF's National policy review concluded, "[t]he assumption of the European context as a multicultural and multilingual dimension has clearly affected education in Catalonia and Spain" (D.1.2). Awareness of the multicultural environment results in expectations – and requirements – of respect for cultural diversity. Yet, "Europe" comes third after Catalonia and Spain, while the rest of the world, with a few notable exceptions, is effectively excluded, which is well demonstrated by the list of authors from the Catalan *Bachillerato* curriculum in literature which include mainly (male) European and a few US-American writers (of European descent).

A similar philosophy and 'graded' approach can be found in the Georgian National curriculum. While it primarily focuses on Georgian history and culture, when learning various subjects the pupils are expected to see their country within the Caucasus region, and, also, as a part of Europe and the world, thus promoting a certain "holistic worldview" (D.2.1) of the Georgian curriculum. "Teaching pupils to analyse interrelations between different cultures is one of the objectives of the curriculum. Pupils are expected to note the effect that different cultures (European cultures and Eastern cultures) have on each other and on Georgian culture, and select those artworks or literature where this effect is especially visible" (D.2.1). In contrast with Georgian Policy documents, which offer a rather narrow, Georgia-focused approach (D.1.2), the

Georgian National curriculum is of a more cosmopolitan character: "in respect to virtually all subjects covered in this report, students are encouraged to look beyond Georgia, and compare the situation in Georgia with the situation in other countries. Georgia is regularly considered a part of the Caucasus, Europe, the World, and/or is presented as a (geographic) link between Europe and Asia" (D.2.1).

Europe, as a frame of reference underlying definitions of cultural belonging, is more pronounced in the educational contexts of Croatia and Slovakia. The new Croatian curriculum represents a clear attempt to define Croatia as inextricably connected to Europe in terms of both history and culture. On the one hand, there is a focus on establishing Croatia as a key member of the central European region in geographical terms, from a regional development viewpoint. Additionally in ethno-cultural terms Croatian culture is presented as an integral part of a 'pan-Central European culture' (D.2.1). For example, in the social sciences and humanities curriculum, Croatian society is presented as part of the "European cultural circle" (D.2.1). Here, references to European culture signify advocacy for 'modern democratic values' (ibid). Several reported examples from the Croatian curriculum indicate that the stated aim of education is to develop a sense of belonging to the 'Croatian homeland' along with fostering a sense of belonging to the European civilization. In practice, the process of establishing a close link between Croatian national identity and European identity is achieved through a strong focus on fostering democratic citizenship, which is regarded as a precondition for European integration and stability.

In a similar manner, ideas about Europe and European culture are prominent in the Slovakian curriculum. Europe is often constructed with reference to 'humanistic values of Europe'. The idea of Europe in the Slovak curriculum is also evoked in relation to the development of key competences for becoming a 'modern European and a democratic citizen prepared for a life in the united Europe' (D.2.1). In this context, objectives highlight the importance of language learning as well as supporting youth mobility and in general put forward the need for adopting 'a more open approach' towards young people.

In Germany and in the UK, the links between Europe and cultural belonging are significantly weaker and mainly draw on historical perspectives. Manifestations of Europe in the German context can be illustrated by how policy and curricula approach the relationship between cultural education and history. According to both the policy and curricula reviews, "cultural education in Germany has a strong link to historical education", and "the ancient languages (i.e. Latin and Greek) are the only subjects that explicitly mention European culture as one of the main contents of their curriculum" (D.2.1). Importantly, neither subject is compulsory. The concept of Roman and Greek heritage as central to the European culture raises a key issues relevant to understanding

the interdependencies between cultural literacy and inclusion, e.g. the fact that "[c]ultural influences through migrations, crusades, colonialism and capitalism, among other factors that made and are still making European culture, are not recognized" (D.2.1). The German history curriculum touches upon the "conflict between universalism, Eurocentrism and cultural relativism" but it remains unclear how these terms are defined and which paradigms are to be applied. However, claims of German identity being a part of the European identity are relatively vague (D.1.2). Moreover, the former "is often assumed to be in a kind of tension" with the identities of migrants, refugees and/or Muslims, which have not yet been officially integrated into the concept (ibid). Finally, the protection of German cultural heritage outside the country – mainly in the East European territories lost after the WWII, but also Italy and France – are regarded important for the sake of European identity (ibid.).

Similarly, in the UK, references to Europe are mainly identified in the English curriculum, while the so-called European dimension of education, especially in terms of culture, is broadly absent. The history curriculum offers some exceptions to this general position where the Renaissance and the Enlightenment are included in the history of art and culture and the Reformation is considered part of religious history. Additionally, aspects of the social history of Europe are addressed in the study of the two World Wars and the Holocaust. References to Europe in the context of art history foreground 'a version of the history of art dominated by learning about the main cultural and artistic developments in Europe and their effect upon British cultural history' (D.2.1). Approaches to cultural history foreground a top-down perspective while largely omitting references to the social histories of local and regional communities.

In India, references to Europe are weak and are mainly included in the teaching of history. Learning about certain aspects of European history, such as Renaissance or revolutions aims to widen the historical perspective of pupils through knowledge about "the contributions made by various cultures to the total heritage of human kind" (D.1.2). In this respect, learning about European philosophers and civilisations is framed in terms of gaining insight into different 'western cultures' (ibid).

In Turkey, in the recent past, concepts of Europe and European belonging provided the context, as well as the legitimacy, for the implementation of particular education policies. As a result of the accession negotiations with the EU, programmes and policies with inclusive interpretations of culture, literacy and heritage have been widely implemented. In practice, these interpretations are constructed within "a neo-liberal subjectivity" which emphasizes the need for individuals to "compete in a high-skilled global economy" (D.1.2). Although several programmes now run successfully and are widely accepted, there has been a shift in recent years towards more nationalist, traditional and religious understandings of culture (ibid.). Turkish curricula

development reflects this trend. In 2005, "competences", based on the EU educational approach, have been introduced along with "skills and values". However, the renewed curricula for the school year 2018/19 has put greater emphasis on "values education", specifically "national values" (D.2.1), with religion being the main reference point of these values. European cultural heritage is mainly addressed through thinkers and scientists in the curricula. Though Europe figures in a number of subjects, its presentation is perceived as narrow and shallow (ibid.)

3.4 Language

Lingual diversity is common in each of the CHIEF countries/regions. Formal educational approaches and policy priorities regarding the management of this diversity encapsulate understandings of cultural identity, pluralism and participation while also reflecting a country/region's specific socio-demography and history. Throughout the policy and curricula reviews, a number of tensions emerge around a focus on national language as a pillar of national identity on the one hand, and multilingualism on the other. Issues of participation are central to language and diversity management policies and appear to be evoked in educational discourse in two ways: one that is related to the inclusion of ethnic minorities and one that is concerned with enhancing young people's mobility and marketability.

Few countries' curricula privilege multilingualism, with the exception of India, where it is recognized as a "resource for the enrichment of school life" (D.2.1). However, there is no consensus on whether school education should be provided in English. Considerable tensions persist within the country around the official language as medium of instruction and the role of English as both "colonial baggage" and the "language of the world" which can potentially ensure "marketability of students" (ibid.).

In Croatia, policy commitment to multilingualism seems to be strong, yet it is discussed as being overshadowed by a focus on national language as key component of national identity. The Croatian review identifies three models of educational provision for minority population, whose first language is not Croatian, but describes them as being based on 'liberal cultural separatism'. This refers to policy concerns with teaching minority pupils their first language, in a way that leads majority and minority cultures developing in parallel 'rather than within, a more expansive, pluralist national identity and culture' (D.2.1). It is also noted that these approaches 'reduce the pressure to teach the Croat majority about the culture and identities of national minorities' (ibid) and fail to reduce social distances in this respect. Additionally, it is highlighted that Croatian language is still understood as a 'bastion' of national identity despite the

incorporation of intercultural competence as an educational objective of the Croatian curriculum,

By contrast, German policy documents consider "our common German language" as key to participation, but rarely address lingual barriers to participation, (D.1.2). This is reflected in school curricula, which put great emphasis on German language proficiency. An option for students to take additional classes in their first language is offered to those whose first language is not German, but this is justified on the basis that proficiency in a first language helps students to master German (D.2.1). In terms of foreign languages offered (European and colonial), priority is placed on 'marketability': "as a way to increase participation in the global world for private contacts, professional mobility, further education and international cooperation".

Equally, in Slovakia, the role of language in national integration is stressed, indicating it as key in fostering national belonging as well as establishing affinities with other ethnic/linguistic groups. Language learning is also described as a key competence for the type of democratic participation required in modern European contexts, while language learning is linked to enhancing mobility across Europe.

A focus on language as a key site of intervention in order to achieve inclusion and raise the participation of ethnic minority population is a common ground of policy across the CHIEF counties. In Latvia, while currently minority schools use their respective languages as the language of instruction, with Latvian as a compulsory second language, which is an obvious characteristic of multilingualism, the current school reform aspires the introduction of Latvian as a language of instruction in all schools. The move towards monolingual education might have another "side-effect": the alignment of the bilingual and multicultural school experience of Russian-speaking students with the monolingual (and mono-cultural) majority education. However, this move is justified by the promises to ensure wider access and participation of minority students (D.2.1).

A small number of minority language schools also exist in Georgia, but the government receives a lot of criticism, due to lack of resources, poor quality of translated textbooks and lack of qualified teachers, resulting in a significantly lower quality of education and success rate of graduates. The Georgian National Curriculum largely ignores the ethnic diversity of Georgia, even though the diversity of world cultures is highly appreciated (D.2.1).

An alternative approach to combining language teaching and diversity has been proposed in Spain recently. A new model of teaching languages to the children of international migrants was put forward, introducing what was described as "pluri-lingualism". According to these proposals, the first languages of the children of

international migrants will be incorporated into the mainstream education and will be taught along with English and other foreign languages.

Beyond issues of language policy and diversity management, the overall approach to language, emerging through the policy and curricula of the CHIEF countries, is underpinned by elements of nationalism. Latvia, a de facto multilingual country, is mainly concerned with preserving and developing the Latvian language. Officially, "the Latvian language and culture should be regarded as the foundation for the unification of peoples living in Latvia" (D.1.2). Language and culture are treated as if they were synonymous, relating "national culture" to the majority language (Latvian). This is reflected in the curricula, which are primarily concerned with proficiency in the Latvian language for all students (D.2.1).

In UK policy, language has until recently only been attributed significance to national identity in Wales where it has been evoked as a marker of the distinctiveness of Welsh identity and a means of drawing boundaries with British or English identities. However, in the revised English curriculum, language is approached as an instrument in developing a renewed sense of national belonging, while literature is deployed as a means of fostering a sense of national heritage.

Turkish policy documents present the Turkish language as "one of the most important and valuable treasures' of humanity" (D.1.2). The fact that Turkish is also perceived to be under threat underpins efforts to ensure that young generations learn old Turkish (ibid.) and for the Turkish language to be taught to young Turks living abroad diaspora, forming the "geography of the hearts" by expanding the understanding of cultural space beyond the country's boarders (ibid.) Turkish curricula distinguish between Turkish language and foreign languages while minority languages are only taught at private schools (D.2.1). This emphasis on the Turkish language is arguably at the core of the essentialist approach to national identity in school curricula, which does not reflect the country's lingual (religious, ethnic etc.) diversity (idib.).

Legally, Catalonia has two official languages that are supposed to be equally important: Spanish and Catalan. Catalan is, however, the (main) language of education in Catalonia. While there is no specific policy for the Spanish language in Catalonia, it is taught universally, and there is a belief that pupils learn both languages fluently. They have "the right and the duty to know the Catalan language and the Spanish language at the end of compulsory schooling" (D.1.2). Still, there is a de-facto dominance of the Catalan language.

3.5 Religious Education

In the policy documents, religion is often described as related to national

identity and national culture, while at the same time, being identified as a dimension of diversity. In this second respect, it is conceived of as an aspect of the social and cultural wealth of societies, and, at the same time, as a legal right to be protected and socially respected. The curricula review found that churches representing majority denominations were involved in the formation of religious education curricula in many CHIEF countries and that not all countries offered "Religious education" as a separate subject.

In some cases (e.g. Spain), religion is taught from a historical perspective, as pupils should be able to "understand and value our world according to the cultural roots that have shaped it" (Spain, D.2.1). This approach seems to be particularly strong in Georgia, where religion features prominently in the teaching of Georgian and World histories. Similarly, pupils in Georgia "are encouraged to perceive art in a historical, religious, economic and cultural context" (Georgia, D.2.1).

Indian discourses evolve around religious, regional and caste identities. The curricula review analyses the tensions observed between the declared educational aims of "unity through diversity" and "a clear segregation in terms of religion": most students belonging to minority religions attend schools and colleges run by religious trusts and are often viewed with suspicion (D.2.1).

A common gap is identified, between the claims of importance of religious diversity and coexistence, on the one hand, and what the curricula actually offer to the pupils, on the other hand. In the Croatian policy documents, religion is deployed as a dimension of diversity, with a focus on minority and marginalized groups, declaring the need to ensure equal access and inclusion irrespective of their minority status. However, the Croatian curriculum presents Christian religion as a key component of the Croatian national identity. Even where religion is evoked in relation to the enhancement of a common European identity, based on inter-culturalism and the respect of diversity - that is, respect of different religions - a focus on Christianity dominates.

A Euro-centric and more specifically Christiano-centric focus marks religious education teaching across several countries. In the UK, the objectives of Religious Education described in the curriculum guidelines are wide. Nevertheless recent guidance to schools makes clear that the curriculum 'needs to reflect the fact that the religious traditions in Great Britain are, in the main, Christian whilst taking account of the teachings and practices of the other principal religions represented in Great Britain' (D.2.1) Through this guidance, Christiano-centricism becomes formally institutionalised as the primary focus of religious education, while the study of other religions represented in the UK is attributed a secondary importance. This direction, while accorded to a wider turn towards enhancing a sense of Britishness, works against

the stated objective of religious education as a means of 'supporting pupils' development as world citizens' (D.2.1).

In German policy, the "Protestant Reformation is repeatedly referred to in the context of cultural heritage" (D.1.2). In one document, 15 Theses formulated to define German *Leitkultur* (German for "leading culture"), are compared to Martin Luther's 95 Theses (ibid.). While celebrating Martin Luther, aspects of Reformation, such as its implication in anti-Semitism, colonialism, racism, nationalism, misogyny etc. are concealed in the official discourse (ibd.) Non-Christian religions are usually mentioned to address "otherness": Islam or rather, Muslims solely in the context of integration, as those to be integrated into German (meaning Christian) society. The only reference to Judaism is made in the context of anti-Semitism. Despite the official separation of state and religion, it is the Protestant Church that provides the curriculum for (in the first six years compulsory) religious education, which, though acknowledging diversity and respect towards different religions, is oriented towards Christian Protestant values. The role of Christian traditions in European history is also emphasized (ibid.)

Policy objectives regarding religious diversity and respect alongside a focus on Christianity were identified in the majority of the curricula reviews. In these cases, pupils are expected to learn rather abstract ideas of respect of religious beliefs that are different from their own ones. The review of the Georgian curricula did not find any interest in teaching pupils about religious diversity in Georgia, thus pupils do not learn at schools about religions of ethnic minorities living in the country. Findings of a study conducted in Georgia demonstrated that "teachers sometimes saw their role as "putting Non-Christian students on [the] correct road" meaning that conversion of students of different religions to the "True Religion", Orthodox Christianity, was the best strategy" (D.1.2).

The concept of cultural heritage in Turkish policy and curricula is "identified with what is traditional and Islamic." (D.1.2). The Turkish-Islamic Synthesis – described by the curricula review as a "project put forward as a solution for the political conflict environment in the society" (D.2.1) – is rooted in history and entered educational discourse after the military coup of 1980. Three years later, it materialized as the first curriculum applying a Turkish-Islamic approach (ibid.). The discourse is currently facilitated further by the ruling AKP, for example by converting general high schools to imam-hatip schools (D.1.2). The new 2018/19 curricula strongly emphasize cultural identity based on "Islam & Islamic civilization and a shared historical past" (D.1.2). Religion (Sunni-Islam) is the main reference point of values and values education (D.2.1). Elective courses are almost exclusively presented "in an Islamic/nationalistic way." (D.1.2) Only the Religious Culture and Moral Education curriculum addresses other religious beliefs than Islam (D.2.1).

3.6 History, Post-colonialism, Post-national socialism and Post-socialism

Official (national) history telling is a powerful tool to the formation of ideas of identity and nation. The Modern Turkish history curriculum, for example, is "intended to reshape the young people's national emotions", when recent protest acts of the opposition are depicted as a threat to the state (D.2.1). Historical narratives can manifest power relations and foster both, nationalism and multiculturalism, having an impact on more or less inclusive (or exclusive) notions of culture. From the post-colonial perspective, histories of most of the partner countries are intertwined, but this is very differently reflected in the reviewed documents.

The issue of colonialism is most evident in the Indian report, and its treatment in curricula creates tensions and dilemmas in regard to: the role of the English language; the definitions of nation and patriotism; the conceptualisation and even naming of 'Civics'/'Political science'; the teaching of Europe; and the teaching of History with an attempt "to place India on the map of the world as an independent Nation that suffered colonisation, yet is ready to be a global actor" (D.2.1). Emancipation from the colonial past as well as recognition of its impact on contemporary India and the world are issues of constant, contemporary debate (ibid.). By contrast, in England, British colonialism is relatively peripheral to policy priorities relevant to cultural literacy. Nevertheless, the country's colonial past is accounted for, as part of the history curriculum. Topics related to different periods and themes associated with the British Empire and colonialism, are addressed throughout the programme of study in history (D.2.1). Notwithstanding this however, colonialism is framed as a strictly past phenomenon with no observable links or implications for contemporary social functions. Discussions of immigration, for example, feature in ancient and medieval history, with no explicit references to the country's imperial past. This also applies to how the multicultural composition of the British society is assessed: 'the emergence of modern multicultural Britain as a direct legacy of British imperialism and colonialism are noticeably absent in the history curriculum' (D.2.1).

Germany is a postcolonial and post national socialist as well as post-socialist country. Until recently, neither German colonial history, nor its impact on contemporary Germany was addressed in any of the official documents, reflecting the "German colonial amnesia" (D.1.2). The curricula treat colonialism accordingly – as an external phenomenon, where German colonialism and its impact on contemporary

society are absent; moreover, the term "discovery"[1] is persistently used in history curricula in reference to colonial expansion (D.2.1). More recently, the official discourse has begun to shift towards acknowledging Germany's colonial past, in the context of doubtful legitimacy of colonial artefacts owned and exhibited by major German museums that were in most cases forcefully and illegally appropriated. The use of the term "colonial…" has risen from null in 2016 (D.1.2) to 11 in updated official documents from Federal Ministry for Culture and Media (BKM) released at the end of 2018[2]. The up-dated BKM document claims that it was the Humboldt Forum[3] that has initiated the debate. It is too early to say whether and how this discursive turn will develop and whether and how it will find its way into curricula and textbooks.

By including stolen colonial artefacts in the restitution debate, a kind of connection between German colonial and national-socialist history has been established. Indeed, historians have long pointed out ideological and personal continuities, but this has so far not been the official way of interpreting history. While colonial crimes have been erased from the collective memory, Germany has prided itself for its *Erinnerungkultur* (commemoration culture), which aims to provide "an intellectual, cultural and social climate in which a recurrence [of Auschwitz] would no longer be possible"[4]. It became an important concept of post-NS West-Germany's cultural identity and education. It has however been criticized for addressing exclusively those with biographic involvement and guilt[5], whereby ignoring Jewish, Sinti, Roma and migrant learners.

The meaning of *Erinnerungskultur* has shifted since German reunification. Historical responsibility for "never again Auschwitz" now includes the crimes of "the SED-dictatorship" and extends to responsibility for "two dictatorships in one century" (D.1.2). The NS and the SED have been put on the same level in terms of national shame as well as potential threat. This is reflected in history curricula, which set up the contrast of "dictatorship" (meaning both, NS and SED regimes) vs. "democracy".

In line with national policy, the analysed West-German (Hamburg) curricula only mention East Germany in the context of SED-dictatorship or "the overcoming of

---

[1] "Discovery" has a positive connotation; the term stands for progress, thus trivialises colonial crimes and normalizes brutality and exploitation (Danielzik and Bendix, 2011).

[2] BKM (2018) Im Bund mit der Kultur. Kultur- und Medienpolitik der Bundesregierung, p. 7, 9, 23. https://www.bundesregierung.de/resource/blob/975292/735324/1f0c56735fecb2745648fbe4a0327e4e/im-bund-mit-der-kultur-26-08-2016-download-bkm-data.pdf?download=1

[3] For the relevant materials see the following: 1) debates on the Humbold-Forum by Kum'a Ndumbe III, Afrotalk TV 2014 (https://www.mangoes-and-bullets.org/no-humboldt-21-ndumbe-berliner-stadtschloss-debatte-humboldt-forum/), 2) initiative for decolonisation of German museums by Berlin Postcolonial, 2013 (http://www.no-humboldt21.de/), 3) Colonialism in the Box, postcolonial audio-guide to standing exhibition of the German History Museum in Berlin, 2013 (https://www.kolonialismusimkasten.de/).

[4] Adorno (2005)

[5] Fava (2015)

German-German separation". While some of the policy documents point to the still existing structural and social inequalities between East and West, it is nowhere considered in terms of improving access and cultural participation. Cultural practices that developed during the time of the separation seem to have suddenly disappeared" with the change in politics reflecting cultural hegemony of the West.

Latvia's post-socialist situation is well demonstrated by the policy and curricula reviews in the context of Latvian language, national culture and identity, where the "symbolic confrontation between Latvian and Russian-speaking people based on different biographical experience and different external sources of historical knowledge" (D.2.1) is strongly reflected. Latvian society seems to be polarized over the interpretation of the 20th century's events such as the proclamation of the Republic of Latvia, the Second World War, the Soviet and Nazi occupations, the collapse of the USSR etc. Issues relating to language and ethnicity have given rise to disagreements, which are being used by various political movements for political gain, worsening relations between the Latvian-speaking and Russian-speaking population. At the level of official state cultural policy, a clear preference is given to promoting Latvian language and national (D.2.1). This is justified with reference to the marginalization of Latvian language and culture during the Soviet era and the central role of language and culture in creating Latvia's national identity. This is reflected in education reform, which has introduced Latvian as the language of instruction in Russian schools (D.2.1). Another effect of the reform will be the alignment of the bilingual and multicultural school experience of Russian-speaking students with the monolingual (and monocultural) majority education. Current language politics can be interpreted as a reaction and reversion to socialist language politics.

Croatia's education policy and curriculum priorities have also emerged in the context of on-going processes of economic and political transition from socialism to capitalism, occurring from 1991 onwards. (D.1.2). Interpretations of the socialist era, which were included in the revised history curriculum, were highly contested, indicating that divisions and memories of the recent socialist past are still present, and active in shaping contemporary socio-political dividing lines.

Although in the case of Croatia and Latvia, post-socialism is a frame of reference for education policy and curricula, this is not a shared experience for all post-socialist countries. In the case of Slovakia there is no reported concern with rethinking or recalibrating the country's experience of socialism as part of cultural literacy education. This is evident in both the policy and the curriculum documents.

4. Parallel discussion and concluding remarks

The main objective of the report is to bring together the findings of the policy and curricula reviews of the nine CHIEF countries in order to provide comparative insights on the themes surrounding the conceptualisation and implementation of cultural literacy education. Through a thematic synthesis of the findings of the country reports several ambiguities are revealed both within and between countries' educational contexts. A common finding across the CHIEF countries concerns the fact that cultural literacy is not an established term in formal educational settings. Objectives related to the provision of cultural literacy are identifiable in all countries/regions but are expressed through different concepts such as, intercultural education (Germany, Croatia, Georgia, Latvia), global education (Turkey, Slovakia), human rights education (Slovakia). Thus, the state of cultural literacy education has to be pieced together from various relevant subjects, initiatives or knowledge fields.

The overall approach to cultural literacy emerging through the discussion of these alternative terms and their educational content draws together diverse or even contradictory elements. These include: a focus on community cohesion and raising participation (Germany, UK); concerns with overcoming stereotypes, battling discrimination, fostering cultural communication (Georgia, Croatia); the articulation of cultural literacy along with legally framed discourses of human rights (Slovakia); intercultural competence as increasing marketability of individuals (Turkey, Germany, Latvia). There were instances of a fluid, inclusive conceptualisation of intercultural education in the Hamburg (German) curricula, which foreground issues of multiple belonging. Further, in the case of the Croatian curriculum, the quest for developing intercultural competence as one of the main stated educational objectives indicated a shift towards a wider canon for cultural literacy.

How cultural heritage is conceptualised varies and may include more or less dynamic or static approaches. The Catalan curriculum, for example, highlighted cultural heritage as, ongoing, in the making and not solely connected to the past. In the case of Croatia, cultural heritage is related to complex interactions between majority and minority cultures, religions, traditions, and behavioural patterns. In Georgia, by contrast, cultural heritage is narrowly defined, emphasising a cumulative collection of art objects. One common feature cutting across all the countries is the relationship between cultural heritage and national culture: in all the cases, cultural heritage is related (to varying degrees) to the preservation and protection of national culture. In some cases links between cultural heritage and national culture were particularly pronounced. Such strong links were evident for example, through constructions of a glorious past feeding into national pride (India), efforts to redefine heritage through a

set of fundamental national values (UK) or the consideration of cultural heritage as a foundation for unifying a nation (Latvia). In other cases, ongoing tensions exist between national and post national foci in emerging notions of cultural heritage (Slovakia). Additionally, there were observable contradictions within countries, such as in Croatia, where constructions of cultural heritage in the curriculum were more open and less restricted to national boundaries, compared to those identified in policy. Overall, the particularities of each country's history and current socio-political developments mediated approaches to cultural heritage. For example, in the Catalan curricula, the main focus was on local history and cultural heritage.

The different approaches to conceptualising cultural heritage were based on different notions of culture. In some cases, constructions of cultural heritage were based on a division between high and low culture (Germany, UK). Additionally, an economic viewpoint to culture and cultural heritage was identifiable in several cases (Latvia, Slovakia, Germany). The economic potential of cultural heritage was also accounted for, highlighting the need for its responsible use in the context of sustainable growth (Croatia).

Finally, how each of the constituents of cultural literacy – such as identity, cultural education and understanding, and cultural heritage - is situated relative to Europe and Europeanness vary. In some cases, an 'ordered framework' (Spain, Georgia) was identified, where policy and curricula start from the local dimension and move towards regional, national and international dimensions. In this respect, the importance and significance attached to European belonging is secondary to the local and national belonging, reflecting the peripheral status of Europe, European Culture, and European identity to formal cultural literacy education. In some cases approaches of Europe were primarily developed through historical perspectives, for example, with references to the Roman and Greek heritage as central to European culture (Germany) or through constructions of common European history through the study of Renaissance and the Enlightenment (UK). In the above cases there is selective referencing of certain historical periods or events and downplay of others (such as crusades or colonialism) as well as absence of social histories of local and regional communities.

In other cases, Europe holds a more pronounced position as a reference of cultural belonging (Latvia, Slovakia, Croatia). In these cases a dual belonging is put forward involving national and European dimensions. Articulations of Europe involve references to a 'pan-central European culture', or the 'European cultural circle', which are constructed as synonymous to modern democratic values, humanistic values and a culture of participation. In the case of Turkey, the prospect of European belonging signified an emphasis on developing youth as neo-liberal subjectivities with a focus on developing certain skills and competences. Most recently this focus has shifted through

the domination of national culture and Islamic religion as key markers of identity and belonging.

Language and language policy emerged as key elements in the provision of cultural literacy education. Across all the CHIEF countries an overwhelming focus on national language as a main pillar of national heritage and identity was identified –even in the cases where inter-culturalism was underscored. National language was perceived as a bastion of national identity (Croatia), as a force for unifying people (Latvia) or a necessary precondition for participation (Germany). Language was also constructed as a key dimension of diversity and was evoked in diversity management policies, along with human rights discourses. In most of the cases, the rights of ethnic minorities to be taught both their first language as well as the national language was the key stake of policy (Croatia, Slovakia, Germany, Georgia). Existing approaches are very much underlined by what the Croatian report referred to as 'liberal cultural separatism', that is, the parallel development of different cultural frames. One exception to this approach was identified to the recent Catalan policy proposals putting forward 'pluri-lingualism' whereby the first language of ethnic minorities will be part of the mainstream schooling alongside the teaching of English and other foreign languages. Finally, in some cases (India, Germany, Slovakia) language was also approached as a tool for boosting the marketability and mobility of young people, thus yielding competitive individualism and neo-liberalism as a framework of youth subjectivity formation.

Religion was identified as another layer of cultural diversity. In the majority of the countries, religious education was articulated in policy along with declarations about fostering respect (UK), battling nationalism and exclusion (Germany), fostering unity through diversity (India), enhancing inclusion (Croatia). Nevertheless, in all these cases, the predominant focus that the curricula place upon Christianity was highlighted. There were instances where references to non-Christian religions mainly addressed 'otherness' (Germany) and, in the case of the UK, recent guidelines indicated that, the curriculum needs to reflect, that Christianity is the main religion in the country. In other cases the links between religion and national identity were even stronger. In Georgia, there is a more explicit emphasis on Christianity, with very limited opportunities available for pupils to learn about the various religions (Georgia). In Turkey, Islam and Islamic civilization are central to constructions of shared history and contemporary versions of national belonging (Turkey).

Through the discussion of the different aspects of cultural literacy in the formal education settings of the CHIEF countries, it becomes evident that a number of tensions and ambiguities are at play. Cultural literacy is therefore to be materialised within multi-faceted, fragmented and often incoherent contexts, constructed via policy and

curricula. The most significant ones, which are identifiable across all the CHIEF countries, although in different forms and degrees, are as follows:

(1) The on-going and uneven balance between national and post-national cultural frames of reference: Cultural literacy is very often employed as a means for building-up and maintaining a sense of national identity, while at the same time it is intended to deepen understandings towards diversity and foster respect. A frequently identified scheme is the conceptualization of national culture in terms of presupposition for building-up multicultural understanding. In this respect, cultural literacy is developed along with ethno-cultural terms of reference and in line with existing symbolic boundaries surrounding nation-states. In effect, rather than challenging existing cultural divisions, cultural literacy education tends to embrace them, by placing its main focus on fostering respect, rather than on remaking existing boundaries and related differences.

(2) Notions of European culture and identity emerged along with asymmetries and incoherence. The so-called European dimension of education was identifiable is some countries, while being considerably underplayed in others. This uneven emphasis on Europe as a layer of identity, along with the variation in meanings of European culture, to a great extent, reflect the strength of national cultural politics as well as the complexity and contradictions entwined with processes of European integration.

(3) The paradoxical co-existence of essentialism and instrumentalism underpinning cultural literacy approaches: Throughout the discussion these tensions and the various forms they take, were highlighted. One the one hand the static, rigid notions of culture generally, and of national culture in particular, were pointed out. On the other hand, instrumental understandings of culture were identified with a focus on economic approaches or through strong links with policy objectives regarding social cohesion. These two different approaches seemed to co-exist in the majority of the cases, generating contradictive curriculum foci and policy objectives.

(4) The existing mismatches between political declarations and curriculum contents: At several cases it has been highlighted how policy discourse and objectives regarding diversity and cross-cultural communication remain abstract statements as they do not seem to materialise or substantiate within the curricula. This has been the case, for example in religious education, where policy declarations regarding diversity and co-existence are blurred by a focus on Christianity and strong links between religion and national identity.

(5) A lack of diversity in the content and context of educational provision: The parallel discussion of policy and curricula revealed a lack of diversity in the actual content of taught knowledge. Euro-centricism, as well as Christiano-centricism, was often identified through the research findings, both in terms of policy objectives, as well as

in the selection and organisation of the knowledge taught in schools. Additionally, the incorporation of alternative sources of knowledge (such as the social histories of local communities), or of bottom-up derived forms of knowledge have limited presence in the curricula. All the above, point towards limitations in embracing and therefore diversifying and democratising the sources and content of cultural knowledge that is offered through formal education.

5. References

Adorno, T.W. (2005) Education After Auschwitz, in: *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 191–204.

Danielzik, C.-M., Bendix, D. (2011) entdecken / Entdeckung / Entdecker_in / Entdeckungsreise, in: Ofuatey-Alazard, N., Arndt, S. (Eds.), *Wie Rassismus Aus Wörtern Spricht (K)Erben Des Kolonialismus Im Wissensarchiv Deutsche Sprache*. Ein Kritisches Nachschlagewerk. Unrast.

Fava, R. (2015) *Die Neuausrichtung der Erziehung nach Auschwitz in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: eine rassismuskritische Diskursanalyse*. Metropol, Berlin.

Thomas, J. and Harden, A. (2008) Methods for the Thematic Synthesis of Qualitative Research in Systematic Reviews, BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8:45, pp. 1-10.

Zimmerer, J. (2015) Kulturgut aus der Kolonialzeit – ein schwieriges Erbe? *Museumskunde* 80.

Appendix 1

Coding Frame:

TOPICS	Description/Questions	Operationalisation/ Manifestation In Policy	Operationalisation /Manifestation In Curriculum
'Cultural Literacy'	Is it used as a term? 1) If so, history and definition/approach 2) If not, are there **alternative terms** used?		

Cultural Education	1) **History** [history of the official cultural education (discourses, development, institutionalization, role in the society) as described by the policy documents – how recent is the phenomena?]
	
	2) **Conceptualization/ Definition/ Approach** How do policy docs and curricula conceptualize cultural education?
	
	Nodes can include:
	a) In terms of content: i.e. focus on
	  - cultural forms/ aesthetic
	  - history and heritage
	  - inter-cultural learning, cult.diversity
	  - citizenship and rights
	b) In terms of scope
		1) Central government's role: steering at a distance/ control
		
		2) Funding issues
		
		4) Involvement of other parties
			(How is it operationalized in the curricula? How specifically do the curricula suggest to culturally educate the young people?)

TOPICS	Description/Questions	Operationalisation/ Manifestation In Policy	Operationalisation /Manifestation In Curriculum
	- institutional VS. expansive definitions c) In relation to orientation towards national/EU/international dimensions: - i.e. national/European/international dimensions of/in cult.education & tensions in their relations 3) **Purpose (aims/objectives) and Expected Impact** of Cultural Education (e.g. marketability in the global world, enhancing participation etc.) For example: - inclusion, raising attainment of disadvantaged pupils - developing sense of national (collective) identity - fostering individual creativity VS. enhancing future economic contribution	5) Pedagogic paradigm	
Culture	In most cases, we'll have an opposition between so called **"purely aesthetic" vs "broad/all-encompassing"** understandings of culture. Importantly, though, these might be different in the context of the same country. <u>Different documents, and different school subjects might use different definitions/understandings</u>, even in the context of the same country, and it would be important and interesting to document, describe, and, to the possible extent, explain these differences. **Defintion:**		

TOPICS	Description/Questions	Operationalisation/ Manifestation In Policy	Operationalisation /Manifestation In Curriculum
	Definition of "culture": aesthetic aspects Definition of "culture": broad Definition of "culture": other - intrinsic/ instrumental - Values-based, normative approach/ fluidity - Division between highbrow/lowbrow culture - Institutional focus vs. "people" focus or top-down/down-up approach **Purpose and expected impact:** - culture as means of developing identity (individual-collective) - focused on economic contribution/ focus on individual creativity and wellbeing - 'talent' > individualisation - consumption / participation - contribution to international relations, soft power etc..		
Cultural Identity			
National Culture	**Definition/Approach:** Is the "national culture" understood mostly as a collective culture of a country's population, or as a culture of the dominant ethnic group? - How is the "national culture" presented in relation to the European		

TOPICS	Description/Questions	Operationalisation/ Manifestation In Policy	Operationalisation /Manifestation In Curriculum
	culture? World culture? - Is the "national culture" presented as superior to other cultures, or not? Is there any discussion on "mutually enriching" cultures? • "National culture" as a collective culture of the country's entire population • "National culture" as a culture of the ethnic majority • "National culture" and the European culture • "National culture" and the World culture Hierarchy of "national" vs "other" cultures		
Citizenship	- issues of citizenship and diversity - individualised/ communitarian focus - DIY by individuals/ granted by state status		
Faith and Religion	- Which role does the religion play in the understanding of culture? - To what extent is the religion of the [ethnic] majority presented as the dominant one? And are the religions of ethnic minority groups represented? - approach to dogma - issues of multi-faith society - links with national identity/ heritage?		- How is religious education operationalized in the curricula?
Europe	- What is the image of Europe in the documents, how Europe is presented in these documents? - What role do the curricula devote to studying subjects focused on Europe, e.g. history, geography, literature, etc.?		

TOPICS	Description/Questions	Operationalisation/ Manifestation In Policy	Operationalisation /Manifestation In Curriculum
	• Image of Europe • Subjects focused on Europe … -		
Post-socialism, post-colonialism	In which way are Postcolonialism and/or Postsocialism mentioned (or not) and reflected upon (or not)?		
Cultural Heritage	Definition of "cultural heritage" Positive or negative Legacy		
Language (check EAL students)	- How the curricula encourages young people to participate in social life? - Inclusion / discrimination of marginalized groups (socio-economic, different abilities, migration, ethnic minority, gender, sexual orientation etc.) : How (whether) is it approached to and dealt with		
Participation			

TOPICS	Description/Questions	Operationalisation/ Manifestation In Policy	Operationalisation /Manifestation In Curriculum
Diversity (intercultural/multicultural education)			
(where applicable) Country specific questions, considerable absences (issues that are present at public discourse but ascent in the policy/curricula)			
How young people's needs are addressed by policy / curricula			