

# Centro de Estudos Sociais

## WP 9 Summary Report

The objectives of WP9 are to map the converging and diverging aspects in the approach to intercultural dimension within active citizenship education, focusing upon university-based postgraduate courses and pre-service teacher development programmes, as well as accredited in-service teacher development courses. Rather than providing an in-depth analysis of those courses within each country, each partner is to analyse them in terms of **tendencies**, selected thematic issues across all four partner countries. The themes for comparison were established as follows:

### UK team (applied to the both levels of teacher preparation):

- Tensions, how are they tackled?
- Diversity and unity as notions related to democracy

### Spanish team (at the both levels of teacher preparation):

- Attitudes to diversity

### Danish team (at the both levels of teacher preparation):

- Problematic of additional language of instruction
- Thematisation of democratic discourse

### Portuguese team:

at the level of university-based programmes ( pre-service and postgraduate courses):

- Intercultural versus multicultural at the level of pre-service programmes:
- The makings of a critical intercultural educator able to generate change

The Portuguese team analysed the discourse of descriptions of the programmes offered across the project participant countries and examined them in the light of *UNESCO Guidelines on Intercultural Education* (2006) and critical pedagogy theory based on Paulo Freire. Thus, comparing the definitions of intercultural and multicultural education provided in the UNESCO guidelines, one can see that whereas both types of education are based on the principles of **social justice** and, may or may not be based on a **critical pedagogy**, they address **diversity** issues, and are **antiracist**, considered **important and pervasive for all**. However, intercultural education differs significantly from multicultural education as it goes **beyond acceptance, tolerant coexistence** or even **mutual recognition**, in that it presupposes **active interaction, dialogue between cultural groups** in order to avoid fragmentation.

Having analysed the programme descriptions across the project participant countries, the Portuguese team has concluded that this difference was in fact reflected in them. Thus, “**multicultural**” would normally refer to **the state** of the society or context. Portuguese and British educational institutions are also

concerned with multicultural **learning**, yet Danish and Portuguese programmes address issues of multicultural **citizenship**. Besides, “multicultural” context could be specified to be “**multiethnic**” (Portugal), “**multilingual**” (Denmark, Spain), and “**multireligious**” (Denmark), thus reflecting the concern with particular issues of the reality.

“**Intercultural**”, in its turn, is often linked to **intervention and mediation** (Spain, Portugal), as well as presupposes **communication and competence** (Portugal, Denmark), since it happens within **dialogue** and interaction. All the countries acknowledge **change** as one of the implications within intercultural communication – reassessment of **values, ethics** and social **history**. The scope of “intercultural” ranges from the relations between the groups within the country (Spain) to those in the global context (UK, Denmark). Most programmes in Britain and in the other countries seem not to distinguish between “intercultural” and “multicultural”, employing these terms interchangeably since the word intercultural generally takes the meaning of multicultural or international as it used to be the case in Denmark. In Portugal there are courses that attempt to draw that dividing line and also to focus on the issues of **power** through the prism of **critical analysis** and, to some extent, that of a **critical pedagogy**.