



This paper is taken from

*A Europe of Many Cultures
Proceedings of the fifth Conference of the Children's
Identity and Citizenship in Europe Thematic Network*

London: CiCe 2003

edited by Alistair Ross, published in London by CiCe, ISBN 1 85377 369 7

Without explicit authorisation from CiCe (the copyright holder)

- only a single copy may be made by any individual or institution for the purposes of private study only
- multiple copies may be made only by
 - members of the CiCe Thematic Network Project or CiCe Association, or
 - a official of the European Commission
 - a member of the European parliament

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as

Ross, A. (2003) Introduction: Cultures, identity and education in Europe, in Ross, A. (ed) A Europe of Many Cultures. London: CiCe, pp 1 - 14

© CiCe 2003

CiCe
Institute for Policy Studies in Education
London Metropolitan University
166 – 220 Holloway Road
London N7 8DB
UK

This paper does not necessarily represent the views of the CiCe Network.



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.

Acknowledgements:

This is taken from the book that is a collection of papers given at the annual CiCe Conference indicated. The CiCe Steering Group and the editor would like to thank

- All those who contributed to the Conference
- Cass Mitchell-Riddle, head of the CiCe Coordination Unit
- London Metropolitan University for financial and other support for the programme, conference and publication
- The SOCRATES programme and the personnel of DGXXII for their support and encouragement.

Introduction: Cultures, identity and education in Europe

Alistair Ross

International Coordinator, Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe Thematic Network

This collection of papers, presented at the fifth CiCe Annual Conference, held in May 2003 in the University of Minho, Braga, addresses a critical debate on the future of Europe and the contribution that educators will play in this. The conference had as its theme 'A Europe of Many Cultures'. Teachers are one of society's prime agents of cultural transmission. What teachers teach will establish the cultural patterns of their pupils. The agenda for the transmission of culture that teachers will teach is set by the framework established by the teacher educators, and all the other disciplines in the CiCe network. And the advice and leadership that we can show, as a body made up of teacher educators across Europe, will be particularly significant.

European cultures today stand at a particular crossroads. We are moving towards a stage where we can discern particular variations and commonalities in what constitutes the cultures of the new Europe. There is a growing heterogeneity in Europe – not just the expansion in May 2004 with the accession of many new states into the Union, but also the heterogeneity brought about by cultural migration and intermingling. These changes bring uncertainties and tensions, but at the same time they bring strengths and causes for hope and aspiration.

Culture: a word of many meanings?

Culture can be seen as a difficult term. One politician with pan-European ambitions in the 1940s - Herman Goering - is supposed to have said, "Whenever I hear the word 'culture', I reach for my gun!" While today we can have a more peaceful discussion of the term, there are a variety of understandings of what is meant by culture, and there are controversies and differing ideas about what culture might mean.

Culture is often used to mean 'high culture' – the culture of the educated and civilised person. Thus the cultivated person is one who has acquired a particular set of values: who 'understands' refined forms of art – paintings, sculpture, music, drama and opera – many of which in turn are manifestations of a particular cultural history or experience. Visiting the great art galleries of Europe, one is struck by the way that the Old Masters consistently dwelt on classical themes, reflecting what were seen as the cultural roots of European civilisation in contemporary terms. Early modern art forms transmit a strongly Christian culture, particularly around the death and life of Christ. Byzantine culture – a specific subset of European – maintained this art form for rather longer. Later artists took up Old Testament themes, stories doubtless very familiar to the times in which they were created but now less well known: for example, there are pictures of 'Judith and Holofernes' and 'Tobias and the Angel' in many European galleries, but how many of us today know the allegories surrounding them or even the original stories? Greek and Roman mythology also appears in cultural forms: the assumption is that the cultured persons who commissioned and viewed these works would know and understand what linked them to the cultures of ancient Greece and Rome. These art forms were, of course, also educational in intention: they were ways to transmit and perpetuate particular cultural norms.

As well as visual culture, this form of high culture was applied to literature. Writers have often taken on classical or religious themes: Dante and Milton, for example, in *The Divine Comedy* and in *Paradise Lost*, both use contemporary literature to recount Christian cultural values and stories. There was a particular wider literary canon of works which the 'cultured person' could be expected to know and understand and which defined the culture. Many of these works were Greek and Roman, and the cultured person - naturally fluent in both languages - would read classical authors in the original language - or at least the original works as preserved and passed down to modern Europe by the Arab and Muslim scholars who had preserved the originals. (We know many of these Arab scholars by their Europeanised names, thus Europe's Avicenna is 'our' form of the man who called himself Ibn Sina.

This reminds us that this notion of high culture is not simply European. Other societies have their own forms of high culture, which is manifested and transmitted in sometimes similar, sometimes different forms. Thus the Islamic culture of the eighth to fourteenth centuries preserved the literary cultural works of the Greeks, but also developed a culture of mathematics and science that was only later taken up by Europeans, as is evident in much of our current scientific vocabulary. Equally culturally revolutionary was the invention of zero - though this may well be an Hindu cultural innovation transmitted by Arab culture. Islamic culture has different forms of high art, based on pattern rather than representation: but just as in early modern Europe this demands a familiarity with the cultural forms and norms in order to appreciate its specific subtleties. All societies have their culture.

The cultured person was rather different in nineteenth and early twentieth century Europe, in that the culture that was transmitted had shifted: there were different cultural artefacts created by the romantic, naturalist and scientific movements, and high culture, perhaps particularly in the arts, took on forms that were provocative and challenging. But the concept of a 'high' culture remained, and some of its essential characteristics were that it was exclusive, acquired, and served to distinguish those who had it from those who did not. Understanding and possessing high culture was a mark of inclusion into an elite. But there still persists the idea of 'the canon' - the works that every cultivated person should know. That the canon consists largely of the products of dead white males shows it as a particular social manifestation, but rival canons are equally socially constructed and exclusive. Canons persist even in CiCe - our last conference had a presentation of Great Books, a list of works supposed to contain the particular virtues and values of western civilisation. Culture can be defined so as to mark out the elite, and to exclude the *hoi polloi*.

Working class 'culture' was always something rather different. Some of our 'high' cultural writers are today particularly esteemed because of the way in which they managed to portray both 'high' and 'low' culture - for example, some of the stories from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* or from Boccaccio's *Decameron* capture everyday low life as much as high society. Some other writers - Shakespeare in particular - managed to produce cultural artefacts that were appreciated by both high court society and theatregoers in 'the pit'. But Boccaccio and Shakespeare would have both have been seen as very much only part of high culture fifty years ago: today perhaps, it is rather different, with films by Passolini and Baz Luhrmann bringing them to a much wider cultural audience. High culture can become low culture; and low culture high.

To the archaeologist and anthropologist, culture is something rather different: it is about the everyday patterns of life, customs and artefacts that constitute a society. For example, they will refer to a Beaker Culture, or palaeolithic culture, identifying each by artefacts that are the result of particular cultural technologies, and thus implying particular societies that maintain these ways of working. It is rather interesting to note just how some of these cultures are today being re-defined to portray specially current 'needs' of European society: there is a travelling exhibition of European Neolithic culture organised by the Council of Europe which seems designed to demonstrate the homogeneity and essential unity of the European region four and five millennia ago: the maps and displays show the patterns of similarity in culture across the continent. Similarly the culture of the Celts is now fashionably ubiquitous across much of the European land-mass, whereas fifty years ago (at least in Britain) Celtic was used as a term for the fringes – the wilds of Wales, the highlands of Scotland, Brittany and Ireland. Definitions of culture can have political intent.

Zoologists are now also using the term culture, at least with reference to primate behaviour. Over the past few decades it has been discovered that there are different cultures among chimpanzees: the animals are genetically identical but demonstrate different behavioural patterns – of feeding, of manufacturing tools, of making warning signs – that are passed on by the social group to its offspring. Taking a chimpanzee from the wild, and then re-introducing it to another chimpanzee group, can only be done successfully if the chimpanzee is returned to a tribe with the same culturally specific behaviour. So culture is not simply a human trait.

Culture as a word is also related to ideas of growth and development, and particularly of controlled growth and development. Thus we have the scientific concepts of a microbiological culture, where micro-organisms are grown and tended in a controlled environment, in a petri dish - bacteria are grown on jelly-like agar, which has been enriched with specific nutrients, and indeed the particular mix is referred to as a cultural medium. Culture is also used by the agriculturalist and the horticulturalist. The cultivation of plants for food was the essence of the first great revolution of humanity - the Neolithic revolution - and transformed the way we lived: it implied semi-permanent settlement and the development of society, the development of towns. Agriculture was the direct cause of a civic culture, of civilisation and thus of the concept of citizenship.

Today, most of us are more likely to cultivate our gardens than our fields. In horticulture, particular plants are selected and favoured over others, and made to grow in particular forms, with often specifically selected colours, fruits and flowering periods. The gardening metaphor is particularly appropriate to education – the term kindergarten is widely used – and much of the language of education is based on ideas of nurturing, of training, of providing an appropriate environment for growth.

The construction of culture: class

This ramble around the many ways we use the word culture is to show not just the generic roots of the word, but the many interconnections that structure the way that we think and talk about education and about societies. The essence of all these uses is that culture is not natural. It is always about nurturing, bringing up differently to that which would occur in a 'state of nature'. It is about making decisions about what to select – which plants to breed from and develop, which lines of technology to work on, which works of art to give

value to, and which to dismiss as kitsch. It is environment, rather than genes. It is constructed by society – and it is deliberately transmitted to the next generation by society.

In the 1920s T.S.Eliot offered us *Notes towards the definition of culture*, which saw culture as an organic system of shared beliefs, transmitted primarily by the family. His was a specifically Christian culture. Eliot breaks culture down into three subclasses: individual, group or class, and whole society. He begins with the individual level of society, analysing personality characteristics and the like, and moves his way up into group/class and then to the whole society. He goes into great detail on class, geographic regions, sects, politics, religion, and education in relation to culture and society.

Education has a particular role to play in the maintenance of culture. Teachers are professionalised agents of cultural transmission. Schools institutionalise culture: the schooling process and the curriculum define what will be the culture of the next generation. And, as teacher-educators, and educators of other professions who will work with children and young people, we determine how the next generations of teachers will behave: we are, as it were, super-cultural transmitters. This is a highly politically charged activity. What we are doing is not neutral. Nor is it static: our societies are changing, and we are in the thick of the debate about what should be conserved and what should be different about tomorrow's society. Ideas of identity, citizenship and culture are at the very heart of this controversy.

I want to suggest four points about this process of identifying what will constitute the culture of tomorrow:

- choices are made
- choices need not be exclusive
- societies are increasingly showing more cultural heterogeneity
- cultures are constructs: they are artificial.

These competing notions of culture have suggested to many that there is a battle to preserve a particular kind of culture. In England, the chief of the national Curriculum Council, Nick Tate, expressed this in a speech a few years ago arguing that a key purpose of the curriculum is to introduce young people to some of the characteristics of high culture "because some works of art, music, literature or architecture are more valuable than others". He argued that specific examples of high culture are better than contemporary culture – he contrasts Schubert's *Ave Maria* with Blur, Milton with Mills and Boon (a publisher of inexpensive romantic fiction), and Vermeer's *View of Delft* with "a dead sheep at the Tate" (Damien Hirst). Postmodernists would suggest that all these artefacts should be seen as cultural products, to be understood in relation to the structures and circumstances surrounding their production, not simply in themselves, and in terms of value.

But does a choice have to be made? Do we have to give priority or precedence to a particular form of culture? Even if it was simply a class-based cultural disparity that was being favoured – high culture over working-class culture – does a choice have to be made? Should a choice be made? Should we teach high culture only to middle class children, the favoured elite – giving them access to the *habitus* of acceptable middle class values,

enabling them to accumulate cultural capital, as Pierre Bourdieu would have put it? Do we give only prole-culture to the proletariat? Do we only offer access to elite education to those members of the working class who are prepared to acquire middle-class culture and values? Do we insist that schools only convey – or attempt to convey - high culture, and accept the consequent alienation of a wide slice of society from full participation?

The construction of culture: a multicultural Europe

This apparent dilemma has been compounded by population migration and settlement patterns in Europe. The world-wide empires that many European states once maintained are now adding to our populations, not as transient workers but as permanent settlers and additions to our societies. Others have come intending to be temporary members of the workforce but have put down roots, brought up families, and developed stronger connections within Europe than beyond. And there is still great intra-European population churning, that has been endemic for centuries. Our cultural heterogeneity is developing very fast, and the idea of a single European 'high' culture, that only recognises specific Graeco-Roman and Christian roots, is a position as unsustainable, or even more so, than that of a class-based culture. The perpetuation of parallel class-based cultures - a high culture and a working class culture - could be sustained within a country without wide ethnic diversities by the trick of national identity, persuading the working classes to accept their membership of a common national identity with the elite through tribalistic totem, jingoism and the occasional war. The same deception cannot be maintained with an ethnically diverse population with different cultural, linguistic and religious traditions. Any attempt to maintain strong national distinctiveness will feed racism and xenophobia, will create sub-societies that are 'othered' and which become alienated and excluded.

Frederick Barth pointed out that it is 'the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that it encloses' (1979, p 15). What makes a culture distinct is not what it is about, but the boundary with other cultures: a culture (and a nationality, or an identity) is relational, contingent on others. Boundaries come to be demarcated when they are under threat, or when there is a perception that some marginal person or group, on the threshold, needs to be 'othered'.

Teachers are at the heart of the process of cultural transmission. And I want to suggest that we should be considering what kind and forms of cultures we need in the new Europe: what kind of histories, musics, literatures, arts, artefacts and belief-systems will underpin a diverse society, will be democratic and inclusive, tolerant and understanding. Cultures are certainly not static and immutable, and what appear to be irreconcilable today may well find mutate to patterns of cultural mingling and inter-mixing in the future, if we can create the conditions for cultural diversity and understanding.

Any culture is artificial, in the sense that it is not natural. Culture is the product of choice, individual human choice, about what to sustain, what to transmit, how to train – how to educate. We do not have to chose one culture over the other. Nick Tate was wrong: Schubert and Blur can coexist, Damien Hirst and Vermeer can be placed side by side in a gallery. But we can and should also include the music of Umm Kulthum, the literature of Chinua Achebe and the paintings of Orhan Taylan.

Deconstructing a 'national culture': an example

Cultures are synthetic, artificial and wholly constructed. Our so-called national cultures are inventions, put together very often for political reasons, but maintained and transmitted by educational practices in their broadest sense. This introduction now seeks to demonstrate the artificiality of these national inventions by deconstructing two particular national identities. Doing this with the identity of any particular country will almost certainly offend some of the nationals of that country, so these examples are limited to examining Scots and British¹ cultures, so that they offer potential offence only to the authors' compatriots. The reader should reflect that one could equally expose the national cultural myths of any country – and there are a number of studies that do just this, examining how so-called traditions and identities are constructions – often very recent constructions, sometimes even constructions that are still being put together today – but that all our cultures are social constructs, are artificial, and are there for some political reasons.

To start with Scotland: two of the most potent images of Scottish culture are the kilt and the tartan. The kilt is seen as a traditional form of highland dress, emblematic of the highland resistance to the English. Mel Gibson wore one in the film *Braveheart*, successfully leading kilted hordes of Scots against the English invaders in the fourteenth century. However, the kilt is not a form of dress of anything like such antiquity. The kilt was invented in 1718 by an Englishman who came from Lancashire and founded one of the first iron foundries in the Scottish highlands. Recruiting local workers, he found that the form of dress that they wore was unsuitable and unsafe, getting caught up in the machinery and liable to catch fire. He invented a simple form of dress called the kilt, which was much safer for his workers. It caught on, and today the kilt has become a symbol of Scottish identity which has been grafted back to earliest Scottish history.

Kilts are made of woven tartan cloth, and it is part of Scottish tradition and culture that each clan or dynasty has its own unique patterns of tartan. There are various styles, for court life and for hunting, which mark common ancestry and culture far back into mediaeval life and which purists say that only members of each particular clan are entitled to wear. However, this is not quite accurate. In 1834 King William IV of Britain decided to visit Scotland, which had been a part of the British Kingdom since the Act of Union in 1707. It was the first ever visit of a British monarch to Edinburgh. The Scottish lords planned a reception for him, and met with representatives of an Edinburgh woollen weaving firm. It was agreed that the lords would appear in 'traditional' highland dress - in kilts - but the kilts had patterns of no particular significance, and were not tied to particular clans. The firm's representatives produced a pattern book, showing examples of the different weaves and patterns of cloth that they could create. Each clan leader in turn selected a pattern of tartan from the pattern book, and decreed that they and their followers would wear that pattern exclusively. The visiting king was presented with a new and totally artificial cultural tradition that had no basis in history, but that presented him with a sense of clan loyalty and history that identified Scotland as a unique and different part of his kingdom.

¹ Or rather, aspects of the UK, Britain and England: see the following footnote.

And so to the culture of the British². What does the idea of Britain convey? There is the roast beef of England, and there is fish and chips, and Morris dancing on the village green. The nation's patron saint is St George, and many see the British Royal Family as an icon of Britain today. How authentic are the cultural roots of all of these?

The United Kingdom is a relatively recent political construction – its present boundaries were only fixed in 1921. Great Britain came into existence as a political entity with the merger of England and Wales with Scotland in 1707, after which there began an intense re-branding of the image, to construct a unity. Scotland even began to refer to itself as 'North Britain'. Much of this re-branding was aimed at making Britain different from mainland Europe, a process of 'othering' centred around Protestantism, mercantilism, the Empire and Royalty.

One aspect of culture is what we eat – the French philosopher-gastronome Jean Brillat-Savarin once wrote 'you are what you eat'. In the early eighteenth century, the upper-class British family would almost invariably employ a French chef who would prepare continental food, elaborate dishes replete with complex sauces. This did not accord with differentiating Britain from the continent. Continental food was dismissed: there were protests in London in the early eighteenth century to chants of 'No garlic, no wooden shoes' - symbols of French cooking and servitude. 'Beef and liberty' was the slogan: cookbooks extolled plain English cooking. There began a new tradition, that Britain should eat 'honest' and simple food: and this became epitomised by roast beef. Fielding wrote a popular song *The old roast beef of England* - and the English writer and artist William Hogarth, painted a famous picture (*The Calais Gate*) of a side of roast beef being delivered to the English tourists in the city in 1748 (Rogers, 2003). Hogarth had taken a short holiday in France, in which he complained non-stop about the foul food, the French and the local buildings - "*all gilt and beshit.*" In Calais, on his way home, as he sketched the ancient gateway which had been built by the English, he was arrested on suspicion of being an English spy. After exchanges that verged on the farcical he was packed off back to England. In revenge, he painted a picture - quickly turned into a print - that became an enduring icon of English patriotic xenophobia. So out went the French chefs, and in came the roast beef. French cooking became a political casualty of the process of inventing the British – in almost exactly the same way that we have this year seen French Fries become Freedom Fries in another part of the world. (Interestingly, beef is not really an English word: it is imported from the French *boeuf*. All the words for different kinds of meat in modern English are Norman-French: the Anglo-Saxon words were transferred to the names of the animal the meat came from, because it was the Normans who ate the meat after the Norman conquest, and the Anglo-Saxon serfs who tended the animals.)

² Here we have a problem. Most inhabitants of the UK would probably claim their nationality was 'British', but Great Britain (the island of Britain and some of its surrounding smaller islands) is not a nation comprising three countries – England, Wales and Scotland. The UK is the legal nation-state, and comprises these three countries plus Northern Ireland, which is not part of Britain. So one cannot be 'British', in the strict sense. Of the cultural icons discussed here, St George is the patron saint of England (the other three countries have their own patron saints), but the Royal Family pertains to whole of the UK. Roast beef is English, but fish and chip shops are found all over the UK (and in Eire). Morris dancing is found in many parts of the British Commonwealth.

Fish and chips seem to be a time-honoured traditional British dish: fish, after all, is one of Britain's very few natural resources, or at least it was until the Common Fisheries Policy emerged. However, fish and chips appears not only to be a recent invention – the first fish and chip shop is recorded as being opened in London's East End by one Joseph Mali, an east European Jewish immigrant in the third quarter of the nineteenth century – but the dish itself is an invention of the Portuguese Marranos - Jews who hid their ethnicity due to persecution, who came as refugee migrants to Britain in the sixteenth century. (Roden, 1997).

Morris dancing seems a particularly English eccentricity. Grown men dress up all in white, wear leather straps of bells and ribbons around their legs, waists and chests, and then strut about banging sticks together. What could be more typical of the reserved and unemotional English than this? But although Morris dancing does date back some 700 years, it is unfortunately not English – or even European. It is based on Arab male dancing encountered and brought home by soldiers from the crusades – 'Morris' is a corruption of Morisco (môriskoz) = Moorish. And St George was born in the third century, in what is now southern Turkey, and died there in 303 AD - he never came to Britain. The connection is probably that he was 'adopted' by English crusaders in the thirteenth century.

Surely the Royal family is British through and through? George I, the Elector of Hanover, was invited to become King of Great Britain in 1714. He spoke not a word of English, nor did he ever learn it (nor did his son, George II). George, and all his descendants up until the twentieth century, married non-British spouses, generally from the German states. Queen Victoria married a Saxe-Coburg: her preferred domestic language for all of her life was German. Eventually her grandson George VI married a Briton who became Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother, which makes the current monarch, Elizabeth II, the first monarch with any British blood for over 200 years. Under EU labelling regulations, we could at least describe her as "made with British genes". The situation did not last. Queen Elizabeth did not marry a Briton: Phillip was a Prince of Greece, the third son of the deposed monarch and part-Danish. Their first child, Prince Charles, is one quarter British, half Greek and a quarter an amazing mixture of Danish and German principalities. Fortunately for the British sense of identity he married Diana, who was of genuine English descent: we can trace her ancestry through seven generations of English Earls of Spencer. So Prince William is now 62.5% British. When – if – he succeeds to the throne, perhaps in thirty or forty years time, we will at last have a monarch of British origin - mostly.

These aspects of 'British culture' are either politically contrived like roast beef or immigrant imports like fish and chips, a patron saint from Turkey, folk dances from a decidedly multicultural origin, and in the case of the Royal Family something truly European.

So what is the teacher's role in transmitting these cultural myths? If all our so-called traditions and national identities are social constructions – and often are still being put together today – what do we tell the children? Could we not tell them some other tales? Perhaps some stories that reflect the struggles and the successes of our common histories? Do we have to peddle myths that create differences, when we could equally peddle myths that highlight solidarities?

Finally, a short story – perhaps legendary but containing a deeper truth – about the way in which history and geography can confuse us about different cultures. We tend to give names to cultures and societies, and to imagine that they are necessarily unique and exclusive. An old man tells the story of his life:

“I was born in Austro-Hungary, but went to primary school in Czechoslovakia. Then I started college in Hungary, but joined the German Army. After that, I married in the USSR. Finally, I retired in the Ukraine.”

“Why!” exclaimed his listener. *“What a lot of different cultures in which to live – you must have moved around so many times!”*

“Not at all,” replied the old man. “I’ve never once left the town in which I was born.”

This part of what is now western Ukraine, the oberst of Transcarpathia, has changed hands between countries fourteen times in the past century. But the cultural identity of the area has persisted from the nineteenth century and earlier. One culture or many cultures? One Europe, or many Europes?

Cultural diversities in Europe

The opening group of papers in this book examines aspects of Europe’s cultural diversity, and the meaning of this for schools. Many of the examples are of long-standing diversities: the continent has a long history of minorities. *Riitta Korhonen* describes the cultures of pre-schooling in Finland: children are supposed to be guaranteed settings in which they know their own culture, and develop their own cultural identity. Cultural identity and cultural understanding are transmitted in a variety of ways, and *Zoja Chehlova* looks at cultural openness in the context of cultural diversity in the Baltic region. Language is an essential element of culture, and in parts of Croatia there are significant long-standing linguistic minorities: *Nevenka Tatovic*, *Aida Muradbegovic* and *Sabina Morosini* explore the Croatian framework for the preservation of the Italian minority culture in Istria. Music in Latvia is also the focus of *Anna Liduma*’s paper, where she describes the musical contests in Latvia and in Europe as having an important integrative function while maintaining cultural diversity.

Internal migration in Europe is increasing, and peoples of different European heritages are now settled in places away from their national origins: *Lurdes Figueiral* and *Inés Gómez-Chacón* describe how a subject such as mathematics can be used in multicultural contexts, writing principally about children of Portuguese origin settled in Belgium. Learning another European language also involves – or could involve – learning about another culture. What do Serbian children learn about the French from their language textbooks? is the question addressed by *Ana Vujovic*. The final two papers in this section consider one of Europe’s most long-standing, and least appreciated minorities, the Roma. *Pavel Vacek* and *Jan Lasek* look at how Roma adolescents in the Czech Republic view their position as the country prepares to join the European Union, and *Joana Alexandre* and *Maria Monteiro* examine multiple self-categorisation of Roma children in Portugal.

Culture and migration: the new diversities

Migration is a world-wide phenomena. The first paper in this section looks at cultural contexts of migrant in education in the Latino context in the United States: *Maria Pacino*

asserts that we need more minority-origin researchers, who will develop more culturally appropriate research instruments, to work in these sorts of sensitive settings. Migration is beginning to affect all Europe. Iceland was traditionally cut off from the main landmass, and was relatively monocultural until recent years: *Sigrún Adalbjarnardóttir* and *Eyrún Rúnarsdóttir* examine how teacher training programmes and schools are adapting swiftly to these changes. Greece, also for long regarded as an exporter of citizens, now finds a rapid change as migrants move into the country. In one of several papers in this volume on the Greek context, *Panyota Papoulia-Tzelepi*, *Julia Spinthourakis* and their colleagues examine how Greek children represent immigrant children. Migration also affects Spain: *Maria Villanueva* and *Carmen Gonzalo* describe their work with student teachers exploring the individual contexts of migration – internal and from overseas – in a study that spans over ten years. Teacher training in Greece which is designed to prepare for the new cultural mix in schools is analysed by *Julia Spinthourakis* and *John Katsillis*. In Denmark, the Social Education Institutions are working to recruit members of migrant communities to work as social pedagogues: *Helle Kjaerulff* describes one such attempt, and her colleagues *Kirtsen Scheel Nielsen* and *Jesper Froda* look at practice in a multi-ethnic kindergarten.

Cultural tensions

Migrations and population movements also cause tensions. Three papers in this section report such situations. Danish educators *Leif Christensen* and *Trine Rasmussen* describe their work trying to build citizenship with young Serbians and Albanians in Kosovo. School bullying, as a form of ethnic group dominance, is analysed in the context of Mapuche young people in Chilean schools in a paper by *Paula Alonqueo* and *Cristina del Barrio*, with important potential lessons for European contexts. Adolescents from the Cape Verde island living in Portugal are the subject of *Ines Maurício* and *Maria Benedicta Monteiro's* paper, which reports on the development of inter-group tensions and policies that may diminish this.

Language and culture

Multiculturalism is often intricately connected to multilingualism. This section contains four papers, from France, Denmark, Latvia and Portugal, that consider various aspects of language. *Annemarie Dinvaux* reports on work in Lyon to involve parents and children in constructing linguistic and cultural biographies, and the relationship of this work to the stages between diglottism and bilingualism: teachers, she concludes, must start by analysing their own linguistic biographies. Multilingual staff are seen as critical in the study by *Mathias Blob* and *H.T.R.Persson* of work in Denmark: switching from a one-way approach to language learning to a dialogic two-way practical approach has significant effects on attitudes to learning generally, they report. *Inese Jurgena's* paper is about foreign language learning, rather than bilingualism per se, but in the context of a country where many people have a first language other than Latvian. Finally, *Ana Raquel Simões* and *Helena Araújo e Sá* describes how Portuguese students develop plurilingual competencies, and the relationship this process has had with cultural understanding.

Culture and values

Papers in this section consider various relationships between values and culture. *Robi Kroflič* takes an incident of a six-year old playing in a Slovenian school and examines the

ethical stance of the children, who assert tolerance and pluralistic values to each other. Classroom discussion and ‘elaborated forms of recitation’ in Iceland work towards promoting student teacher’s citizenship competencies in the paper by *Eyrún Rúnarsdóttir* and *Sigrún Adalbjarnardóttir*. Values from a child’s perspective are considered by *Tulle Torstenson-Ed* in the context of the philosophy of Merleau-Ponty of ‘our body in the life world’: a phenomenological approach owing much to Husserl and Heidegger. Global approaches to inter-cultural learning are reviewed by *Georgios Nikolaou*. The paper by *Rain Mikser* examines the educational traditions of equality in Estonian education, drawing on competing Anglo-Saxon, Continental and Soviet paradigms. In a rather different approach, *Gunilla Welwert* and *Inge-Marie Svensson* examine art as a communicative form, and the potential it has to develop and implement the UN Convention on Children’s Rights.

Teachers and culture

Many of the papers consider aspects of teachers, their training and behaviour: these three papers have a particular and specific focus on the profession. The core qualities that teachers are considered to need in the Latvian context is the focus of *Sandra Rone* and *Liene Ozola's* paper: if schools are to develop children with free and self-responsible personalities, what should teachers be like? *Nanny Hartsmar*, on the other hand, considers the self-reflective processes involved in becoming a teacher: she examines the demands of discussion, self-analysis, and consideration of experience in the Swedish system, and the particular demands that this makes for multicultural education training. Finally, *Alistair Ross* looks at the UK teacher body, analyses the extent to which it reflects the cultural mix of the population it serves and the hidden curriculum implicit in the staffing of schools.

Culture, history and economy

The following section brings together papers that examine variously the role of history education and of economic understanding in the transmission and creation of culture. A long historical view of history education is taken by *Luigi Cajani*, who traces the development of the subject from the 1750s to current conferences and negotiations. In complete contrast, *Roger Johansson* and *Lars Berggren* focus on a single incident in Swedish history – the massacre of protestors at Ådalen in 1931 – and from this analyse how the incident has been interpreted to create different histories of the Swedish polity. Cultural diversity through remembered history is the centre of *Maria Henriques'* analysis of a ‘memory club’ in Portugal, and historical material about the holocaust is examined in the Scottish context by *Paula Cowan*, who links this to citizenship education.

Elisabet Näsman and *Christina von Gerber* examine children’s economic experiences, particularly of poverty, and how the development of economic competency has a strong moral dimension. Another aspect of culture as it relates to the economy is the culture of consumerism. A detailed analysis of the advertisements shown during children’s television programmes in Hungary is the basis of *Ákos Gocsál* and *Ágnes Huszár's* paper, which points to the often objectionable moral content of these advertisements. The final paper in this section, from *Márta Fülöp* and *Mihály Berkics*, also from Hungary, contrasts English and Hungarian young people’s attitudes to coping with competition, particularly with winning and losing.

Teaching, culture, society

The first three papers in this section all focus on aspects of socialisation. *Marjanca Pergar Kušcer* examines inequality in the socio-economic background of children, asks how this impacts on attainment in education, and examines the implications for equal opportunities. Other tensions in family life may also affect educational performance, and *Jana Bezenšek* examines the effects of divorce or separation on young people. From Estonia, *Edgar Krull* takes a broader view of peer relations in the socialisation process, and outlines intervention strategies that might be employed if peer relationships seem to be functioning poorly.

The next three papers use specific teaching approaches to develop socialisation skills. In a paper based on a workshop presentation, *Doyle Stevick* and *Klaus Koopman* use problem-based learning to generate feelings of participation and power amongst pupils, and relate this to theoretical considerations of policy analysis. Interactive processes are also at the heart of the drama-based schemes discussed by *Iveta Kovalčíková* and *Juraj Kresila*, and they look particularly at the enhanced incidence of supportive interactive acts between children that follow such interventions. A rather different approach is described in the paper by *Richard Étienne*, who describes how a fictional currency is used to regulate social interactions in a class, and the ways that this can be used to teach values of citizenship to children.

Cultures of democracy

Norway has made particular efforts to reform its educational system to become more democratic in practice, in particular insisting that children are given a real voice in their education. *Lars Monsen* analyses this innovation, and in particular the difficulties in changing teachers' attitudes in a context of increasing multicultural classes, in which children and their parents have been confused by an approach which runs counter to their cultural expectations of a more authoritarian approach. A Swedish approach to preparing teachers for teaching democracy is discussed in *Gunilla Fredriksson's* paper, in which she analyses a course for students on 'The Democratic Leader'. The course develops concepts of fairness, listening to pupils and developing self-confidence and respect. Another approach, also in Sweden, is described in *Margareta Bergström* and *Inger Holm's* article, which specifically looks at issues of exclusion and participation of young people, and how support can be offered by teachers for young people in particular need of support. A third paper from Sweden, by *Elisabeth Elmeroth*, examines how teenagers can be encouraged to participate confidently in dialogue and discussion.

Education for democracy is not, of course, the prerogative of the Nordic states. Political involvement by adolescents in Portugal is analysed by *Pedro D. Ferreira*, *Lúisa Mota Ribeiro* and *Isabel Menezes*, and a typology of criteria for participation in citizenship education is developed. An example from Poland, presented in *Beata Krzywosz-Rynkiewicz's* paper, deals with younger children's development of self-responsibility, showing how a short programme of suitable activities can transform the confidence and self-esteem of children.

Citizens in a multicultural Europe

What does citizenship education mean in the European context? Is it different from education for citizenship? This is the issue considered by *Emilio Lastrucci*, who suggests

that there are different and specific issues that must be addressed, and rather different outcomes, when the European dimension is added. *Cathie Holden* looks at similar issues within the context of a specific course for student teachers in three UK universities. How knowledgeable are student teachers about global issues? Do they feel able (and willing) to teach for global citizenship? Generally, she finds them enthusiastic, willing, but anxious for more knowledge on issues and approaches. From the US, *Doyle Stevick* considers the contribution that international networks have to play in developing civic education, particularly in those countries formerly in the Eastern Bloc.

Resources for teaching and learning citizenship are considered by *Jan Mašek*, particularly resources available on the world wide web. In a most useful survey of sites, he also produces a set of core evaluatory questions to be asked of civic education internet resources, that could well have a wider application in evaluating any social issues on the web. The paper by *Jelena Petrucijová* and *Marcel Meciar* returns to the issue of citizenship at the European level: there is a possible clash of cultural and civic identities, they argue. They develop the idea of cultural citizenship as a potential enabling device for all. *Jill Rutter* turns to a revealing micro-study of how citizenship departments in English schools responded to the widespread protests by school pupils to the outbreak of the second Iraq war. She suggests that many schools that advocate policies of self-expression and political action were unable to accept the pupils' actions, and resorted to punitive attempts at control. More micro-studies, from three Portuguese schools are reported by *Florabela Trigo-Santos*, *Joaquim Pintassilgo* and *Carolina Carvalho*. They report that the teachers' former hegemony is being weakened as the new personal and social dimension of the curriculum takes hold, and that personal self-expression and student autonomy are being developed.

The two final papers in this section are both from Greece. *Maria Nikolakaki* reports that civic education in Greek primary schools is constrained by the centralising character of the educational system. Using Bernstein's analysis of curriculum, she suggests that the emphasis on approved national texts leads to dated approaches that cannot keep up with contemporary events, or the changing nature of the school population. Similar conclusions are reached in the paper by *Maria Ivrideli*, *Nikos Papadakis* and *Ioannis Fragkoulis*, who look at Europe and multicultural dimensions of the curriculum: the curriculum remains oriented towards the nation state impeding cross cultural understanding with a 'parochial pedagogy and ethnocentric orientations'.

Identity and culture

The final section of papers returns to the central questions of cultural identity. *Wolfgang Berg* asks the fundamental question about the nature of a European identity. Does it exist? He finds that it does, but that it needs to be more clearly labelled and identified, with more confidence: and that the Union needs to be transformed to become more transparent and with greater opportunities for real participation. Moving from general principles to fine detail, the contribution of *Yveline Fumat* is to consider the identity issues that confront a two-year old entering a nursery for the first time. She develops the idea that nursery staff need to actively involve parents in the learning process, working with them to preserve and develop the child's identity. *Guðrún Alda Harðardóttir* also focuses on early childhood education: in this case particularly linking the approaches at Reggio Emilio with Lipman's Philosophy for Children programme. Both approaches, she argues, place significance on children being motivated to make enquiries, and on teachers having the

insight to understand the capacity of the child to do this. *Lotta Bjervås* and *Anette Emilson* are concerned with the child's identity in the pedagogic process, particularly in processes that are verbalised as 'the child in focus' and 'the competent child'.

National identity is the issue in the paper presented by *Olga Hoyos*, *Cristina del Barrio* and *Antonio Corral*, examining the evidence of adolescents' conceptions of national identity in Spain and in Columbia. Identity and computer use are examined by *Anne-Mari Folkesson*, who finds some considerable gender issues in how boys and girls respond: some boys who had identified themselves as in opposition to the school were able to respond, and this had an effect on the girls. *Dorota Misiejuk* examines how Polish adolescents create an identity, and its relation to the other, which has a particular emphasise in a still largely mono-cultural society such as Poland. The paper by *Carmel Mulcahy* considers student teachers' identity in relationship to citizenship and inclusion. A particular module on values, identity and intercultural learning is described, and student responses to this are analysed. The final paper, by *Adam Niemczyński*, analyses how Polish teachers, pupils and parents are changing their views of the nature and purposes of education: each group, he suggest, has different views, and there is a general emphasis on 'pragmatic' outcomes and romanticism' (over cultural transmission and naturalism).

This collection represents the Network's largest conference to date. We have in this volume 68 papers, written by over 100 different authors who come from 24 different European countries (and three in the Americas). But these papers were not the only work of the conference. A number of working parties are producing guidelines and support documents for the network: drafts and outlines were put before groups at the conference, and ideas and suggestions from those attending the conference were taken on board. Parallel to this collection of conference proceedings, we will publish the first three of these guideline documents. The Network now moves on to its second year of Phase 2 – the fifth year of its formally supported existence.

References

- Barth, F. (ed) (1969) *Ethnic Group and Boundaries: The social organisation of Culture*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co
- Roden, C (1997) *Encyclopaedia of Jewish Food*
- Rogers, B. (2003) *Beef and Liberty: Beef, Bull and English Patriots*. London: Chatto and Windus