

**INTERACT, WP 6**  
**Vertical analysis, Summary**  
**The Danish University of Education**  
**April, 07**

## **Introduction**

The aim of this WP 6 was to compare and contrast information collected about institutional objectives at European and national level with regard to intercultural citizenship education. Part of the analysis focused on how European education documents within intercultural citizenship education were received and reflected on in a Danish context.

For WP 5 the partners agreed to interview persons from each country involved in intercultural citizenship education at a European level. The aim was to explore the ideas behind the regulations and recommendations provided by European and national institutions. However, it turned out to be difficult to identify persons in Denmark involved in citizenship education at a European level. Further the national and European interviews pointed to a gap between European recommendations and the national curriculum. As a consequence of this we chose to include in our analysis the question of how documents within the field of intercultural citizenship education find their way from a supranational to a national level and how intercultural citizenship education is conceptualized in Denmark.

The analysis is based on interviews with officials within the Danish Ministry of Education and researchers working within the field of citizenship education as well as interviews with consultants and policy makers involved in citizenship education at European level. The analysis also draws on former reports (WP2-WP5) made by the Danish team. These regard both document analysis of intercultural citizenship education at a European level and document analysis of intercultural citizenship education at a national level in the case of Denmark.

## **Conclusions**

We started by asking questions regarding the ideas behind the regulations and recommendations provided by European and national institutions. The aim was to compare and contrast information about institutional objectives at European and national level. However, the interviews pointed to a gap between the European and national level in this regard, and during the working process we consequently chose to include the question of how European education documents within intercultural citizenship education are received and reflected on in a Danish context.

The gap between the recommendations by the Council of Europe regarding citizenship education on the one hand and the work of developing national curricular formulations in Denmark on the other hand is stressed as both a result of political priorities by the current government in Denmark as well as a lack of institutional supportive structures within the Danish Ministry of Education.

The concept *citizenship education* is not a widely used concept among officials in Denmark. However, *Demokratisk dannelse* (democratic education), which is similar to the concept of citizenship is commonly used and education for democracy forms part of the overall objective of the reformed primary and secondary education. The term democracy is a buzz word within the education system in Denmark, but at the same time a notion of a '*Danish tradition for democratic education*' tends to nationalise the concept and related ideas of democratic education. A risk of the existing attitude of '*We know how to do this ourselves*' is a closed attitude towards other approaches to the issue as well as scepticism towards common European recommendations within the field.

Democracy is a term given political priority in education in Denmark, but in general it is not in any clear sense associated with intercultural or multicultural issues. This in opposition to formulations on a European level where relations between citizenship education and intercultural education are explicitly stated.

Both national and European interviews point to an increased importance of the intercultural dimension, however, *intercultural* takes various meanings and there seems to be no clear definition of what the concept contains. A positive aspect is outlined in both European and national interviews stressing internal European questions such as student exchange programmes within the EU, learning European languages and awareness of various European cultures as well as an awareness of a common European cultural heritage. The communicative aspect of intercultural education is also stressed in the interviews, which highlight *intercultural communication* as related to globalization, the invention of technology, international trade and economic growth.

Intercultural education is however also problematized in a Danish context, as it is often interpreted as referring to integration issues. At a European level intercultural education is similarly related to issues of immigration and integration but conceptualised in a broader sense as the focus is on how to prepare *all* children to live together in the future society.