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About CHIEF

The CHIEF (Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe’s Future) project aims to build an effective dialogue between different stakeholders in order to facilitate a future of Europe based on inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity. The project focuses on the production and transition of cultural knowledge in both formal educational settings initiated from above, and a variety of informal human interactions. CHIEF will contribute both to understanding and enhancing cultural literacy for young people, and to more effective use of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge. It will also recognise existing innovative practices and develop a new organisational model to enhance the cultural and inter-cultural competence of young Europeans.

CHIEF is funded by the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 Programme. It brings together ten partner institutions:

- Aston University, United Kingdom,
- Daugavpils Universitate, Latvia
- Institut Drustvenih Znanosti Ivo Pilar, Croatia
- Caucasus Research Resource Centers, Georgia
- Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
- Universidad Pompeu Fabra, Spain
- Culture Coventry, United Kingdom
- Univerzita Komenskeho V Bratislave, Slovakia
- The Savitribai Phule Pune University, India
- Hochschule Fuer Angewandte Wissenschaften, Germany
Overview of Policy Reviews

Introduction
This deliverable comprises a series of systematic reviews of policy documents relating to cultural literacy education within CHIEF countries and regions. Each report contains a background section to aid understanding of the policy context, a description of methods, key findings, and a discussion of the results. Collectively, they aim to offer a comprehensive understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within government policies. This overview provides a brief account of the key findings of the national reports.

In most countries, the terms cultural literacy and cultural literacy education are not used in policy documents, save with one important exception. In *Global Education - Learning for the 21st Century*, produced by Slovakia’s Institution for Teachers’ Education and Training, cultural literacy is defined to include the following competencies: the ability to perceive and understand culture and to express oneself within cultural practices; an appreciation, respect for, and acceptance of the cultural values, traditions and tastes of other people; tolerance and empathy towards other cultures; the ability to express oneself in a way that exhibits respect, tolerance and acceptance of other cultures; a realisation of the importance of cultural communication in students’ lived experiences, in the life of society as a whole, and in communication with other cultures. However, even in Slovakian policy documents, the concept is not consistently applied and use of the term is rare. More typically, cultural literacy is discussed using different terms (such as cultural awareness, intercultural dialogue, and public culture), under different themes (such as cultural education, multicultural education, cultural heritage, traditional culture, regional education, language policy, child development, and human rights), or with respect to specific cultural forms (such as architecture, the visual arts, digital media).

There are obvious difficulties in mapping how different countries designate the scope of educational practices (broadly defined) for which there is no explicit policy lexicon. Cultural literacy education can take three general forms: formal (which relates to schools, colleges, and training); non-formal (which is semi-structured, and typically takes place in institutional settings, such as museums, but outside of settings association with formal education); and informal (which comprises self-organising cultural activities). The extent to which, and how, national policy documents reported on and seek to combine these different educational forms is highly varied.

Only one country, Croatia, defines non-formal education,⁴ and only two, Croatia and Slovakia, consistently distinguish between formal, non-formal and informal modes of cultural literacy education in mapping out effective policies for cultural development, engagement and participation.

Where policy documents make a distinction between different educational forms, accounts of the value of a mixed economy of cultural literacy education (and the potential limitations of specific methods of delivery) is relatively developed. In Croatia and Slovakia, for example, non-formal (and, to a lesser extent, informal) cultural literacy education is considered an important complement to formal education, and less constrained than formal education in adapting to different and changing needs and interests. In Croatia, the diversity of non-formal education is also regarded as a powerful indicator of general social development.

---

⁴ *Croatia’s 2011 Action Plan for Education about Sustainable Development* defines non-formal education as organised learning processes with the goal of improvement at work or in terms of various social activities, as well as general personal development. Informal education or self-education, by contrast, is defined in the same document as discrete, self-taught educational activities, typically by someone who spontaneously acquires experience and knowledge from home, through electronic media, and/or contact (real or virtual) with other people.
However, in the United Kingdom, which does not formally highlight a distinction between different education forms, museums, galleries and heritage sites are also identified as key institutions in enabling young people to gain new perspectives on their studies inside the classroom. In fact, collaboration between schools and other groups is regarded as central to the perceived need to develop a more coherent cultural education.

More generally, policy documents from several other countries (Georgia, Germany, Latvia, United Kingdom) highlight projects bringing together formal and non-formal modes of cultural literacy education. In Germany, schools are encouraged to cooperate with other cultural institutions and non-formal settings to enable young people to be creative, to express their individuality, and experience new perspectives. Similarly, Georgia’s *Unified Strategy for Education and Science 2017-2021*, outlines plans to integrate museums, protected areas, and historical and cultural monuments into formal cultural education. Likewise, in Latvia, where formal education adheres to a relatively restrictive, traditional understanding of culture, plans to introduce a new, competence-based approach within schooling, complement efforts to transform education and cultural education institutions into network hubs (co-managed by parents, trainers, learners, and stakeholders from the wider local community), which are expected to drive the development of new methods in cultural literacy education.

Either way, policy documents across countries reported on a wide range of formal and non-formal educational practices, including: workshops; *ad hoc* cultural events, seminars and discussions; intercultural community centres; free theatre ensembles; new national curricula foregrounding civic competencies; exchange programmes and international networks; formal cultural and arts education and training; cultural and educational camps; courses on human rights; specific teaching philosophies that seek to embed civic values, respect for diversity, tolerance of difference, and the value of social justice, human and democratic rights, and ethics within formal school curricula.

The above initiatives are part of what can best be described as an uneven (and disjointed) process across countries to embed and extend cultural literacy within young people’s lives and education. This is also evidenced by several strategic developments in educational practices, such as: the introduction of themes constitutive of cultural literacy (e.g. multiculturalism and global education) as cross-subject topics in school (e.g. Croatia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia); efforts to integrate culture and creativity into formal education (e.g. Georgia); training of education providers (e.g. Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Slovakia); and major investment in virtual cultural spaces (e.g. Germany, Latvia). The process is underpinned by the wide range of perceived social goods associated with cultural literacy education.

---

2 This reflects survey findings, which suggest that schools and cultural spaces associated with *Hochkultur* (high-culture) are less popular among young people compared to non-formal and (especially) informal self-created cultural spaces, particularly those associated with youth sub-culture, as well as virtual spaces of creativity and artistic/aesthetic expression.

3 As part of its efforts to facilitate the inclusion of national minorities, for example, *Croatia’s National Strategy for Children’s Rights (2014-2020)* has called for a programme of intercultural training for teachers to ensure that they are better equipped to resolve interethnic problems in the workplace and to engage constructively with the complex pasts of minorities. In addition, the Education and Teacher Training Agency has developed several projects to implement civic education in schools and from 2001 to 2011 trained more than 10,000 educational workers. In Germany, cultural education is to be integrated in training and professionalisation of teachers and other educational and cultural professionals such as artists and curators.

4 The Bund, for example, has undertaken several initiatives that aim to exploit digital technologies (virtual spaces) as a means of facilitating the “democratization of knowledge and resources. These include the large state funded *Hochkultur*-projects, like the Festival of the Digital Culture, the German Digital Library and the online platform “Cultural heritage Eastern Europe”, as well as *Breitenkultur*-model cultural education youth projects.
To this end, cultural literacy education is seen as: a means of preserving cultural diversity (Catalonia, Croatia, Latvia, Georgia) and national identity (Catalonia, Croatia, Latvia, Georgia, Germany); a key element in forging individual identities (Croatia, Germany, Slovakia), monetisable skills (Catalonia, Croatia, Georgia, Latvia, Slovakia, Turkey, United Kingdom), and a greater sense of social cohesion, community belonging (Catalonia, Croatia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia, United Kingdom), and tolerance for minority groups (Catalonia, Latvia, Georgia, Germany, Slovakia, United Kingdom); as a means of combatting social exclusion and promoting a shared sense of belonging to cultural spaces (Croatia, Germany, Latvia, United Kingdom) and gender equality (Germany); a precondition of responsible citizenship (Croatia, Germany, Slovakia, Turkey), in which young people exhibit a range of socially functional attributes (e.g. patriotism, respect for the rule of law, a sense of social equity); a means of facilitating international diplomacy (Germany, United Kingdom) and the security of the state (Latvia) and mitigating emigration (Georgia, Latvia, Turkey); a primer of creativity (Croatia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia, United Kingdom) and general educational and emotional development (Croatia, Germany, United Kingdom) and health and well-being (Croatia, Georgia, United Kingdom); and as a potential source of revenue generation (Croatia, Georgia, Slovakia, United Kingdom), economic growth (Catalonia, Croatia, Slovakia, United Kingdom), and socio-economic regeneration and development (Croatia, Georgia, Slovakia) (see further below).

Access to, and participation in, cultural literacy education (hereafter just access and participation) are also considered instrumental in helping young people to develop social and cultural links (Croatia, Turkey, United Kingdom) and cultural capital (Croatia, Slovakia, United Kingdom), become more active and responsible citizens (Croatia, Germany, Slovakia, Turkey, United Kingdom), realise their talents (Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia, United Kingdom) and represent a powerful tool for safeguarding the values (Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia, Turkey) of society and the importance of representative democracy (Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Slovakia) within those values. Moreover, discrete policy recommendations on cultural literacy education rest on the (rarely expressed) assumption that access and participation can have important multiplier effects. Croatia’s National Youth Programme (2014-2017), for example, reports that cultural programmes can help to raise awareness of the general importance of cultural heritage and a vibrant arts and cultural landscape. Equally, the same document notes that involving young people as producers and co-creators of cultural activities can encourage them to express their own creativity, which allows them to both grow as individuals and develop a sense of belonging to the community. Volunteering is also reported to help in bringing communities together and (in so far as it encourages young people to problem solve or acquire information from peers, other countries, and other cultures) is considered to play a key role in building networks and young people’s personal development.

These social goods are commonly cited in the context of efforts to depict cultural literacy as a driver of economic development (Croatia, Catalonia, Georgia, Latvia, Slovakia, Turkey, United Kingdom). The reported nature of this relationship varies significantly across states. In Georgia, for example, cultural literacy is primarily tied to building internationally competitive, self-sustaining creative industries. This also partly characterises policy documents in the United Kingdom, but here equal emphasis is placed on the interdependencies between cultural literacy education and the development of human capital, whereby cultural literacy education is steadily marshalled to construct ‘neo-liberal subjects’: resilient and responsible individuals capable of contributing to the national economy. These objectives also underlie Croatian and Slovakian policy narratives. However, in these countries cultural literacy is also foregrounded as a major component of socio-economic development. Indeed, in Slovakia, the state, culture and economy are identified as fundamental, interconnected systems which serve to create the material and immaterial wealth of society.
The reasons underlying the emerging association between cultural literacy and economic development are complex and highly contextualised. In Croatia, for example, policy documents emphasise how cultural literacy provides a basis for responding to the challenges posed by more open capital markets by developing specific industries (e.g. domestic tourism) and human capital (developing competencies in young people which help them to compete in an increasingly competitive and fast-changing labour markets). However, the prominence given to the economic potential of cultural literacy in policy documents also appears to be part of departmental strategies to attract additional funding for cultural literacy education, which declined substantially following the 2008 global financial crisis. This compounded a growing perception that culture represented an expense, rather than an investment (reflecting the fact that money invested in culture does not result in direct and immediate economic returns) and provided an impetus for policy actors to emphasise both the economic potential of culture and cultural heritage and their capacity to drive local and regional development.\(^5\)

The case of Croatia illustrates the complexities involved in mapping the fiscal politics of investment in cultural literacy education. Several other countries (Georgia, Latvia, United Kingdom) report the impact of governments’ responses to the global financial crisis on cultural and educational budgets. In the United Kingdom, for example, the budget of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport was cut by 25% in 2010 and by a further 20% in 2015. The degree to which policy documents detail investment in cultural practices varies considerably. Nonetheless, declining or static public funding appears to be shaping the economics of cultural literacy education in three key respects. First, public investment in cultural literacy education appears to be increasingly targeted towards larger institutions (typically associated with high culture)\(^6\) and projects that are considered to produce either observable returns or economically self-sustaining cultural practices. In Georgia, for example, both the priority areas identified in its cultural strategy for investment (e.g. visual arts, theatre and the performing arts, museums, literature, traditional crafts) and the specific aspects or practices within these areas earmarked for investment reflect the importance attached to cultural activities and education as a strategic resource for economic development. Government plans for museums, for example, involve support for local and international collaboration to enable professional knowledge and practices to be shared, which is designed to overlay new training programmes for museum workers that centre on audience building, fundraising, developing networks, strategic design, and marketing. Plans to support the music industry centre on sponsoring events, festivals, competitions, and workshops to raise the profile of classical musicians and composers at home and abroad, and support for artisans involved in traditional crafts centres on developing studios and providing training on marketing and copyright protection to support sustainable entrepreneurship. Second, major reforms tend to focus on innovations that, relative to total government budgets, are fiscally benign. This is exemplified by reforms to school curricula and teacher training in transition economies or economies that have recently completed the transition process. Third, declining public funding coincides with calls for cultural providers to diversify financial support. This seems to be especially marked in the United Kingdom, where funding streams are highly diverse and include finance from major companies, as part of their corporate social responsibility programmes, increasing reliance on self-funding through earned income and fundraising, philanthropic giving, and crowd-funding. Likewise, Germany has seen major reforms to the legal governance of charities (2007 and 2013), which are claimed to have promoted cultural education by improving the tax framework for donations and charitable work.

---

\(^5\) The government’s current formal programme (2016-2020) states the share of funding for culture will be steadily increased.

\(^6\) In addition, the German report notes that whereas funding of high-culture institutions is long-term and more sustainable, funding for cultural education tends to be transitory and selective, limited to the award of prizes for model projects.
Our research design has not been tailored to evaluate these funding trends. Nonetheless, calls for cultural providers to become self-sustaining and exploit the untapped potential of private sources of funding (e.g. Latvia, United Kingdom) appear to have been made in the absence of serious examination of the feasibility of these strategies to fill funding gaps. More generally, the funding landscape outlined above does not address the heavy reliance of many cultural practices on unpaid labour, may reinforce the capacity of public companies and wealthy individuals to shape the direction of cultural literacy, and is likely to work to the detriment of less fashionable, non-formal and informal sources of cultural literacy, which potentially represent the richest sources of cultural literacy innovation, creativity, and inclusion (see Croatia, Germany, United Kingdom).

Governance and Policy Coherence
At the national level policy relevant to cultural literacy is typically the responsibility of ministries of culture and education, although the work of a wide range of other governments departments (such as those concerned with young people, families, regional governance and development, foreign affairs, and welfare) is also relevant. In some countries, specific institutes within ministries (e.g. the Slovak Youth Institute, JUVENTA) and semi-independent bodies also have responsibility for policy development and implementation relating to non-formal education and educational practices delivered through school curricula. Cultural literacy governance is further complicated by the division of responsibilities between national, regional, and local levels. In Germany, the federal government plays a co-ordinating role in cultural education, but effective responsibility resides with the Länder and local authorities. In the UK, cultural literacy education is divided among the UK Government at Westminster, and the respective devolved administrations of Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. In most cases, as such, the governance of cultural literacy education policy is complex, multi-faceted, and, in many cases, overlapping.

The dispersed responsibility for cultural literacy education partly explains the considerable variation in the extent to which, and how, cultural literacy is covered in formal policy documents both within and between countries. Only three countries, Germany, Slovakia and the United Kingdom, had produced policy documents dedicated to cultural education within the period covered by the review. Notwithstanding this, in both these and other countries, government policy on cultural literacy is essentially ad hoc, constituted by relatively isolated statements, objectives, and initiatives in formal policy documents covering a range of related areas (such as national identity, education, language policy, cultural heritage, media, young people). This is reflected in considerable variation in how the scope of cultural literacy education is circumscribed in documents produced by different government departments. Cultural education in Latvia’s Sustainable Development Strategy, for example, encompasses formal and non-formal education. However, planning documents with shorter time horizons reduce cultural literacy education to the country’s formal education system and professional (art and music) training. In youth policy documents, engagement in cultural activities is defined as a useful way of passing leisure time and entertainment. The relatively uncoordinated approach to cultural literacy education also partly accounts for the different emphasis placed on different elements of cultural literacy in documents produced by different departments (but see Cultural Tolerance, Diversity, Inclusion, and National Identity below for a more detailed discussion). In Slovakia, for example, documents produced by organisations affiliated to the Ministry of Education promote teaching methods and materials aimed at facilitating understanding and acceptance of unfamiliar cultures.

---

7 Although “cultural education” is used within German public policy, the term remains ill-defined. Recent recommendations on cultural education by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder, for instance, do not contain a clear definition of the concept.
This contrasts with documents produced by the Ministry of Culture, which focus on the themes of national identity and culture. In short, dispersed responsibility for cultural literacy education compounds the inevitable ambiguity that arises in policy contexts where fundamental concepts are ill-defined and equivocal and raise important questions about the degree of co-ordination and coherence within policies relevant to cultural literacy education.

Policy coherence in the context of cultural literacy education implies that all relevant policies should work towards a country's cultural literacy goals and, ideally, support one-another in attaining these goals. The review did not specifically focus on the effects of policy incoherence. Nonetheless, a failure to coordinate the development of policies relevant to cultural literacy may potentially lead to ineffective policy design or stymie effective implementation of policy goals by reducing buy-in among stakeholders, sending mixed signals for investment or action, or simply leading to conflicting mandates and a misallocation of limited resources. Our analysis suggests that policy incoherence is widespread and manifests itself in a range of ways.

For example, policy incoherence arises in the context of a bifurcation of trends in access. Croatia’s National Strategy for Children’s Rights (2014-2020) maintains that all children should have equal access to education regardless of gender, race, socio-economic status, religion and ethnicity. By contrast, major changes to the education system have seen a drop off in both the number of art and music classes offered to children and fewer additional activities relevant to art and culture offered outside of compulsory teaching activities. This has compounded the depressive effect of the high cost of arts education on provision and led to music, art, and dance education being increasingly directed to, and becoming the preserve of, gifted students. Likewise, despite its status as a core priority of Latvia’s Sustainable Development Strategy (which formally provides a framework for all policy planning), developing cultural awareness and participation are relatively incidental concerns in policy documents directly concerned with young people. Moreover, the existence of a “guidance gap” – the fact that guidance in planning documents on how cultural literacy education should be developed and governed remains fragmentary and ill-defined – works to further weaken policy coherence and is likely to ensure that calls in strategic documents to increase non-formal education activities and enhance cultural literacy through innovative practices remain policy aspirations for the foreseeable future.

Policy incoherence may also arise where different government departments are working according to different, and in some cases competing, priorities. In the context of government-wide efforts to expedite convergence between EU and Turkish policies, regulations, and norms relevant to cultural literacy education both the Turkish Directorate for EU Affairs and National Agency (which have responsibility for co-ordinating Turkey’s accession to the EU within the public administration) have increasingly emphasised how Turkey is moving towards a shared set of cultural values with Europe by, for example, pointing to efforts to encourage constructive interaction among diverse cultures. This is ostensibly consistent with a commitment to increase awareness of “universal ethical principles” and “universal values” in documents produced by the Ministries of Youth and Sports and National Education. However, these concepts are not developed and are used interchangeably with “education of values”, a concept associated with Islamic and religious ideas, which reflects the organising role of the Directorate of Religious Affairs in embedding ethno-religious values across Turkish public policy.

The above example illustrates a more general point about the impact of deeper-lying, opposing objectives of cultural literacy education on policy coherence. In the section below, we develop this point with reference to how policy documents report on cultural tolerance, diversity, inclusion, and national identity.
Cultural Tolerance, Diversity, Inclusion, and National Identity

Policy documents in most countries/regions (Catalonia/Spain, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia, Turkey, United Kingdom) outline broad commitments to cultural and social tolerance and an openness to cultural and ethnic diversity. This aspiration is captured, for example, in the idea of ‘Open Latvianness’ (which includes acceptance of local national minorities and immigrants), Georgia’s present cultural strategy (which provides a general declaration that all citizens are equal in cultural life, irrespective of their national, ethnic, religious, and linguistic differences), and the concept of culture as a critical corrective of society in some German documents (which reflexively problematizes hegemonic forms of cultural knowledge and aims to give a voice to groups who might otherwise be excluded).

Broad commitments to cultural and social tolerance are reflected in a range of programmes that seek to operationalise cultural literacy as a driver of social tolerance for diversity and inclusion (hereafter just inclusion). Croatia’s inclusion of civic education as an integrative inter-subject theme, for example, represents a pedagogical interpolation of civic competence which seeks to embed understanding, skills, and values in respect of political, social, (inter)cultural, economic, and ecological issues into all aspects of formal education. Slovakia’s Global Education agenda has a different emphasis but is designed to work to the same effect in so far as it encourages students to acquire the values of active global citizens, deepen their understanding of diversity and global inequalities and confront stereotypes. Moreover, the agenda complements efforts to push teaching of human rights in schools (which is considered to help young people orient themselves in a modern multicultural society, partly by introducing them to a diversity of ideas and convictions), and address elements of cultural literacy in the context of young people’s psychological development (which aims to develop young people’s capacity to move between different countries, cultures and groups of people with respect and acceptance of their equivalence). Similarly, citizenship education in the United Kingdom centres on giving young people an opportunity to explore “diverse national, regional, religious and ethnic identities” and the need for “mutual understanding”.

Alongside these commitments and programmes, cultural literacy education is also reported to instil a strong awareness and understanding of national culture in young people as it relates to collective, national identity. Georgian policy, for example, links young people’s participation in cultural practices to the preservation of national identity and keeping traditions alive. Likewise, Slovakia’s Strategy for the Development of Culture (2014–2020) links specific fields of human creativity (e.g. movies, theatre, architecture, songs, dances) to the concept of state-constitutive nation, which, in effect, is the Slovak ethnic group nationally conceived. Similarly, Turkey’s National Youth and Sports Policy Document (2013), which outlines recommendations for how Turkish history and cultural heritage should be presented to young people, advocates that poetry, sagas, and other literary works be used as basis for teaching young people “about our history and cultural values”, that young people perform and follow “our traditional arts”, and that financial support be provided for TV series, movies and cartoons which “transmit our history and cultural heritage” [emphasis added].

Countries’ motivations for emphasising national culture and identity (hereafter just national culture) centre on the association commonly drawn between cultural literacy and social cohesion and are shaped by their specific historical trajectories and demographic characteristics. Post-communist countries (e.g. Croatia, Georgia, Latvia), for example, have at various points since independence identified a renewed sense of national identity as integral to creating a shared sense of purpose and social stability during the transition to independence.

---

8 In formal terms, global education encompasses global development education (education on developing countries and poverty in the world), environmental protection, multiculturalism, and the socio-politics of peace and human rights.
In Croatia, for example, the coterminous relationship between independence, ethnicity, and cultural identity, lead to bipartisan political support for efforts to develop and strengthen a distinctive sense of Croatian national identity and is highlighted in the Government’s present programme (2016-2020), which identifies a shared culture as the most important element in sustaining a common Croat identity during a time when there was no independent Croatian state. This has led to policies relevant to cultural literacy being situated within a narrative of national reconstruction and renewal. Likewise, Georgia’s Law on Culture, which addresses “the centuries-old, rich traditions of Georgian culture” represents a commitment to forge an independent cultural policy that marks a symbolic shift away from its Soviet heritage. In Latvia, the context is complicated by a declining population: programmes relevant to cultural heritage and language that seek to shape a distinctive national identity are part of a package of strategic, national-level measures which reflect underlying concerns about the continued viability of Latvian culture over the longer-term. By contrast, the nationalist conceptualisation of cultural literacy education in the United Kingdom embodied in the language of ‘British values’ and emphasising the need to strengthen national identity as a source of binding sentiment in diverse, multicultural communities, gained political traction in the early 2000s as a result of the perceived need to strengthen the integration of diverse communities in light of the threat of home-grown terrorism and civil disorder.

The importance of this twinned commitment to inclusion and national culture to understanding policy coherence in cultural literacy education primarily resides in the fact that its tensions and potential contradictions are rarely recognised: even though emphasising national culture can lead to orientations beyond those associated with national identity being treated primarily as ‘other’ cultures and indirectly assign belonging to those who can claim a long family history of nativity. In practice, policy texts either fail to address how inclusion and national culture should be reconciled or subtly conflate inclusion with integration around prevailing cultural norms. This second effect takes a strong and a weak form. In relation to the former, the German policy review reports that the concept of culture as a set of national features, habits, traditions and values often makes a distinction between “our culture” (Leitkultur) and Migrantenkulturen (migrant cultures). Because policy documents do not define Migrantenkulturen, migrant culture is largely defined by what it is not, and with respect to where efforts to integrate are required. This underpins expectations that migrants engage with Germany’s values, customs and traditions (defined as “our values, customs and traditions”) and leads to forms of cultural integration that primarily aim to convey Leitkultur and commemorate culture to people with Migrationshintergrund (immigrant backgrounds). The weaker form is exemplified by Georgia’s present cultural strategy. This provides a broad commitment to safeguarding all Kartvelian languages and tones and endangered languages as part of Georgian identity. However, greater emphasis is placed on promoting Georgian, which is described as key to circulating intercultural information and represented as instrumental in forming common cultural values and increasing cultural participation and awareness. There are some exceptions to this phenomenon, where efforts are made to present diversity and national culture as indivisible. Latvia’s National Development Plan (2014-2020), for example, calls for civil action and democratic institutions to be “linked with the ideas of a single national cultural, ideals and practice” which is “based on interaction of national identity and cultural diversity”. However, these broad calls are asserted, rather than explained, and tend to be contradicted by other policy texts. Thus, although Latvia’s Guidelines on National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy (2012–2018) reject the idea of basing nationalism on ethnic purity, national identity is described as a mutual community of people having similar national cultural features and the objective of preserving and developing Latvian cultural traditions is presented as paramount.

9 But see the Latvian report, which outlines nationwide events that celebrate cultural and ethnic diversity under the rubric of national identity.
More generally, the failure to satisfactorily reconcile the tensions between inclusion and national culture poses several mutually reinforcing risks to developing inclusive forms of cultural literacy education. First, it may inform the direction of travel of inter-cultural learning, which risks ossification as a means of achieving community cohesion, rather than as a platform for highlighting the essentially fluid and hybrid nature of culture as a product of individual and collective interaction and adaptation. Second, it can lead to inclusion becoming conceived of as a conditional offer: in which diversity is indulged in so far as citizens submit to unspecified (or underspecified) national cultural characteristics or forms of cultural heritage. This is particularly problematic where national cultures and identities reproduce national myths that fail to engage with difficult pasts (see, for example, the colonial amnesia characteristic of German commemoration culture and “British values’) that may stymie cultural participation of those whose histories are excluded. Third, it can lead to the general population being excluded from actively creating cultural education. In German policy documents, for example, inclusion in the context of access to cultural literacy education is aligned as a one-way street from Hochkultur to Breitenkultur (e.g. by giving young people free entry to the museums of Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation) in which cultural integration centres on conveying this knowledge to migrant youth or those labelled as such (e.g. by training Arab speaking refugee museum guides for the Arab speaking refugee public). Finally, it provides policy space for cultural literacy education to actively work against commitments elsewhere to cultural and social tolerance. This is illustrated by the promotion of Kulturnation in Germany, which understands a nation as a community of people who feel connected to one another through language, traditions, culture and religion that exists independently of state structures and borders. The concept of Kulturnation is tied to Hochkultur (closely associated with museums, opera, and other major cultural institutions, and is rooted in Prussian/Reformation cultural heritage), which, historically, has uncritically transmitted several key drivers of social exclusion (e.g. colonialism, racism, anti-Semitism, classism, misogyny).

Access and Participation

Barriers to Access and Participation

Policy documents in most countries refer to barriers to young people’s access to and participation in cultural activities (broadly defined) relevant to cultural literacy education (hereafter just access and participation). Reported obstacles include: time and financial constraints (exacerbated by the high cost of enrollment in some cultural activities); a mismatch between the needs of young people and “cultural offers” (where, for example, core, publicly funded cultural institutions provide content that is largely unattractive to young people); incomplete provision due to inadequate provider resources; geographical constraints (where cultural activities are concentrated in cities, larger towns, or more developed regions); poor information on existing programmes (particularly where, for instance, there is no single, publicly available source of information on non-formal education programs which are taking place); general youth passivity. In general, discussion of barriers to access and participation tends to be selective and superficial. The national reports support six common findings.

First, little consideration is given to barriers of access and participation, beyond socio-economic status and ethnicity. The effects of inequalities arising from religion, gender, and physical and mental disabilities are underemphasised. In some instances, socio-economic status as a barrier to access and participation is presented as primarily epiphenomenal: a function of poor cultural provision in rural areas and small towns (e.g. Croatia, Turkey). Second, barriers to access and participation do not appear to be mapped systematically. No policy documents reported in depth empirical data on obstacles to access or participation. The documents reviewed neither contained evidence of the extent of the problem nor how it takes effect. This is reflected in policy documents’ tendency to report obstacles in isolation, rather than holistically.

10 Whether, for instance, weak access and participation is confined to more received forms of cultural expression and cultural spaces, such as museums and art galleries or whether weak access and participation applies generally.
There was little discussion of what combination of factors prevent access and participation or what cultural activities are affected. Policy documents typically ignored how discrepancies between cultural offers and young people’s needs and interests affects access and participation and failed to explore the tensions between efforts to monetise culture, which places an emphasis on the development of talent, and participation for all. Third, policy documents in some countries tend to conflate barriers to access and participation. Weak access and participation for ethnic minorities in Germany for example, is typically linked to their socio-economic status, with little consideration given to the specific effects of racial discrimination. Fourth, the longer-term social consequences of fiscal contraction on access and participation are rarely outlined in depth. Fifth, policy documents in some countries (e.g. Catalonia, Georgia, Latvia, Turkey) focus primarily on access, ignoring questions of participation. In countries where policy documents discuss participation as well as access (e.g. Croatia, Germany, Slovakia, United Kingdom), discussion of participation tends to focus more on youth people’s involvement in cultural production, rather than decision-making. Sixth, the contemporary financial and institutional environment of civil society organisations, is rarely discussed. This is despite the fact that they play a key role in facilitating access and participation: their active role and open structure placing them in an ideal position to facilitate the participation of young people, monitor and respond to their changing needs and interests, and initiate new trends themselves.

Addressing Barriers to Access and Participation
Policy documents in most countries report on strategies and commitments designed to soften the economic drivers of cultural exclusion. These include: connecting schools to cultural institutions in economically weak regions; targeted efforts to promote non-formal cultural educational initiatives and projects located directly in these environments; funding formula that link financial support to cultural institutions to the provision of cultural education that reaches out to underrepresented groups; free entrance to cultural institutions for children and young people. The national reports support five common findings.

First, although reports in some countries place a significant emphasis on opening up access and participation to economically disadvantaged groups, this is not necessarily backed up with meaningful financial support. Barriers to access are a central theme of several policy papers in the United Kingdom, for example, which is described as a fundamental issue of social justice. However, these documents make reference to initiatives that involve no new public investment (e.g. programmes offered by privately-funded orchestras and theatres aimed at reaching out to young people living in deprived areas). Second, strategies aimed at enhancing access and participation tend to focus on supply side issues, such as the digitisation of cultural sources in Latvia (access-based) or efforts in Croatia to encourage forms of organised leisure in which young people are active and self-organising and, consequently, produce cultural content on their own account (see below). The socio-cultural effects of supply-side strategies can be radically different. One potential effect of Croatia’s efforts to encourage self-organisation of young people, for example, is that future shifts in cultural practices and understanding may be initiated from below, away from, less flexible and creative, public bodies. By contrast, Croatia’s Strategy of Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Economic Use of Cultural Heritage, advocates encouraging young people to become active participants in conservation, protection, and economic exploitation of existing cultural heritage by raising their awareness of the economic potential of what is essentially a static “cultural offer”.

11 Only one policy document (Croatia), for example, discussed in depth how the decline in access to formal cultural literacy education might exacerbate inequalities in access and participation.
12 One Croatia document examines a range of factors that impair civil society organisations’ work, namely: the fact that they are not fully recognised by public institutions; are only weakly institutionalised; and suffer from a near-permanent crisis of resources.
13 Only one country, Slovakia, specifically advocated direct financial subsidies to young people (income support) as a means of encouraging active participation in cultural practices.
Third, strategies that seek to address discrepancies between cultural offers and young people’s interests are noted take two broad forms. Germany’s efforts to use formal cultural education as a bridge between *Hochkultur* (high culture), its associated institutions (museums, opera houses and other major cultural institutions), and young people exemplifies a *stem the tide approach*, where instruction is used as a means of curating tastes and preserving cultural practices associated with *Hochkultur* and there is no meaningful exchange of ideas. By contrast, Croatia’s encouragement of young people to become producers of cultural content represents a *go with the flow strategy*, which seeks to tap into young people’s creative energies and popularise cultural production. Fourth, we found little evidence of efforts to inform institutions associated with high culture of the needs, ideas, histories and identities produced within youth cultures. This reflects the general emphasis of efforts to increase participation on cultural creation, rather than decision-making (but see the Croatian report). It also coheres with the predominant approach taken in some countries to expanding cultural participation to under-represented groups. For example, stated ambitions to tackle under-representation of black and minority ethnic and disabled people in the United Kingdom focus predominantly on including young people from diverse backgrounds into the narrower, institutionalised cannon of what constitutes culture, such as classical music or ballet, rather than re-defining the cannon as a consequence of demographic diversity (see also the German report). Fifth, we found no evidence of evaluation of either initiatives aimed at enhancing access and participation or whether the level of investment is sufficient to address unequal access and participation.

**National and European Cultural Literacy**

Policy documents in several countries (Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Slovakia) refer to the interdependencies between their own national cultures and a pan-European culture and identity. Although this was typically asserted or implied, rather than explained, 14 four broad themes can be identified.

First, few countries seek explicitly to promote a common European identity to young people (but see below): we found little evidence of either specific programmes aimed at situating national cultural practices within a pan-European identity or of discrete initiatives within programmes to this effect. Only one German document reported teaching European identity in schools as an educational goal. This was also the sole document in our collective dataset to highlight a common European identity as an aspiration. Second, in some countries an emphasis on national culture is represented as constitutive of EU cultural and identity. This is characteristic of Latvian policy documents which note that their national identity, language, cultural values, and lifestyles represent an important part of maintaining European Cultural diversity. Germany’s approach was more nuanced. Policy documents described the fluidity of European culture as having been shaped by both cultural exchange across national borders and the appropriation of different cultural influences, but, in practice, European engagement appears to be relatively one-sided – promoting German cultural heritage, language and history. Third, in countries either seeking accession to, or having expressed an interesting in joining, the EU (Georgia and Turkey), policy documents emphasised the growing convergence between national cultural practices and the European Union (EU). The Turkish Directorate for EU Affairs and National Agency (the two public institutions responsible for ensuring convergence with EU policies among Turkish government departments), for example, have increasingly emphasised that Turkey is moving towards a shared set of values and culture with the EU (in terms of, for example, promoting cultural diversity, and protecting cultural heritage), although we found no documents outlining the steps being taken by the Turkish government to this end. Equally, in Georgia, policy documents consistently emphasised plans to ensure compliance between domestic policy on cultural issues (e.g. relating to cultural heritage) and EU rules. Finally, in some cases an emphasis is placed on European regions, rather than the EU.

14 Save one German policy document, which reported Germany’s commitment to European cultural values of the Enlightenment, cosmopolitism and peaceful dialogue
This is true of Croatia, where commonalities are drawn between national culture and Central Europe, and Germany, where German cultural heritage in former German territories in Eastern Europe, is presented as a potentially binding element in this process of creating a common European identity.

Cultural Literacy Beyond Borders
Cultural literacy beyond borders is an emerging policy theme within many of the countries we reviewed (e.g. Latvia, Croatia, Georgia, Germany, Turkey, UK). Policy documents generally provide few details of the steps that governments are taking (or plan to take) to promote cultural literacy abroad. There are some notable exceptions. Georgian policy documents, for example, outline (among other things) participation of domestic musicians in international events, establishing cultural centres in other countries, exchange trips, festivals, exhibitions, and training programmes for translators of Georgian literature (and the development of professional networks of translators) to boost the translation of Georgian literature into other languages. In some cases, the underlying purpose of these initiatives can be highly focused and only loosely tied to youth cultural literacy. More generally, beyond the basic aim of raising a state’s international profile and creating international goodwill, the target audiences and purpose of these practices vary according to how regional instability, the processes of globalisation, and, where relevant, EU membership are perceived to affect key government concerns. The Georgian government, for example, has expressed a commitment to ensuring that young people living in the territories occupied by Russia after the Russo-Georgian War in 2008 receive information about the cultural life of the country in order to cement relations between all young people in Georgia. In the United Kingdom, by contrast, developing understanding of British culture abroad is regarded primarily as an instrument of soft power, through which cultural practices seek to project an image of the country, as it prepares to leave the European Union, as a stable democracy with a belief in individual liberty, diversity and freedom of expression. In Germany, it centres on (but is not reduced to) promoting “German cultural heritage” in Eastern and Central Europe and former German territories associated with the displacement of ethnic Germans following World War II. In Latvia, by contrast, the promotion of cultural literacy is aimed at Latvians living abroad, partly with a view to developing a global network supportive of Latvia and partly to encourage voluntary return. Similar concerns appear to underpin the Turkish government’s interest in extra-national cultural literacy education, where one government ministry has advocated that young people based in Turkey interact and organise events with young Turkish people living abroad in order to stem the flow of economic migration and encourage young people from abroad to live and work in Turkey.\footnote{In Turkey, cultural literacy beyond borders is also considered to provide a basis for young people in Turkey to develop the skills necessary to compete internationally.}
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Executive Summary

The review involved a systematic analysis of policy documents relevant to cultural literacy education in the Republic of Croatia. A systematic search was conducted of the webpages of the official Government of Croatia, the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Science and Education and the Ministry of Demographics, Family, Youth and Social Policy. After the screening process, 10 documents were analysed using an inductive thematic approach.

Cultural literacy is not recognised as a specific policy topic in Croatia. Nevertheless, most documents relevant to the topic are underpinned by two organising assumptions, the importance of preserving both national identity and a democratic, non-discriminatory society within which cultural diversity is respected.

The most commonly used term in policy documents relating to cultural literacy - interculturalism/intercultural education – is not defined in any of the reviewed documents. It is primarily discussed in relation to national minorities, in the context of efforts to help them preserve their identity and culture through special school programmes within formal education. A major risk of this approach, confirmed in empirical research on the issue, is that it leads to a more pronounced separation, as minority identities and cultures develop alongside, rather than within, a more expansive, pluralist national identity and culture.

In general, changes in formal education, held up by a complex past, have been slow. Moreover, fiscal tightening has led to greater emphasis being placed on the civil sector. Civil society organisations are considered to have already made great strides in educating young people about democracy, the value of active participation in cultural and civic life, and the importance of respecting diversity and human rights, as well as in encouraging young people’s creative expression in order to involve them more in cultural activities as creators and not just consumers. Nevertheless, even more is expected from civil society organisations in future despite static public funding. This lack of funding is partly a consequence of an increasing perception about culture as an expense, reflecting the fact that money invested in culture does not result in direct and immediate economic returns. Policy actors have responded by emphasising the economic potential of culture and cultural heritage in particular, which is represented as self-sustainable, if well-managed, and a basis for local or regional economic development.
Introduction

Aims of the Review
The purpose of this review of policy documents is to provide a systematic analysis of official policies relating the cultural literacy education of young people in the Republic of Croatia. The review: (1) critically analyses official forms of cultural literacy education (defined as formal and informal educational activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage); and (2) underpins the design of the empirical components of the wider CHIEF project. More information about this can be found at http://chiefproject.eu. More specifically, we seek to provide an understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is conceived, planned and presented in Croatian policies (laws, strategies and actions plans) and draw out strengths and weaknesses of successive Croatian governments’ approaches to cultural literacy education.

Structure of the Report
The report begins with a brief overview of the Croatian policy context in order to provide basic background information for readers unfamiliar with Croatia. We then outline the methodology used to collate and analyse the data and present our main findings. This is followed by a brief discussion which sets our findings against the (Croatian language) academic literature on cultural literacy. Final concluding remarks are presented at the end.
Policy Context

Croatia constitutes a relatively homogenous society. According to the 2011 Census, 99.4% of the population have Croatian citizenship, 90.4% of the population are ethnically Croats, and 86.3% of the population declare themselves as Catholics (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). Despite this, Croatia has a strong multicultural element: 22 “national minorities”, formally recognised in the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia (and other laws), have traditionally inhabited Croatia. This is reflected in how the Constitution defines Croatia: as a national state of both Croatian people and members of national minorities (Croatian Parliament, 2010). According to the 2011 Census, national minorities represented just under 8% of the total population. The largest national groups were Serbs (186,633 or 4.36%), Bosniaks (31,479 or 0.73%), Italians (17,807 or 0.42%), Albanians (17,513 or 0.41%), and Roma (16,975 or 0.40%) (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2011).

National minorities are guaranteed the right to organise education in their own language and script. There are three education models from which members of national minorities can choose. According to Model A all classes are held in the language and the script of a national minority, but students are also required to learn Croatian. Model B encompasses bilingual teaching: science is held in Croatian, whilst subjects in social sciences and humanities are held in the language of the national minority. In Model C most classes are held in Croatian, but students are encouraged to learn the language and promote the culture of a national minority (Ministry of Science and Education, 2018). In 2017/2018, 34 primary schools and 11 high schools were organised in accordance with Model A, 3 primary schools and 1 high school used Model B, and 136 primary schools and 19 high schools organised teaching in accordance with Model C (Government, 2018).

The status of national minorities, particularly Serbs as the largest minority group, is an especially sensitive issue in Croatia due to the historical circumstances, marked by the Homeland war (1991-1995), between Croat forces and rebel Serb forces (on the eve of the war, Serb’s constituted 12.2% of the population) (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2011) and the Serb-controlled Yugoslav People’s Army. The total number of people killed or missing is estimated at 20,091 (Živić, 2001). At its peak, the war displaced 550,000 people and 150,000 refugees moved to different countries (Perković & Puljiz, 2001). The legacy of both the Homeland War and the Croat–Bosniak Conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina,\(^{16}\) is still felt, creating considerable challenges for policymakers responsible for cultural literacy and intercultural understanding.

As a result of this context a particular emphasis has been placed (in all aspects of life) to the Croatian national identity, which potentially jeopardises the implementation of policies of respect toward diversity and acknowledgment of minorities’ culture.

In addition to the large number of human casualties, the economy was also severely affected. The State’s Commission for the Assessment of War Damage puts the direct cost (1990-1999) at HRK 236,431,568,000 or DEM 65,350,635,000: while 180,000 housing units were destroyed (Perković & Puljiz, 2001). Since 1991, Croatia has gone through a long (and continuing) process of economic and social transformation from socialism to capitalism. This has involved the wholesale privatisation of public companies; the non-transparent manner of which has produced a large class of “transitional losers”. These transitional losers, primarily farmers and the former "working class", remain relatively poor and, as a social class, have become less socially mobile (Tucker, Pacek & Berinsky, 2002).

\(^{16}\) Tensions between Croats and Bosniaks during the first year (1992) of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina culminated in the Croat–Bosniak War (1993-1994).
During the 1990s two major political blocs, still relevant today, had already formed, led by the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) (the largest centre-right party) and the Social Democratic Party of Croatia (the largest party of the centre-left). New ‘populist’ political forces have since emerged, exploiting the general dissatisfaction with the established political parties. Their rise has coincided with the 2008 economic crisis which has had a severe effect on the national economy and government spending. In 2017, the budget of the Ministry of Culture (1.088.624.863 HRK or 0.65% of total government spending) is still lower than it was in 2008 (1.192.705.911 HRK or 0.92% of government spending), although a trend of increase is noticeable since 2014 when it was record low at just 0.5% (793.908.160 HRK) of government spending (Šugar-Glavaš, 2018). Post-crisis politics has also been characterised by the recurrent collapse of governments and premature parliamentary elections. (See Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Croatia</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union and Coalition (2003 - 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union and Coalition (2008 - 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union and Coalition (2009 - 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party and Coalition (2011 - 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union and Coalition (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union and Coalition (2016 - present)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Croatia Governments, 2007-2018

During the same period there have also been two presidential elections (2009 and 2014) and two referenda (on EU accession in 2012, and the constitutional definition of marriage in 2013). Political and economic instability have manifested themselves in a series of cultural conflicts on a range of symbolic issues [covering history (World War II, Yugoslavia and the Homeland War), religion (abortion rights), LGBTQ rights, national minority rights, the refugee crisis and education] around which traditional supporters of the two main political parties have coalesced. Political actors from both ends of the political spectrum have used the conflicts to mobilise support (Mustapić & Balabanić, 2018).

In terms of cultural literacy education, the most relevant public conflict emerged from plans to introduce a new school curriculum. The first drafts of the curriculum were strongly criticised from a number of scientific institutions and right-of-centre political actors.

Most objections related to interpretations regarding the Second World War, socialist era and the Homeland war in the proposed curriculum for history. The introduction of civic education and health education was also strongly criticised for challenging traditional social values. On the other hand, more than 50,000 people across major Croatian cities protested in 2016 in support of educational reform and the new curriculum. After a number of revisions, the curriculum is currently being piloted, having been introduced in 2018 to 72 schools across Croatia (8,500 students and 1,500 teachers and professors involved). A close analysis of the curriculum will be undertaken in CHIEF work package
Method

A systematic search for eligible sources examining cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage, was carried out using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher et al., 2015). The web page of the Government of the Republic of Croatia (https://vlada.gov.hr) was searched, as well as the web pages of the Ministry of Culture (https://www.min-kulture.hr), the Ministry of Science and Education (https://mzo.hr) and the Ministry of Demographics, Family, Youth and Social Policy (https://mdomsp.gov.hr), using a research strategy developed around three constructs (‘youth’, ‘cultural literacy education’, and Europe) to develop the string:

(mladi OR učenici OR učenik OR dijete OR djeca OR gradani) AND (odgoj OR obrazovanje OR školstvo OR nastava OR učenje OR znanje OR vještine OR kompetencije OR vrijednosti OR stavovi OR održiv OR diskriminacija) AND (baština OR kultura OR kulturna OR umjetnost OR povijest OR identitet OR pripadnost OR gradanski OR tradicija OR dobra OR integracija)

*In English:
(youth OR pupils OR pupil OR child OR children OR citizen) AND (upbringing OR education OR school system OR teaching OR learning OR knowledge OR skills OR competencies OR values OR opinions/attitudes OR sustainable OR discrimination) AND (heritage OR culture OR cultural OR art OR history OR identity OR belonging OR civic OR tradition OR goods OR integration)

In addition, we also conducted manual searches of the government’s and ministries' websites to ensure that we identified all relevant policy documents. Due to how the websites are structured we could not rely exclusively on the search of policy and legislative document repositories, so we performed searches of all other sections of the selected web pages.

This resulted in a larger number of records collated relative to the initial search. Searches were conducted between 1st and 15th September 2018 and limited to policy documents published between January 2007 and September 2018.

The initial search of the Government’s web page yielded 185 most relevant results. The initial search of the Ministry of Science and Education web page yielded 154 results, the search of the Ministry of Culture web page 174 results, and the search of the Ministry of Demographics, Family, Youth and Social Policy web page 47 results. The first reviewer screened all results against the exclusion and inclusion criteria. The second and third reviewers reviewed a random sample of 10% of all decisions blind. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus. After this initial search, eight documents were identified as relevant and eligible for the review. In the second step of the search we conducted a manual search of the Government’s and the ministries’ web pages. Through our manual search, we found another two relevant documents. After the screening process 10 documents were deemed eligible for in-depth review.

In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the following data were extracted from all eligible documents: author (government, ministry or department) and a year of publication. A thematic analysis of the documents was undertaken using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the review aims and objectives. To create codes, three reviewers independently read all eligible documents and coded them.
This approach was considered optimal given the small number of relevant and eligible documents. Results were compared, and agreed codes were developed through discussion and consensus to create a coding matrix, which was then used to review all documents in-depth.

In-depth review was undertaken using NVivo 12 programme for qualitative data analysis. This analysis was conducted by three researchers coding the three most comprehensive documents together. Later on we divided the remaining documents and when the individual analysis was finished, we went through Level 1 Nodes together to make sure that we agreed on the coded data. Level 2 Node ‘Democratic and civic education’ was created through reading selected documents and recognising the need to include topics related to active participation, civic competence, civic education, civil society, cultural education, cultural values, human rights, intercultural dialogue, non-institutional culture and education, respect towards diversity and sustainable development and education. This Level 2 Node had a total of 122 references from the 10 documents we analysed.

Level 2 Node ‘Key points’ was conceived as the Node in which we could more structurally code our key interests divided in four categories: globalisation influencing national identity/heritage/culture, goal of cultural literacy education, national heritage and culture as a resource, and national minorities (culture and identity inclusion). This Level 2 Node had 40 references from all 10 documents we analysed.
Findings

The main findings have been grouped into five major themes. First, we discuss how cultural literacy education is conceptualised in policy documents and the key goals underlying its implementation. Then we analysed the modes of implementation of cultural literacy education through formal and non-formal education. After this we assessed the status of national minorities and policies towards migrants. We concluded by considering the place of natural heritage and culture in modern Croatia, underpinned by a market-based economy.

Conceptualisation of Cultural Literacy Education and its Goal
Croatia does not have an explicit policy on cultural literacy education (CLE), nor has cultural literacy as a term been used explicitly in any of the documents. CLE policy is, instead, comprised by diffuse observations, objectives and recommendations (hereafter just observations) in policy documents covering a range of issues relating to young people, culture and education. The most common term in this context is interculturalism/intercultural education. However, neither this term, nor cultural literacy, multiculturalism or culture are defined. Nevertheless, despite some variation in terminology, most of the observations in the reviewed documents are underpinned by two organising assumptions: the importance of preserving the national identity and promoting of a democratic, non-discriminatory society within which cultural diversity is respected.

In line with this, the Law on Education (Croatian Parliament, 2008), which regulates primary and secondary education in Croatia, focuses on educational content; stressing the importance of competences necessary for young persons to live and work in a market based-economy driven by modern information technology and scientific knowledge, and characterised by rapid socio-cultural change. The document recognises the importance of education in enabling students to navigate living in a multicultural society, to respect diversity and exhibit tolerance towards others, and to participate responsibly in the democratic development of society. At the same time the Law sets the development of the national identity of students as one of the goals of education.

The National Youth Programme 2009-2013 states that the Republic of Croatia recognises education as key to long-term social stability and economic progress.

\[17\] The overarching goal of the National Youth Programme 2009-2013 is to improve the activities of all public institutions dealing with young people in order to enhance their quality of life. Particular measures and activities are suggested in eight areas: education; employment and entrepreneurship; social policy; health protection and reproductive health; active participation of young people in society; youth culture and leisure; mobility; informing and consulting local and regional self-government.
A stated method of achieving these two goals is to create institutional prerequisites for the development of civic competence among young people. In the document, civic competence, as one of eight key competences\(^{18}\), is defined as a set of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and behaviours that helps individuals to fulfil their civic roles. According to the Programme, an important part of civic competence among young people is active participation, which includes preparing young people for more active involvement in different segments of social life, formal and informal activities, public discussions, social changes and encouraging young people to familiarise themselves with social problems. In this context, the Programme seeks to encourage young people to self-organise in cultural, sporting and other forms of organised leisure and promote young artists’ education, the public dissemination of their work, and their involvement in decision-making processes. It also outlines specific measures aimed at providing financial and institutional support to civil society organisations working with people active in the field of youth culture, and encouraging young people’s creative expression. In close connection with the promotion of active participation of all young people, is the premise that education should stimulate the development of human resources at the local level. This is designed to facilitate sustainable development, and in close connection, create the conditions for the emancipation and inclusion of discriminated social groups (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).

This last objective is the central concern of the Strategy for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion in the Republic of Croatia (2014-2020), which stresses anti-discrimination as a guiding principle in government efforts aimed ameliorating poverty and social exclusion. Long-term education and lifelong learning are understood as the main ways of accomplishing this goal. The Strategy concludes that within both formal and non-formal education, a particular emphasis should be given to prejudice and discrimination against socially vulnerable groups, such as national minorities (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014a).

In line with this, the National Strategy for Children's Rights 2014-2020 maintains that all children should have equal access to education regardless of gender, race, socio-economic status, religion and ethnicity. According to this strategy, special attention should be given to ensuring the inclusion of marginalised groups of children, such as children belonging to the Roma minority, asylum seekers and migrants (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014b).

Similarly, the Sustainable Development Strategy\(^{19}\) ( Croatian Parliament, 2009) highlights respect for diversity and democratic values within the education system as preconditions of social sustainability. In addition, the document lists respect of fundamental rights and cultural diversity as key aspirations. Greater respect for the rights and traditions of national minorities is likely to correlate closely with the degree to which their contributions to Croatian culture are acknowledged. This is ignored in most policy documents. The Strategy for the Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Economic Use of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Croatia for the period 2011-2015 (Ministry of Culture, 2011), for example, does not address the issue of minorities’ cultural heritage, but rather focuses on how best to raise general awareness of the importance of Croatian cultural heritage and its sustainable use through educational and promotional activities.

\(^{18}\) The eight key competences defined in the National Youth Program from 2014 to 2017 are: the ability to communicate in a native language; the ability to communicate in a foreign language; mathematical competence and basic natural science and technology competences; digital (IT) competence; social and civic competence; a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship; the ability of learning to learn; cultural awareness and expression.

\(^{19}\) Sustainable Development Strategy of the Republic of Croatia sets a goal of directing economic and social development of Croatia in long-term, as well as to sustainably protect environment. The Strategy notes current state of affairs in eight key areas and proposes measures for improvement. Identified key areas are: population, environment and natural goods, sustainable production and consumption, social cohesion and justice, energy, public health, regional interdependence and protection of the Adriatic.
This not only includes knowledge of certain cultural assets, but also knowledge of their potential social utility in the development of local communities and beyond. The monocultural rationale underlying the above strategy is outlined in the Government’s formal programme for the period 2016-2020 (Government, 2016), which identifies cultural identity as having been a key organising element in uniting the Croatian people when there was no independent Croatian state. The Programme goes on to signal the Government’s intention to promote cultural creativity in all areas (including theatres, museums, archives, audiovisual activities, literary activities, and new art practices), states that the share of funding for culture will be steadily increased, and that a Strategy for Cultural Development (still under development) will be adopted, identifying medium-term and long-term development goals.

In summary, the reviewed documents stress the importance of cultural literacy and identify respect for diversity and cultural literacy as preconditions for successful participation in an open, market-based economy. In order to empower young people in this sense, policymakers address two main issues; on the one hand they seek to encourage active participation of young people in all aspects of everyday life, particularly in cultural activities. On the other hand, they promote anti-discriminative practices to protect national minorities, who are designated as vulnerable social groups due to the potential for prejudice and bias within a largely homogenous population.

Implementation of Cultural Literacy Education through Formal and Non-formal Education

All documents covering topics related to cultural literacy education provide some indication of how policy preferences should be put into effect through formal and non-formal educational organisations. In terms of formal education, the Action Plan for Education about Sustainable Development (Ministry of Environment Protection & Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, 2011) points to three important recent developments for the implementation of civic education in the formal education system, namely: the (re)establishment (2010) of the National Committee for Human Rights and Democratic Citizenship as a government advisory body; the establishment (2010) of a University Centre for Human Rights; and the adoption (2011) of a National Framework Curriculum for elementary and secondary schools, which includes civic education both as a subject in its own right and as an integrative inter-subject theme. In addition, the Education and Teacher Training Agency has developed a number of projects for the implementation of civic education in schools, and from 2001 to 2011, trained more than 10,000 educational workers. The South-Eastern Mediterranean Sea Project (SEMEP) run by UNESCO was also carried out in 40 secondary schools in Croatia. The project aimed to create an educational, environmental and cultural network for contact and cooperation among students in the region. It promoted environmental education through science and intercultural dialogue in the region (Ministry of Environment Protection & Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, 2011).

Awareness raising about civic rights and duties through formal education represents an important way of preventing social exclusion, as the Strategy for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion in the Republic of Croatia (2014-2020) confirms. The document emphasises the importance including education on human rights in curricula (focusing on prejudice and discrimination against socially vulnerable and minority groups, the prevention of violence, and the promotion of intercultural activities) (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014). In a similar vein, the National Youth Programme 2014-2017 seeks to encourage civic competence among young people by promoting civic education in formal school curricula and extracurricular activities.
The Programme advocates the introduction of civic and intercultural education in all grades of elementary and secondary schools, and makes the subject compulsory in the 8th grade of elementary school and 1st and 2nd grades of secondary education (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014c).

Non-formal education is also presented as an important complement to formal education. Non-formal education is defined in two documents (the Action Plan for Education about Sustainable Development (Ministry of Environment Protection & Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, 2011), which is an instrument for the implementation of the Strategy for Sustainable Development, and the National Youth Programme 2009-2013 (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009)) as organised and spontaneous educational activities established outside the formal education system. Both documents highlight non-formal education as capable of adapting to different and changing needs and interests and note that the diversity of non-formal provision represents a powerful indicator of the development of society as a whole.

Both documents note that in Croatia, a relatively large number of institutions and organisations provide non-formal education services (public institutions, cultural centres, foreign language learning centres, professional associations, religious communities, sports societies and other civil society organisations). The areas covered by these organisations are diverse (human rights; non-discrimination; gender equality; non-violent conflict resolution; intercultural understanding; democratic citizenship; environmental protection; sustainable development and consumer protection). The National Strategy for Children's Rights 2014-2020 reports that the active role, played by civil society organisations in non-formal education, puts them in an ideal position to monitor and respond to the changing needs and interests of young people, as well as helping to initiate new trends themselves. Moreover, their open structure is considered to facilitate the inclusion and participation of a large number of young people, and develop their interests in cultural consumption (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014b). However, both the Action Plan for Education about Sustainable Development and Strategy for Sustainable Development, and the National Youth Programme note that non-formal education is neither monitored closely nor audited systematically. There are, as such, no reliable data on the number or type of users and it is, therefore, unclear how (or to what extent) non-formal education supplements the formal education system. This is important for defining the level of access to cultural activities. The Youth Programme (2009-2013), for example, reports that most non-formal projects and initiatives are concentrated in larger cities and are not, therefore, equally available to all citizens (although this observation needs to be read against the National Strategy for Children's Rights 2014-2020, which points out that civil society organisations have made great strides in involving young people as producers and co-creators of cultural activities in smaller towns, rural areas and underdeveloped regions over the last 15 years).

Access is also complicated by poor information on existing programmes (there is no single, publicly available source of information on non-formal education programs which are taking place) and the high costs of enrollment (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).

This apparent contradiction between the Youth Programme and the National Strategy for Children's Rights regarding the role of civil society organisations on the periphery has occurred primarily from the focus of the National Youth Programme on the potential civil organisations have, but not fulfilling it. The importance of non-formal education is emphasised in the Youth Programme, which notes that youth needs are marginal to the main policy agenda and that young people in society are treated primarily as consumers of commercial products due to their exposure to the media and the entertainment industry.
At the same time, core, publicly-funded cultural institutions (institutions and centers under jurisdiction of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia), are considered to provide content that is largely unattractive to young people (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).

The same document also acknowledges a range of aggravating factors that impair civil society organisations’ work, namely: the fact that they are not fully recognised by the public sector/state; are only weakly institutionalised; and suffer from a near-permanent crisis of resources. This combination of factors helps to explain the objectives outlined in the National Youth Programme, which, in addition to developing culturally educated young people, their empowerment for creativity and their training for active participation in cultural development; includes: strengthening the capacities of civil society organisations working in the field of youth and youth culture and involved in developing the creative expression of young people; encouraging the self-organisation of young people in cultural, sports and other forms of organised leisure; encouraging cooperation of civil society organisations dealing with youth culture at local, national and international levels; and involving young people in decision-making processes (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).

The subsequent National Youth Programme 2014-2017, notes that enhancing access is key to sustaining future audiences for cultural and artistic programmes, as well as being a worthwhile end in itself. Any efforts to this effect are understood to come up against a multitude of barriers to youth access to cultural life, including: lack of time and/or money due to the bad economic situation in Croatia; a mismatch between the needs of young people and cultural offers due to the lack of resources cultural institutions deal with; geographical constraints due to unbalanced regional development and strong centralization of the country (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014c).

This is in accordance with the National Strategy for Children’s Rights 2014-2020 finding, about the decrease in the number of art and music classes and additional activities in art and culture being offered to students outside of compulsory teaching activities in the formal education system. As a result, music, art and dance education are increasingly being directed to gifted students. This has compounded both the long-run impact of the high costs of art education, and the growing public perception that the arts and humanities are no longer relevant to contemporary labour markets (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014b). The impact of these processes are emphasised in the National Youth Programme 2014-2017, which outlines the potential multiplier effects of cultural participation: discrete cultural and artistic programmes each have the capacity to raise awareness of the importance of a common cultural heritage, a vibrant cultural and artistic landscape, and the role of cultural participation in promoting active citizenship, which understands the development of civic competence of young people through civic education within formal education (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014c).

Cultural heritage is highlighted as an important education topic for education about sustainable development, in Croatia’s Strategy for Sustainable Development. Additionally, the Strategy advocates various strategies for ensuring that sustainable development becomes an integral part of everyday life, namely: including it as a topic in formal education; encouraging non-governmental organisations to give it greater focus; and popularizing sustainable development through the media (newspapers, television, radio) (Croatian Parliament, 2009).

The Strategy of Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Economic Use of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Croatia for the period 2011-2015 makes a similar claim. The document outlines a plan of action to improve the quality and expand formal and non-formal education aimed at highlighting the importance of cultural heritage, its preservation, protection and sustainable use.
The Strategy was developed in recognition of the fact that: the basic knowledge of cultural heritage provided in primary education failed to maintain awareness of the importance of heritage over the long term, and does not adequately cover issues concerning its protection; and that non-formal post-primary education on the issue was sporadic, left to the initiative of individual stakeholders, and uncoordinated. In order to educate a broader audience on this subject, it was deemed necessary to introduce: coordinated programmes in curricula from pre-school to higher education and encourage civil society organisations (at the level of non-formal education) to engage more in raising awareness about the importance of cultural heritage and its protection; education of local authorities about the use of cultural heritage for the development of local communities (Ministry of Culture, 2011).

National Minorities (Culture and Identity Inclusion)
National minorities' rights are defined in the Constitutional Law of 2002, in respect of which all subsequent legislation and official documents (strategies, programmes, etc.) are aligned (The Constitutional Act, 2002). Policymakers focus primarily on securing the preconditions necessary for the preservation of minorities’ cultures and identities. This is manifested mainly through special education programs for national minorities within formal education (Model A, B and C – see policy context), which are funded by the state and local self-governments. The National Programme for Youth (2009-2013) reports that in 2009, 9 out of 22 national minorities in Croatian primary school programmes were implemented in the language and script of national minorities (the Serbs, the Italians, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Austrians, the Germans, the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Slovak). Secondary education was organised for four (the Serbian, Italian, Czech and Hungarian), while higher education programmes existed in one case only (the Italian minority) (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).

Providing assistance to help preserve the identity and culture of national minorities and improve their position in society has been confirmed as a goal by both centre-left (2011) and centre-right (2016) governments. The centre-left government’s programme introduced plans to include content important to both national minorities’ identities and the general identity of Croatia in primary and secondary school curricula. The proposed content, that was produced in cooperation with organisations allied to minority communities, highlighted the historical contributions of national minorities to Croatia, and advocated the promotion of cultural, ethnic and linguistic identities of areas inhabited by national minorities (in order to help preserve the toponomastics, denominations, architecture, culture, and artistic heritage as goods under special protection) (Government, 2011).

A similar programme was proposed by the Government in 2016, which aimed to facilitate the activities of national minorities’ institutions and societies. The Government announced more funding for cultural, research and media institutions run by national minorities. Monies were also earmarked in the budget for the translation and circulation of textbooks and teaching materials and an office dedicated to the education of national minorities was established within the Ministry of Education (Government, 2016).

National minority groups are recognised as particularly vulnerable in terms of discrimination. Therefore the Sustainable Development Strategy advocates the importance of designing labour market policies around them.
Within the document, the Roma population is singled out and the Strategy calls for stronger involvement of the Roma population in education and training (Croatian Parliament, 2009). In a similar manner, the National Strategy for Children's Rights’ (2014-2020) calls for greater financial support for minorities’ children throughout their formal education to facilitate their inclusion in Croatian society. In recognition of the significant number of national minorities (especially those of the Serbian national minority and Roma), living in underdeveloped areas, the Strategy also advocates increased investment in regional development. Suggested improvements in education are to be made on the basis of analyses of the existing models of education and their impact on wider social relations. The expectation is that varied and innovative forms of minority education will be developed to meet the diversity of needs, which respects the principles of multiculturalism, democracy and inter-ethnic communication. According to the Strategy, one of the first steps to be taken, involves the establishment of intercultural training for teachers, to ensure that they are better placed to resolve interethnic problems and to engage constructively with the often complex pasts of minorities. This is to be combined with a number of specific goals, namely: the development of a system for monitoring and supporting gifted Roma children, with particular attention to girls; the development of programmes to encourage Roma parents’ competences and to encourage them to adopt more positive and active attitudes towards their children's education; the provision of support to Roma children in learning, including encouragement to participate more in recreational activities; the development and implementation of local and regional anti-discrimination plans - kindergartens and schools will define ways of acting towards the majority population to reduce prejudice and encourage tolerance and cooperation (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014b).

Migrants
Historically, migration to Croatia has been inconsequential. This is reflected in the relatively little attention given to the social inclusion of migrants in official documents. Since the late 19th Century, Croatia has been characterised primarily by high levels of emigration. Although net migration has been negative, the country has attracted some non-ethnic Croat immigrants. However, most immigration has comprised ethnic Croats from Bosnia and Herzegovina and other countries formerly constituting the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia.

According to the Strategy for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion (2014-2020), only 58 asylum applications and 51 subsidiary protections had been approved by 2014.

As one of the most important measures to ensure integration and prevent discriminatory behaviour towards immigrants, the Strategy stresses the need to implement the Croatian language learning programme for asylum seekers and foreigners under subsidiary protection, who are considered particularly vulnerable to discrimination (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014a).

Under the Law on Education (Croatian Parliament, 2008) EU citizens, asylum seekers, and foreigners under subsidiary or temporary protection are guaranteed the right of learning their language and they have the same right of enrollment in elementary or secondary schools as Croatian citizens. This is reaffirmed in the National Strategy for Children's Rights 2014-2020, which seeks to ensure the education of: children of asylum-seekers, foreigners under subsidiary protection, foreign nationals without parental consent, illegally staying foreign nationals, and migrants.
The Strategy outlines the importance of adequate accommodation for children in reception centres for asylum seekers, and minimum standards of social welfare with an emphasis on childcare and ensuring that children are able to practice their own recreational, cultural, and artistic traditions. All are provided with Croatian language teaching for up to 330 hours in order to ensure a basic understanding of the language. The Strategy also stresses the importance of their inclusion in schools and a robust response to discriminatory practices and behaviours. Finally, the Strategy highlights the value of cooperation between schools, local authorities and migrants to helping children to integrate into the education system (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014b).

National Heritage and Culture as a Resource in a Globalising World

The National Youth Programme (2009-2013) points to tightening labour markets and the increasingly open nature of Croatia’s economy as reasons for young people to take a greater interest in other cultures and generally develop a better understanding of the world. In addition, the Programme points out that some of the complex problems faced by young people in contemporary societies can no longer be satisfactorily resolved at local or national level. These instrumental drivers reinforce the increased opportunities for young people to network with one another across the world and are reported to set the stage for a rapid transformation in the three key areas of youth mobility - tourism, education, and cultural mobility. The experience of other cultures, customs and people are reported to encourage the development of positive values towards and greater tolerance for, and understanding of, other cultures and feelings of understanding, tolerance and respect for diversity, while it also provides a platform for the flow of ideas (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).

The Strategy of Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Economic Use of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Croatia (2011-2015) identifies national heritage and culture as a resource on which further development could be based. Its economic potential is reported to reside in its impact on tourism. National cultural heritage is also reported to have a significant role in sustaining cultural diversity (in so far as local, regional, and national cultural heritage is effectively conserved). To ensure both, the Strategy highlights the value of raising awareness of the general importance of cultural heritage and increasing its economic valorisation. The aim is to reach as wide an audience as possible and, ultimately, to encourage the public to become active participants conserving, protecting and economically exploiting cultural heritage (Ministry of Culture, 2011).

The National Youth Programme (2009-2013) identifies civil society organisations as having a particularly important role in encouraging young people’s access to, and participation in cultural activities. As the document notes, more specifically, the civil sector is of great significance in counterbalancing what is becoming an increasingly commodified cultural offer. However, despite being one of the only sources of organised leisure for young people in smaller towns and rural areas, the government has yet to match this observation with meaningful investment (Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity, 2009).
Discussion

Policy recommendations and initiatives largely reflect the demographic context and historical trajectory of Croatia: the fact that Croatia represents a relatively homogenous society (religiously and culturally); and the need to curate a strong, shared sense of national identity as a newly independent, post-Communist nation.

Throughout most of the 20th Century Croat identity was subordinate to a supranational Yugoslav identity.20 Given the coterminous relationship between independence, ethnicity, and cultural identity, bipartisan political support for efforts to develop and strengthen a distinctive sense of Croatian national identity is to be expected. This is highlighted in the official Government’s present programme for 2016-2020, which identifies a shared culture as the most important element in sustaining a common Croat identity in a time when there was no independent Croatian state.

A similar set of priorities can be found in the academic literature (Vrgoč, 2005). Mrnjaus, Rončević & Ivošević (2013), for instance, argue that the primary goal of formal education is to teach students about their own (Croatian) culture, which they go on to maintain is a precondition of successful intercultural communication. This corresponds with the findings of empirical research, which suggest that national identity is significantly more pronounced than supra-national identity among Croatian youth (Baranović, 2002; Sekulić & Šporer, 2008).

At the same time, Croatian culture is also increasingly being interpreted with reference to Europe in both public policy and the academic literature, although emphasis is primarily placed on representing Croatian culture as part of a pan-Central European culture. Thus, Mijatović (2002) highlights the importance of associating Croatian social development in teaching lessons within its “natural European surroundings”. Similarly, Paar & Šetić (2015) recognise “adequate” presentation of national identity and values as a crucial principle in the creation of a new curriculum, which should mirror the approach taken in Central European countries to which Croatia “historically, and by civilization, belongs”.

Our findings suggest that, in terms of formal statements of principle and high level strategy, policymakers acknowledge the importance of cultural literacy.

Respect of diversity (national, cultural, religious and linguistic) is presented as a fundamental premise of interculturalism, while education is reported to play a central role in strengthening the sensibility toward diversity (Hrvačić & Sablić, 2008). However, all reviewed documents fail to define key terms, such as culture, multiculturalism, interculturalism and cultural literacy. The Croatian academic literature, on the other hand, often points to the complexity of terminology, usually citing definitions from the international literature. In this context we can single out Piršl (2016), who identifies four categories that constitute intercultural education.

---

20 This reflects the fact Croatia was part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes from 1918 to 1929, renamed to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia from 1929 to 1941, and then socialist Yugoslavia from 1945 to 1991.
These are: empathy education (learning to understand and identify with others), solidarity education (greater sensitivity to inequalities and social marginalization/exclusion), respect of diversity (respect for different life styles) and education against ethnocentrism, nationalism, racism and other ways of discrimination (fostering the development of intercultural sensitivity, as well as awareness of oneself and of others). The same author states that the first goal of intercultural education is to encourage development of critical thinking towards global culture and consumer mentality, to raise awareness about the need to fight against discrimination, injustice and manipulation, as well as to teach about different cultures. In a similar manner Rosandić (2005) identifies legal protections for various forms of cultural diversity as a fundamental element of democracy by creating a presumption in favour of valuing people from different countries, ethnicities, cultures and socio-political outlooks.

Croatian policy documents suggest that policy actors acknowledge the deficiencies in operationalising intercultural education in the formal education system. This is reflected in the prevailing view historically taken within the Croatian academia literature. Puzić (2009), for example, noted in 2009, that intercultural education was not part of school programmes. Accordingly, Lukić (2010, according to Mrnjaus, Rončević & Ivošević, 2013) defines the Croatian approach as ethnocentric multiculturalism - in other words, a very narrow form of multiculturalism – which is consistent with Spajić-Vrkaš’s (2002) conclusion that the Croatian educational system implements cultural pluralism in theory only. It has still mainly focused on the preservation of the national identity and characterised by a monocultural perspective with only basic presentation of cultural diversity (Puzić, 2009).

Some efforts, such as the inclusion of civic education in school curricula, have been made to improve matters. This has been presented as a pedagogical interpolation of civic competence, within which Spajić-Vrkaš (2015) differentiates a functional and structural dimension.

The functional dimension comprises civic knowledge and understanding, civic skills and capacities, civic values and attitudes, whilst the structural dimension covers human-legal (promotion of the dignity of human beings, protection of individual rights and freedoms), political, social, (inter)cultural, economic and ecological issues. Aims of civic education include: developing children as active citizens; helping them to appreciate the core values of democracy and pluralism; stimulating a sense of societal interdependence, social bonds, and conditionality (Strugar, 2005). However, it is unclear how far the introduction of a stand-alone subject can undo the traditional emphasis within formal schooling on dominant cultural and social values (Strugar, 2005). On first examination, the implementation of civic education as an inter-subject theme (see below) seems to offset these uncertainties. However, subjects to which this most obviously applies in practice - art, humanities, and social science – are in decline, as reported in some documents, and the innovation may also be stymied by the increasing emphasis in formal education on improving students’ employment prospects (Mijatović, 2002).

Civic education may, however, encourage some young people to become active participants and producers of culture, rather than simply consumers, which is one of the main policy goals in terms of cultural literacy education. One potential effect of this (obliquely acknowledged in some policy documents) is that future shifts in cultural practices and understanding will be initiated from below; shifting responsibility from less flexible and creative public bodies. In so far as cultural production is popularised and expanded, this approach may potentially support the type of active and responsible (democratic) citizenship that is considered key to European democratic development and stability (Spajić-Vrkaš, 2015).
Civil-society organisations are likely to play a particularly important role in accomplishing this objective, are reported to have already achieved considerable success in spreading knowledge about culture, art, democracy, tolerance, and diversity among young people. However, there are continuing problems in assessing the quality of this work. Evaluative standards have not yet been developed and there are no set criteria or expectations to qualify for public funding and official support. As a consequence, identifying good practice and value for money continues to be problematic. Moreover, this may place a drag on efforts to facilitate co-operation between non-formal and formal education organisations.

Culture and cultural literacy are increasingly perceived as an expense, rather than investment; reflecting the fact that money invested in culture does not result in direct and immediate economic returns. Policy actors have responded by emphasising the economic potential of cultural heritage.

A case in point is the Ministry of Culture’s Strategy of Conservation, Protection, and Sustainable Economic Use of Cultural Heritage. The Strategy notes that heritage can be self-sustainable if well-managed, as well as providing a basis for local or regional economic development.

The Strategy also notes that the preservation of cultural heritage is fundamental for the preservation of cultural diversity. Including the issue in school curricula represents an obvious way of raising awareness about its importance (Hrvatić & Sablić, 2008). The value of taking this path is threefold: it encourages children to be open to different cultures; helps them to respect and show tolerance towards diversity; helps them to become aware of their own individualities; and increases the likelihood of children making an active contribution to their communities (Mijatović, 2002; Baranović, 2006).

In Croatia both cultural literacy education and intercultural relationships in general have primarily focused on the status of national minorities, which in a way reflects evidence of negative attitudes amongst the general public toward religious and national minorities (Mrnjaus, 2013). This has been confirmed in a number of empirical studies (Previšić, Hrvatić & Posavec, 2004; Sablić, 2004; Čorkalo Bируški & Ajduković, 2007; Blažević Simić, 2011; Mrnjaus, 2013), which have consistently found high levels of social distance toward Serb, Bosniak, Montenegrin, Slovenian, Roma and Albanian minorities (Blažević Simić, 2011). These studies have also revealed a correlation between the type of education and the level of social distance. Gymnasium students have consistently been found to demonstrate higher degrees of tolerance and lower levels of social distance than vocational school students (Sablić, 2004). This has been explained in terms of their higher level of knowledge about the differences between social groups and different cultures (Sablić, 2004).

These findings confirm the importance of cultural literacy education and highlight the importance of implementing existing policies and further policy development.

Among all national minorities the Roma population represent the most intensively studied group. According to Hrvatić (2014) this reflects the degree of variance of Roma traditions and culture from other ethnic groups, which puts their members in a particularly vulnerable position. In contrast to other national minorities, policy documents present Roma cultural literacy as a problem, on the basis of their reported negative attitudes toward education and reluctance to ensure children attend school. The effects of discrimination against Roma people on their perceptions of formal schooling are not foregrounded. Policy actors have, however, sought to provide a framework for addressing Roma disengagement from education, which observes a spirit of culturally sensitive and intercultural pedagogy (Hrvatić & Sablić, 2008).
Proposed measures emphasise the importance of supporting and engaging all stakeholders (Roma children, their peers, teachers, parents, and local communities). This is in accordance with Matoić’s (2014) and Puzić et al.’s (2015) findings about the importance of the wider context in implementing policy initiatives regarding the discrimination of minorities.

Another major policy focus in relation to minorities has concerned ensuring the conditions necessary for preserving their national identity and culture. This is consistent with Rosandić’s (2005) observation that all individuals aspire to preserve their own identities. The prevailing approach to meeting this aspiration in Croatia is liberal cultural separatism, illustrated by the provision of formal education in the language and script of national minorities. One unintended consequence of this approach may be to reduce the pressure to teach the Croat majority about the culture and identities of national minorities (Blažević-Simić, 2013). Another unintended consequence is that minority identities and cultures develop alongside, rather than within, a more expansive, pluralist national identity and culture. This reflects the balance and focus of policy documents, which accentuate a monocultural Croatian national identity, culture and heritage. As Blažević Simić (2014) claims, this type of education can result in even more pronounced social distance towards national minorities. For this purpose she scrutinised all three models of minorities’ education in Eastern Croatia, which suffered severely during the Homeland war. She concludes that Model A largely fails to promote intercultural tolerance, and commonly results in greater separation. In practice, lack of financial resources means that the most common type of minorities’ education is Model C. This model can also cause separation and social distance because only minority students are enrolled. Therefore Blažević Simić considers Model B as the best solution, but only when all classes are taught bilingually and majority students are included in bilingual teaching, which is still not the case in Croatia (Blažević Simić, 2014).

There is some evidence to suggest that policy actors have recognised the risk of these unintended consequences. Thus, the National Strategy for Children's Rights 2014-2020 recommends intercultural training for teachers in order to help them deal with complex relationships between members of different ethno-religious groups. This is also in accordance with Drandić (2013), who concludes on the role of teachers as the main facilitators in the implementation of cultural literacy education. In the case of Roma, the Strategy specifically proposes training to reduce and prevent discrimination. In addition, the Government proposed a plan in 2011 to include content exploring the interdependencies between minority and national identities in curricula and textbooks The aim of the plan was to affirm the historical contributions of national minorities to Croatia, but it has yet to be implemented (Government, 2011).

The issue of asylum-seekers and foreigners under subsidiary or temporary protection are only superficially addressed in policy documents. They guarantee all children holding one of these statuses are granted the right to education and, before enrollment, are to be included in a Croatian language learning programme in order to facilitate their integration. The National Strategy for Children's Rights 2014-2020, indicates that efforts will be made to ensure the cooperation between schools, local authorities and migrants in order to assist children's integration into the education system (Ministry of Social Policy and Youth, 2014b). These issues are likely to grow in importance, given increasing immigration to Europe and a predicted increase in demand for labour.21

---

21 This reflects an ageing population and net negative migration, which has become more pronounced since Croatia joined the EU in 2013.
Conclusion

Globalisation and Croatia’s accession to the EU pose major challenges to cultural literacy policy, which centre on mediating the tensions between preserving traditions and adapting to new, and in some cases, fast changing circumstances.

Our analysis suggests that cultural literacy has not been recognised as a specific policy topic in Croatia, while interculturalism in education has been discussed mostly in the context of national minorities, with an emphasis placed on helping them to preserve their identity and culture. Changes in formal education, held up by a complex past, have been slow. This, in addition to post-crisis fiscal tightening, has led to greater emphasis being placed on the civil sector in reviewed documents.

Civil society organisations are considered to have already made great strides in educating young people about democracy, and the importance of respecting diversity and human rights. At the same time, weak economic growth has underpinned high levels of emigration among young people. In conjunction with greater opportunities for travel this is likely to enhance cultural literacy. The levelling effect of globalisation on cultural differences underpins the increasing emphasis placed on national heritage, culture, and identity in official documents and may stymie efforts elsewhere in official policy to encourage greater understanding and respect for minority cultures and identities.

Implementation of cultural literacy education continues to be a fundamental issue, taking into consideration that out of the ten documents reviewed, four are strategies comprising relatively general observations, four are programmes, and one is an action plan, none of which are legally binding. The extent to which the documents outline policymakers’ intentions and objectives, rather than educational practices, is, therefore, uncertain.
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# Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Law on Education in Elementary and Secondary Schools</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Croatian Parliament</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Programme from 2009 till 2013</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ministry of Family, Veterans’ Affairs and Intergenerational Solidarity of the Republic of Croatia</td>
<td>National programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education has been constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is out specific interest for this component of the CHIEF project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy(^{22}), rather than refining by a specific form of document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to our research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded all documents which</td>
<td>Were published before 1/1/2007</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{22}\) For the purposes of the review, policy is defined as an authoritative statement of a proposed course, principle or codification of government action, which typically states matters of principle and focuses on action (stating what is to be done and by whom).
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Executive Summary

In Georgia, there are no specific policy documents that cover the subject of youth cultural literacy. However, government ministries have produced a range of documents that address issues constitutive of cultural literacy, including cultural heritage, cultural identity, and cultural engagement of young people.

The “field of culture” is widely defined within Georgian legislation and includes “historical and cultural areas and objects, buildings and edifices, movable and immovable cultural monuments, folklore, art, souvenirs, handicraft art and handwork, professional art and literature, arts education and the related pedagogy, scientific research and methods, technologies, promotion and popularization of cultural and creative activities, entertaining and educational programmes and show business” (Law of Georgia on culture, Article 5g).

From 2008, culture came to be seen as something that can assist economic growth. This has been reflected in an increasing number of documents on cultural policy, the most important of which is “Culture Strategy 2025”, Georgia’s first cultural policy strategy (published 2016).

The most relevant guidelines for youth cultural education are contained in documents and strategies about culture. Youth policy documents rarely refer to cultural education (and largely provide guidelines on education generally).

Policy documents cover a broad range of issues, including: the importance of integrating culture and creativity in the education system; making culture accessible to all members of society; promoting Georgian culture abroad; and including the general public in the policy-making process. The documents highlight the important role that government has to play in supporting and promoting objects of culture, such as architecture, visual art, theatre, cinematography, music, libraries, archives, museums and traditional crafts.

The documents stress that policy guidelines should be consistent with European laws and regulations. A European (or more general “western”) orientation is mentioned in many documents highlighting the importance of close cooperation with the contemporary world. At the same time, Georgian policy documents push a narrow, nationalist-centred interpretation of culture and cultural literacy, mediated in part through an emphasis on Georgians’ bond with history.

Overall, cultural policies are aimed at preserving the historical figures and memory, although documents also report the value of developing a contemporary culture, characterised by new cultural lifestyles, activities, and creative ideas.

Cultural heritage is linked to the country’s international image and considered key to strong socio-economic development. These assumptions underpin calls within policy documents for cultural heritage to be protected and for cultural values to be widely studied and popularised.

The Georgian language is considered a core component of national identity, which underlies calls to prioritise its preservation.

Emphasis is also placed on young people’s participation in cultural, creative, and leisure activities. To achieve this goal, the government plans to develop and improve the quality of cultural education. Special attention is paid to visual arts and music education. Overall, policy documents advocate integrating culture and creativity across all levels of the education system.
Introduction

Aims of the Review
This report is based on a systematic review of official policy documents relating to cultural literacy education of young people in Georgia. It aims to provide an understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised in policy, and to draw out strengths, weaknesses, and tensions in the government’s approach to cultural literacy education.

The review (1) critically analyses official forms of cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal educational activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices, and cultural heritage; and (2) underpins the design of the empirical components of the wider CHIEF project. More information about this can be found at http://chiefproject.eu.

Structure of the Report
The report first provides an overview of Georgia’s policy context, followed by a brief outline of the methodology used to collate and analyse policy documents. It then presents the findings of the analysis and concludes with a discussion of these findings with reference to the academic literature on cultural literacy education in Georgia.
Policy Context

Georgia has a unique and ancient culture and heritage and has had to fight to maintain its traditions and religion over the centuries, as a result of persistent conflict with neighbouring countries. Georgia was annexed by Russia in the 19th century. After a brief period of independence in the early twentieth century (1918–1921), Georgia became part of the Transcaucasian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic from 1922 to 1936, and then formed the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic until the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The three years of independence (1918-1921) were important for Georgia in terms establishing democratic principles and developing the grounds for a cultural policy. The main aim of government policy was to “introduce democratic processes and to preserve national identity” (Gunia-Kuznetsova, 2018, p.3). In the first year of independence (1918), Tbilisi State University, the first national university in the South Caucasus, was opened. The university was based on Georgian educational traditions, but was guided by wider European principles, and served as a centre of cultural and scientific life.

During the Soviet era, many Georgian artists managed to maintain a national element to their work, and created artworks that “helped to develop an understanding of culture as a system of values which determines and forms national identity and, as a result, unites the nation” (Gunia-Kuznetsova, 2018, p.3).

Georgia became independent in 1991 following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, but had to face conflicts and wars, economic reconstruction and a long process of political reformation. Between 1991 and 1992, Georgia lost control over the autonomous region of South-Ossetia and, in 1993, lost control over the Abkhazian breakaway region. In addition, in the late 1990s and early 2000s Georgia experienced major economic problems and high level of corruption. This led to protests against the government and then president Edward Shevardnadze, and resulted in The Rose Revolution in November 2003. Shevardnadze was forced to resign and Mikheil Saakashvili and the United National Movement (UNM) came to power. In August 2008, Georgia was dragged into a military conflict with Russia, which resulted in Russia occupying South Ossetia.

Taking into consideration this political and economic environment of the country “it has been extremely difficult to install a sustainable system of policy development. In the field of culture, it has indeed prevented the creation and implementation of a long-term cultural strategy” (Gunia-Kuznetsova, 2018, p.41). Shortly after the UNM came to power, The Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sport started active work in the field of culture.

However, cultural policy-making only began to take on a systematic, formal approach with the establishment of the Commission for Development of Culture policy and Strategy in 2013, appointed by the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia.23

The Commission created the Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period (2014-2016) which advocated greater interdisciplinary research in the field and that Georgian cultural policy be based on “universally recognised principles and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.” Even though the draft document has not been officially adopted, the concept has become the reference point for the development of cultural policy (Gunia-Kuznetsova, 2018, p.8).

23 In 2010, the Ministry of Culture, Monument Protection and Sports turned into two separate ministries: the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection and the Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs. At the end of 2017, more structural changes were implemented: the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia was given the sport section of the cancelled Ministry of Sports and Youth Affairs and turned into the Ministry of Culture and Sport in early 2018. Finally, in July 2018 the ministry was integrated with the Ministry of Education and Science and turned into the present Ministry of Education, Science, culture and Sport of Georgia.
Prior to 2013, annual declarations by the Ministry of Culture had little substantive impact on cultural policy or strategy. The effective role of the state appeared to shift after 2008, when culture came to be considered as something that could assist in economic growth and the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia began to play a more active role (Gunia-Kuznetsova, 2018). Culture was linked more frequently to the creation of employment and tourism, and government ministries gave emphasis to the need to develop and support creative industries. This is also clearly stated in two strategic documents, that the Government of Georgia adopted after 2012: the *Main Data and Trends of the Country for 2013-2016*, and the government programme *For a Strong, Democratic and United Georgia*. The cultural sector was partly de-regulated, with the new policy aiming to ensure non-interference of the government in the creative process.

_Culture Strategy 2025,* adopted in 2016, represented the first substantive attempt at giving Georgia a long-term strategic document with a holistic approach to cultural policy making. The overarching aim of the strategy is to develop Georgia as “a creative country and regional hub where innovation and creativity, along with safeguarding and revitalization of national heritage and cultural diversity, are the fundamental pillars of social wellbeing and sustainable development” (p.3). It also advocates an international, innovative, inclusive, democratic, and comprehensive approach in the context of cultural life, and reaffirms the link between culture and “economic progress” by highlighting employment opportunities in the field, and recommends greater public as well as private funding.

To achieve these ends, a Culture Policy Unit has been set-up within the *Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia*, which has assumed responsibility for developing strategy and monitoring its implementation (*Culture strategy 2025*, 2016, p.43). In 2017 the Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection of Georgia also published two a year action plan to implement the strategy, which primarily focuses on the promotion and funding of cultural practices through organising events, meetings, and other means of communications.

Georgian cultural policy was initially shaped by broader efforts within Georgian political to make a decisive break from the Soviet past.

This has partly manifested itself in efforts to develop cultural policy in line with internationally shared values, an emphasis on inclusivity and democratic values, and an openness to international support. International organisations like UNESCO and cultural policies of European countries have played a crucial role in shaping Georgia’s culture policy development (Ministry of Culture and Sport, 2017).

Moreover, NGOs have also contributed to shaping cultural policy in Georgia. In 2014, the Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection signed a Memorandum of Cooperation with 31 NGOs. In addition, “an EU cultural policy expert provided by the Regional Monitoring and Capacity Building Unit (RMCBU) under the Eastern Partnership Culture Programme supports and advises the ministry and the cultural sector in this process”(Gunia-Kuznetsova, 2018, p.9).

Georgia’s commitment to forge an independent cultural policy has culminated in a discrete Law on Culture, which addresses both “the centuries-old, rich traditions of Georgian culture” and the “experience of the civilised nations of the world.” The second declaration was designed to mark a symbolic shift from Soviet heritage by aligning Georgian culture with those of developed liberal economies.

---


The “field of culture”, according to Georgian legislation is widely defined to include “historical and cultural areas and objects, buildings and edifices, movable and immovable cultural monuments, folklore, art, souvenirs, handicraft art and handwork, professional art and literature, arts education and the related pedagogy, scientific research and methods, technologies, promotion and popularization of cultural and creative activities, entertaining and educational programmes and show business” (Law of Georgia on Culture, Article 5g).

Finally, it should be noted that cultural policy in Georgia is highly centralised, despite efforts to make the “making of culture” independent of the state. This is consistent with Georgians “strong political habit…of centralising” (Jones, 2013, p.5). In the policy documents, the government has emphasised various ways in which it aims to support and promote the cultural field. This is also reflected in the new Constitution, adopted on October 15, 2010, which entrusts the state with the development of culture. “The State shall support the development of culture, unrestricted participation of citizens in cultural life, expression and enrichment of cultural origins, recognition of national and universal values, and deepening of international cultural relations” (Constitution of Georgia, Article 34).
Method

A systematic search for eligible sources examining cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage, was carried out using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher 2015). The policy and legislative document repositories of the Government of Georgia were searched using a research strategy developed around the constructs (‘youth’ and ‘cultural literacy education’) to develop the string:

(Youth OR young OR child OR pupil) AND (education OR learn OR participate OR knowledge) AND (art OR dance OR drama OR film OR music OR theatre OR history OR commemoration OR museum OR galleries OR libraries OR poetry) AND (culture OR identity OR heritage OR creativity)

Searches were conducted between the 16th and 25th of July 2018 and limited to Georgian language policy documents published between January 2007 and July 2018. This initial search yielded only 70 records. Since this search did not deliver enough relevant policy documents, three broader concepts (‘youth’, ‘education’ and ‘culture’) were searched on ministry sites using the strings:

1. site:http://msy.gov.ge/ youth education culture (Ministry of Sport and Youth Affairs of Georgia): A google search generated 70 results. These documents included youth policy development strategies, government policies, and laws relating to youth. However, few contained policies related to culture and cultural education.


The google search generated 16 results. A manual search of the website was also undertaken. The following additional websites were manually searched:

- site:http://www.cultureandsports.gov.ge/ - Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia
- https://www.heritagesites.ge/ - National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation Georgia
- http://gov.ge/ - Government of Georgia
- https://mof.ge/ - Ministry of Finance of Georgia
- http://matsne.gov.ge/ - Legislative Herald of Georgia

As a result, 10 policy documents were selected for in-depth review. In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the following data were extracted from all eligible documents: department of publication, year. A thematic analysis of the documents was undertaken using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the review aims and objectives. NVivo was used to code the data under ‘descriptive’ and ‘interpretative’ codes. The ten documents that were coded and analysed are listed in Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents.

26 In Georgian translation for the string is: “(ახალგაზრდობა ან ახალგაზრდა ან ახალგაზრდები ან მოსწავლეები) და (განათლება ან სწავლა ან მონაწილეობა ან მონაწილეობა) და (ხელოვნება ან ცეკვა ან ფილმი ან მუსიკა ან თეატრი ან ისტორია ან მუზეუმები ან გალერეები ან ბიბლიოთეკები ან პოეზია) და (კულტურა ან იდენტობა ან მემკვიდრობა ან შემოქმედებითობა)”
Findings

Overview

In Georgia, there are no policy documents specifically dedicated to youth cultural literacy. However, youth culture literacy is covered in documents on youth policy, as well cultural and educational strategies that discuss cultural identity, cultural heritage, and cultural practices. The most relevant guidelines for youth cultural education are contained in documents and strategies about culture (e.g., *Culture Strategy 2025*[^27], *National Policy of Cultural Heritage*[^28] and *Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period*[^29]).

The Georgian constitution states that the government takes responsibility for: promoting cultural development; ensuring unlimited participation of citizens in cultural life; furthering the expression and enrichment of cultural identity; designating national and universal values; and deepening intercultural relations. In addition, policy documents (e.g., *Culture Strategy 2025* and *Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period*) emphasise the value of (and importance of preserving) cultural heritage to the country’s socio-economic development and stress innovative and creative thinking, and the importance of a modern education system.

The policy documents produced by the government and the ministries (e.g., *For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia*[^30] and *Unified Strategy for Education and Science for the Years 2017-2021*[^31]) also emphasise the country’s close orientation to Europe and shared values with the EU. This is true for all fields (youth, education, and culture) and extends to strong recommendations that sectoral legal frameworks, especially in respect of the cultural sector, should be in line with European laws and regulations.

[^27]: http://cultureandsports.gov.ge/getfile/55e94af7-46ff-43c6-8e5c-d7393abfeb2e/.aspx
[^28]: http://cultureandsports.gov.ge/getfile/00f3c22d-d784-4f14-ad86-67a2a8ba05d3/.aspx
[^29]: http://cultureandsports.gov.ge/getfile/3fce789a-db86-420d-892c-6c270eeb19ec/.aspx
Key Objectives of Cultural Policy

According to *The Present Situation of Georgian Culture and the Concept of its Development*[^32], published by the Ministry of Culture and Sport in 2012, cultural policy has two main goals: to preserve the historical past and cultural memory and take care of it; to develop modern culture by promoting the creation and dissemination of new approaches in culture.

The document highlights the role of government in creating an environment in which cultural heritage and diversity are maintained and cultural life and activities, and creative ideas and businesses, are encouraged and promoted.

The precise role to be played by government is outlined in the *Culture Strategy 2025*. This reports that the government plans the following.

1. Integrate culture and creativity into the education system (including formal pre-school, general and non-formal educational entities) in order to raise public awareness of the importance of national culture and the role of innovative, creative thinking.

2. Make culture accessible to all society members, including Georgian citizens living in mountainous regions and occupied territories in order to ensure that the wider public is engaged in cultural processes.

3. Integrate culture and creativity into other areas’ policies, by raising awareness of policy makers, government agencies and stakeholders of different fields about the role of culture by holding regular meetings and consultations [and] developing joint projects (so that culture is reflected in different areas of sustainable development and social life).

4. Ensure that employment in the cultural sector is attractive in order to generate interest in working in the sector among the general public.

5. Develop modern infrastructure of Georgian culture that will ensure a professional environment and new technologies in the cultural sector.

6. Support the development of creative industries in order to create jobs, enhance economic growth and innovation (aimed at enhancing the development of cultural economics and the industrialisation of culture).

7. Strengthen Georgian culture’s internationalization process and promote culture abroad so that it becomes a subject of interest for the rest of the world.

8. Make cultural policy evidence-based and support the general public to openly participate and contribute to the policy-making process. This will make sure that culture is governed with democratic principles.

The ambition of these plans, combined with the emergence of national culture as a strategic priority, underpins calls from the government to increase financial and material-technical assistance to all fields of culture, based on EU practice (*The Present Situation of Georgian Culture and the Concept of its Development*, 2012, p. 14).

[^32]: http://cultureandsports.gov.ge/getfile/d5f17bfb-4601-c9df-bb69-b0f9a30e305e.aspx
This has been reflected in increased funding for the Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection (GEL 93.85 million in 2013, 125.832 million in 2016) (Main Data and Trends of the Country for 2013-2016, 2013, p. 79\(^3\)). In practice, funding sources are more diversified. For example, funding for the protection of cultural heritage from the following sources is outlined in the Law on Cultural Heritage: the state budget; the local government budget; the state budget of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara; the budgets of owner/owners [of cultural entities]; grants issued by international organisations; donations; as well as other, miscellaneous, funds not prohibited by the legislation of Georgia (Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage, Article 56).\(^3\) Culture Strategy 2025 explicitly seeks to extend and deepen the diversity of funding for all cultural practices in order to enhance the sustainability of funding for culture (2016, p.16).

Cultural fields prioritised for support
A number of policy documents report that cultural practices, institutions, and expression are poorly attended to and that renewed efforts of preservation and restoration are critical (e.g., National Policy of Georgian Cultural Heritage). Culture Strategy 2025 has highlighted a number of priority areas to be supported and promoted.

\(^3\) https://mof.ge/dziritadi_monacemebi_mimartulebebi_2013_2016

1. Visual art.
The strategy reports that art as the creative, social, economic, and cultural capital of society is considered a strategic resource for social and economic development of the state and is considered on a par with science and education. It specifically highlights the government’s commitment to supporting the development of modern art and helping all artists to present themselves and develop.

In addition, *Culture Strategy 2025* reports the government’s aim of supporting “the development of corresponding business models and business skills for the personnel of galleries, curators and art consultants in order to promote visual arts and stimulate the dynamics of the domestic art market” (*Culture Strategy 2025*, 2016, p.36). It also signals major infrastructure projects, such as plans to create both a multifunctional facility of culture and a museum of contemporary art to promote visual art in Georgia, in order to attract international attention.

2. Theatre and dramaturgy/ performing arts
Policy documents, such as *Culture Strategy 2025,* *The Present Situation of Georgian Culture and the Concept of its Development* and *Main Data and Trends of the Country for 2013-2016,* have recommended a package of measures to grant theatres autonomy and become self-sufficient. The measures include: changes to the legal and regulatory framework for the performing art sector; initiatives aimed at popularising national dramaturgy (e.g., by introducing thematic competitions to promote the creation of new plays); support for festivals and workshops in order to encourage involvement of the general public, particularly young people; the promotion of children’s and youth theatre. The government has also announced financial support for theatres to tours outside Tbilisi.

3. Cinematography/ audio-visual sector/ movies
Georgian cinematography is considered to play (and have played) an important role in the development of Georgian culture. Under *Culture Strategy 2025,* the government plans to establish the national cinema reserve in order to preserve and organize the film heritage and ensure the public’s accessibility to the Georgian and world cinematography” (*Culture Strategy 2025*, p 32). The strategy also outlines government plans to develop multifunctional cultural-educational centres as well as alternative means of screening (e.g.: mobile cinemas) to support film screenings.

4. Music industry
Several policy documents (e.g., *For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia* and *The Present Situation of Georgian Culture and the Concept of its Development* and *Culture Strategy 2025*) advocate strong support for the music industry.

The strategy outlines plans to support the domestic music industry by promoting Georgian composers and musicians and sponsoring events, festivals, competitions and workshops, with an emphasis on classical music. To ensure the professional development of national composers and musicians, the strategy highlights the potential value of facilitating the participation of Georgian musicians in international events (e.g. competitions, festivals, residency programmes).

The government also plans to “collect, document, publish, and promote the artistic heritage of national professional performers and composers” (*Culture Strategy 2025*, p 34).

5. Libraries and Archives
*Culture Strategy 2025* reports that state will help to increase the number of library collections and will support the introduction and application of innovative approaches and new technologies (e.g. mobile libraries). The government will also work on standards and certification guidelines for people working in this field (p. 30).
6. Museums
The strategy also includes plans to improve and support museums. For this purpose, development of infrastructure, implementation of activities that would renew exhibitions, and diagnostic analysis of museum collections is planned, as well as the restoration of exhibits and improvement of bookkeeping. New initiatives (e.g. museum nights, open door days, museums in school) are also planned to promote museums (p.30).

The government supports, “the protection and enrichment of Georgian museums’ collections in order to safeguard cultural heritage and to prevent the outflow of cultural heritage from the State” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.31). The state also encourages museums to use new technologies and innovative approaches, to develop software applications and to collaborate with other museums, cultural institutions, universities, and the business sector to exchange ideas and approaches. The government wants to implement different educational and research programmes where museums will be part of education and learning. The government also wants to “support local and international collaboration in order to share professional knowledge and museum practices and develop training programmes for museum workers (audience building, foreign language, fundraising and building networks, communicating with people with disabilities, strategic design, marketing, etc.)” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.30).

7. Literature and publishing.
Policy documents For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia, The Present Situation of Georgian Culture and the Concept of its Development and Culture Strategy 2025 talk about the crisis in the field of Georgian literature and highlight its importance. Culture Strategy 2025 also ties efforts to promote reading habits/skills and the general literacy of young people to protecting and developing national literature.

This entails working with different organisations (e.g.: the National Parliamentary Library, the Writers’ House, the Literature Museum, the Service Development Agency) and support special projects and events (e.g. artistic evenings, literature competitions, book festivals, mobile libraries, meetings with writers). The strategy also advocates supporting the teaching of creative writing at all levels of education and encourages the development of literature studies and criticism.

The strategy also advocates an ambitious translation strategy in which Georgian literature is translated into other languages and vice-versa. The state will provide training programmes for translators of Georgian literature and develop professional networks of translators. It also intends to support publishing companies by helping with production and distribution of cultural, scientific, and technical literature. The state claims it will introduce innovative approaches and technologies to promote e-books.

8. Traditional crafts
According to Culture Strategy 2025, traditional crafts should be supported by developing craft studios and supporting artisans to participate in exhibitions and fairs. Artisans will also be able to participate in training sessions on marketing and copyright protection to help with the production and sale of their products. The government intends to “support the development of sustainable entrepreneurship…by employing the resources of existing and forgotten traditions” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.31).
9. Architecture, monuments and properties

Overall, the policy documents portray architecture as a complex discipline bearing cultural, creative, and aesthetic value. The government plans to restore the architectural monuments and properties in the country as well as execute the obligations Georgia has towards UNESCO to monitor and study Georgian cultural monuments outside the country as well as plan and implement joint activities with relevant states (Main data and trends of the country for 2013-2016, 2013).

According to the Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage, the types of cultural property are: a) archaeological, b) architectural, c) engineering, d) urban development (urban), e) park and garden landscape art and landscape architecture, f) palaeontological, g) elements of artistic monuments, h) memorial, i) ethnographic, j) fine art, k) archival, l) cultural properties related to the development of science, technology or industry” (Article 19).

According to the National Policy of Georgian Cultural Heritage (2014), the state register contains 6,803 monuments, from which 484 are of national importance. Three objects from Georgia are listed in the World Heritage List (p.3). Plans have been put in place to restore and conserve historical monuments to preserve the cultural heritage of the region and to transmit it to future generations. According to one government programme, For a Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia, a cultural heritage database management system and heritage geographic information system (GIS) have been developed. The same document highlights a wide range of ongoing restorative work (started in 2014-2015) on: the architectural complexes of Mutso Nokalakevi, and Vardzia; the village of Chazhashi, ; the Squiri Church, the Bebris Tsikhe and Nogha Fortresses; the Grakliani Hill (outdoor museum); the Geguti Palace; and Bagineti (archaeological work) (p.53).

10. Media and broadcasting

Media and broadcasting have been identified as priority areas, primarily because of their role in promoting cultural events, but also cultural diversity and inter-cultural relations. New and old media are recognised as cost-effective channels for disseminating information to groups interested in the field and encouraging participation. Culture Strategy 2025 notes that media dissemination should be in ethnic languages, as well Georgian, in order to enhance inclusivity. Specific initiatives have not yet been outlined other than funding commitments to the Georgian public broadcaster (to produce television and radio performances) and support films and TV show production, in order to “contribute to the creation and distribution of products of cultural importance” (Culture Strategy 2015, 2016, p.36).

Cultural engagement, participation and access

While policy documents discuss promoting specific fields of culture, the cultural engagement of youth either in these fields or in the context of promoting cultural literacy is relatively conspicuous by its absence.

Nonetheless, some documents (e.g., National Youth Document; For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia and Culture strategy 2025) imply that the government encourages young people35 to get involved in cultural events and activities.

Cultural involvement and engagement is encouraged on the basis of its importance to “providing conditions for health and social welfare, regional development, tourism and other key areas” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.3).

35 According to the State Youth Policy Document of Georgia that was finalized in 2014 “youth” is considered to be a person aged from 14 to 29 years.
In addition, culture and culture engagement is considered to be “the best instrument for safeguarding the values of a society and its democratization” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.3).

For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia encourages Georgian citizens to freely engage in cultural activities and declares that the state will not interfere in creative processes. According to the programme, arts, culture, and sporting activities help young people to fulfil themselves and realise their talents. The programme places an emphasis on bringing “young people closer to the Euro-Atlantic space”, to which effect introducing youth programmes in cooperation with international organisations and partner states is regarded as key (For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia, 2015).

National Youth Policy (2014)36, links young people’s participation in cultural, creative, and leisure activities with the maintenance of national identity and keeping traditions alive, and signals the government’s intention to support cultural participation for these reasons. Young compatriots living abroad should also get information about the country's cultural life, be able to participate in it, and maintain ties with young people living in Georgia. It is also important to involve young people living in the occupied territories in the cultural life of Georgia (National Youth Policy, 2014, p. 10).

The document outlines a number of secondary objectives and actions to involve more young people in cultural activities, namely: supporting young people to participate in activities related to monuments’ protection and maintenance; increasing the number and size of cultural, creative and leisure programmes for young people; increasing the number of creative competitions among general and higher education institutions; ensuring young Georgians residing abroad acquire information on the cultural life of the country, be able to participate in it, and maintain ties with young people living in Georgia; ensure that young people living in the territories occupied by Russia receive information about the cultural life of the country and deepen relations with young people living in non-occupied parts of the country.

More generally, the government has announced a variety of cultural initiatives for international audiences aimed at raising the countries international profile and creating international good-will (both associated with the country’s long-term socioeconomic development).

These include the creation of cultural centres abroad, organising cultural days, exchange trips, competitions, festivals, and exhibitions (Main Data and Trends of the country for 2013-2016, 2013, p. 59).

Culture Strategy 2025 provides a general declaration that Georgian citizens are equal in terms of participating in cultural life, irrespective of their national, ethnic, religious, linguistic or other differences. Consequently, culture policy is reported to guarantee the creative practices of Georgians in accordance with their interests and ability. In addition, the government particularly encourages activities that are linked with creative actions, as “strong creative industries can serve as a catalyst for the country’s economic development. When creativity is exploited, it can transform a unique and authentic cultural sector into a modern competitive realm” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.3).

36 The aim of the youth policy is to support the environment for the full development of young people, where young people can fully realize their potential and actively engage in all areas of public life. The document is available at http://msy.gov.ge/files/veko/2014%20weli/marti/_ხატ_ახალგაზრდა_პოლიტიკა_30082013.pdf
Cultural education

The policy documents (e.g., *For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia* and *Main Data and Trends of the Country for 2013-2016*) state that the government’s top priority is to develop and improve the system of education in Georgia. The new Social-Economic Development Strategy of the Government "Georgia 2020", as well as the four-point plan from the reform of the Government of Georgia gives priority to education, which ensures the development of human capital and citizens’ effective involvement in the country's development.

This is reflected in steady growth in the budget of the Ministry of Education and Science (GEL 650 million to 1.1 billion in five years prior to 2017) (*Unified Strategy for Education and Science for the Years 2017-2021*[^37]).

Despite the efforts to improve the system of education, little has been done to develop programmes of study in culture. One of the serious challenges in cultural education is the lack of qualified professional staff. This is reported to be due to the lack of higher education and vocational education institutions that offer courses relevant to the conservation and management of heritage.

Out of thirty higher education institutions education related to culture (e.g., education in cultural heritage, cultural management, the theory and history of art, cultural policy) is available in just five (Tbilisi State Academy of Fine Arts, Tbilisi State University, Ilia State University, Tbilisi Shota Rustaveli Theater and Film University, GIPA - Georgian Institute of Public Affairs).

Moreover, the report argues that teaching programmes/curricula at these institutions are not well organised, undeveloped and fragmented and that there is a lack of specific research and publications in this field (*National Policy of Georgian Cultural Heritage*, 2014, p.42).

In response to this, the government has begun to place greater emphasis on supporting cultural education. *For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia* outlines the government’s plans to support formal art education. This is anticipated to involve activities aimed at: supporting the studies of creative and outstanding students; motivating young people to participate in international competitions and festivals; supporting teachers; and enriching libraries and museum collections. Overall, these activities are described in the following summary of the government plans to develop cultural education: “The Government attaches paramount importance to supporting art education and art institutions. Master’s programmes and professional development programmes are carried out through government support, which also goes towards gifted children from regions who study music arts. The Government also encourages Georgian citizens to receive higher arts education or to attend art courses abroad” (*For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia*, 2015, p. 53-54).

Another major component of the government’s support for formal cultural education concerns teacher training. According to the *Unified Strategy for Education and Science for the Years 2017-2021*, in coordination with the relevant ministries, the Ministry of Education and Science will facilitate the creation and implementation of a professional module of teachers of performing arts (music) and physical education. According to *Culture Strategy 2025*, educational standards and teaching methodologies should be improved. The state plans to “increase the number and quality of culture and arts lessons in schools of general education.

Support the integration of culture and creativity into the school educational system through creating stable professional learning and training systems for teachers (develop curricula, refine study and other materials in collaboration with relevant institutions of higher education; integrate innovative and creative approaches in the teaching process)” (Culture Strategy 2025, 2016, p.6). One of the priorities set by the government is visual arts. According to the strategy, in order to develop effective visual arts education and improve its quality, the government aims to establish new teaching standards and learning methodologies. Furthermore, the government plans to support the development of visual arts education institutions by providing work inventories and study materials and establish visual arts education institutions to develop professional skills and thinking in this field.

Another priority for the government outlined in Culture Strategy 2025 is music education. In respect of this, the government plans to “develop professional performing skills and thinking in parallel with general education and practice in mastering (the instruments) from basic education to higher education; improve the quality of education (via new teaching standards and methodologies); support the development of a favourable study environment (musical instruments, study materials and scores) in music educational institutions” (Culture strategy 2025).

Finally, according to Unified Strategy for Education and Science for the Years 2017-2021, the government plans to integrate informal resources of cultural literacy (such as museums, protected areas, historical and cultural monuments) into formal cultural education. Moreover, additional libraries will be opened to ensure access to quality higher education.

Cultural heritage
Cultural heritage’s relevance to cultural literacy education primarily resides in the potential for historical resources (such as cultural monuments, protected areas and museums) to be integrated into formal cultural education and serve as “knowledge carriers”.

The Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage distinguishes between tangible and intangible forms of cultural heritage. Tangible heritage covers any immobile or mobile, architectural, art, urban, agricultural, archaeological, anthropological, ethnographic, monumental, technique related objects that are created by humans or (as a result of an impact on) human nature that have aesthetic, historical, or memorial value and includes landscapes, parks, documentaries, architectural objects, and historic settlements. Intangible cultural heritage encompasses traditions and expressions, language, performing art, customs, knowledge and skills related to traditional art, artefacts and cultural spaces, that the society, certain groups of people and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage.

According to other policy documents (e.g. Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period, 2013), cultural heritage is recognised as human creation that has historical value. This may be tangible or intangible cultural monuments/memorials, carrying aesthetic, scientific, technological, social, and/or other values of historical significance.

In most Georgian policy documents (e.g. Culture Strategy 2025) cultural heritage is a considered to symbolise the country’s international image and is viewed as a crucial factor for the country’s socio-economic development. This underpins three recurrent themes in policy documents - the importance of cultural heritage being protected, exhaustively studied, and popularised (which is currently being progressed under plans to improve the museum system of tangible and intangible cultural heritage).
Policy documents stress that the conservation, restoration, and rehabilitation of cultural heritage should be carried out in compliance with relevant international standards and based on relevant research. This is taken up in a number of prescriptions outlined in *Culture Strategy 2025* which reports that: traditional architecture should be prioritised for protection and preservation; the state should ensure that relevant knowledge and skills (e.g. identification and processing of traditional materials, traditional greening, landscapes and city building, traditional rules of hydro isolation) are transmitted to future generations; that intangible cultural (particular endangered forms of cultural heritage, such as oral expressions, traditional craftsmanship, performing arts, social practices and knowledge) should be should be revitalised and practiced.

Emphasis is also placed on preservation of national folklore. The policy documents suggest that the state should “support research in order to ensure the protection, preservation, development, and promotion of national folklore – traditional music, choreography and oral traditions, traditional plays, medicine and etc.” (*Culture Strategy 2025*, 2016, p.28).

In addition, *Culture Strategy 2025* reports that the government should “ensure the protection of relevant facilities and spaces (instruments, artefacts, household objects, etc.) associated with traditional Georgian performing arts, social practices and craftsmanship” (*Culture Strategy 2025*, 2016, p.28).

A closely related theme, emphasised in a number of policy documents (e.g., *Culture Strategy 2025* and *For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia*), concerns the importance of promoting cultural traditions, which involves both preserving cultural heritage and developing what is described as cultural modernity (promoting innovations in modern culture, their presentation and dissemination). This means that, the policy documents often consider cultural heritage to be a basis for modern culture and art. The diversity of heritage and active cultural environment is the basis of the most innovative contemporary art, architecture, or street art. Cultural heritage is the origin that inspires and creates a high creative environment, refines taste, develops a wide vision, and thus is directly related to the freedom of creativity.

Finally, while the government aims to keep, protect and promote its cultural heritage in the country, it is also important to safeguard the country’s cultural heritage outside the borders. *The Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage* says that “Georgia cares for the protection of the cultural heritage of Georgia located abroad” (Article 2). In addition, according to *Culture Policy Concept for the Transitional Period (2014-2016)*, there is a special threat to Georgia's cultural heritage monuments in the occupied territories of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The document argues that Georgia should continue to actively engage in international organisations and to implement international law mechanisms in the process of cultural heritage protection in these territories. For this purpose, it of great importance to cooperate with UNESCO and the Council of Europe (p. 9).

**Cultural identity/ Georgian language and cultural diversity**

Georgian language is reported to be one of the most important components of cultural identity. This is reflected in the *Culture Strategy 2025* which notes, that the Georgian nation has historically identified itself in the Georgian language (as well as Georgian culture generally). The importance of language to Georgian’s national identity is also asserted in *Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period (2014-2016)*, which cites UNESCO to support the claim that the state language is a symbol of the state that serves political, social and cultural integration. Against a backdrop of concern that young people are increasingly using international words, the strategy advocates the value of thinking of culture and language as phenomena that have a strategic purpose in preserving national identity and outlines special measures to protect Georgian as a state language.
This reflects a recent law (2015), described as an “emergency measure”, which guarantees Georgian as the official language (*Culture strategy 2025*, 2016, p.8).

In addition, *Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period (2014-2016)* presents the Georgian language as a key means of circulating internal intercultural (and international) information and notes that its proper study and use is especially important in multi-ethnic states, in which is considered to represent an effective instrument for the formation and distribution of common cultural values and facilitate the creation of an equal cultural environment for all ethnic groups. Universal knowledge of the official language is reported to develop a unified cultural discourse and enhance an open society, where everyone can express their attitudes and beliefs. In addition, universal knowledge of the official language is said to increase cultural participation and awareness of ongoing cultural processes and, consequently, something from which national minorities are reported to especially benefit. (*Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period 2014-2016*, 2013, p.5).

These assumptions underlie, government’s plans to “support research and safeguard the Kartvelian languages (Georgian, Mingrelian, Laz, Svan) and tones, the Georgian scripts and alphabet (designing the fonts for three types of Georgian alphabet, encouraging the use of the Georgian languages and scripts on the internet)” (*Culture Strategy 2025*, 2016, p. 28).

Alongside the government’s commitment to the universal teaching of the official language, the state reaffirms the right of ethnic groups living in Georgia to preserve and develop their language. According to the *Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period 2014-2016*, this will facilitate the disclosure of Georgian cultural diversity together with learning the official language (2013, p.3).

Ensuring cultural diversity is one of the main focuses of the Georgian government. Georgia tries to implement the UNESCO 2005 Convention on Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expression which ensures cultural life and self-expression of all people and communities living on the country’s territory (*For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia*, 2015). Cultural activity in Georgia is an unrestricted human right, irrespective of national, ethnic, religious or linguistic belonging (*Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period 2014-2016*2013, p.3).
Discussion

(Commentary on policy review set against literature)

Preserving Georgian heritage, traditions and identity are regarded as important not only for Georgian youth, but generally, for the whole nation. This is reflected in the policy documents produced by the government as well as in the given academic literature. In addition, academic research (survey results and qualitative data) highlight the importance that young and old attach to remembering Georgia’s history (with its identity, heritage, traditions and identity) and transmitting it to the next generations (MYPLACE\textsuperscript{38}, 2013; FES\textsuperscript{39}, 2016).

Although some policy documents (e.g., National Policy of Georgian Cultural Heritage) link culture to nationalism and highlight the importance of preserving national identity and cultural heritage, others (e.g., Culture Strategy 2025) are more oriented towards promoting creative thinking and modern approaches within young people’s cultural practices and education. Studies of young people in Georgia reflect this dichotomy: on one hand, young people are inclined towards traditional values and view the preservation of Georgian identity, culture, and traditions as important factors, although here is also a tendency towards self-expression and secular-rational values, especially in the capital and urban areas (Sumbadze\textsuperscript{40}, 2012; FES 2016; Khoshtaria\textsuperscript{41}, 2017).

Many policy documents highlight the importance of “keeping the old” while creating “something new”. For example, the vision of Culture Strategy 2025 is to portray Georgia as “a creative country and regional hub where innovation and creativity, along with safeguarding and revitalising national heritage and cultural diversity are the fundamental pillars of social wellbeing and sustainable development” (2016, p.3). This approach reflects the findings of some key academic studies. For example, Lia Tsuladze (2012) describes how Georgian youth maintains traditions while at the same time moving beyond traditional borders. She looks at how youth identities are constructed through global and local cultural elements and concludes that Georgian youth aspire to maintain and preserve some traditional cultural features that distinguish Georgian culture from others (such as Georgian polyphony, Georgian folk songs and dances, Georgian table traditions, and even “Georgian relations” mostly implying close emotional relationships and support among in-group members), while also seeking to adapt traditional practices through more “modern” representations of “Georgianness”.

\textsuperscript{38} Memory, Youth, Political Legacy And Civic Engagement (MYPLACE) project http://www.fp7-myplace.eu
\textsuperscript{40} http://www.ipseng.techtone.info/files/9213/4245/8172/Taobebi_da_Girebulebebi_-_Book_1.pdf
\textsuperscript{41} https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13617672.2017.1359480
Amongst other things, this involves “adapting the old system of toast-making, listening to contemporary versions of Georgian folk music, and inventing modern versions of traditional ‘Georgian relations’” (Tsuladze, 2012. p.95). Tsuladze argues that this is complex process as it, “entails retaining the traditional system of young people’s subordination to elders while gaining a considerable amount of freedom from them, and even a more complex aspiration to become freer in the sphere of sexual relations while retaining the traditional religious-normative perception of the Georgian woman as rather desexualised” (Tsuladze, 2012. p.95).

In the context of youth cultural identity, it is important to take into account how national identity has taken shape in the recent past in Georgia. The transition from ethnic to civic national identity has been complemented with another, arguably more important, transition from future oriented secular nationalism to past-oriented religious nationalism. The attempt to overcome ethnic nationalism and initiate an extensive modernisation process promoting civic national identity, is seen as one of the major achievements of the Rose Revolutionary government, which came to power in 2003. The national identity model, which politicians promoted at that time, was no longer based on ethnicity. Rather, they emphasised citizenship as the primary factor defining national identity: “The State, on the levels of both policy and official discourse, stopped differentiating between its citizens according to their ethnic background and elevated citizenship to the only principle according to which it defined Georgian identity” (Zedania, 2011, p.121).

Nevertheless, national and cultural identity in Georgia today is still closely linked with ethnicity as well as religiosity. Moreover, religion can be regarded as an even more important determinant of Georgians’ cultural identity. A majority of young people in Georgia identify themselves as Orthodox Christian (85%), followed by Muslim (10%) (FES, 2016). Being Georgian is closely related to being orthodox Christian: qualitative data indicate that atheism is viewed as something against Georgian traditions (FES, 2017, p 112). Moreover, young people in Georgia tend to be more religious than older generations (Sumbadze, 2012; Mestvirishvili, 2014). Religious institutions, together with the Georgian army, are the most trusted institutions of the country (CRRC, 2017). According to the MYPLACE report, Georgian young people (in Kutaisi and Telavi) score the highest of the 14 countries in the study on the religiosity scale in terms of perceived religiosity and also in terms of frequency of attending religious services, with 86% of Kutaisi youth and 74% of Telavi youth reporting attendance at religious services at least once a month. Moreover, 89% of young people in Kutaisi and 81% in Telavi think that there is only one true religion (MYPLACE, 2014). The FES survey (2016) also found that the majority of young people believe in the existence of God (97%) and in the creation of the world by God (91%) (FES, 2017, p 112).

In a broader context, several scholars have talked about a values shift among young Georgians. In contrast to the older generation, which are oriented towards traditionalism, family coherence, and bringing up obedient children, the younger generation values independence and self-determination as well as self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism. Young people in Georgia are characterised as more open to change and tolerant towards different minority groups, although tolerance towards religious and sexual minorities is still very low (Sumbadze, 2012; Khoostaria 2017). Interestingly, this value shift has not affected youth religiosity These findings lead to the conclusion that emancipative, self-expressive, or post-materialist values (except with regard to religion) are becoming more widespread among the younger generation in Georgia compared with the older generations.
A high level of religiosity can be an obstacle for tolerance towards minority groups. Young people in Georgia are relatively intolerant towards sexual minorities. Moreover, as for ethnic and religious minorities, their attitudes are mixed. Even though policy papers (e.g., Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period (2014-2016) and Culture Strategy 2025) emphasise government support for integrating minorities into social and cultural life, empirical research reveals the existence of practices within schooling which are likely to cement, rather than challenge, intolerant attitudes towards some groups.

Tabatadze and Gorgadze’s (2013) study of primary school education is a case in point. The study sought to identify challenges and problems relating to multiculturalism through interviews with teachers, focus groups with parents and students, and textbook analysis. The textbook analysis showed that the majority of textbooks fail to develop intercultural sensitivity among children and “encourage and perpetuate stenotypes among the students in different directions, namely by territorial settlement, socio-economic status, health and abilities, gender, etc. Also, it should be noted that most of the textbooks do not reflect ethnic, religious, territorial settlement diversity of Georgia and are written with ethnocentric perspective” (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p.89). Significantly, focus groups with 5-7 graders and their parents found that in primary grades, students were quite interested in different cultures and noticed inequality and inappropriate attitudes towards different cultural groups better than their parents (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p. 152).

Moreover, the study found that teachers’ multicultural sensitivity and tolerance towards different ethnic groups were relatively low and selective towards different ethnic groups and that their general cultural sensitivity varied according to different aspects of cultural identity: “Tolerance towards social status, disabilities or gender does not exclude intolerance towards racial, lingual, religious, ethnic or civil differences” (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p. 123). These observations reflected the finding that primary school teachers had a limited understanding of multicultural education and its goals. Most had not participated in any multicultural education courses and found it hard to talk about specific strategies for multicultural education. Religion was perceived as most problematic in terms of multicultural education. The study showed 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 (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p. 139).

Tabatadze and Gorgadze’s findings are consistent with other research relevant to intercultural dialogue, among the young. A recent study by Malazonia, et al. (2017) on cultural education in schools used a student survey, interviews and focus groups with teachers, and textbook analysis to examine intercultural education. The research focused on secondary schools and 10-12 graders (16-18 years old) in public and private schools in Georgia. The study showed that students’ intercultural knowledge is very limited, stereotypes about other cultures were common, and that ethnic Georgian students had a sense of superiority over other cultural groups living in Georgia. (Malazonia, et al., 2017). Notwithstanding this, the survey results revealed a mixed picture. Seventy eight percent of respondents agreed that all cultures should be equally respected, 72% agreed that knowledge about different cultures facilitates relationships between humans, and 63% agreed that there are connections between different cultures and languages. However, only 35% agreed that they were able to detect incorrect opinions (prejudices) about cultures. Thirty-one reported being open to helping people from another culture, and only 28% were ready to live in a different cultural environment.
The study found 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. Malazonia, et al. (2017) note that this reflects the lack of experience of teachers and is consistent with curriculum design and textbook content, which can foster negative attitudes towards other cultures (Malazonia, et al., 2017).

Attitudes towards other cultures closely reflects perceptions on the European Union. Policy documents in Georgia reflect the government’s aspiration for closer European integration, evidenced by efforts to ensure that guidelines are consistent with European laws and regulations.

A European (or more general “western”) orientation is also referred to in several documents. Despite this, recent surveys reveal a relatively widespread fear (stronger in rural areas) among Georgians that closer integration with the EU potentially threatens Georgian culture and traditions and is associated with a loss of values and traditions. According to the FES study (2016), this fear is partially explained by the lack of information or misinformation about EU related issues and European values and culture.

In order to address these perceptions, the government has allocated greater support to exchange programmes and encouraged Georgian citizens to receive education or to attend courses abroad. This is especially true for art courses (For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia and Main Data and Trends of the Country for 2013-2016). Research by Javakhishvili and colleagues (2013) aimed at studying the impact of international educational exchange programmes on identity formation in early adulthood (18-25) suggests that educational exchange programmes have a positive impact on Georgian youth. The study used a quasi-experimental design, in which 30 young adults who were selected by international study programmes to continue their education in various countries of Western Europe were interviewed before their departure from and after their return to Georgia. The results were compared to a control group, where interviews were conducted with short-listed candidates who did not participate in the exchange programmes. Qualitative analysis of life interviews revealed that participants in exchange programmes were better placed to realise differences between individual host cultures and their collectivistic home culture, “giving more critical thought to their own culture (Javakhishvili et al., 2013. p.41), and demonstrated increased tolerance to others.

Finally, policy papers (e.g., Culture strategy 2025) place an emphasis on cultural involvement and engagement and encourage young people to be more active in this regard. However, youth studies show that the perceived importance of Georgia history and culture is not directly translated into behaviour among young people in Georgia, whose participation in cultural/heritage related activities remains very low (UNICEF, 2014; MYPLACE, 2014).

According to a 2013 UNICEF study (2014), only 57% of young people (aged 15-29) (72% and 41% for urban and rural dwellers respectively) attended cultural activities on at least one occasion for the purpose of entertainment, recreation, or acquiring knowledge, and only 12% participated in cultural/heritage-related activities in the 12 months prior to the survey.

---

42 This fear is not specific to young people. According to EU survey data, the fear that the EU will harm Georgian culture and traditions has increased in Georgian society over the past years, and especially after 2013. In 2017 almost half (49%) of Georgia’s population agreed with the statement, “The EU threatens Georgian traditions” (EF/CRR-Georgia, 2017).
44 The latter can be explained due to the small number of cultural events taking place in rural areas (UNICEF 2014).
45 And most of these young people (75%) participated in activities that mainly related to obtaining information about objects of cultural heritage (UNICEF 2014).
Conclusion

Policies and recommendations relevant to youth cultural education in Georgia are concentrated in policy documents focusing on culture, rather than young people. This reflects a general emphasis within cultural education policy in Georgia, in which young people are, in some cases, incidental to general efforts to enhance cultural literacy. Nonetheless, a key theme of government policy is that a combination of cultural heritage, creativity and contemporary approaches to cultural practices and education should be a basis for youth engagement in the country. Policy documents indicate the government plans to, or is in the process of: integrating culture and creativity in the educational system to ensure that young people are aware of the importance of national culture and the role of innovative, creative thinking; making culture universally accessible; strengthening efforts to promote Georgian culture’s abroad; and making cultural policy evidence-based.

Cultural education is considered to serve a range of ends. However, increasing young people’s participation in cultural, creative, and leisure activities through what can broadly be described as cultural education represents a key goal. This is reflected in: commitments to introduce more education programmes (e.g., in the fields of visual art, choreography, and music); plans to support young people’s participation in activities related to monuments’ protection and maintenance; efforts to increase the number of cultural, creative and leisure programmes for young people; and increases in the number of creative competitions among general and higher education institutions.

At the same time, policy documents emphasise the general value of cultural heritage and stress the maintenance and preservation of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, which is considered core to be the country’s international image and is viewed as a crucial factor for the country’s socio-economic development. The conservation, restoration, and rehabilitation of cultural heritage should be carried out in compliance with international standards and based on relevant research. Georgia’s cultural strategy suggests that the state should pay special attention to architecture, museums, libraries, and archives on the one hand and to national art, music, literature, movies and traditional crafts on the other hand to preserve national heritage. A special emphasis is also made on Georgian language which is viewed as the main basis of national identity. Finally, the policy documents reflect the government’s aspiration for closer European integration, evidenced by efforts to ensure that guidelines are consistent with European laws and regulations.
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## Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Data and Trends of the Country for 2013-2016</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance of Georgia</td>
<td>Government program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Strong, Democratic and Unified Georgia</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Government of Georgia</td>
<td>Government program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Policy Concept for the Transitional Period (2014-2016)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Strategy 2025</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Policy of Georgian Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>ICOMOS Georgia</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Present Situation of Georgian Culture and the Concept of its Development</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Sport of Georgia</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Policy</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ministry of Sport and Youth Affairs of Georgia</td>
<td>Policy document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Policy</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ministry of Sport and Youth Affairs of Georgia</td>
<td>Policy document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>2017 (last amended)</td>
<td>Legislative Herald of Georgia</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education was constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is out specific interest for this component of the CHIEF project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy, rather than refining by a specific form of document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to our research questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excluded all documents which</th>
<th>Were published before 1/1/2007</th>
<th>See above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Cultural/Educational Policy Review (Germany)
Louis Henri Seukwa, Elina Marmer and Cornelia Sylla

Executive Summary

A systematic thematic analysis of official policies relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in Germany was undertaken using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the review aims and objectives. The review critically analyses official documents’ use of the concepts of culture, cultural identity and cultural heritage, as well as related educational policies. This analysis is oriented towards CHIEF’s aim to facilitate more inclusive notions of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, responsibility for cultural education policy is shared between the Federation (Bund) and the sixteen Länder (Federal States). National cultural policy defines the main responsibilities of the Federation as: protecting the freedom of art and culture; representation of Germany’s culture and language in other countries; preservation of German and world cultural heritage; the commemoration and remembrance of the victims of crimes associated with National Socialism and the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED).

Cultural participation for all is a declared responsibility of the federal government and cultural education is considered central to achieving this aim. In practice, however, effective responsibility for cultural education resides with the Länder and municipalities. Federal government programmes rely heavily on philanthropy and unpaid labour, and primarily centre on providing networks, spaces and awards for best practice projects. In financial terms, the state contributes relatively little to cultural funding and only a marginal part of this budget is directed towards cultural education.

Policy documents use different concepts of culture, sometimes interchangeably, in parallel or in connection to each other. Culture is often understood as creative artistic/aesthetic production/consumption, also termed “art and culture”. This definition of culture is conceptualized as Hochkultur (high culture) and Breitenkultur (lit. “broad culture”: mass or popular culture). Some studies outlined in policy documents suggest that Hochkultur, associated with museums, opera houses and similar major cultural institutions, is exclusive of many young people and may have elitarian tendencies. In the context of Hochkultur, Germany is often portrayed by the documents as Kulturnation Deutschland (lit. “cultured nation” or “cultural nation”).

The often-cited term Kulturnation is a widely contested and ambiguous concept. It can mean a nation, which presupposes a common culture, whereby culture might be used in essentialist terms (cultural nation). Depending on how culture is defined, this understanding of Kulturnation leaves little space for plurality and migration.
The term is also often used in a judgemental way (cultured nation) suggesting superiority of what is understood as German culture. The use of this term in policy documents fuels feelings of superiority for those who belong and are included. Notions of Hochkultur and Kulturnation in the documents coincide with the recognition of the Weimar classic, the works related to the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, and commemoration of the Protestant Reformation as cultural heritage. Federal cultural policy aims at preserving this cultural heritage in the form of museums, buildings, cultural festivals etc. However, drivers of exclusion (imperialism, nationalism, colonialism, racism, anti-Semitism, classism, misogyny, ableism etc.), which, historically, have been developed and passed through knowledge production associated with high culture are not critically reappraised. The notion of Breitenkultur as an active participation for all, has the potential of constructing an inclusive understanding of culture. However, its sub-ordination under the values produced by the Hochkultur, its emphasis on unpaid work and its restriction to art and aesthetics puts strong constrains on this process. Breitenkultur does not offer equal participation in terms of access to resources, decision-making or production of “relevant” cultural knowledge. Little attention is being paid to cultural heritage produced by young people in informal settings and virtual spaces.

A different aspect of culture, Erinnerungskultur – commemoration culture – has become an increasingly important concept to Germany’s cultural identity and within its cultural education. Since the 1960s, the historical responsibility for the “never again Auschwitz” – through awareness raising and prevention of nationalistic tendencies – has been strongly emphasised in Western Germany, resulting in a concept called “Education after Auschwitz” (Adorno, 1966/2005), but not in Eastern Germany. After the reunification in 1990, however, the focus of commemoration has shifted to include the victims of the former ruling party of Eastern Germany, the SED (Social Unity Party of Germany). In the policy documents, National Socialism (NS) and the Social Unity Party of Germany (SED) are now equally considered as sources of national shame. In addition, cultural knowledge production of the former DDR has been marginalised in the united Germany, so that the DDR cultural heritage became reduced to remembrance of SED victims and Vergangenheitsbewältigung (struggle to overcome the negative past) of SED crimes.

There is a strong case for re-evaluating how these concepts of commemoration are made sense of and communicated in the context of the current revival of national socialist ideology and symbols in the German public sphere, and the rising tendency to nationalistic hatred and violence, especially in Eastern Germany. This should include a reappraisal of how Germany’s colonial past fits into commemoration culture and education policy. Colonialism served as a framework for the racist ideology, which legitimized the crimes against humanity committed by the German colonial troops, such as the Herero and Nama genocide in 1904-08.

Colonial exploitation, violence and oppression shaped German cultural knowledge production, and the NS-ideology can be often traced back to its pre-colonial precursors. Germany’s colonial past is not currently part of the assumed historical responsibility: victims of colonial crimes are not officially commemorated and this chapter of the German history is ignored in the documents. “Colonial amnesia” has wide reaching consequences. By failing to reflect on this historical legacy, cultural knowledge associated with colonialism is effectively reproduced within contemporary cultural education, which contributes to manifestation of structural racism and discourages and even hinders cultural participation of those, whose history is not considered.
The concept of culture as a set of national features, habits, traditions and values, often makes a distinction between “our culture” (sometimes defined as a normative –Leitkultur) and Migrantenkulturen (migrant cultures). Policy documents do not define Migrantenkulturen. By remaining vague, the cultural heritage of migrant culture is largely defined by what it is not, and with respect to where integrational efforts are required. Here, “culture” is formulated to define the lines of inclusion and exclusion. Drawing the lines of difference between an imagined culturally homogenous “German” society and the assumed culturally migrant other, policy documents implicitly assign belonging to those who can claim a long family history of nativity, and cultural foreignness to those who cannot. Regional, rural-urban, as well as class, age and educational etc. cultural differences are not accounted for in this model. Despite this, some policy documents acknowledge that for generations, people with a “migrational background” (Migrationshintergrund), have strongly contributed to what is conceptualised as “our culture”. Nonetheless, emphasis is largely placed on cultural differences rather than on the fluidity, hybridity and plurality of culture(s) as a product of individual and collective interactions and adaptation processes.

There are several ways in which cultural education as formulated by national policy is insufficient as a tool to increase participation and facilitate an inclusive notion of identity. First, because of its orientation as a one-way street from high culture to broad culture – conveying the hegemonic high-cultural knowledge to the various groups, among them the youth (e.g. by free entry to the museums of Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation), as well as aiming at investing in youth in order to educate the future customers of high-culture institutions, which is an end in itself. Similarly, framed as “cultural integration”, it is meant to convey this knowledge to migrant youth or those labelled as such (e.g. by training Arab speaking refugee guides for the Arab speaking refugee public in the same museums). What is missing in our view is the role of cultural education to inform high-culture institutions of the needs and ideas, histories and identities produced by broad-culture and culturally marginalised groups.

Therefore, the concepts of “high culture”, “Leitkultur”, “cultural heritage” and “commemoration” need to be critically evaluated by analysing the mechanisms of exclusion based on class, race, religion, language, gender, ability etc. produced and reproduced by the cultural knowledge production. Second, in order to achieve some transformation towards a more inclusive notion of culture, participation for all on the decision-making level should be considered at the policy level. Third, cultural education programmes need more sustainable and broad funding compared to that of high-culture institutions.
Introduction

Aims and Structure of the Report

The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policy documents relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in Germany. It outlines how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within German policy, and draws out strengths, weaknesses and tensions apparent within official documents.

The report opens with an overview of the German policy context designed to provide a general background for those who may be unfamiliar with the structures and processes of this context. It then provides details of the methodology used to collate and analyse documents, before presenting the findings of the analysis. Finally, it discusses these findings with reference to relevant academic literature in Germany and internationally, before offering some concluding remarks.

Between 2007 to 2018, the period covered by the review, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) has been governed by a coalition between the centre-left Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) and the centre-right alliance of two political parties, the Christian Democratic Union of Germany (CDU) and Christian Social Union of Bavaria (CSU).

In the Federal Republic of Germany, responsibility for cultural education policy is shared between the Federation (Bund) and the sixteen Länder (Federal States). The Basic Constitutional Law (Grundgesetz), specifies the scope of the federal government’s responsibilities at the national level and awards legislative powers to the Länder. The Grundgesetz also accords cultural sovereignty to the Länder and outlines their key responsibilities for education and culture.

The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs (KMK) provides a forum of co-operation for Ministers of the Länder, in which the common interests of the Länder (in the fields of culture, education and research) can be discussed and promoted.

The extent of the Bund’s involvement in cultural policy remains a subject of public debate. The limited responsibilities of the Bund in cultural policies are actioned through the Federal Commissioner for Culture and Media (BKM) (est. 1998) and the Federal Cultural Foundation (Kulturstiftung des Bundes) (est. 2020). In terms of cultural education, other federal ministries also became involved (of Family, Senior Citizens and Youth; of Education and Research etc.) by initiating and funding specific cultural education programmes, model projects and awards.

47 https://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/germany.php?aid=41
Financial Context
Public financing of cultural institutions and activities in Germany reflects the subsidiarity principle: fiscal responsibility therefore primarily falls on local authorities (45%) and the Länder (42%), with the Bund providing a relatively small share (13%) of the total spending. According to the Cultural Finance Report 2016, total public spending on culture in 2013 amounted to €9.9 billion. €1.3 billion of this was provided by the Bund, corresponding to 0.8% of the total federal budget; 0.05% of GDP, and €16.6 per capita, which is an increase of 34.3% on 2005.

Financing by the Bund focuses on initiatives identified as being “of national significance”. In 2013, State Ministry for Culture and Media funds were primarily directed to foreign cultural relations, like the international broadcast station Deutsche Welle, and the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, established in 1957 by German Federal law with the mission to acquire and preserve the cultural heritage of the former State of Prussia. The third largest expense item is the Stasi File Authority (BStU), which has responsibility for the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany) historical legacy. Only a small part of the federal budget (some 3-4%) was dedicated to initiatives explicitly focusing on educational aspects, mainly providing additional funding to programmes run by the Länder.

The BKM spending on cultural education, estimated €20 million, is relatively trifling compared to the total cultural budget of €1.4 billion in 2016. Independently of the BKM, the Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF) has run a €50 million cultural education programme since 2012 (recently extended to 2022), while the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) launched a €120-million programme supporting model projects that develop new and innovative approaches in the areas of radicalisation prevention and democracy promotion.

https://www.destatis.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Kultur/Kulturfinanzbericht1023002169004.pdf?__blob=publicationFile
50 Bockhorst et al., (2012)
51 https://www.bmbf.de/pub/Staerken_entfalten_durch_kulturelle_Bildung.pdf
52 https://www.bmfsfj.de/blob/115658/1080633f687d3f9c462a0432401c09d7/zweiter-engagementbericht---bundestagsdrucksache-data.pdf
Method

For the purposes of the review, policy is defined as an authoritative statement of a proposed course, principle or codification of government action, which typically states matters of principle and focuses on action (stating what is to be done and by whom).

A systematic search for eligible sources (see App. 2) examining cultural literacy education (defined as formal and informal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage) was carried out using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, 2015).

As a starting point, we have used the terms to express four constructs central to the CHIEF project, determined by the Work Package 1 leads in English:

1. Youth: Youth, young, child, pupil
2. Education: Education, learn, participate, knowledge
3. Culture: Art, dance, drama, film, music, theatre, history, commemoration, museum, galleries, libraries, poetry
4. Cultural literacy: Culture, identity, heritage, creativity

To help understand how these constructs are expressed in German national policy documents, we examined the document


We identified German terms relating to each of the constructs in this document and developed our string using Boolean operators AND and OR:

(Jugend OR jung OR Kinder OR Schüler OR Jugendliche) AND (Bildung OR bilden OR lernen OR teilnehmen OR Wissen OR vermitteln) AND (Kunst OR Tanz OR Literatur OR Film OR Musik OR Theater OR Geschichte OR Gedenkstätte OR Museum OR Ausstellung OR Bibliothek) AND (Kultur OR Identität OR Erbe OR Gedenken OR Erinnern OR Kreativität)

We performed the search on two relevant websites, where all eligible policy documents were likely to be found (see Policy context):

- https://www.bundesregierung.de/ - The German Federal Government

Searches were conducted 1st-10th July 2018 and limited to policy documents published between January 2007 and July 2018. The initial search resulted in 93 entries for the https://www.bundesregierung.de/ site and 73 entries for the https://www.kmk.org/ site. The manual eligibility check (Appendix 2) resulted in 14 documents from the KMK site and 14 documents from the Federal Government site.
Manual searches resulted in 11 additional documents from other federal ministry websites (Ministry of Science and Research, Ministry for Social Affairs, Family and Youth; Department for Foreign Affairs). The second reviewer reviewed a random sample of 10% of all decisions blind. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus. After this initial screening process, 33 documents have been selected as eligible and relevant for in-depth review (Appendix 1).

In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the following data were extracted from all eligible documents: department of publication, year. A thematic analysis of the documents was undertaken using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the review aims and objectives. To create initial codes, two reviewers independently read one eligible document. Results were compared, and agreed codes were developed through discussion to create a coding matrix. This process was then repeated, until all documents were reviewed in-depth. On each iteration, additional codes were added to the matrix, which was used to guide the generation of codes and identify major themes in the documents.
Findings

The presentation of our findings is structured as follows. We begin by summarising the Bund’s main responsibilities, in relation to culture and cultural education as outlined in the reviewed documents. We then discuss how “culture”, “cultural heritage”, “cultural identity” and “cultural diversity” are conceptualised in policy documents, focusing in particular on how these concepts relate to young people. We conclude by discussing “cultural participation”, a declared political responsibility of the Federal Government and overall goal of cultural education.

Responsibilities of the State
Culture

“It is the state’s duty to protect artistic freedom and provide the environment in which cultural life can flourish.” (DOC1)

Protecting the freedom of art and culture and promoting general awareness of its significance in a democratic society are considered the major responsibilities of the federal government’s cultural policy (DOCs 1; 3; 7; 12; 20; 30). Other key responsibilities relate to the outside representation of the country’s culture and language; and representing Germany on various international committees, such as the EU Council of Ministers for Culture in Brussels (DOCs 1; 30). Major responsibilities also include the preservation and promotion of German cultural heritage. This heritage is either related to the work of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation, established in 1957 by German Federal law with a mission to acquire and preserve the cultural heritage of the former State of Prussia (DOCs 1; 9; 12; 16; 30); or else to the German cultural heritage in Eastern Europe, e.g. the Foundation Flight, Expulsion, Reconciliation commemorating “German expellees” in Eastern Europe during WW2 (DOCs 1; 9; 30; X2). In relation to the preservation of world cultural heritage, considerable emphasis is put on the emerging Humboldt Forum in Berlin (DOCs 1; 12; 30), which is envisioned as the “greatest cultural project in Europe” (DOC12) and which will be concerned with world cultural heritage in the possession of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. The federal government has also formally assumed “historical responsibility” (DOC1) for “commemoration, reappraisal and reconciliation”. Prior to 1990, this was primarily realised through commemorating the victims of the National Socialist (NS) régime (DOCs 1; 9; 13; 16; 17; 30) through maintaining and (co)funding commemoration sites, promoting research, and assisting restitution of looted art during the NS-era (DOCs 1;12;30).

Since 1990, “historical responsibility” has been expanded to cover the SED dictatorship, which has been actualised through initiatives to commemorate the “victims of Communism” and by supporting reappraisal of this history through the Stasi File Authority (BStU) (DOCs 1; 30; X1).

Cultural Education

“It is the aim of the federal cultural policy, to open equal opportunities for participation to every individual, independent of their gender, age, background, religion and social status”. (DOC12)

Cultural participation for all as a political aim is affirmed in many documents (DOCs 1-3; 5; 8; 15 ;16; 18-20; 23; 24; 29; 30; X1; X3). Cultural education is often acknowledged to be key to enhancing cultural as well as social participation (DOC7); the delivery of which primarily falls to the Länder and the local authorities. The responsibility of the federal government in this field is limited to “providing stimuli” and networks and identifying and promoting best practice to serve as models for other projects (DOCs 1; 3-6; 16; 30).
Note, that only a marginal part of the Federal budget on culture, less than 2% (see 4.1) is directed towards cultural education. Federal government programmes rely heavily on philanthropy and unpaid labour: It has also pushed through major reforms to the legal governance of charities (2007 and 2013), which are claimed to have promoted cultural education by improving the tax framework for donations and charitable work, considered to be its main pillar (DOCs 1; 4; 8; 16; 30).

Concepts of Culture
Culture as a Set of Common Features
How culture is conceptualised, either through explicit definitions or through use, - varies widely across policy documents. Only one document, which is concerned with “Cultural Integration” (DOC 7), provides an explicit definition of culture, drawing on UNESCO’s definition as a “set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual, and emotional features of society or a social group” that “encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs” (DOC 7). This document defines the common German culture as a set of features “shared by many”, through normative values such as “politeness, respect, openness, tolerance, debate culture, and willingness to compromise” (DOC 7). Other documents also mention values like “discipline and mindfulness” (DOC 8), but also “the freedom of art and culture” is often emphasised as a national cultural value of high esteem (DOCs 1; 3; 7; 12).

“Art and Culture”
Similarly, different concepts are used in the context of “art and culture”. Here culture is conceptualised as creative artistic/aesthetic production and consumption. When addressing culture in this way, a kind of binary understanding can be detected. On the one hand, there is the so-called Hochkultur (high culture), represented by major, professionally organised and publicly funded cultural institutions (usually located in big cities).

On the other hand, there is the so-called Breitenkultur (literally: broad culture – mass culture or popular culture), which encapsulates volunteer activities (neither professionalised, commercialised nor publicly funded) that targets the wider population, such as clubs and associations. In many of the documents, culture is understood to comprise both areas. Although the dichotomy of “high” versus “broad” culture is seen to be dissipating within the current cultural policy debates (DOC 4), these two concepts are often treated separately. This is also reflected through cultural spaces described in the documents.

Institutions and spaces associated with high culture, such as the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation are heavily referenced in policy documents. Described as “one of the world’s largest cultural institutions” (DOCs 1; 12; 16; 30) it has 15 museums, as well as research institutes. The Berlin State Library and the Secret Prussian State Archives also figure prominently, as does the planned Humboldt-Forum in Berlin (DOCs 1; 12; 30) which will feature a permanent ethnological exhibition of non-European art (the controversy surrounding this institution is discussed in section 7 below). However, a study cited in DOC 16 found that the overwhelming majority of young people do not frequent these kinds of high culture institutions.
The major sites of *Breitenkultur* referred to are schools (DOCs 1; 5; 8; 15; 16; 30), especially full-day schools, and various non-formal and informal cultural spaces, including socio-cultural centres, innovative cultural projects, free theatre ensembles, intercultural community centres, workshops (DOCs 1; 4; 5; 8; 30). *Hochkultur*-spaces and schools are reported to be much less popular among young people compared to non-formal and (especially) informal self-created cultural spaces, particularly those associated with youth sub-culture, as well as *virtual spaces* of creativity and artistic/aesthetic expression (DOC 31). Virtual cultural spaces are becoming more important with time.

The *Bund* has undertaken several initiatives that aim to exploit digital technologies (virtual spaces) as a means of facilitating the “democratization of knowledge and resources” (DOCs 1; X1; X2; X3) These include the large state funded *Hochkultur*-projects, like the Festival of the Digital Culture (DOCs 1; 30), the German Digital Library (DOCs 1; 5; 30) and the online platform “Cultural heritage Eastern Europe” (DOC 9), as well as *Breitenkultur*-model cultural education youth projects (DOC 8).

**Cultural Heritage**

*Hochkultur*-spaces such as the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation and the Humboldt-Forum have been developed to preserve and sustain **cultural heritage**, which encompasses a wide range of concepts and ideas.

Some documents understand cultural heritage in accordance with UNESCO’s use of the term (DOCs 1; 30). Elsewhere, cultural heritage in the form of the German language, “expressed through poetry and literature” is defined as a prerequisite for participation in culture and society (DOC 7). Significant attention is paid to protecting and promoting the “German cultural heritage” in Eastern and Central Europe, the former German territories, under the Federal Expellees Act (DOCs 1; 9; 30). The history of migration in Germany and Europe is sometimes seen as “also a part of our own cultural heritage” (DOCs 7; 9; 16). A distinction is made in the policy documents between the “positive and negative” aspects of Germany’s past (DOC 7). Positive aspects, like “distinguished literature and great music, philosophy and scientific findings that are shaping the world” are proudly presented as the German cultural heritage (DOC 7), while the negative aspects are dealt with within “commemoration culture”.

**Commemoration Culture**

Commemoration culture predominantly deals with the negative aspects of the country’s past (DOC 7). This places an emphasis on Germany accepting the “historic responsibility” (DOC 1) for the Shoah (described as “the darkest chapter of German history” in DOC 7) and for the crimes of the NS-regime in general (DOCs 1; 9; 12; 13; 30), by committing itself to “commemoration, reappraisal and reconciliation” (DOCs 1; 17; 30; X2). Keeping alive and passing on the memory of the Holocaust by “decisively positioning oneself against anti-Semitism” is reported to be an ongoing duty for “people born in Germany as well as for the migrants” (DOCs 7; 13).

---

53 Traditionally, schools in Germany operate on a half-day basis, but the promotion of full-day schools has seen their numbers increase in recent years. A school is called “full-day”, when it offers lunch and extracurricular activities on at least three afternoons per week in addition to the half-day taught curriculum.

54 The Federal Expellees Act (German: *Bundesvertriebenengesetz*, BVFG; *Gesetz über die Angelegenheiten der Vertriebenen und Flüchtlinge*; lit.: Law on the affairs of the expellees and refugees) is “a federal law passed by the Federal Republic of Germany on 19 May 1953 to regulate the legal situation of ethnic German refugees and expellees who fled or were expelled after World War II from the former Eastern territories and other areas of Central and Eastern Europe. The law was amended on 3 September 1971” (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_Expellee_Law)
While the memories of migrants are expected to become a part of German commemoration culture in time, there is a strong expectation that German commemoration culture becomes a part of newcomers’ identity (DOC7). Original research and the restitution of artistic and cultural assets (looted, expropriated or stolen primarily from Jewish owners) is a part of this legacy (DOCs 1; 12; 30).

Since 1990, the “SED-dictatorship” has been added to this “negative” historical legacy (DOCs 1; 17; 30; X1), to be reappraised and commemorated in schools (in dialogue with contemporary witnesses), and at numerous commemoration sites along the German-German boarder (DOCX1). This centres on the remembrance of displaced and expelled Germans from the former German eastern territories at the end of WW2 and the deportation of Russian-Germans in 1941 (DOCs 1; 9; X2). The aim of formally commemorating the legacy of what is described as “two dictatorships in one century” is to preserve “the freedom of art, science, research and teaching” (DOC12).

Benefits of Culture

**In terms of individual benefits**, engaging in culture is said to “enrich, open up new perspectives, widen the horizon and strengthen the judgement” (DOC1;30) and is understood as a basic human need rather than a luxury (DOC12). To these ends, culture is reported to shape personality and identity, teach values and orientation, develop creativity and strengthen social competence (DOCs 3; 8). Culture is also considered to develop individual skills and talents as well as the self-esteem of young people. It is a source of self-expression and a liberating force. Culture is also reported to be vital in forging human relationships (DOC8). These empowering qualities are primarily assigned to cultural activities that centre on individual and collective engagement with creative artistic activities, like singing and theatre acting, with the emphasis on Breitenkultur, rather than Hochkultur.

The relevance of culture for society encompasses various aspects. Several documents use the popular expression “Kulturnation” for Germany as a country (DOCs 1; 3; 12; 16; 30), or even “one of the most important cultural nations” (DOC12). Culture, when used to refer to a set of values, traditions and customs, is understood to be essential for social cohesion (DOCs 1-4; 7; 9; 12; 16; 30). The term “Leitkultur”, used to refer to cultural common grounds, is reported to be the fundamnet of the commonwealth of the society (DOCs 2; 3).

In DOC7 these cultural values are defined in 15 Theses (and explicitly compared to Martin Luther’s 95 Theses, see more in section 7. below), which are claimed to be “important for many in this country”, to be respected by “every citizen of this country and everybody, living here”, and “therefore important for integration”.

The Breitenkultur concept of culture is used to similar effect where cultural activities on a communal level are considered to contribute to social cohesion, (e.g. in structurally weak regions suffering from out-migration, lack of infrastructure and unemployment, but also in schools and non-formal settings, DOC4). The relevance of Hochkultur-cultural institutions to the society is seen in “conveying Germany’s past and present” to the public, to sustain traditions and to “act as agents for our democratic principles, values and customs” (DOCs 1; 4; 7; 12; 30).

---

55 Kulturnation is a widely contested and ambiguous concept and can be translated as both: a “cultural nation”, i.e. a nation, which presupposes a common culture, whereby culture might be used in essentialistic terms. as well as a “cultured nation” (culture in terms of “civilization”) suggesting superiority of what is understood as the German culture. This is illustrated by DOC 12, where Germany is described as “one of the most important cultured nations (Kulturnationen) in the world”.

56 Leitkultur can be translated as „guiding/leading culture“ or “core/basic culture” and it is a contested concept in Germany, coined by Bassam Tibi in 1996. The term has been appropriated by the right wing populist AfD-party, among others, to define the criteria for exclusion from their ideal of German culture and nation.
More specifically, culture is reported to unite people from different origins (DOC 16) and to contribute to “integration” (DOCs 1-4; 7; 9; 12; 16; 18; 19; 30). This sits alongside a recognition that the creation of a “Zuwanderungsgesellschaft” represents a cultural challenge (DOC 16) and an assumption that cultural differences routinely contribute to socio-political conflict (DOC 7). Migrants are expected to respect and engage with Germany’s values, customs and traditions, defined as “our values, customs and traditions” (emphasis added) (DOC 7). DOC 16 also speaks of “our cultural self-concept” as a prerequisite of integration. Despite this, different nations and religions are understood to have different cultures, and their successful coexistence is considered to be predicated on opposing nationalism and exclusion (DOC 9). This is reinforced in another document, which reports that multiperspectivity and controversy are essential parts of democracy (DOC 17). Elsewhere, these ideas are expressed as a specific goal, “cohesion in diversity,” (DOC 7).

Finally, culture, in the sense of creative artistic/aesthetic production/consumption, often called “art and culture” is expected to provide “impulses, intellectual inputs and changes of perspective”, and artists’ creative energy, experimental spirit and criticism to “protect the creative forces of the society from lethargy and standstill” (DOCs 1; 30). Culture is seen as a critical, sometimes inconvenient but necessary corrective of the society (DOC 12).

Europe

These ideas of culture as something binding as well as dividing society, are mostly applied on the national level as “German”/“our”/“our country’s” culture.

Europe as a cultural entity is also mentioned sometimes (DOCs 3; 12; 16). In the “cultural project Europe” (DOC 12), the “fluidity of European culture” is described as being shaped by cultural exchange across national borders and “appropriation of different cultural influences”. Germany is sometimes viewed as a “Cultural nation (Kulturnation) grown in Europe” (DOCs 3; 12). German culture is once described as having been developed and shaped by migration “over centuries” (DOC 16), at the same time, the German “cultural self-concept”, together with the “moral concept” and “the liberal-democratic order”, are seen as “shaped by German and European Histories” (ibid.). There is Germany’s commitment to “European cultural values of Enlightenment, cosmopolitism and peaceful dialogue of peoples” (DOC 12), while the creation of a common European cultural identity is seen as essential for European cohesion (DOC 5). In terms of cultural projects and initiatives, however, European engagement is one-sided – promoting “German cultural heritage”, language and history – and geographically limited, to projects in Italy and Eastern Europe (DOCs 1; 6; 9; 30). France, is the only country mentioned in terms of two-way cultural exchange programmes (DOC 6).

Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity is understood differently across (and sometimes within) policy documents. Cultural Diversity as Source of Cultural and Economic Wealth (DOC 7) The idea of cultural diversity as “a source of cultural and economic wealth for both Germany and other European countries is tied to “historically successful integration processes”.

57 Migrationsgesellschaft, Einwanderungsgesellschaft and Zuwanderungsgesellschaft are popular terms in contemporary discourses meaning “(im)migration society”. Until 2000, policy and public discourses generally ignored migration as a relevant social process. Citizenship rights for migrants were formalised in 2002, when the principle of jus soli was integrated into German law. In 2005, after the Migration Act entered into force, the Government formally recognised Germany as “Enwanderungs-gesellschaft.” Three different terms, each with slightly different meanings, have since been used in this context. While Enwanderungs-gesellschaft assumes, that people arriving across the borders will mostly constitute new permanent members of the society, Zuwanderungsgesellschaft connotes a temporary stay of those arrivals. (Neue Deutsche Medienmacher, 2013, http://www.neuemedienmacher.de/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Tagungsdocumentation-NDM-Begriffe-2013.pdf) Migrationsgesellschaft, literary migration society, has no such connotations (Mecheril, 2015).
These are reported to constitute an important part of Germany’s cultural heritage and identity (DOC 7) on the basis that “encounters with different cultures open chances for a differentiated perception of one’s environment.” (DOC 7) Cultural diversity is also reported to “enrich the exchange and creativity in art and culture” (DOC 1).

This is reflected in discrete publicly funded programmes. Kultur öffnet Welten (Culture opens worlds), for example, is a federal initiative that aims to promote intercultural dialogue (DOCs 1; 5; 30) and “build bridges between people and cultures” (DOCs 1; 30).

Cultural Diversity as a Challenge Cultural diversity is also described as a major challenge (DOCs 2; 7; 16), because “the confrontation with foreign cultures” triggers fears (DOC 7). Public initiatives and institutions that focus on or seek to promote cultural diversity are, therefore, seen as part of “a struggle to transform these fears into curiosity” (DOC7).

Cultural Identity Policy documents use and interpret the concept of identity in different ways along collective and individual lines.

Collective Identity In some policy contexts, identify specifically refers to collective identities. This primarily combines aspects of “national identity” based on cultural heritage (lessons learned from dictatorships and cultural and historical/political achievements) (DOCs 7; 9) and an, undefined, European identity (DOCs 3, 12, 16), although aspects of certain local identities also feature in some contexts (DOC4).

German national identity (as imagined in policy documents) is constituted by a commitment to: human rights; diversity; non-violence; freedom; tolerance; and democracy (DOCs 7; 17; 23; X1). The evolution of this interpretation of German national identity is linked to three key historical phases. First the material and intangible heritage of the former State of Prussia seems to be the foundation of the “Kulturnation” (DOCs 1; 3; 12; 16; X2), which does not necessarily correspond to existing national borders, but may also involve former German territories (DOCs 1; X2; 9). The second influence is the impact of the violent Nazi dictatorship (DOC 13), liberation from which is considered a great historic achievement (DOC 17). As currently commemorated, experience of the dictatorship obligates the German people to position themselves clearly against all forms of extremism, and to protect the cultural heritage of ethnic/cultural minorities in general (DOCs 1; X2) and the Jewish community in particular (DOC22). The third influence is the “peaceful revolution” to overcome the SED regime in Eastern Germany and the German reunification (DOCs 17; X1). However, it should be noted, that a sense of separation still lingers in the German identity: especially in Western Germany, the GDR-history is not always conceived as something belonging to one’s own culture (Doc X1) and some explicitly national documents still differentiate between Eastern and Western Länder (DOC 1).

A “common European identity” is perceived as an aspiration in one document (DOC 23). European identity is primarily constituted as an educational goal (DOC 16) for schools to be taught in all subjects (DOC 23), although languages are seen to play a particularly significant role in achieving this end (ibid.). German identity is sometimes vaguely described a part of this European identity (DOC 3). Elsewhere (DOC 6) German cultural heritage, still persistent in former German territories in Eastern Europe, is expected to be a binding element in this process of European identity creation (DOCs 9; X2).
National identity is juxtaposed with national minorities, defined as either “German national minorities” in the Eastern European countries (DOCS 1; 9; 30) or else “national minorities” in Germany, which encompass groups of German Sinti and German Roma, the Danish minority and Saterfriesen (DOC 1, 30).

People “mit Migrationshintergrund” (with migration background) are perceived to have their own cultural identity (DOCS 7; 8; 16). Many documents (DOCS 4; 8; 13; 16; 31; 32; 35) implicitly construct the identity of the Other as different from the German/Prussian/European-“we-identity”. “Their” culture is often assumed as deficient, e.g. in terms of language, education, employability and willingness to integrate (DOCS 16; 35). These culturally others are also referred to as “Refugees” (DOCS 1; 4; 7; 8; 9; 16; 34; 35) and “Muslims” (DOCS 4; 7; 13; 16). German cultural identity is often assumed to be in a kind of tension with these unspecified identities (DOCS 7; 8; 16; 17). The need to integrate these identities in one “we”, the “new German identity” (DOC 7) and not to let it be defined by populist nationalism, or those “individuals who fuel fears”, is urgently stressed in DOC 7, but also discussed by other documents (DOCS 1; 9; 30). Youth

Youth and young people were absent from most of the documents reviewed. Where referred to, young people were presented as having special interests and needs differing from those of adults (DOC X1; 18). Recommendations and stated examples of good practice suggest that use of new media represents one of these interests/needs (DOCS 8; 16; 31; X1).

More generally, these interests/needs were not specified, although policy documents nonetheless advocated that educational settings should consider them and develop methods and programmes according to the age and level of maturity of their clientele (DOC 24).

A study, cited in DOC 31 shows that most young people, independent of their educational background, are actively participating in artistic/aesthetic activities. Despite this, some documents express concerns that young people are either disinterested in culture (and, therefore, policy intervention should seek to encourage greater interest (DOC3) through, for example the use of online-learning (DOC X1)) or afraid of approaching cultural topics (“Schwellenangst” DOC 18). These observations are primarily made in relation to established high cultural institutions (e.g. opera, ballet, classical music) for whom most young people are considered to be out of reach (DOCS 3; 16). Experimenting with new ways of reaching out to young people, by, for example, “speaking their language” (DOC 12), is considered essential to sustaining cultural heritage (DOC 6). These efforts are primarily advocated in relation to educationally disadvantaged young people (so-defined) (DOCS 4; 8; 15).

One document (DOC X1) reports on young people’s poor knowledge and understanding of history, which is considered to be particularly acute in relation to their knowledge of conditions within Eastern Germany prior to reunification. This has given cause for concern that young people may struggle to differentiate between liberal democratic forms of governance and those associated with the SED dictatorship and has formed the basis of calls for the educational system to give greater focus to German separation and reunification.

58 Migrationshintergrund, literally migration background, is a relatively new German creation, defined in DOC31 as follows: “Persons with a migration background are those who themselves or their parents immigrated to Germany after 1949, irrespective of their current nationality. This is based on a broader understanding of migration, which, in addition to the legal status of the persons, also takes into account the immigration constellation according to the individual (1st generation) and familial migration experience (2nd generation)” (DOC31)
Other documents in contrast, constitute young people as experts of their own lifeworld\textsuperscript{59} (DOC 18). The latter is considered to be defined by demographic change, increasing diversity and insecurity, digitalisation and globalisation (DOCs 18; 19; 20; 25) and perceived in a youth-specific manner (DOC 25). Experiences and knowledge of young people in this context are considered to be influenced by both their own memories and also the memories and biographies of family members (DOC 17). DOC 17 also suggests critical reflection on students’ family memories in the teaching of history.

Access and Participation

Universal Cultural Participation and Social Mobility “Participation for all” is emphasised in most of the documents reviewed. Although most are dealing with equal access to cultural participation and reaching out to disadvantaged groups, cultural education is also seen as a tool to increase equal opportunities in education (DOCs 3; 8;15), the labour market (DOC 7), and society in general. Through cultural education, disadvantaged youth are said to gain confidence and self-esteem, experience acceptance and appreciation, discover their potential, find the means to express themselves, acquire a sense of belonging (DOCs 8; 15; 16).

Promoting Universal Cultural Participation BKM funds cultural education projects, which support integration and intercultural opening, facilitate participation of people with disabilities, increase gender equality or are carried out in rural areas (DOC 2). Participation and access in rural areas is linked to their socio-economic situation, whereby disadvantaged areas are mostly located in the new eastern Länder (DOC4). Socio-economic status is generally seen as the main obstacle to participation (DOCs 4; 5; 7; 8; 10; 15; 16).

Policy documents differ on the number of children and young people growing up in “difficult economic conditions”, although there is a consensus that the numbers are high (one fourth of all children according to DOC 15, and one third according to DOC 8). One federally funded programme (Kulturagenten) aims to reduce socio-economic barriers to cultural education by connecting schools to cultural institutions (DOCs 1; 5; 10). Precarious economic conditions are associated with structurally and economically weak regions and “troubled neighbourhoods”, and therefore, a designated programme (Kultur macht stark) promotes non-formal cultural educational initiatives and projects located directly in these environments (DOC 8; 15). Lack of participation is understood to lead to weakening social ties and, potentially, social disintegration (DOC 16). Since 2008, BKM-funding for cultural institutions have been explicitly linked to the provision of cultural education that reaches out to the underrepresented groups (DOCs 1; 3). Free entrance to cultural institutions for children and youth is recommended to reduce financial, lingual, and social barriers, and encourage parents’ participation (DOCs 1; 16).

Characterising Non-Participants in Cultural Practices. Beyond socio-economic status, little consideration is given to other potential barriers of participation. Although “our common German language” is considered key to participation (DOCs 7; 16; 19; 35), for instance, lingual barriers are only explicitly addressed in two documents (DOCs 19; 35).

\textsuperscript{59} “Life-world, German Lebenswelt, [...] the world as immediately or directly experienced in the subjectivity of everyday life, as sharply distinguished from the objective “worlds” of the sciences, which employ the methods of the mathematical sciences of nature; although these sciences originate in the life-world, they are not those of everyday life. The life-world includes individual, social, perceptual, and practical experiences.” https://www.britannica.com/topic/life-world
Inequalities arising from religion are mentioned only once (DOC 7) but not further dealt with. Similarly, the role of disability (DOCs 1; 2; 5; 9; 29; X3) and gender discrimination (DOCs 1; 2; 5; 7) in cultural participation is treated only superficially. In addition, the documents make a number of assumptions about social mobility, socio-economic status, ethnicity, and gender equality, which suggests that public officials in Germany may be poorly equipped to enhance participation in cultural education. The National Integration Plan claims that poverty is not primarily a material problem, but a product of social and cultural exclusion and lack of educational opportunities (DOC 16). Ethnic minorities are mainly represented as migrants and/or refugees, i.e. as outsiders and not as Germans, confirming the culturally homogenic and essentialist construction of the German identity within policy documents generally (see 6.4). Lack of opportunities to participate for ethnic minorities is typically linked to their socio-economic status (DOCs 8; 16; 35), with little consideration given to the specific effect that racial discrimination might play in cultural participation. Instead of examining mechanisms of gender inequality in cultural participation, “classic gender roles” in one document (DOC 8) are implicitly associated with “Arabic and Persian” backgrounds, thus manifesting racial stereotypes. Suggested solutions to enhance participation of migrants include engaging them as mediators and partners in cultural institutions (DOCs 4; 7; 16; 19; 20; 35) – however, power sharing or participation at the higher decision-making level is never touched upon.

Cultural Education

**Cultural Education and Cultural Literacy Education** There is no direct translation of the term “cultural literacy education” in the German language. The German concept of education is relatively complex and many different terms are used to cover different aspects, such as *Erziehung*, *Bildung*, *Unterricht*, all of which can be used with different prefixes, such as *Kunsterziehung* (art education), *kulturelle Bildung* (cultural education), “Musikunterricht” (music education). Cultural education is a term used within German public policy, but it remains ill-defined. Recent recommendations on cultural education by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder (DOC 18), for instance, do not contain a clear definition of the concept.

**Cultural Education as Artistic/Aesthetic Education.** In this sense, it is considered to take place in interactions between reception and production, individual and collective learning, aesthetic perception, recognition and creative activity. Schools are encouraged to cooperate with other cultural institutions and non-formal settings to enable young people to be creative, to express their individuality, and experience new perspectives (DOCs 1; 8; 10; 16; 18). Cultural education is also recognised as a mediator between *Hochkultur*, its associated institutions (museums, theatres, opera), and the masses (DOCs 1; 6; 9; 16).

**Cultural Education as Political and Historical education** Cultural Education is constituted in a very close relationship to historical and political education (DOCs 3; 7; 9; 13; 17; 23; 28; X1; X2), reflecting the close association between Germany’s history and how culture is formally conceptualised within German policy. History lessons on the Holocaust are compulsory to ensure no child leaves school without a basic knowledge of the period (DOC 28). Germany’s separation and reunification is also considered important to cultural heritage. The Federal Foundation for the Study of the Communist Dictatorship in East Germany, for example, offers reports and recommendations on how political and historical education in this context can be operationalised (DOC X1). Educational attempts at reappraising history have to consider young people’s specific interests and needs. Youth camps near heritage sites and discussions with contemporary witnesses are mentioned as successful examples (DOCs X1; X2). Also the history of the European Union is a compulsory part of the curriculum in geography, economics and political science (DOC 23).
Education towards globalisation is constituted in the context of ecological sustainability (DOCs 23; 25; 36). German schools are encouraged to participate in international networks like the Foundation for Environmental Education (FEE) (DOC 23). Global development should be considered in all school subjects and show ecological and political interdependencies (DOC 25).

Digital literacy is seen as increasingly important in order to participate in rapidly changing societies; it is constituted as an opportunity and a challenge for social inclusion in a globalised world (DOC X3). The digitalisation of cultural heritage is seen as a prime objective of cultural policy, although progress is reported to be slow due the large costs involved (DOCs 1; 30).

The Aims and Objectives of Cultural Education

The recommendations of the Standing Conference (see above) place great store in the instrumental value of cultural education. The cognitive and creative skills engendered by cultural education, for example, are considered helpful for young people's general educational development as they broaden the scope for individuals to express themselves and communicate with others. Cultural education is also considered to be important to the emotional and social development of young people and a key component of general efforts to integrate communal responsibility into all aspects of education. Cultural education is considered to promote social cohesion (DOCs 1; 3; 4; 5; 7; 16), by conveying traditions, knowledge and values (DOC5), enable young people to understand and actively and responsibly participate in a democratic and diverse society (DOCs 3; 4; 6; 16; 17; 19; 23; 28; X1; X2) and to foster equal opportunities of the marginalized groups (DOCs 8; 10; 15), and is even understood as a “key to integration” (DOC 16).

Guidance and Professional Governance of Cultural Education

The Standing Conference identifies three dimensions of learning in general: knowledge and recognition; reflection and evaluation (presupposes knowledge); agency and creation (DOCs 19; 25; X3). In an intercultural context, this translates to knowledge about diverse cultural practices and historical perceptions, reflection on one’s own position and conscious action against discrimination and towards exchange and peaceful settling of conflicts (DOC 19). In some specific domains such as digital literacy for example these dimensions are refined into certain competencies that should be obtained (DOCs 2; 3; X3).

To enable young people to understand and participate responsibly in a democratic and diverse society, schools are advised to develop internal curricula with regards to democracy, Human Rights and commemoration/remembrance and organise fieldtrips to remembrance sites in and outside Germany (DOC 17). Recent political events have to be analysed in their historical dimension (DOCs 17; 22). Pupils should be encouraged to reflect on the past and create their role in “our democracy” beyond school activities.

Values shall be taught “in relation to the Community of European peoples and states” (DOC 23). The significance of borders and the possibilities to challenge and/or negotiate them (through diplomacy, war or simply migration) is also part of this process (DOCs 17; 23; X2). The European dialogue (in DOCs 1; 3; 5; 6 mainly with Poland and France) is not about creating a unanimous image of history but about focusing on common interests and values like freedom and human rights while at the same time respecting different views and collective memories (DOC X2).

Cultural education is to be integrated in training and professionalization of teachers and other educational and cultural professionals such as artists, curators etc. (DOCs 16-20; 22-25; 28; X1; X2; X3). This should as well be conducted in cooperative settings including schools, universities, artistic and heritage sites (DOC 17), even crossing national borders (DOC X2). It is also stated that the demand for diversity-oriented qualification has not yet been met (DOC 20).
Intercultural Education All attempts at cultural education should also contain “intercultural education” (DOCs 1; 2; 3; 8; 13; 16; 20), operationalised as “cultural opening” of educational institutions, which means that diversity should be promoted, intercultural activities should be carried out and constantly evaluated by teachers, pupils, and parents for further progress (DOC 19; 35). This complements calls to recruit more professionals with “migrations background” (DOC 20). Another way to promote “intercultural education” seems to be through international exchange programmes (DOCS 1; X1; X2; 5; 6; 9; 17) and promoting and discussing “cultural diversity” (DOCs 1; 7; 8; 13; 16; 18; 20; 22; 23; 30; 35). Schools and other educational institutions are also encouraged to increasingly take parents into consideration. Their responsibility as well as their expertise in their respective lifeworlds are supposed to add value to educational concepts (DOCs X3; 16; 18; 19; 24; 35).

Promoting Cultural Diversity within Cultural Education Examples of programmes that aim to promote cultural diversity centre on discrete initiatives. These include: federally-funded institutions, like the House of World Cultures in Berlin, with its “Trialogue between the cultures of origin, migrant communities’ cultures and the German majority culture” (DOC 16); the Barenboim-Said Academy, also in Berlin, where young people from the Middle-East (Jews, Muslims and Christians) study music together to promote reconciliation (DOC 1); and best practice project awards for initiatives that “help refugees to engage with our culture” (DOC 5). The National Integration Plan (DOC 16) calls for “migrant cultures” to be better represented in cultural institutions and schools.

All these efforts on cultural education are supported by scientific research and educational sites are asked to actively take part in research projects and consider the results in their concepts (DOCs 4; 8; 13; 16-18; 20; 25; 29; 31; 35; 37; X2; X3).
Discussion

Our discussion will be developed in two parts. The first centres on the meanings of culture, cultural identity and cultural heritage, produced within the reviewed documents, leading us to critically scrutinise cultural knowledge production from above. This part of the analysis will try to answer the question, how cultural literacy and cultural education are constituted within policy. To answer how these concepts are operationalized, the second part will discuss the declared goal of the German cultural literacy and cultural education policy, to achieve “Participation for All”. We want to show, how the imagined and demanded cultural participation in a heterogeneous society is in tension with hegemonic cultural knowledge production. This leads us to conclude that participation for all should be seen as not the end, but the beginning of the cultural literacy project.

Cultural Knowledge Production from Above

The reviewed documents attributed (and developed) different meanings to culture, some of which were used interchangeably, in combination, or in relation to one another. Each meaning assumed a specific cultural identity and defined a specific cultural heritage (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>culture</th>
<th>cultural identity</th>
<th>cultural heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hochkultur</td>
<td>Kulturnation</td>
<td>Prussian Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitenkultur</td>
<td>Participation for all (open democratic inclusive society)</td>
<td>Hochkultur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erinnerungskultur</td>
<td>German historic responsibility</td>
<td>Remembrance of two dictatorships (NS and SED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leitkultur</td>
<td>Cohesion in diversity (Pluralistic society subordinated under normative cultural rules)</td>
<td>All the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Concepts of culture, identity and heritage in German policy documents

1. Culture and cultural practices referred to in policy documents are primarily associated with *Hochkultur* (high-culture). High-culture is understood to be represented by the major professionally organised and publicly funded cultural institutions in big cities, such as large museums, opera houses and concert halls.

This understanding of culture evolved in Germany towards the end of the 19th century and positioned itself above everyday culture as a specific field of art, literature, philosophy and music (Busche et al., 2018). The elitarian aspects of high-culture are largely discussed by Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1984), in his theory of cultural capital, which, he argues, serves to reproduce inequality by exclusion. Some policy documents suggest that this exclusion extends not just to class, but to age also. One cited study, for example, found that some 94% of under 25-year-olds had not visited an institution associated with *Hochkultur* in 2005 (DOC 16). The respective cultural identity is referred to as *Kulturnation*, i.e. “cultured nation”, as a national entity, that produces high-cultural heritage and values, as a nation of individuals united by common culture. Both meanings of *Kulturnation* are non-inclusive. The hierarchical approach to the definition of culture opens up feelings of national superiority – e.g. Germany as “one of the world’s most important cultural nations” (DOC 12).
At the same time, it might also discourage identification with Kultur nation Germany of those who do not participate in and/or feel represented by high-culture. Cultural heritage corresponding to high-culture is manifested through an accumulation of historically produced works and ideologies, primarily preserved by the institutions of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. The Protestant Reformation is also repeatedly referred to in the context of cultural heritage. Thus, German cultural identity is uncritically assumed to stand in this tradition. Nowhere in the documents is there critical engagement with Reformation or Prussian legacy in terms of autocracy, obedience, militarism, colonialism, racism, nationalism, anti-Semitism, misogyny, ableism etc., which may exacerbate patterns of exclusion. Kultur nation Germany is perceived to comprise European values related to the European Enlightenment. This “Europeanness” is Eurocentric in so far as certain aspects of this era, which coincided with European colonialism, are not considered as naturally part of this cultural heritage. Much attention is paid to sustenance of the German cultural heritage in the territories lost after the WWII, indicating the use of culture for some kind of national strategic interests.

To sum up, the notion of culture as Hochkultur is elitarian in so far as it fails to represent many underprivileged groups and exclude young people. Cultural identity promoted in policy documents is embedded in a distinctive Prussian/Reformation cultural heritage, fails to critically appraise the modes of exclusion potentially facilitated by this heritage, and may fuel feelings of superiority for those whose interests and identity resonate with it.

2. Breitenkultur (broad-culture) is often understood in opposition to high-culture and is defined as voluntary activities, neither professionalised nor commercialised or publicly funded and targeting the wider population in non-formal and informal cultural spaces as well as schools.

Broad-culture perpetuates a sense of inclusiveness as it targets people across social, racial or gender divides; however, it is hierarchically subordinated to high-culture within national policy. Broad-culture is neither considered representative of the country nor of national importance and consequently receives marginal financial support from the Federal government. The cultural identity corresponding to this model could ideally be an inclusive and open society. There is no explicit expression of cultural heritage allied to broad culture found in the documents. The fact that broad-culture activities supported by public funding are often informed by standards and ideals associated with high-culture is suggestive of a policy aspiration that Hochkultur heritage underpins both. Non-formal and informal expressions of broad-culture may potentially offer more dynamic, autonomous and inclusive interpretations of identities and heritages. However, the focus of non-formal and informal cultural practices on art and aesthetics tends to limit their expression to the fields of “free time” and “entertainment”, preventing their entry into historical, philosophical, economic spheres of society. In this respect, the subordination of broad to high-culture, may (re)produce cultural differences which sustain unequal access to full cultural participation.

3. Cultural education is often understood as the “bridge” between those two modes of culture: but primarily as a means of promoting popular participation in high-culture, rather than as a mechanism for facilitating a mutual exchange of ideas. In this respect, cultural education is often set-up as a one-way street, conveying high-cultural knowledge to various under-represented groups, including young people generally (e.g. by free entry to the museums of Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation) and so-called migrant youth (e.g. by training Arab speaking refugee guides for the Arab speaking refugee public in the same museums). In one respect, this represents an investment in sustaining Hochkultur: a means of cultivating the tastes of the future customers of institutions associated with high-culture. What is missing from cultural education is a sustained effort to inform high-culture institutions of the needs, ideas, histories and identities produced within Breitenkultur.
Moreover, even this unidirectional approach to increasing participation ranks low among the state’s cultural priorities. Cultural education programmes attract limited federal funding relative to high-culture institutions. Funding also takes a different form. Whereas funding of high-culture institutions is long-term and more sustainable, funding for cultural education tends to be transitory and selective, limited to the award of prizes for model projects. In addition, methods of funding are underpinned by an assumption that most activities will be covered by un-paid work, even when professionalism and competence is expected.

In summary, cultural education as currently formulated by national policy neither appears sufficient to significantly increase cultural participation nor meaningfully foster the adoption of inclusive interpretations of identity.

4. Erinnerungskultur Pioneered by Theodor Adorno, and aimed at providing “an intellectual, cultural and social climate in which a recurrence [of Auschwitz] would no longer be possible” (Adorno, 2005, p. 3) Erinnerungskultur (commemoration culture) became an important concept of post-NS West-Germany’s cultural identity and education. There was no equivalent in post-NS East-Germany. In the policy documents, Erinnerungskultur as a concept of culture is of an explicit interest, but its meaning has shifted since reunification. Historical responsibility for “never again Auschwitz”, the core idea within German Erinnerungskultur, now includes the crimes of “the SED-dictatorship” and extends to responsibility for “two dictatorships in one century” (DOC12). This production of historical knowledge is guided, among others, by the Federal Commissioner for the “Records of the State Security Service of the former GDR”, who has ultimate responsibility for history teachers’ training. The NS and the SED have been put on the same level in terms of national shame as well as potential threat.

5. In terms of cultural commemoration education, several sites for the remembrance of victims exist and the KMK formulates extended recommendations to Länder schools to attend educative programmes. The current revival of the NS-ideology and symbols in the public sphere, and the associated rise in nationalistic hatred and violence, call for an urgent evaluation of what started as the “Education After Auschwitz” project. Adorno’s appeal for political instruction to teach “openly […] without fear of offending any authorities” about social and political power relations “beneath the surface of political forms” (Adorno, 2005) is not reflected in the contemporary policy agenda. The educational programme Democracy live! supports initiatives exploring new concepts in this respect (DOC13), but the documents we reviewed provide no indication of how the knowledge gained will be broadly applied (for example, in school curricula).

6. Commemoration culture and education as defined by cultural and educational policy, suffer from a historical amnesia of Germany’s colonial past. This finding is not surprising. Although German colonial history was a feature of the GDR-histography, albeit with Marxist-Leninist ideological constraints (Bürger, 2017), as Eggers observes, German presence in the African colonies and its economic, political and cultural implications were not part of the West-German collective memory (Eggers, 2005). The observed westernisation of historical and cultural master narratives after unification may have suppressed this knowledge. Since 2004, the 100th anniversary of German genocide in Namibia, organised descendants of the victims, German civil society and some historians have made great efforts to bring the colonial legacy to public attention. In 2018, the Namibia Commissioner of the federal government demanded an establishment of “commemoration culture” for German colonial crimes60. So far, however, these developments have not been picked up within cultural policy: in fact, no reference was made to colonialism in the policy documents.

60 http://www.migazin.de/amp/2018/01/29/polenz-erinnerungskultur-herero-vertreter-beteiligung/
This neglect is reflected in the lack of scrutiny given to how the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation’s collection of world cultural heritage, to be exhibited in the up-coming Humboldt-Forum, was acquired. Lack of awareness of the colonial past is reflected in underlying racist assumptions in policy documents, where the Humboldt-Forum in Berlin is praised as a place where “non-European cultures will present themselves” to satisfy the “curiosity for the foreign, the other” (DOC12). Colonial crimes are not considered a part of the assumed historical responsibility; colonial history is not considered a national shame. The collective reluctance to reflect on this historical legacy, exposes the coloniality of knowledge, defined by Quijano (2000) as the continuity of colonial epistemes beyond the official end of the colonial era. This raises two interdependent risks: that colonial concepts like Euro-centricity, whiteness, nationalism, racism and the exclusive claim on universal democratic, humanistic ideas by a small privileged group, dominate official as well as mainstream cultural narratives; that this knowledge produces the “culturally other” (Mecheril, 2003) as exotic, or as a threat, but always inferior.

Commemoration culture and the identity of Germany’s historic responsibility do not, per se, include those defined as “natio-ethno-culturally others” (Mecheril, 2003) –migrants or labelled as such (see below). “Migrant culture(s)”, so-defined, are perceived to have their own separate commemorations, while adapting German commemoration culture is instilled as a prerequisite of integration. Whose memories define the writing of “our” history is therefore pre-determined.

In summary, German commemoration culture is conceptualised within the reviewed documents as historical responsibility for selective collective crimes, and an equivalence is now assumed between the crimes of NS and the former DDR. Furthermore, the westernised interpretation of history discourages participation of those whose history is not considered.

7. Culture as a set of features Finally, there is the fourth concept of culture as a set of features and characteristics of cultural entities, including their traditions and habits. The cited UNESCO definition of culture as a descriptive “set of features” of a “social group and society” is often interpreted as the normative and desired features of a nation. The proclaimed cultural identity is “cohesion in difference”, a pluralistic society under the umbrella of the normative German Leitkultur. As Habermas observes, the notion of normative culture is inconsistent with the German Basic Constitutional Law, which distinguishes between the majority/minority cultures and the political culture, the core of which is the Basic Law itself, within which minorities’ cultural rights are protected (2017). The so constructed German Leitkultur relies on high culture and commemoration culture for its cultural heritage, something, that the “cultural other” needs to assimilate in order to belong. Here, culture is formulated in order to define the lines of inclusion and exclusion, by simultaneously constructing the cultural identity of the other.

8. Migrant(en) (migrant culture(s)) is a concept referred to but not unpicked in the documents. By remaining vague, its foreignness is emphasised. Although the term Migrationshintergrund (migrational background) in its official definition does not exclude a “German” identity, it implies that certain familial histories of migration are an essential background for an individual’s identity, without considering the individual’s own experiences or when and whether they migrated (Utlu, 2015).
More generally, this cultural identity as a migrant, a person with *Migrationshintergrund*, Refugee, Muslim, Jew etc. as used in the policy documents, primarily points to their not-belonging. We learn what the cultural heritage of migrant culture is not (*Leitkultur*), and where integrational efforts are needed.

9. **Cultural integration** Cultural education and cultural participation of the migrant other (Mecheril et al., 2010), is synonymous with “cultural integration”. In parallel with the unidirectional idea of cultural education outlined above where the populous are, a priori, excluded from its creation and definition, cultural integration primarily aims to convey *Leitkultur* and commemoration culture to people with *Migrationshintergrund*.

10. The concept of culture as a **critical corrective of society**, also referred to in some documents, is a promising concept for facilitating more inclusive forms of cultural participation and acceptance, in so far as it reflexively problematizes hegemonic forms of cultural knowledge and aims to give a voice to the otherwise excluded. More specifically, it creates a presumption in favour of asking uncomfortable questions, raising difficult issues and representing a diversity of perspectives.

Where this concept of culture is mentioned it is rarely further specified. How this concept of culture can be incorporated effectively in cultural knowledge production, in programmes promoting cultural literacy and cultural education, remains unresolved.

**Participation for All**

In principle, “participation for all” represents an important political priority. In practice, however, discussion of participation and access in many policy documents is highly selective and superficial.

First, participation and access are not discussed holistically. Difficulties relating to access focus on discrete obstacles (e.g. programmes developed to grant access to cultural sites or activities for people with disabilities), they do not consider its intersections with other differences.

Second, some potential obstacles, such as gender, language, disability, are underemphasised, whilst others, such as economic factors (deprivation) and “cultural” differences, are referred to repeatedly. Third, consideration of potential sources of exclusion appears impressionistic, rather than targeted and empirically based. Neither the economic factors nor “cultural” differences assumed to stymie cultural participation, for example, are defined in the policy documents. Use of “cultural” differences implicitly refers to ethnic or national deviation from the German “*Leitkultur*. This primarily focuses on language (and, to a lesser extent, religious) differences. The effects of regional cultural differences (e.g. regional dialects, customs) is not discussed. Consequently, intercultural education as interpreted in policy papers, is almost invariably associated with the constructs of ethnicity and nationality (Mecheril et al., 2010, p. 21).

Fourth, the East-West divide that maintains social inequality as mentioned in some of the documents, is nowhere considered in terms of access and participation. Cultural practices that developed during the time of the separation did not suddenly disappear with the change in politics (Kollmorgen, 2010). One significant example is the discourse on migration, which developed differently in the East and in the West. (Krüger-Potratz et al., 1991)
And finally, participation in decision making for disadvantaged groups is not broached. Although most policy documents state that participation for all is a political goal in some way, disadvantaged groups hardly ever actively participated in constituting the policies as well as in their cultural knowledge production. Therefore, hegemonic cultural knowledge production and cultural hierarchy continue being maintained and reproduced which can hinder access, identification and opportunities of those who are not represented (Schütze and Maedler, 2018) (Ziese and Gritschke, 2016).

**Funding arrangements** The state’s delegation of cultural education to other (non-formal) institutions leads to the fact that most cultural education programmes are executed by volunteers and/or are financed through private investment. This contradicts in a way the importance of cultural education as stressed by the government.
Conclusion and Recommendations

Current political developments in German society raise a pressing question: to what extent the official concepts of “our” culture, cultural identity and cultural heritage stand in opposition to increasingly open expressions of racism and anti-Semitism, violence, exclusion and anti-democratic world views. Our analysis not only points to what we see as major barriers and gaps in the German national cultural policy to facilitating more inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity, but also illustrates how prevailing policies relevant to these ideas might provide cultural grist to the rise of right wing populism and neo-Nazi radicalisation.

Our analysis shows that despite the awareness that “participation for all” is an important prerequisite for social cohesion, the uncritical use of official notions of culture, cultural heritage and identity promote cultural knowledge which perpetuates various mechanisms of exclusion, such as classism, racism, nationalism, “westernism”, sexism, ableism and adulthood. New pedagogical approaches for a diverse society, such as Migrationspädagogik (migration pedagogy) (Mecheril et al., 2010), advocate emancipative views on cultural education. To achieve this end, a continuous critical engagement at every level, including policy, is needed with mechanisms of structural, cultural, institutional and individual forms of discrimination inherent in official concepts of culture (in its both definitions: as features and values of any given social group as well as “art and culture”). A critical revision of whose culture, whose values and whose memories matter should lead to a re-evaluation of German commemoration culture and what is considered to be national cultural heritage. The westernisation of German cultural narratives needs an urgent evaluation in postcolonial and post-socialist terms. This process should be accompanied by awareness raising for policy makers and other stakeholders. To achieve full cultural participation, culturally marginalised groups have to gain access to the decision-making and policy-making levels, as well as better access to resources, cultural representation and recognition. In the same vein, the interests, concerns and visions of young people need to be more sincerely considered, including informal self-created cultural spaces, as well as virtual spaces of cultural production. Furthermore, we suggest widening and developing the concept of cultural education beyond aesthetic-artistic production and political-historical education to include all aspects of social life.
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## Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC1 Im Bund mit der Kultur. Kultur- und Medienpolitik der Bundesregierung</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
<td>Policy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC2 Fördergrundsätze Vermittlung und Integration der Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Kultur und Medien (BKM)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
<td>Policy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC4 Zweiter Bericht über die Entwicklung des bürgerschaftlichen Engagements in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, BMFSFJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC5 Kulturelle Bildung für alle</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC6 Kunst- und Kulturvermittlung in Deutschland, Polen und Frankreich</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC7 Initiative Kulturelle Integration. Zusammenhalt in Vielfalt. 15 Thesen zu kultureller Integration und Zusammenhalt</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cultural Integration Initiative c/o German Culture Council</td>
<td>White paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC8 Stärken entfalten durch kulturelle Bildung! Programm, Projekte, Akteure</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Education and Research</td>
<td>Funding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulturelle Bildung. Kultur macht Schule</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
<td>Funding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kultur ist mehr als alles andere ein Wert an sich</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modellprojekte zur Prävention von aktuellen Erscheinungsformen des Antisemitismus. Im Bundesprogramm Demokratie leben</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, BMFSFJ</td>
<td>Funding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bündnisse für Bildung. Inhalt und Ziele</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Education and Research</td>
<td>Funding Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kultur für alle</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bericht der Bundesregierung zum Stand der Aufarbeitung der SED-Diktatur</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bildung in der digitalen Welt Strategie der Kultusministerkonferenz</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Im Bund mit der Kultur, Kultur- und Medienpolitik der Bundesregierung</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and Media, BKM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC32</td>
<td>Darstellung von kultureller Vielfalt, Integration und Migration in Bildungsmedien - Gemeinsame Erklärung der Kultusministerkonferenz, der Organisationen von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund und der Bildungsmedienverlage</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>KMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC34</td>
<td>„Kultur macht stark plus“ – ein Beitrag zur gesellschaftlichen Teilhabe junger erwachsener Geflüchteter</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Education and Research, BMWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC36</td>
<td>Kulturelle Bildung und Umweltbildung: Zukunft ganzheitlich und nachhaltig gestalten</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>German Cultural Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education has been constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is out specific interest for this component of the CHIEF project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy(^{61}), rather than refining by a specific form of document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to our research questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded all documents which</td>
<td>Were published before 1/1/2007</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{61}\) For the purposes of the review, policy is defined as an authoritative statement of a proposed course, principle or codification of government action, which typically states matters of principle and focuses on action (stating what is to be done and by whom).
National Cultural/Educational Policy Review (India)
Chandrani Chatterjee and Swati Dyahadroy

Introduction

The aim of this policy review is to see the Indian Nation-States relationship with Culture and cultural literacy, the level of importance they attach it to as a marker of national identity in an age of globalisation and specifically how they position themselves in the debates around the heterogeneity of Indian Culture, such as it is. We of course also wanted to explore the ways the State positioned the youth in their vision of a unified Indian Cultural Identity. Before we began to read the policies earmarked for this review, it was necessary to contextualise the relationship between cultural policy and the formation of the Indian Nation State after independence from the British Raj. For this we relied on a reading of Cultural Policy for India, an exhaustive country profile of India prepared for the International Federation of Arts Council and Cultural Agencies (IFACCA) by A.Rajadhyaksha, P. Radhika and R. Tenkalaya (2012-2013). The document also raises some crucial current cultural policy issues which we have used to inform our readings of the policies, programme reviews and reports used in this review.

The context from this profile relevant to our review is briefly reproduced here.

National cultural policy after 1947 was defined in five specific ways:
1) India’s cultural resources, represented by the artisan-producer and crafts-producer were seen as central to nationalism and informed all programmes within National cultural policy.
2) Cultural resources were seen as a part of the nationalist project to identify and protect national heritage.
3) Cultural resources can only be protected by the sustaining and encouraging the artisan, the economic and administrative aspects of which inform national development. Therefore Culture was irretrievably linked to ideologies of development.
4) The administrative elements of culture directly impact the field of education, which is why the Department of Culture was located in the Ministry of Education until 1985 then it moved to the Ministry of Human Resource Development.
5) The support and development of artisanal practices exist unproblematically alongside stated forward-looking nationalist goals of industrialism, and the advancement of science and technology etc. in the founding documents outlining National Cultural policy.

A key concern of the State since independence has been the containing of judiciable definition of Indian culture that can be brought within a legal and constitutional framework that deals with Cultural Rights. The problem was what the authors call an ‘expanded definition of culture’ that encompassed the arts, learning, philosophy, religion, the heritage of multiple, co-existing communities, value systems and ‘much else besides’ (Prof. T. K. Shah: Constituent Assembly Debates, 1948). In 1984, the definition was pared down to include the more stable categories of language and religion, or a combination of both (Justice Hidayatullah (Constitutional Law of India, 1984).

Historically speaking, Culture can be seen as unfolding in three distinct phases of India’s history: One, the period of development, from independence until the Emergency in 1975. This was the Nehruvian phase where culture was linked to the goals of national development. Two, the period of Autonomy, which occurs in the decades after the Emergency, where there were moves to curtail the state interference in Cultural matters and there was a rise in Cultural rights. Three, the period of globalisation or economic neo-liberalism; where, culture was concerned with the protection of intellectual property rights and creative economy; following the Jodhpur Consensus of 2005.
As Rajadhyaksha points out, culture as national legacy has been the preoccupation of the State since it was formed. Here culture can be taken to mean both sanskriti (lit. being cultured) and parampara (lit. tradition). Such a formulation shows how crucially the notion of culture is linked to identity, a theme explored briefly and in a different context, in our Academic Review. We see that this twin notion of culture as national legacy finds expression even in contemporary policies, programmes and initiatives of the State.
Method

Considering the need of the project and adopting a systematic review method we identified the following key words to seek relevant policy documents: Cultural policy, Youth, Society, Difference, Cultural diversity, Asia, Cultural Knowledge and literature. These key words were derived after looking at the few documents and academic literatures on culture in general and youths in particular.

Our initial search on policies related to cultural literacy amongst youths revealed that there is no direct engagement with youth and culture in India. In many research areas, particularly in the social sciences, the bulk of the relevant evidence may not appear in journals but will be located in reports and other literature. So we have broadened our search and have identified policies and reports which were representing the state’s position on culture.

The most critical part was selecting the right material which is useful for the research. Thus in the next stage, each individual piece was examined critically to determine whether it is fitting into our frame of research and whether it is useful in answering our research questions. As required we first did a rapid reading of the collected material and identified the themes which are recurring in these reports and policy documents.

This suggested that there were two themes which emerged as prominent: one, engaged with cultural sites and heritage places; and the other one is the dilemma of the state about what constitutes culture and the inherent contradictions in it. In the Indian context another complication was the different understanding of culture at the state and national levels. Looking at the geographical expanse and complication of State vs. Nation we have decided that we will look at the state of Maharashtra’s policies.

Thus, we reviewed the cultural policies and reports specifically dealing with culture and how do they conceptualise youth in it.

Following is the initial chart which we have prepared based on our early search.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.no</th>
<th>Name of the document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adoptaheritage.in/pdf/Adopt-a-Heritage_Guidelines.pdf">www.adoptaheritage.in/pdf/Adopt-a-Heritage_Guidelines.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><a href="https://indiaculture.nic.in/annual-reports">https://indiaculture.nic.in/annual-reports</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ccrtindia.gov.in/statistics.php</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CSCS report, 2011 CIDASIA RESEARCH PROGRAMME, CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF CULTURE AND SOCIETY, BANGALORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government of India Ministry of Minority Affairs “Hamari Dharohar” 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>REPORT OF High Powered Committee ON THE AKADEMIS AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS UNDER THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/policy/international.../country-reports/india_en.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/document-reports/Culture.pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ncf.nic.in/ncf_annualreport.htm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><a href="https://www.hridayindia.in/hriday-scheme-operational-guidelines/">https://www.hridayindia.in/hriday-scheme-operational-guidelines/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After going through the available literature to prepare the draft of the review of the available literature, common themes were identified and then accordingly documents were searched and the review process was initiated.
Findings

Of the 11 policies reviewed, 2 were annual reports by the Ministry of Culture, Govt of India and Centre of Cultural Resources and Training; 1 was an Assessment and review of State cultural institutions by an external committee; 5 outlined various initiatives, schemes and proposals undertaken or elaborated by various state ministries; 2 were schemes and proposals either prepared or funded by transnational bodies and organisation and 1 was towards policy recommendations by an autonomous cultural institution. All the reports were published after 2000, with a majority (9) being from after 2010. This locates them firmly within the phase of globalisation that marks and informs the States’ priorities when it comes to defining, promoting and preserving culture and cultural landscapes in India. These policies reviewed are representative of the various priorities, concerns and anxieties of the Indian-Nation State as it struggles to contain a stubbornly heterogeneous cultural landscape into an unified culture that obeys the dictates of a deeply traditional Hindu Rashtra that is also ‘world-class’ and ‘global.’

A majority of cultural policies in this review targets the youth through education initiatives which involve the training of teachers and students in cultural literacy and learning various art forms. The setting up of fairs and art festivals also seem to be seen as engaging the youth to participate in culture appreciation and creative pursuits. The review of the documents published by the ministry such as position papers, annual reports and other occasional papers suggests that they are commenting on the following issue - culture and development, culture and youth, culture and politics of state and culture and globalisation.

Culture and Development

The ‘Adopt a Heritage’ - Apni Dharohar (our heritage), Apni Pehchaan (Our identity) program undertaken by the state ministries of tourism, culture and the Archaeological Survey of India essentially tries to connect the spheres of culture and tourism by preserving India’s Archaeological sites and monuments and making them more accessible to tourists.

The ‘HRIDAY’: Heritage City Development & Augmentation Yojana, guidelines by the Ministry of Urban Development also emphasizes the need to bring together the preservation of heritage sites and the development goals of the city. The Report of the Working Group on Art and Culture for XII Five-Year Plan (2012-17), prepared by the Ministry of Culture, argues that culture is at the core of all developmental activities since it aids in not just economic growth but also ‘gives meaning to human existence’. This document, directed toward the Planning Commission, highlights the Ministry’s need to position itself as a key player in the development initiatives undertaken by the State. We can interpret this as a need for culture to be seen as something significant and crucial, not as a marginal and ‘soft’ sector.

The documents mentioned above are all prepared by the Government of India Ministries. However, ‘development’ also finds mention in the policy recommendations conducted by the Culture and Society (2011). This report was an ethnographic study of cultural hubs in the city of Bangalore, aimed at civil society and corporates, encouraging these bodies to promote the arts and cultural spaces in urban development policy. They highlight the need for ‘culture-in-development’, where development is conceptualized through a cultural lens.
They mark ‘creative economy’, where culture is capitalised for economic reasons as an unviable model for a creative city and recommend ‘cultural ecology’, based on the principles of diversity, as a more useful paradigm. Unlike the documents prepared by the State this report advocates cultural diversity rather than cultural nationalism.

The documents mentioned above clearly show how both the State and stakeholders in cultural development articulate their priorities when it comes to culture. The need to mention development in the same breath as culture speaks to a need to think about what material and economic benefits can arise from the preservation and promotion of Indian Culture such as it is, rather than an exploration of what culture is or can be or what kind of society it can create and nurture.

The problem here is again the heterogeneous nature of culture in India which is tackled by a drive for better documentation of diverse and often intangible art forms, as outlined by the National Mission on Cultural Mapping and Roadmap, Ministry of Culture (2017). This proposal aims at Cultural Revival through a National Cultural Work Place portal that would serve as an interaction ground for stakeholders like artistes, NGOs and government bodies.

Culture and the Youth

How does the Youth figure in the States’ conversations around Culture and cultural literacy? This guided our reading of various policies, programmes and reports. For the most part, education at the school level was seen as a good platform by which to bring the Youth and Indian Culture together. (Integration of cultural education in the school curriculum – A Report; Committee of Central Advisory Board of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development (2005); Annual Report Centre for Cultural resources and training (2016-2017); Study of Emergent Arts and Culture spaces in Urban India: Towards Policy Recommendations, The Centre for the Study of Culture and Society, Bangalore (2011); Education and Cultural Diversity; UNESCO, (2003-2004)). The school is therefore seen as a place where culture or cultural literacy can be imparted either by learning an art form, can be encouraged by setting up a reward or incentive by way of scholarship or by engaging in it by the setting up of ‘cultural clubs’. In most of the documents drafted by State Bodies, the youth are envisioned as passive receivers or learners of Culture. This leaves the State free to decide and control which art and cultural forms make the list of acceptable forms to learn and engage with. There is no elaboration of how such programmes will enable the Youth to see Culture as discursive and dynamic rather than fixed and see themselves as agents in the continuous making of culture. However a slightly different approach is articulated in the policy recommendations prepared by the Centre for the Study of Culture and Society (a non-state actor), which advises incorporating art as a perspective in education as well as encourages creative expression among civil society.
Culture and Politics of the State
Individual offices within State bodies often align themselves with schemes, initiatives and agendas taken up by the Government at the Centre. Therefore, as the recent Annual Report of the Ministry of Culture outlines, implementing Swachcha Bharat Abhiyan (A cleanliness drive put into action by the present government) in museums, monuments etc., celebrating Yoga and emphasizing a revival of an ancient Hindu past are incorporated into many of the programmes at the Ministry of Culture. This also happens alongside a move towards e-governance, digitization and a focus on technology to bring about transparency in heritage management – digitization has been a striking feature of this government. As Rajadhyaksha and others have pointed out in the Cultural Policy for India document brought out by the International Federation of Arts Council and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), the late 80’s and early 90’s were marked by a rise in hindutva which brought with it a new era of State interference in cultural expression and participation (such as the attacks on the screenings of the film ‘Fire’ and the banning of Salman Rushdies ‘The Satanic Verses’). The pro-Hindutva central government BJP sought to revise NCERT textbooks to align with Right wing ideology and carried out a number of similar activities during its tenure (1998-2004) (Rajadhyaksha et al, 2012-2013). If the report of the Ministry of Culture is anything to go by, such a theme of State control of the Arts is a striking feature at present time and is cause for alarm since it definitely spells doom for the ideal of cultural diversity and marginalised and alternative art forms and art that arises from grass-roots social and cultural movements.

Culture and Globalisation
The fact that these reports come out of the age of globalisation is evident in several ways. One, the State is concerned with India’s public image when it comes to the preservation of heritage sites. There is an emphasis on allotting resources that ensure that facilities such as toilets and ticketing services at such sites (framed as a tourist attractions) are ‘world class’ and of international standards.

Two, this is seen as achievable only through a public-private partnership (Adopt a Heritage - Apni Dharohar, Apni Pehchaan program, The HRIDAY: Heritage City Development & Augmentation Yojana guidelines). Alliance with the private sector can be seen as move to engage civil society in an age where corporations have a more tangible impact on the day to day of citizens than the State does. It can also be seen as a way to follow the money and resources sorely required in post globalisation heritage conservation projects. Third, the document funded by the European Union is specifically a call for transnational cultural exchange, where the pluralism of Indian society is seen as a key resource for European nations, where the movement of people across borders via migration has become an important factor in cultural and social life. What is interesting is that Rajadhyaksha and others have called the Age of Autonomy (The 80’s and 90’s) a period where the State involvement with culture became increasingly marginalised. This marginalisation happened either at the level of the extent of State involvement or the nature of State involvement. The authors claim that this point in India’s history sees phenomenon where State-sponsored cultural initiatives gradually lose out to corporate, community-driven, market-driven or independent cultural festivals, initiatives and art forms. This leads to, “discrediting of state agencies on the one hand, coupled with growing (and preferred) alternatives for both making and showing art independently of the State.” (Rajadhyaksha et al, 2012-2013, pp 24).
Subsequently in the age of Globalisation, the Planning Commission facilitates the transition of cultural industries (art and crafts) into creative industries, thus marrying technology and tradition (Ahluwalia 2005). This is seen as an inevitable move to bring art and culture into the public domain. This provides us with a new angle in the readings of both State reports and documents and policy recommendations by external or non-state actors. When the power to create a new kind of culture is in the hands of design and media industries, IT sectors and private companies which bring with them their own sets of priorities, the State then positions itself as a sort of guardian of a hegemonic Indian culture.
Conclusion

India, ever since Independence in 1947 has harboured a rather unproblematic vision of culture as national culture and most of its cultural policy has been influenced by the view that legitimate culture is that which contributes to the idea of nation-building (Raghavendra Tenkayala, P. Radhika, Ashish Rajadhyaksha; *India - Historical Perspective: Cultural Policies and Instruments*). However, there’s been no single coherent cultural policy, but it has been rather scattered through various ministries and government organisations. That India should have a National Cultural Policy has been debated through the decades (for ex. 1992 Draft Approach Paper on National Cultural Policy) but it has been rejected on account of the sheer heterogeneity and diversity of Indian culture and the complexity in classifying the many art forms. In the absence of a clear understanding of India’s cultural policy, the job of ‘preserving and promoting India’s tangible and intangible cultural heritage’ has fallen under the purview of Ministry of Culture. While the constitution of the Ministry itself has undergone changes over the years, the work of cultural preservation rests in the hands of its many institutions and their bureaucratic machinery. As the High Powered Committee Report, drawn under the Ministry of Culture in 2015 suggests, the rigid structures of these institutions runs against the essence of creative arts. The recommendations include transferring power from clerical administration to creative persons actually responsible for practising and teaching arts and an inflow of young blood into these institutions, among others. Calls for more budgetary allocations to the Ministry of Culture (the spending on culture out of the total government budget is dismal) and treating is as a core sector, not marginal to other development sectors have also been made. The various policy documents that have been annotated also reveal the viewing of the Ministry of Culture in isolation, and not as an intrinsic component of development. In this context, instead of ‘development of culture’, ‘culture-in-development’ approach has been suggested as being more effective. While technology and digitization have been very talked about in the Ministry of Culture’s annual reports, for instance, there seems to be no clear path envisaged towards an engagement of youth and culture.

Independent, privately funded cultural initiatives seem to be attracting more youth than government-supported projects. Public-private partnerships, corporate sponsorships and Corporate Social Responsibility make their presence felt in post-globalisation heritage conservation policies, with the state acting merely as a catalyst, a far cry from the Nehruvian era when the state actively shaped cultural agenda. At the same time, the revival of ‘cultural nationalism’ as seen in the Ministry of Culture’s annual reports, with a thrust on Hindu past, brings back the intertwining of politics and culture in contemporary India. Artistes, intellectuals, civil society actors (as shown in *STUDY OF EMERGENT ARTS AND CULTURE SPACES IN URBAN INDIA: TOWARDS POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS*; The Centre for the Study of Culture and Society, Bangalore; 2011) strongly urge for a shift from ‘cultural nationalism’ to ‘cultural diversity’. One of the most important paradigm shifts has to come through a fundamental change in school curriculum, policy advisers feel. Cultural sensitivity and cultural awareness have to be made cornerstones of school life in order to truly achieve the transformative potential of education towards shaping a secular, tolerant, plural society (Integration of Cultural Education in the School Curriculum – A Report; Committee of Central Advisory Board of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development; 2005). It is through reaching out to schools and colleges that cultural literacy (the competence to understand cultural references and actively participate in the society; Hirsch 1988) in a plural society can be achieved.
Annexures

Annexure I

Categorisation of Policy Documents under Review

Annual Reports by Various Ministries under Government of India (2)
- Annual Report Ministry of Culture; 2017-2018
- Annual Report Centre for Cultural Resources and Training; 2016-2017

Assessment and Review of Cultural organisations under the Ministry of Culture by a committee (1)
- Report of HIGH POWERED COMMITTEE on the akademis and other institutions under the ministry of culture; may, 2014

Initiatives, schemes and Proposals undertaken by Govt of India Ministries (5)
- “Adopt a Heritage”- ‘Apni Dharohar, Apni Pehchaan”; Project for Development of Tourist Friendly Destinations; Ministry of Tourism, Govt of India; September 2017
- HRIDAY: Heritage City Development & Augmentation Yojana (Operational Guidelines); Ministry of Urban Development, Govt of India; 2015
- Report of the Working Group on Art and Culture for XII Five-Year Plan (2012-17); Ministry of Culture, Govt of India; 2012
- National Mission on Cultural Mapping and Roadmap; Ministry of Culture; 2017
- Integration of Cultural Education in the School Curriculum – A Report; Committee of Central Advisory Board of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development; 2005

Initiatives, Schemes and Proposals prepared or funded by transnational organisations (2)
- Education and Cultural Diversity; UNESCO; 2003-2004
- Preparatory Action – Culture in External EU Relations, India Country Report; (funded by) European Union; 2014

Policy Recommendations by Indian autonomous institutions (1)
- Study of emergent arts and culture spaces in urban india: towards policy recommendations; the centre for the study of culture and society, Bangalore; 2011
Annexures II

Report of High Powered Committee on The Akademis And Other Institutions Under The Ministry Of Culture; May, 2014

The report of High Powered Committee on the Akademis and other institutions under the Ministry of Culture, May 2014, was submitted by a 7-member High Powered Committee in 2014. Its mandate was to assess issues of administration and functioning of cultural organizations National School of Drama (NSD), Centre for Cultural Resources & Training (CCRT), Lalit Kala Akademi, Sahitya Akademi, Sangeet Natak Akademi, National Gallery of Modern Art (NGMA), Indira Gandhi National Centre of Arts (IGNCA) and Zonal Cultural Centres (ZCCs) etc. and suggest ways to make them more efficient and effective.

The High Powered Committee underlines the need to review the workings of these eminent cultural institutions, set up in post-independent India, with the acknowledgement that times have changed since their inception and culture, being dynamic and interacting with other forces like politics and economy, has evolved too. It recognises the work of earlier committees, like the Khosla Committee 25 years ago that had a similar mandate, and notes with regret that their suggestions were not implemented. In this context, it recognises the rigidity and bureaucratic inflexibility that has set in the processes of these institutions and stresses the need to make them more responsive to the ever-changing cultural environment of India today. In their very essence, bureaucracy and creative arts are at odds with each other and there is a need to strike a practical balance between the two disparate-in-spirit worlds, the High Powered Committee argues. Only if a practical balance is struck between the freedom and unbound nature of the arts and the checks and accountability that administration brings can the institutions achieve their goals of promoting and preserving the rich, diverse cultural traditions of India. Throughout the report, the emphasis is on shaping the Ministry of Culture more as a facilitator, a point of co-ordination and a guide rather than a controller of the institutions.

For this, it recommends a shift of power balance from clerical administrators into the hands of creative people who are directly, passionately involved in the arts. In this sense, it urges the Ministry of Culture to set itself as an example of a ministry handling a unique portfolio, which needs to go beyond its power centre of Delhi and going to other centres where creative work is taking place. One of the recommendations is to make the Ministry of Culture more transparent and accessible by appointing a point of contact that will be the public face of the ministry and can be approached with ease by the various institutions. While the High Powered Committee goes into detailed investigation of what ails each of the cultural institutions in terms of budgets, functioning and the direction they should take, the main thrust of its argument is that there needs to be an inflow of young blood into the institutions, an attempt to make the institutions more premier and autonomous like IITs and IIMs (in keeping with neo-liberal times) and providing more financial and infrastructural support (by way of setting up buildings or funds, for example) and managerial insight to the institutions so that they can run smoothly.
Education and Cultural Diversity; UNESCO; 2003-2004

To make its goal of Education for all more meaningful for its member countries, UNESCO has identified the need to make knowledge more sensitive to their cultural and linguistic contexts. This document iterates the need to see education as more than just literacy or the ability to read and write and emphasises that in order to meet the pressing needs of the 21st century – world peace, sustainability, HIV/AIDS and so on – education has to be tuned in to specific local contexts, which are the first sites where knowledge and attitudes towards health, nature, life of a population are shaped. A multi-sectoral, inter-disciplinary approach, culled from the best practices from different cultures, is best suited to promote the goal of Education for All, since its opens up the learner’s mind to the diverse possibilities of interpreting the world. The need to harness cultural and linguistic diversity for educational goals also becomes imperative to preserve the rich heterogeneity of the world we live in, especially at a time when globalisation and digitisation are threatening to homogenise it.

The document mentions specific methods UNESCO will employ to further these aims – like focusing on marginalised ethnic groups, finding the best possible way to provide functional basic education to people discriminated along various axes, developing curricula that promotes understanding of different cultures and languages, to develop culturally sensitive preventive education material, implementing gender policy development, tying up with B@bel which promotes multilingual Internet and so on. The statement aspires to infuse the goal of Education for all, to be fulfilled by 2002-2003 biennium, with the perspective of cultural diversity.

“Adopt a Heritage”- ‘Apni Dharohar, Apni Pehchaan’; Project for Development of Tourist Friendly Destinations; Ministry of Tourism, Govt of India; September 2017

Adopt a Heritage - “Apni Dharohar, Apni Pehchaan” - is an initiative undertaken by the Ministry of Tourism, Govt of India, in 2017. The project guidelines provide a detail view of the government’s vision of developing tourist friendly destinations in India. Adopt a Heritage proposes to be a joint collaborative exercise between Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Culture and the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), which is the official body looking after the many heritage sites, monuments, palaces, temples and cultural destinations in India. The project guidelines emphasise the need to make the rich, diverse cultural heritage of India more accessible to tourists, both foreign and domestic. It sees this effort as generating three necessary outcomes – that of cultural preservation, employment generation and economic development through promoting tourism. With this in mind, the initiative invites participation of private and public companies and individuals too to build a vision for the development of select tourist sites, which are in turn, graded as per their visibility and footfall. All of this falls within the brand of Incredible India, and the move is towards public-private partnership that also promises limited visibility to companies under whose CSR the heritage sites will be developed. Under the project, the bidders will offer competitive and innovative visions of developing the monuments with clear focus on providing basic and advanced amenities of world-class standards as well as services that would make the sites more attractive to tourists.
The partnering company or individuals will be responsible for vision building, development of sites, operations and maintenance for a period of 5 years. They will work with various committees appointed by the ministries and a project management consultant and the development proposed will only be accepted if it falls within the statutory guidelines of ASI, under the Ancient Monument and Archaeological Site and Remains Act, 2010. The project guidelines provides further details of basic and advanced infrastructural amenities required in terms of toilets, signage, cafeteria, ticketing, surveillance, general illumination, night viewing, digital interactive kiosks, facilities for disabled tourists and so on. The document is an effort to connect the spheres of culture and tourism and promote the tourist brand of Incredible India through its heritage sites.

**Study of Emergent Arts and Culture Spaces in Urban India: Towards Policy Recommendations; The Centre For The Study Of Culture And Society, Bangalore; 2011**

The Centre for the Study of Culture and Society (CSCS) Report, 2011, envisions Bangalore as a creative city with a focus on reviving theatre, music, dance, visual arts and literature. Brought about by an ethnographic study of cultural hubs in the city, the report emphasises the role of civil society and corporates in promoting arts and cultural spaces in urban development policy. Not only should ‘cultural development’ be on the agenda, but culture-in-development, where development is thought through with a cultural lens, should be the goal of collaborative efforts of urban planners and the art community. Marking ‘creative economy’, where culture is capitalised for economic reasons, as a largely unviable model for creative city, the study recommends ‘cultural ecology’, based on the principles of diversity, as a more useful paradigm. Under this paradigm, the hierarchies between English and regional languages, classical and folk arts forms are broken and an openness to all forms of culture, including that of the minorities and the marginalised, becomes the organising node of creative city. In this light, public cultures - city festivals, intangible art forms and so on – become as legitimate as those recognised by cultural institutions. The guiding principle, thus, should be cultural diversity rather than cultural nationalism.

The report also recommends using existing spaces, reviving them, opening up of corporate houses for cultural performances, uplifting metro stations and airport for the sake of displaying art and so on, instead of building new infrastructure. Incorporating art as a perspective in education is also very important. Govt bodies for preservation of arts and culture needs to be revived and government spaces and public places like parks also need to be opened up for cultural performances, says the study. In addition, a sustainable tourism plan for Bangalore must be drawn up by the government as the IT city attracts visitors from across the globe. The creative city project needs a partnership for various city departments, artist community, civil society and corporates, for the free and fearless flow of creative expression.

**HRIDAY: Heritage City Development & Augmentation Yojana (Operational Guidelines); Ministry of Urban Development, Govt of India; 2015**

The HRIDAY (Heritage City Development and Augmentation Yojana) Scheme guidelines, prepared by Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India, proposes to develop 12 heritage cities across India guided by the principle of inclusive and integrated urban development. It acknowledges that previous attempts to preserve India’s vast and diverse cultural heritage has been strictly done keeping limited focus on the monuments in question.
HRIDAY points out that heritage cannot be viewed in isolation and needs to be connected with the aspirations of the local community and urban development issues. The need therefore is to develop heritage cities holistically, with a view to “rejuvenate the city’s soul and explicitly manifest its character”. Sponsored by the Central government, the scheme guidelines also evoke the need for private sector partnerships in order to achieve the goal of physical, economic, institutional and social revival of heritage cities. Heritage sites are proposed to be linked to the larger city infrastructure and management made more efficient by simplifying multiple institution governing it. The agenda will be to improve the overall quality of life in selected cities and giving them a unique cultural identity over 4 years of the project’s implementation. The guidelines also propose appointing of heritage experts to handhold the administration as city anchors to implement the scheme.

The aim of the scheme is to mainstream heritage resources into city systems and urban development.

Preparatory Action – Culture in External EU Relations, India Country Report; (funded by) European Union; 2014

Culture in EU External Relations India Country Report, 2014, is an initiative funded by the European Union to understand the possibility and potential of mutually-beneficial EU level cultural relations with India. The report acknowledges that while individual member states of Europe have had healthy cultural relations with India – on both governmental and non-governmental level – there hasn’t been a cohesive effort towards fostering meaningful cultural ties with India on the overarching pan-Europe level. The report lists many reasons for the increasing interest in Indian culture, starting from India’s history of colonialism, the fabric of Indian society that’s woven out of pluralism and hence has an innate tolerance of other cultures and a tendency to synthesise different cultures into its own, the growing idea world-wide of India’s rise as a ‘soft power’, the great number of Indian diaspora across the globe – makes India aptly primed for more vibrant international cultural relations. But though India has been interacting with the world through its cultural actors, it’s been a narrow exchange, primarily because India’s nodal governmental agency ICCR (Indian Council for Cultural Research), which is responsible for cultural exchange with different parts of the world, has been plagued by a blinkered vision of culture as ‘high culture’ and many other institutional, bureaucratic weaknesses. The government has done precious little other than giving patronage to certain cultural and art forms. While the recent economic growth has attracted the world’s attention to India, it hasn’t meant much for the cultural actors in terms of funding – from the government as well as private sector. However, cultural entrepreneurship, public-private partnerships have gone up and international relations of cultural actors from the civil society have seen an organic growth. It’s in this cultural scene that the European Union needs to find space for an amped-up cultural dialogue.
A lack of awareness about EU and its institutions, stereotypes harboured by EU and India about each other, lack of easy and free movement due to tourist regulations and lack of a sustained cultural policy are major lacunae in the landscape of EU-India cultural relationships. The report concludes that there’s a vast potential to increase the cultural dialogue between EU and India, and the effort should be to move beyond the representation of culture in each other’s country and to facilitate cultural relations that are based on non-hierarchical principles towards capacity-building and mutual learning. A well-thought out policy, sustained funding and cadre of experts in international cultural relations guiding the catalytic process points to the way ahead.

**Report of the Working Group on Art and Culture for XII Five-Year Plan (2012-17); Ministry of Culture, Govt of India; 2012**

The Report of the Working Group on Art and Culture for XII Five-Year Plan (2012-17), prepared by the Ministry of Culture, comes at a time of introspection during the transition from the eleventh five year plan to twelfth. One of its main arguments is to put forth culture as not something extraneous or fringe, but as the core of all developmental activities. The thrust of the report is to make the government see culture as important in the five year plan and not as a marginal sector. It underlines the need to create better infrastructural facilities and also to create an environment where there’s an increased demand for cultural goods and services. The working group had six subgroups each focussing on different areas – performing arts, museum and visual arts, archaeology and anthropology, education and research, promotion of culture and heritage and lastly, tourism in India. The mandate of the working group is to review and evaluate existing schemes and their effectiveness, their utility, duplication etc. and identify gaps and creative effective responses by way of new initiatives. The report, while coming up with various innovative inputs and possible directions in the aforementioned areas of culture, stresses that culture be given its due in terms of budgetary allocation and refuse to be treated as a ‘non-developmental’ sector, because it plays a dual role not only in economic growth but also giving meaning to human existence. The report also finds that states need to be strengthened as partners in carrying out new schemes and initiatives.

**Annual Report Ministry of Culture; 2017-2018**

The annual report provides a detailed review of the various offices, zonal centres, government funded organisations and akademis under the Ministry of Culture. The Archaeological Society of India (ASI), national libraries, capacity building programmes and implementation of UNESCO conventions also fall under its purview. It lists down the activities undertaken in the said year, the achievements, publications, celebrations, schemes undertaken, the exhibitions held, outreach programs conducted and major events that gives an overview of the broad functioning of the ministry. While the Culture Ministry outlines preservation of Indian culture and traditions and promotion of tangible and intangible heritage as its purpose, the operations of individual offices throw light on what the government of the day views as significant. In this context, the common thread of implementing Swachcha Bharat Abhiyan in museums, monuments etc., celebration of Yoga, a move towards e-governance, digitization and a focus on technology to bring about transparency in heritage management, and an emphasis on reviving ancient Hindu past can be seen running through the activities of various organisations and akademis.
The youth connect is attempted via festivals (Kala Ghoda in Mumbai), the courses that akademis offer to young students, festivals (ex. Children’s Theatre festival by National School of Drama, New Delhi), community outreach (ex. Community Outreach in state-run schools by Kalakshetra in Chennai), awards (ex. Sahitya Akademi organized its Yuva Puraskar and Young Writers’ Festival in December in Chandigarh) and scholarships and fellowships (for ex. Scholarship to Young Artistes in Different Cultural Fields of Rs 5000 per month), amongst others.

Annual Report Centre for Cultural Resources and Training; 2016-2017

An autonomous organisation under the Ministry of Culture, the Centre for Cultural Resources and Training (CCRT) links education with culture by conducting training programs for teachers, educators and administrators that helps them conduct education grounded in cultural knowledge. Through training teachers and students in various aspects of Indian art and culture, the CCRT ultimately aims to empower local communities to preserve local culture and heritage and develop a cultural identity.

In addition to creating awareness in schools about the richness of India’s cultural expressions through art, drama, music, dance activities, the CCRT implements Cultural Talent Search Scholarship Scheme for providing facilities to young talented children in the 10-14 age group to study one or the other art form and Scheme for Award of Scholarship to Young Artists in different cultural fields for advance training of various art forms. The report reviews the workshops, training programs and lectures by experts conducted to create awareness among students and teachers, especially those in remote rural parts of the country, about arts and crafts, languages and cultural diversity, and the notion of India as a cultural entity. The setting up of ‘cultural clubs’ in school to bring home the importance of preserving India’s cultural heritage and create a sense of community ownership of heritage amongst students, or the vision of project “Sanskriti” in Varanasi (put forth by PM Narendra Modi) that would imbibe knowledge about cultural luminaries from Varanasi among students, are outlined in the report. Apart from bringing out ‘Cultural Education’ kits (audio video material on India’s cultural heritage) to be distributed in schools, the CCRT, in this report, draws out a list of its publications (ex. Forts of Karnataka), festivals it has conducted and the cultural exchange opportunities it is looking forward to.

National Mission on Cultural Mapping and Roadmap; Ministry of Culture; 2017

The document makes a case for consolidating database about local cultural assets from across India given the heterogeneity of cultures present and the intangible nature of most art forms that are preserved and passed down over generations mainly through oral traditions. The Ministry of Culture believes this will not only help create a clear picture of art forms and cultural expressions that need to be preserved, but also sensitize policy about the artist communities in various corners and help them benefit economically. The mission seeks to bring disjointed efforts at cultural preservation and promotion under one umbrella, after pointing out problems owing to the sheer complexity and diversity of Indian art forms, the geographical sweep, cultural differences, historical shifts, language diversity, and a huge loss-making artist community.
While making a SWOT analysis of the Indian cultural scene, the document observes the gap between the ideal of cultural preservation and the daily, lived-in reality of modern life and bureaucratic processes. The aim of the mission is cultural revival and growth, brought about by the synergies of various ministries and artists welfare. While releasing around 469 crores for over three years of the implementation of the mission, the Ministry of Culture hopes to create a National Cultural Work Place, a portal that will be a common interaction ground for various stakeholders like artistes, NGOs and government.

Integration of Cultural Education in the School Curriculum – A Report; Committee of Central Advisory Board of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development; 2005

The report comes out of a deep reflection on the state of school education in the country and a concern that not only has it deprived children of values like collaboration, tolerance and basic social skills, but has contributed to the contemporary crisis where education is only about acquiring a set of competencies to get jobs, completely disconnected from the life worlds and natural cultural strengths of the students. A questioning of the real objectives of education is at the heart of this document. In this context, the mandate of the Committee, made up of writers, intellectuals and artistes, was to look for ways in which cultural values – minus the religious and communal connotations of the term – could be infused into the school curriculum and children could be made aware of the richness of India’s culture. To inculcate cultural sensitivity in students, the committee recommends creating awareness about arts and culture, introducing the learning of one or more art forms and teaching the appreciation of the world of arts. The committee recommendations also places emphasis on dislodging ‘textbook’ pedagogy from its pedestal and restructuring of the classroom based on a new teacher-student communication that encourages learning from the perspective of local cultures, respect for diverse languages, consciously refraining from propagating one dominant culture/language, having arts and culture as an essential ingredient of the curriculum and fostering a classroom culture where differences can thrive.

The sensitization of teachers about cultural education, libraries that include a diverse range of learning material of different art forms, promoting regional languages as mediums of instruction, respecting diversity as a part of school curriculum, encouraging critical thinking instead of rote learning amongst students, introducing humanities into the school curriculum are also discussed by the committee members as ways in which creative learning can be imbibed in school students.
National Cultural/Educational Policy Review (Latvia)
Alina Romanovska

About CHIEF

CHIEF (The Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe’s Future) aims to build an effective dialogue between different stakeholders in order to facilitate a future of Europe based on inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity. The project focuses on the production and transition of cultural knowledge in both formal educational settings initiated from above, and a variety of informal human interactions. CHIEF will contribute to understanding and enhancing cultural literacy for young people, and the project will lead to more effective use of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge. It will also help to recognise existing innovative practices and develop a new organisational model to enhance the cultural and inter-cultural competence of young Europeans.
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Executive Summary

The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to cultural literacy education of young people in Latvia. By way of a systematic review of relevant policy documents, it examines how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised, and outlines strengths, weaknesses and tensions within Latvian public policy.

The development of cultural literacy policies in Latvia is highly centralised – decision-making and coordination of processes take place within the supreme governmental body. The lead institution is the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Latvia. In Latvia, there are no policy documents that are specifically dedicated to youth cultural literacy. However, the topic of youth cultural literacy is episodically discussed or touched upon in policy planning documents on other thematic areas, such as national identity, education, language policy, cultural heritage, and media.

Cultural literacy has been designated as strategically important to sustainable development. This reflects the country’s distinctive history. Following the restoration of independence in 1990, policy-making prioritised both the reconstruction and development of Latvian national identity and the preservation and development of Latvian cultural heritage. Our analysis indicates that the key areas of cultural literacy (in terms of the extent to which they are referred to in policy documents) are: the preservation of cultural heritage and national identity; and the use of the official language in both the public domain and informal interactions.

Cultural literacy is associated with several objectives that are considered key to Latvia’s contemporary development: promoting a sense of belonging to Latvia’s cultural space; strengthening the security of the state and its inhabitants; stimulating the country’s economic development. By developing the creative potential of individuals, improved cultural literacy is expected to contribute significantly to economic growth.

Policy documents’ consideration of cultural identity takes place against emerging tensions between various ethnic groups. In this context, targeted cultural literacy education that provides dedicated activities in both formal and informal education settings for ethnic minority groups, have been introduced to reduce tensions and the likelihood of conflict.
Although cultural literacy has been declared an important component of Latvia’s long-term development strategy, this has yet to be reflected in policy planning documents that provide guidance on how cultural literacy education should be developed and governed, especially for young people. Guidance relating to cultural literacy among young people remains fragmentary and ill-defined, such as calls to increase the number of informal education activities, to develop technological creativity, and to enhance cultural literacy through innovative practices.

There is a tension between national-level policy-making, where cultural literacy education is expressed as a key priority, and the transfer of responsibility for specific activities to the local level, local authorities and non-governmental organisations.

Acting on priorities and initiatives outlined in national strategies is problematic since: short-term documents do not provide a sufficiently clear picture of specific opportunities for the introduction of cultural literacy education at formal and informal levels; and the implementation of activities at the regional level is underfinanced.

The relationship between Latvian and European culture(s) is a recurring theme of Latvian cultural policy. Latvia is situated as an integral part of Europe in terms of culture, politics and economics. Maintaining and developing Latvian identity, language, national cultural values and lifestyles is presented as an important part of maintaining European cultural diversity.
Introduction

Aims of the Review
The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to cultural literacy education of young people in Latvia. It comprises a systematic review of relevant policy documents, examines how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised, and outlines strengths, weaknesses and tensions within Latvian public policy.

The review: a) critically analyses official forms of cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal educational activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage; and b) underpins the design of the empirical components of the wider CHIEF project. More information about this can be found at http://chiefproject.eu.

Structure of the Report
The report first provides an overview of the Latvian policy context in order to provide a general background to the structures and processes that govern cultural literacy policy. It then outlines the methodology used to undertake the systematic review of policy documents, including data collection and analysis, before presenting the findings of the analysis. Our findings are organised on the basis of the content and emphasis of reviewed policy documents. Latvia’s policy documents focus heavily on the role of culture in socio-economic development and security: far less attention is given to cultural literacy and young people’s cultural literacy education. Much of the report, therefore, covers general cultural issues (national identity, cultural diversity, promotion of sense of belonging to the country, language and social memory) in Latvia’s policy documents. We examine the relationship of these issues to socio-political development with reference to the historical background of the country. The report ends with a brief discussion outlines of policy weaknesses and contradictions and our conclusions.
Policy Context

The main legislative body in the Republic of Latvia is the parliament (the Saeima). Draft legislation is passed in three readings and submitted for approval to the President. The President has the right to request that the Saeima reconsider draft legislation. The Saeima is entitled to ignore presidential requests to amend drafts, in which case the President must approve the law in its original form.

Parliamentary elections in Latvia are held every four years. During the period considered (2007-2018), five referendums have also taken place on various issues. In 2012, a referendum was held on constitutional amendments to introduce Russian as a second official language. 74.8% voted against (turnout 70.7%) and the amendments were rejected.

Economic Context
After an unbroken period of economic growth between 1998 and 2007, Latvia’s economy experienced a sharp downturn between 2008–2010, exacerbated by a large current account deficit, debt exposure, and overinvestment in real estate. Declines in GDP of 4.6% in 2008, 17.8% in 2009 and 0.2% in 2010 constituted one of the deepest recessions worldwide. In 2008, the Latvian government signed an agreement with the European Commission and the World Bank and other EU institutions on an international borrowing programme to prevent national insolvency. According to the agreement, a €7.5 billion loan was made available to Latvia on the basis of the government continuing its policy of fiscal contraction and introducing structural reforms. Gradually, the situation stabilised, exports increased, and the economy came out of recession (2010).

Risks to long-term economic development include an aging population and increasing emigration. In the last seven years (since the beginning of 2010), the population has fallen by 186 000. Mortality rates have exceeded birth rates (natural movement) since 1991. In 2017, this lead to a 7,900 decrease in the population (the population declined by a further 7,800 due to long-term migration). (Centrālā statistikas pārvalde)

Educational Context
Strategic decision-making relating to cultural literacy policies in Latvia is highly centralised. Most policy documents relevant to cultural literacy are published by the Ministry of Education and Science. The Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Welfare and the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development have also produced some documents (see Appendix 1)
Since 2007, the number of the policies covering cultural literacy has steadily increased (e.g. no documents were published in 2007, two documents were published in 2011, four documents – in 2016.). This growing interest in cultural literacy follows the 2010 publication of Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, which identified culture and cultural literacy as a priority area for the country’s development. Other medium and long-term policy documents published since are effectively based on this strategy.

In 2018, amendments to the Law on Education and the Law on General Education brought education together into a single system to ensure continuity across all stages of education (from pre-school to year 12). The amendments followed the first wholesale review of training since the restoration of independence and set the terms for the introduction of new education content, which will provide a basis for a transition to competence-based learning. This approach has been introduced to overcome the consequences of the economic and financial crisis and reflect eight key competences defined at the EU level.

These represent a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are considered necessary for personal fulfilment and development; active citizenship; social inclusion; and employment:

- communication in the mother tongue;
- communication in foreign languages;
- mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology;
- digital competence;
- learning to learn;
- social and civic competences;
- sense of initiative and entrepreneurship;

Education content is revised in the light of reports and policy documents both produced domestically and at European level (e.g. the European Commission’s report Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes (European Commission, 2012) and Developing Key Competences at School in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities for Policy (European Commission /EACEA/Eurydice, 2012).

More specifically, the new learning content and related learning approaches are designed to reduce fragmentation of learning content, develop deep understanding and skills, and shape personality and values (Laganovskis, 2018).
The amendments also provide for a gradual transition to the official language as the language of instruction in secondary schools, which is considered to be instrumental in implementing the new general education content and learning approach. The changes aim to promote equal opportunities for all children and young people and help them to acquire knowledge, skills and attitudes relevant to the 21st century (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrijas Komunikācijas nodaļa, 2018).
Method

A systematic search for eligible sources examining cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage, was carried out using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, 2015).

As a starting point, we have used the terms to express four constructs central to the CHIEF project, determined by the Work Package 1 leads in English:
1) Youth: Youth, young, child, pupil
2) Education: Education, learn, participate, knowledge
3) Culture: Art, dance, drama, film, music, theatre, history, commemoration, museum, galleries, libraries, poetry
4) Cultural literacy: Culture, identity, heritage, creativity

To help understand how these constructs are expressed in Latvian national policy documents, we examined the document Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030 (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010).

We identified Latvian terms relating to each of the constructs in this document and developed our string:

(jaunatne OR jaunieši OR bērni OR skolēni) AND (izglītība OR izglītot OR mācīt OR piedalīties OR zināt) AND (māksla OR deja OR dziesma OR literatūra OR filma OR mūzika OR teātris OR muzejs OR izstāde OR bibliotēka) AND (kultūra OR identitāte OR vēsture OR atmiņa OR radošums)

Searches were conducted on 10–28 June 2018 and limited to the Latvian language policy documents published between January 2007 and July 2018. Since the search did not deliver the expected results in the Google search, the decision to investigate the websites containing Latvian policy documents, which summarize all national policy documents, was made.

The main sources were

1) the website of legal acts that ensures free access to systematised (consolidated) legal acts of the Republic of Latvia – Likumi.lv (https://likumi.lv/) – created in 2001 by the official publisher of the Republic of Latvia, according to the Law On Official Publications and Legal Information “Latvijas Vēstnesis”, for everyone to
exercise his or her rights stipulated in the Constitution of the Republic of Latvia; and

2) POLSIS (http://polsis.mk.gov.lv/) – the database of policy planning documents.
The search process was identical in both databases. This initial search yielded 280 records. After the removal of duplicates, the first reviewer screened 95 documents against the exclusion and inclusion criteria (Appendix 2). The second reviewer reviewed a random sample of 10% of all decisions blind. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus. After this initial screening process, 68 documents were excluded and 27 documents were deemed eligible for in-depth review.

In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the following data were extracted from all eligible documents: department of publication, year. A thematic analysis of the documents was undertaken using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the review aims and objectives. The manual encoding was performed using Nvivo coding methodology. To create initial codes, two reviewers independently read one eligible document. Results were compared, and agreed codes were developed through discussion to create a coding matrix. On each iteration, additional codes were added to the matrix, which was used to guide the generation of codes and identify major themes in the documents. A random sample of 20% of each document was coded by a second reviewer to ensure consistency of approach, with any disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus.
Findings

Understanding of the Terms “Cultural Literacy” and “Cultural Literacy Education” in Policy Documents of Latvia
We found no documents specifically dedicated to youth cultural literacy. In practice, youth cultural literacy is episodically covered in policy planning documents on a range of thematic areas (such as national identity, education, language policy, cultural heritage, media, young people’s life and rights), referred to and primarily discussed under the rubric of “cultural education” (kultūrizglītība), cultural awareness, and cultural education.

Strategies for the development of cultural education are contained within both of Latvia’s key development plans (National Development Plan of Latvia 2014–2020 (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs), Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030). In Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, cultural education is defined relatively widely as: “a component of the educational system, which not only encompasses vocational education of all levels (basic, secondary and higher) in cultural sectors and further education opportunities for specialists, but also general education in cultural sectors, and the development of any creative talent in the perspective of lifelong education.” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010, p. 98). The principles for introducing and developing cultural literacy education covered in strategic planning documents typically cover the general interests of all age groups, rather than focusing specifically on young people.

Policy documents differ in how the scope of cultural literacy education is circumscribed. For instance, the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030 provides a relatively broad scope by including both formal and informal education opportunities in the field of culture.

Mandatory subjects, such as literature, visual arts, and music, address various forms of cultural expression. History, social sciences, languages and culturology (also mandatory subjects) also address cultural issues in a general and recapitulative way (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2013). The emphasis given to cultural activities and knowledge in the formal curriculum embeds a relatively traditional understanding of culture in the learning process.

Policy documents relevant to young people and education policy either ignore cultural education outright or address issues relevant to cultural literacy in a relatively fragmented way. 2009 guidelines on youth policy criticised the conventional practice of interpreting cultural education “narrowly within the boundaries of vocational education” and “underestimating the role of cultural resources in the process of lifelong education” (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2009).

The same document provides a range of examples of non-formal practices and initiatives that may potentially complement more traditional forms of cultural education, including: access to professional art (concerts, concerts-lectures, theatre performances, cinema lectures, cultural activities at schools or in regional centres); the offer of cultural education and artistic creation opportunities; accessible public libraries and museums (pedagogical programmes of museums, cultural and educational events organised in libraries); programmes created for children and young people by public radio and TV stations (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2009).

The call to widen the scope of cultural education reflects a broader ambition, outlined in both the Education Development Guidelines 2014–2020 (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2014a), and information report, On the Transition to Learning in the Official Language in General Educational Institutions (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2017c) to increase the number of non-formal education activities, develop technological creativity and enhance cultural literacy through innovative practices. Despite this, subsequent efforts to broaden the scope of cultural literacy education have been relatively unsystematic and disjointed. Moreover, government policy has yet to devise specific and target-oriented guidance to relevant stakeholders (local governments, employees of cultural institutions, young people and their parents, etc.) on how non-formal educative practices and initiatives should be used to broaden the scope of cultural literacy education.

Instead, guidance within formal national policy takes the form of examples of best practice or discrete top-down initiatives. These include Latvian School Bag (Latvijas valsts simtgades birojs, 2017), a national initiative supporting non-formal cultural education launched in September 2018 to celebrate Latvia’s centenary.
The programme encompasses various planned cultural events over the next three years that aim to enhance children and young people’s cultural awareness, creativity, critical thinking, and self-awareness over the next three years. The programme is explicitly linked to improving the quality of education and has been specifically designed to provide pupils with an opportunity to experience a variety of events of historical heritage, professional art and culture with access guaranteed by the state.

Formal education continues to adhere to a more restrictive, traditional understanding of culture. However, current proposals to introduce a new, competence approach has the potential to drive the development of new methods in cultural literacy education. *The draft of the new basic education learning standard* ([Izglītības un zinātņes ministrija, 2018](http://chiefproject.eu)) proposes changes in the content, approach, organisation and evaluation of education. The draft document structures education content into areas, making it possible to introduce inter-disciplinarity into teaching and providing an opportunity for schools to plan and organise the learning process more flexibly in line with student needs. Moreover, proposed education content gives greater focus to modern cultural developments and proposals aimed at introducing more flexible learning allows students to visit various cultural institutions and events for educational purposes.

**Strategic Significance of Culture in Policy Documents of Latvia**

All policy planning in Latvia is based on the *Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030*, a long-term planning document adopted in 2010. Cultural values, literacy, and education are highlighted as key drivers of the country’s development within the document and are linked closely to the priority development axes, such as *Investment in Human Capital* and *Innovative Governance and Public Participation* ([Vides aizsardzības un reģionāls attīstības ministrija, 2010](http://chiefproject.eu)).

“*The strength of the nation will lie in the inherited, discovered and newly created cultural and spiritual values, the richness of the Latvian language and knowledge of other languages. It will unite society for the creation of new, diverse and unique values in the economy, science and culture, and these values will be appreciated, known and respected outside Latvia.*” ([Vides aizsardzības un reģionāls attīstības ministrija, 2010, p.10](http://chiefproject.eu)).

The document contains important guidelines on cultural education (for all ages) and provides a guiding framework for the development of policy-planning relating to young people with shorter time-horizons (3 and 7 years).

---

62 It should be noted that the survey European Cultural Values conducted by Eurobarometer in 2007 describes Latvia as an active country in terms of culture and as an open one to European cultural values and communication with cultures of other countries. More than two thirds (77%, i.e. the same as the EU average) of the surveyed Latvia’s population point out that culture is important for them.
The importance attached to the cultural sphere reflects the specific characteristics of the country’s development and shifting concepts of statehood. Latvian culture and a renewed sense of national identity were identified as integral to creating a shared sense of purpose and social stability during the transition to independence (Runce, 2013). Various manifestations of culture (national culture, cultural heritage, cultural diversity, etc.) form the basis of contemporary political conflicts.

Issues relating to ethnicity have given rise to disagreements between different political constituencies (e.g. during the celebration of festivals, which have not received official recognition, such as Victory Day (9 May) and Orthodox Christmas and Easter) and ongoing disagreements over the status of the official language persist. Various political movements have used these issues for political gain, exacerbating relations between the Latvian-speaking and Russian-speaking population of Latvia.

Latvian legislation sets out various important functions of culture in shaping society:

“In the widest sense culture shapes the value, knowledge and skill set of individuals and society, ensuring the existence of communities and society and identity formation. Most often, only the most visible part of culture – art and cultural heritage – is deemed as belonging to culture. However, the cultural space is formed by the whole public environment and its diverse intellectual and tangible manifestations. Therefore, the diversity, richness and accessibility of the cultural environment and the participation of active and creative individuals in the creation thereof affect not only the quality of personality and life of an individual but also public and State growth.” (Kultūras ministrija, 2014).

In response to EU recommendations on digitisation, a number of key planning documents (such as the National Development Plan for 2014–2020 and the Information Society Development Guidelines for 2014–2020) have recommended a major programme of cultural heritage digitisation. Although the immediate aims of the plan are to enhance public availability of cultural content and widen access to Latvia’s cultural heritage both at home and abroad, it is also regarded as an important component of broader efforts to develop a knowledge-based economy in Latvia and encourage the development of new products and services.

63 In the 2011, the EC published recommendations on digitisation, online availability and the digital preservation of cultural materials, which encourage EU member states to digitalise resources available in memory institutions (museums, archives, libraries). The recommendations are aimed ensuring that Europe stays close to the head of the pack in cultural and creative content and uses its rich cultural material as efficiently as possible. Digital Agenda for Europe. https://eige.europa.eu/resources/digital_agenda_en.pdf

In addition to outlining sources of funding (both domestic and EU), these documents highlight the potential value of cultural heritage digitisation in contributing to the growth, export potential, and competitiveness of the creative industries sector.

The introduction of the Digital Agenda for Cultural Heritage represents a positive example of government efforts to increase opportunities to embed cultural literacy effectively in non-formal modes of education. A sequential policy for digitisation of cultural heritage has been developed (in planning documents with long, medium, and short-term time horizons) containing objectives and tasks for different periods and identifying institutions responsible.

Latvian National Identity and European Identity, and Cultural Diversity
In the context of government efforts to preserve cultural diversity and strengthen a sense of national identity, policy documents highlight two ostensibly competing vectors of cultural development: the preservation of national cultural values and development of national identity; and the openness of Latvian culture to other cultures. This approach reflects the basic principles of European cultural policy, which underline the responsibility of member states to preserve and develop their respective cultural identities while promoting respect for other cultures, and enhancing interaction and mutual enrichment of cultures. To comply with the above basic principles, Latvian cultural policy adheres to the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (UNESCO, 2005), to which Latvia along with other EU countries acceded in 2007, and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (Council of Europe, 1995).

Latvian policy documents emphasise the importance of Latvia retaining and developing its identity, language, national cultural values and lifestyle to the broader aspiration of maintaining European cultural diversity. To this end, Latvian culture is situated as is part, and an integral element of, the diverse European identity (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010).
Across Latvian policy documents, Europe is represented as a cultural and economic centre, against which Latvia’s development potential is closely tied. Latvia is positioned as a full-fledged part of Europe, providing its contribution to Europe’s culture and economy. The Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030 states:

“Europe has a potential of becoming the centre of creativity and creative entrepreneurship on a global scale, a place where originality and difference is cultivated. Europe is the place with the largest resources of culturally-based capital – rich cultural and historical heritage and innovative industry of culture, the best art, design and music schools, museums and unique festivals. Europe is the place where the best creative professionals – architects, designers, and advertising specialists – are working. Latvia is an integral part of the cultural space of Europe.” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionāls attīstības ministrija, 2010, p.13).

The Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030 states that national identity, citizenship, and the official language, combined with a clear idea of the state, represent the most important conditions for the continued existence and stability of the state. It is in this context that calls to strengthen and develop Latvian culture takes effect. Underlying concerns about the continued viability of Latvian culture form the basis of strategic national-level measures aimed at its preservation.

“Latvia is the only place in the world where the Latvian nation, language and culture can exist and develop, but a wide range of people having the sense of belonging to Latvia live outside the country and collectively form a global network. The Latvian language and culture also represent a unifying basis. Therefore, the objective of society and the state is to nurture the language and take care of the values of national identity, civil society and social integration in the long term.” (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, 2013)

One of the conditions necessary for safeguarding and developing national identity is the preservation of traditional cultural values which has been highlighted in Latvian policy documents as a mandatory condition for the existence of culture.
To ensure the existence and development of Latvian culture, various projects and initiatives have been implemented at national level (e.g. the State Culture Capital Foundation operational since 1998, the Latvian Cultural Canon, established in 2008, recurrent national research programmes for studying Latvian culture). Within the context of national identity, the importance of culture of all inhabitants of Latvia, irrespective of their ethnic origin, has been highlighted as an acknowledgement of diversity. However, the objective of preserving and developing the Latvian language and cultural traditions is presented as paramount.

The Guidelines on National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy 2012–2018 emphasise that Latvian culture is open to interaction with other European and world cultures and stresses the value of “mutual enrichment” (Kultūras ministrija, 2011). The Guidelines on National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy 2012–2018 reject the idea that nationalism should be based on ethnic purity and provide a description of national identity that stresses a nation’s uniqueness (but not its superiority) and seeks to claim the concept as a denomination for a mutual community of x people having similar national cultural features, striving for the nation’s continuity.

“The Latvian constituent nation is inclusive. It has an obligation to strengthen its identity and at the same time to be open to those who wish to join it. It means that one cannot only be born a Latvian but also consciously become one. Each person’s choice determines whether alongside his or her Latvian identity, which is the common one, he or she wishes to maintain also his or her national uniqueness and minority identity” (Kultūras ministrija, 2011)

Although strengthening Latvian national identity is a government priority, its interpretation of the concept aims to promote Latvia as a cultural space that is open to a range of cultures and ethnicities. This aspiration is captured in the concept of ‘Open Latvianness’, which includes receptivity to and acceptance of local national minorities and immigrants.

64 The State Culture Capital Foundation (http://www.kkf.lv/) is a public foundation approved by the Cabinet of Ministers. It aims to promote balanced development of creativity of all cultural and arts sectors as well as to preserve the cultural heritage in the country in line with the national cultural policy guidelines.

65 The Latvian Cultural Canon (https://kulturaskanons.lv/) comprises “cultural treasures” from various branches of culture (architecture and design, cinema, literature, music, stage art, national traditions, and visual arts) that aim to form the basis of a common cultural memory for the Latvian population and foster a sense of national belonging.

66 National research programmes National Identity – Language, Latvian History, Culture and Human Security and Letonika as well as the pilot programme Promotion of National Identity supported by the State Culture Capital Foundation approve the state’s orientation towards the maintenance of the national and collective ethnic identity.
Sense of Belonging to the Latvian Cultural Space, and Civic Participation
The preservation and development of national identity within policy documents is closely linked to promoting a sense of belonging to the “Latvian cultural space”\textsuperscript{67} and to civic participation. The assumption behind many of the policy documents that address these issues is that people with a strong affiliation with their country, and who know and appreciate its culture, are more likely to become actively participate in national decision making and socio-political life. The National Development Plan of Latvia 2014–2020 includes an area of action “Cooperation between People, Culture and Civic Participation Underpinning Belonging to Latvia” which states that “people who feel they belong to Latvia are willing to live, work and start a family in their country and support their country by engaging in civic activities” (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, 2013). Meanwhile, an active civic position ensures the viability of the country and its population. Language and cultural competences are not only considered to influence civic participation and belonging to the Latvian cultural space but also contribute to sustained social and economic development.

Policy documents seek to develop an inclusive concept of national identity as “political nation” that encompasses all Latvian inhabitants who recognise the cultural space of Latvia as theirs, irrespective of ethnicity (Kultūras ministrija, 2011), (see Latvian National Identity and European Identity, and Cultural Diversity).

Latvian policy documents define, that knowledge of Latvian cultural heritage are important to facilitate national unity and a sense of belonging to the Latvian cultural space, irrespective of ethnic origin (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, 2013).

Events enhancing a sense of unity of the nation and national identity are also considered to develop a feeling of belonging to the Latvian state and civic participation, both acknowledged to be important preconditions for the existence of the state. “Civil action and democratic institutions should be linked with the idea of a single national culture, ideals and practice, which would be based on interaction of national identity and cultural diversity.” (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010, p.15) To improve the population’s cultural knowledge, various public cultural functions at national, regional and local levels (e.g. town/city festivals, folk festivals) have been proposed to celebrate key events (e.g. national holidays) (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, 2013).

\textsuperscript{67} The term “Latvian cultural space” is widely used in Latvian policy documents. The term is understood as meaning all cultural phenomena, peculiarities, activities, etc, characteristic of Latvia and taking place in Latvia.
One of the most successful cultural events of the past few years organised to celebrate the centenary of the Republic of Latvia was the XXVI Nationwide Latvian Song and XVI Dance Celebration in 2018. This brought together about 40,000 participants of different nationalities and attracted large audiences and aimed to unite the entire population of Latvia irrespective of ethnic origin. This large scale public event is considered to be the most important recurrent cultural event in the country, contributing to the preservation of cultural traditions and their transfer to future generations, facilitating social integration, and developing of national identity (Kultūras ministrija, 2005; Demakova, 2008).

Various measures aimed at enhancing the sense of belonging to the Latvian cultural space among representatives of ethnic minorities have also been implemented, such as projects aimed at teaching the Latvian culture and language. These projects are partly funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-country Nationals and the Society Integration Foundation.

Policy documents report survey results that suggest knowledge of the Latvian language and culture is steadily improving (Kultūras ministrija, 2017). These surveys suggest that 67% of representatives of ethnic minorities feel closely or very closely linked to Latvia. However, the results are significantly higher among older survey participants (81%); only 53% of respondents between 18 and 24 felt the same way (Kultūras ministrija, 2017).

One medium-term priority is to promote cultural literacy among the Latvian diaspora, partly in the hope of encouraging voluntary return:

“Enhancing re-emigration and maintaining identity of those belonging to Latvia and living abroad, including the development of a global network, organisation of events in Latvia, access to education and culture abroad and support measures to enhance re-emigration.” (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, 2013).

More recent policy documents, [such as Annual Implementation Plan 2017-2018 of the Guidelines for National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy 2012-2018], have sought to enhance young people’s cultural knowledge, partly through additional improvements in formal education, but also by involving young people in activities outside formal education and in voluntary work (Kultūras ministrija, 2017).
Latvian Language, Social Memory and Social Cohesion

Policy documents attach considerable weight to protecting the Latvian language, which is regarded as integral to developing a collective sense of national identity. The role of the Latvian language in Latvia and for the Latvian communities abroad is governed by several general laws and regulations (e.g. the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, National Development Plan of Latvia 2014–2020, National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy Implementation Plan 2019–2018); the functioning of language is directly addressed in the Official Language Policy Guidelines for 2015–2020 (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2014d). Policy documents (National Development Plan of Latvia 2014–2020, Official Language Policy Guidelines for 2015–2020) highlight the need to increase the use of Latvian in society by strengthening the position of Latvian in everyday communication.

They aim to promote both the voluntary return of and national identity of Latvian nationals living abroad through a combination of education, access to culture abroad, and the provision of support measures aimed at maintaining Latvian language skills. The need to extend the possibilities of social integration by developing binding forms of learning Latvian is also highlighted. The establishment of a modern, coordinated Latvian learning system for children and adults which promotes the use of Latvian in society is also a priority (Pārresoru koordinācijas centrs, 2013). The relatively large number of Russian speaking population has underpinned calls for introducing a second official language as well as for deliberations on the functioning of Latvian as the language of instruction in education. In 2012, for example, a referendum was called to seek changes to the constitution which would have seen Russian introduced as a second official language.

Alongside language, social cohesion is also considered to be affected by social (cultural) memory. The National Identity, Civil Society and Integration Policy Implementation Plan 2019–2020 states that “the social memory of Latvia’s population or its perceptions of history affect social cohesion” (Kultūras ministrija, 2018). The document highlights several important historical events from the 20th century as key to understanding how social memory affects social cohesion. Over the past 15 years, attitudes towards the events of the 20th century (the proclamation of the Republic of Latvia, the Second World War, the Soviet and Nazi occupations, the collapse of the USSR and restoration of independence) have polarised Latvian society.

Studies show that the number of language users has a significant impact on the language situation, since it is important to ensure competitiveness of the language. Results of the 2011 census show that the most commonly used language at home is Latvian, spoken by 56.3% of Latvia’s population. Russian is mostly used in 33.8% of households in Latvia. 0.7% of the population use other languages at home, such as Belarusian, Ukrainian, Polish and Lithuanian (Central Statistical Bureau data). Taking into consideration these indicators, a national language policy was developed in recent years.
These historical events and associated remembrance practices sometimes lead to confrontation between Latvians and Russian speakers based on different biographical experiences and different external sources of historical knowledge (Kultūras ministrija, 2018). Although weaker among the young, significant differences persist in attitudes towards historical events between the Latvian and Russian speaking population that determine the attitude of minorities to Latvian culture and national identity (Kaprāns, Saulītis, 2017; Cheskin, 2016).

In order to strengthen the use of the Latvian, policy documents propose promoting language digitisation through practices such as automatic translation and the use of computer technologies in language teaching.

Evidence from Eurobarometer and Multilingual Europe Technology Alliance (The Latvian Language in the Digital Age, 2012; Flash Eurobarometer/ The Gallup Organization/European Commission, 2011) suggests that Latvian is one of several EU languages, whose digitisation is underdeveloped. This is reported to reduce the use of ICT capabilities, threaten the long-term survival of the language because of the lack of language digitisation, and create obstacles to cross-border cooperation and Latvia’s economic, political and cultural integration into the EU. More generally, the Information Society Development Guidelines 2014–2020 aims to promote of the use of the Latvian language in the digital environment. The Guidelines point out that Latvian society should be provided with the opportunity to use all e-services, the possibilities offered by e-commerce, access to information and e-education solutions as well as other opportunities provided by information technologies in the official language. Likewise, an opportunity to provide quality translation of Latvian content, including that prepared by the public administration, into foreign languages should be provided (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2013).

Creativity, Social Participation, and Economic Growth
Cultural literacy is tied to the two main culturally-related vectors of Latvia’s national development: strengthening a sense of belonging to Latvia’s cultural spaces and building a “creative society” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010).

The first aspiration is assumed to emerge from the close relationship between cultural literacy and cultural and social participation. The second, according to the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, is linked to the country’s “cultural potential”, which is reported to comprise tangible and intangible cultural heritage. More generally, cultural literacy is assumed to be an essential building block of developing both creative individuals and a creative society.
The Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, for example, reports that “art and culture is the fastest way to open and develop human creative abilities” (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010). Considerable importance, in this respect, is attached to career-oriented music and arts schools available at different levels ranging from 6–7 years of age, and also to professional programmes aimed at young people aged 16 and over and for adults culminating with a professional degree.

However, the contribution of non-formal education, such as various artwork activities and cultural education programmes, is also recognised (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010) (see also Youth Cultural Literacy and Cultural Participation in Formal and Non-formal Education).

The two vectors of Latvian cultural policy (strengthening a sense of belonging to Latvia’s cultural spaces and building a “creative society”) are also reflexively linked to economic development in their own right. According to the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, public awareness about cultural heritage, for example, is reported to be instrumental in increasing foreign tourism, the development of which is emphasised as a way of realising the creative potential of society (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010). More generally, investment in education (including cultural literacy education is tied to developing “the productivity of human capital” (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010) In this respect, the transition to a “creative society” is reported to be dependent on developing the creative capacities of both individuals and working environments. The importance attached to nurturing individual creativity derives from Latvia’s status as a small country (“In a state as small as Latvia every creative person is of great value.”(Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010)).

Investment in developing creative environments is considered to add value to the creative outputs of individuals (“The bigger the investment in social and culturally-based capital, the larger the value added to their work.” (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010)) as well preserving cultural diversity and heritage, which are regarded in their own right as instrumental in developing Latvia’s creative industries and the creation of new products (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010).

Despite the reported importance of cultural literacy to the key cultural vectors of national development, policy documents have yet to either spell out the specific practices required to improve cultural literacy or apportion responsibilities to public institutions to drive the process (Vides aizsardzības un regionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010).
Youth Cultural Literacy and Cultural Participation in Formal and Non-formal Education

Latvian policy documents do not share a common understanding of the role cultural literacy plays in education and the lives of young people. As opposed to key long-term policy documents where culture is given an extremely important role for the country’s existence and for the development of society, culture plays a much smaller part in youth policy and education documents. Cultural literacy of young people has been mentioned mainly in relation to specific subjects, but their participation in cultural events is primarily interpreted as a useful leisure activity.

The Latvian Ministry of Education has proposed a “change of paradigm in education”, which aims to shift the focus of education towards a system that “stimulates imagination, intuition, emotions and creative ideas, develops critical thinking and is able to generate new visions and values.” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010). The planned changes aim to promote individual creativity and are predicated on the same assumptions that underpin Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030, which emphasise the close association between cultural literacy, social cohesion, and economic development.

“General education system has a particular role in the creation of creative society in order to turn children and adolescents into creative personalities and persons having a deep understanding of culture and its regular users. It will promote both cultural consumption and creative industries and thus will increase economic returns on culturally-based capital. By increasing their range of activities, cultural education and cultural institutions (state, local governments, non-governmental organisations and organisations of private sector, mass media) are also fulfilling social functions. Diverse forms and methods of cultural education promote social and communication skills of people, the unity of society and communication between generations, treatment of addictions, social inclusion.” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010, p.40)

In policy documents devoted directly to young people (the Youth Law, Youth Policy Guidelines 2009–2018, 2015–2020, Youth Policy Implementation Plan 2016–2020, National Youth Policy Programmes, 2016, 2017, 2018), cultural awareness and participation are relatively incidental considerations. Involvement of young people in cultural and entertainment events is noted alongside physical activities as a form of leisure in the Youth Law (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2008) as well as other youth policy documents (see immediately above).
Ideas central to the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030 (notably the assumption that developing cultural literacy is an important priority, which contributes to the development of creativity, social participation and economic growth) are largely absent. The only added value reported in young people becoming actively immersed in cultural life is that it promotes their involvement in the decision-making process (i.e. the Youth Policy Guidelines 2009–2018 indicate that active engagement of young people in cultural events help them to develop their critical thinking and participation in the decision-making process) (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2009).

The limited attention given to cultural literacy in this policy literature extends to the role of non-formal education in improving cultural literacy. One exception is the Latvian cultural canon (see above). Youth Policy Guidelines 2015–2020 recommends that this should be promoted to young people in both formal and informal education settings. To assist this aim, a digital version has been created specifically with children and young people in mind (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2014b).

Music and arts schools are treated as an important part of cultural education in Latvia. Politicians acknowledge that the preservation of these schools over time (the first music and arts schools were established during the period of the free state of Latvia (1918–1940) and were retained during the Soviet period) was an important political decision that ensured continuity of cultural education for decades (Demakova, 2008). Latvia’s music and arts schools offer quality education which is recognised in Europe and which is an important component of modern Latvian cultural education.

Recent proposals to reform education aim to introduce new content into school curricula and transition teaching to a more competence-based approach. These proposals have the potential to open up new opportunities in the field of cultural literacy and cultural literacy education. However, their implementation faces major challenges: programmes developed in a pilot project (Valsts izglītības satura centrs, 2016) and the new draft basic education standards (Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija, 2018) do not meet the requirements of teachers; there is insufficient public awareness of the nature of the reform and associated deadlines; the mechanics for introducing both the new competence-based approaches and content are reported to be vague (Latviešu valodas un literatūras skolotāju asociācija, 2018).

This is reflected in plans to involve different cultural institutions (such as libraries, “creative and interest groups”, and non-traditional cultural and educational institutions) in the organisation of cultural education. These plans envisage formal education and cultural education institutions becoming social network hubs, bringing together and co-managed by parents, trainers, learners, and stakeholders from the wider local community, including entrepreneurs, and professional and industry associations (*Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija*, 2009). The plans complement proposals for local government to assume greater responsibility for organising youth cultural life, with a specific emphasis on the availability of cultural activities in regions (*Izglītības un zinātnes ministrija*, 2009).
Discussion
Understanding the role of culture and cultural literacy in modern Latvian society in various policy documents.

Cultural knowledge and education, participation in cultural activities, and (tangible and intangible) cultural heritage have been identified as vital components of social and economic development. They are considered to be core components of national identity, promote citizenship, participation and personal development, and provide a platform for internal political stability and external security.

The relationship between cultural literacy and national identity has been examined in several large studies (Pēdējais karš: Atmiņa un traumas komunikācija, 2010; Ad locum: vieta, identitāte un rīcībspēja, 2014; Nacionālā identitāte: politiskās identitātes un politiskā kultūra, 2011). The national state research programme National Identity (2007–2018) has also examined issues relating to national identity. The concept of national identity covered in academic studies in Latvia includes the following components: cultural heritage, sense of belonging, solidarity, cultural diversity, social memory, language. Each of these components have been investigated historically and by using contemporary situation analysis. The emphasis given to national identity within government policy represents a response to the “fragmented and often contradictory identities” of the Latvian population, which, according to one commentator, is manifested in widespread disrespect of government authority and national laws, and an unwillingness to acquire Latvian citizenship (Tabūns, 2010). As one study has put it, “A large majority of citizens do not feel linked to Latvia and would prefer the nationality of another country” (Tabūns, 2010, p. 269).

Researchers have reported different reasons, for Latvians’ weak sense of national identity, including: different views amongst different ethnic groups on issues relevant to the country’s past, present and future (the different historical experiences of the Russian minority has been a key theme) and different perceptions of geopolitical identity, powerfully activated by ethnic stereotypes (Cik integrēta ir Latvijas sabiedrība? Sasniegumu, neveiksmju un izaiņinājumu audits, 2010; Atcerēties, aizmirst, izdomāt. Kultūru un identitāšu biogrāfijas 18.–21.gs. Latvijā, 2009; Sabiedrības integrācijas tendences un prettendences. Latvijas un Igaunijas pieredze. Etnisko attiecību aspekts, 2008).

Although there are no comprehensive studies on the level and particularities of cultural literacy education, there is a wealth of research into specific aspects of cultural literacy, such as social memory and history.
This research suggests that many Latvians have a limited awareness of Latvian history before the 20th century when the Latvian state emerged and the pro-western identity of ethnic Latvians were formed (Kaprāns, Saulītis, 2017). Limited historical awareness is considered to partly explain a weak sense of national identity and is reflected in a significant increase in activity related to the implementation of Latvia’s centennial programme in the field of public history (Kultūras ministrija, 2018).

An effort by public authorities to integrate non-formal cultural literacy with more formal forms of cultural education is relatively underdeveloped. The Ministry of Education and Science has, however, advocated that schools become multifunctional cultural and educational centres and that the potential of libraries and public institutions should be exploited fully to raise public competence in cultural literacy. Despite this, specific mechanisms and programmes to improve young people’s cultural literacy through non-formal approaches have yet to be developed.

In general, Latvian policy documents have no uniform understanding of the role played by cultural literacy education or how it is acquired. The concept of cultural literacy education (cultural education) only encompasses formal and non-formal education in the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia. In medium and short-term planning documents (Youth Policy Guidelines 2009–2018, 2015–2020, Youth Policy Implementation Plan 2016–2020, National Youth Policy Programmes, 2016, 2017, 2018) related to cultural and/or educational areas, cultural literacy education (cultural education) is equivalent to the country’s formal education system in the field of culture, highlighting the importance of professional (i.e. art and music) schools.

In youth policy documents, engagement in cultural activities is defined as a useful way of passing leisure time and entertainment (which could boost youth participation) rather than a form of non-formal cultural literacy education.

Delivery of Cultural Literacy Education

At the national level, cultural literacy and cultural literacy education primarily falls under the competence of the Ministry of Education and Science and the Ministry of Culture. Their activities are not always harmonised, nor clearly defined, and often overlap. The problem of developing a coherent approach to cultural literacy is further complicated by the involvement of other government departments (such as the Ministry of Welfare, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development).
There is a measure of agreement that a more co-ordinated approach between government departments will make eliminate inconsistencies within policy and enhance efforts to combine formal, non-formal, and non-formal approaches to cultural literacy education (Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, 2011).

The institutions responsible for youth cultural literacy education in formal and non-formal education are not clearly defined. In long-term strategic documents, cultural literacy is defined as “an integral part of the education system” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010, p. 98), which includes all levels (basic, secondary and higher) of vocational education related to the cultural sector, further education for specialists (e.g. teachers, musicians, artists, culture professionals), subjects covering culture in general education, and the development of creative skills of individuals in lifelong learning (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010, p. 98). However, specific activities in cultural literacy education referred to in policy documents only cover vocational education institutions with a relatively small number of pupils. Professional arts and music schools are relatively widely available in Latvia (there are 83 arts and music schools located in various municipalities). However, these are attended by a minority of young people (approximately 20–30% of comprehensive school pupils). Although cultural education can also be acquired at comprehensive schools (learning standards show that a lot of mandatory subjects (literature, languages, music, visual arts, culturology, etc.) are directly linked to the field of culture), this raises questions concerning equality of access to cultural literacy education.

This, however, is not something that can be adequately explored from general policy documents, which give little attention to cultural education and focus on learning standards and their regulations.

There is also a “guidance gap” between high-level strategy documents, which outline ambitious targets for developing cultural literacy amongst young people, and guidelines for regional/local authorities, which specify the actions necessary to implement strategy. Indeed, many national initiatives are problematic in regions and for specific institutions, since short-term planning documents do not provide a sufficiently clear picture of the feasibility of introducing cultural literacy education at formal and non-formal levels. More generally, the successful introduction of young people’s cultural literacy at regional and local levels in the specific institutions is encumbered by several factors. First, areas of responsibility and how resources should be allocated between various regional/local authorities are not clearly specified. Second, there is insufficient human resource capacity to deliver the grand aspirations of high-level planning documents.
Workloads in cultural and education sectors are already reported to be high (LETA (2016)): capacity to develop innovative projects and the competences necessary to drive cultural education forward is, therefore, likely to be limited. Third, under-funding persists despite marginal year-on-year (Centrālā statistikas pārvalde) increases in funding for education and culture (LIZDA, 2012; SATORI, 2018). This partly reflects the fact that historic underfunding of culture and education means that increases build on a weak base. The low priority given to education and culture within broader public debates relative to more pressing issues such (such as improving international political relations, defence, health care, and raising living standards) compounds the problem (LETA, 2018b). Public attention is primarily focused on short-term challenges linked to primary needs, rather than longer run goals outlined in the long-term planning documents, which is reflected in budgetary choices (LETA, 2018b).
Conclusion

Long-term planning documents in Latvia seek to base the country’s future development on a core of values that place less pressure on the utilisation of physical resources. This approach foregrounds the value (and potential) of human capital and emphasises creativity, openness to the new, tolerance and cooperation (that contributes to both cultural development and social cohesion), participation, and economic development.

“The increase in the importance of culturally-based capital has been substantially affected by changes in the global economy – reorientation from resource-consuming industry to creative industry, the basic resource and source of competitiveness of which is the creativity, imagination, intuition of a person – qualities, which are mainly created by culture.” (Vides aizsardzības un reģionālās attīstības ministrija, 2010, p. 13)

Different types of policy documents in Latvia in interpret culture, cultural literacy, and cultural literacy education in markedly different ways.

- General long-term documents consider culture (and cultural literacy) to be an important basis for the existence and development of the country. These consider cultural literacy as a means of: shaping national identity; facilitate belonging to the country and participation; provide opportunities for individual development; produce economic development; and mobilise cultural literacy as a means of securing internal political stability and external security.
- Documents relevant to youth policy refer to culture side-by-side with sports and primarily interpret cultural literacy as a type of leisure activity which can facilitate civic participation.
- Documents relevant to education highlight cultural literacy education as a type of formal vocational education offered by art and music schools.

When outlining the strategic role of cultural literacy in development, long-term policy planning documents provide a general vision with broad goals. The extent to which public authorities are able to act on this in practice is dependent on three key factors (which have yet to take effect).
• Clarification of the roles of competent authorities. These do not appear to be clearly defined and uncertainties persist both between national and regional organisations concerning their respective responsibilities and different ministries.
• Adequate funding.
• The development of detailed guidance outlining how high level objectives should be put into effect.

Tensions between different ethnic groups have been highlight within policy documents and the academic literature. These tensions are central to how the intersections between individual, national, and ethnic identities are constructed and resolved at both individual, group, and government levels. The government’s approach has been to target cultural literacy education, providing tailored activities for ethnic minority groups in formal and non-formal education. The extent to which this will reduce ethnic tensions has yet to be evaluated.

In the context of European cultural diversity, policy documents highlight the importance of Latvia to preserving and developing its identity, language, national cultural values and lifestyle. To this end, Latvian culture is presented as open to interaction with other European and world cultures with a view to facilitating mutual enrichment. As regards how Latvian culture is positioned relative to European culture, documents highlight that Latvia is part of Europe both in terms of culture and in terms of politics and economics: Latvian identity is presented as helping to constitute the diversity of European identity.
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### Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latvijas ilgtspējīgas attīstības stratēģija līdz 2030. gadam</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvijas Nacionālais attīstības plāns 2014.-2020.gadam</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunatnes likums</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunatnes politikas valsts programma 2009.–2013. gadam</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunatnes politikas valsts programma 2016. gadam</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunatnes politikas valsts programma 2017. gadam</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunatnes politikas valsts programma 2018. gadam</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noteikumi par valsts pamatizglītības standartu, mācību priekšmetu standartiem un izglītības programmu paraugiem</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noteikumi par valsts vispārējās vidējās izglītības standartu, mācību priekšmetu standartiem un izglītības programmu paraugiem</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education and Science</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacionālās identitātes, pilsoniskās sabiedrības un integrācijas politikas pamatnostādnes 2012.– 2018.gadam</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacionālās identitātes, pilsoniskās sabiedrības un integrācijas politikas īstenošanas plāns 2019.– 2020. gadam</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dziesmu un deju svētku tradīcijas saglabāšanas un attīstības plāns 2016.-2018. gadam</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvijas valsts simtgades pasākumu plāna 2017. –</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021.gadam īstenošanai piešķirtā valsts budžeta finansējuma sadalījums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elektronisko plašsaziņas līdzekļu likums</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Saeima</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informācijas sabiedrības attīstības pamatnostādnes 2014.–2020.gadam</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacionālās drošības koncepcija</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Ministry of Defence</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieviešu un vīriešu vienlīdzīgu tiesību un iespēju veicināšanas plāns 2018.–2020.gadam</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education has been constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is out specific interest for this component of the CHIEF project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy[^69], rather than refining by a specific form of document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to our research questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded all documents which</td>
<td>Were published before 1/1/2007</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^69]: For the purposes of the review, policy is defined as an authoritative statement of a proposed course, principle or codification of government action, which typically states matters of principle and focuses on action (stating what is to be done and by whom).
National Cultural/Educational Policy Review (Slovakia)
Monika Bagalová, Ľubomir Lehocký, Dušan Deák, Matej Karásek

About CHIEF

CHIEF (The Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe’s Future) aims to build an effective dialogue between different stakeholders in order to facilitate a future of Europe based on inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity. The project focuses on the production and transition of cultural knowledge in both formal educational settings initiated from above, and a variety of informal human interactions. CHIEF will contribute to understanding and enhancing cultural literacy for young people, and the project will lead to more effective use of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge. It will also help to recognise existing innovative practices and develop a new organisational model to enhance the cultural and inter-cultural competence of young Europeans.

CHIEF is funded by the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 Programme. It brings together ten partner institutions:

- Aston University, United Kingdom,
- Daugavpils Universitate, Latvia
- Institut Drustvenih Znanosti Ivo Pilar, Croatia
- Caucasus Research Resource Centers, Georgia
- Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
- Universidad Pompeu Fabra, Spain
- Culture Coventry, United Kingdom
- Univerzita Komenskeho V Bratislave, Slovakia
- The Savitribai Phule Pune University, India
- Hochschule Fuer Angewandte Wissenschaften, Germany
Executive Summary

Aims of the Review
This report aims to provide a systematic review of Slovak cultural/educational policy documents (published by government and government-associated institutes which seek to put government policy into practice). The reviewed documents address how young people acquire knowledge about cultural identity and cultural heritage, how they gain cultural literacy, and how they participate in cultural activities. The review analyses how and whether the concept of cultural literacy has been employed in the reviewed documents. Although primarily focusing on documents that address the formal educational environment in Slovakia, it also examines documents that address the non-formal educational environment.

Method
The methodology used for the review is based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, 2015). Searches were conducted between 3rd-10th September 2018 and limited to Slovak policy documents published between January 2007 and July 2018. The data (government documents) were analysed in Nvivo using the approach to thematic analysis characteristic of grounded theory. We developed a preliminary coding framework by selecting representative documents from those collated via our searches, which were read and coded independently by each member of the research team. This initial coding framework was then applied to other documents in the sample. Additional codes were added to the framework on an iterative basis and agreed during regular discussion of the research team.

Findings
Policy documents in the field of cultural literacy education in Slovakia primarily fall within the competence of two ministries: The Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport (hereafter, the Ministry of Education) and the Ministry of Culture.

There are also several, semi-autonomous, institutes and centres (hereafter institutes) working under each Ministry that implement educational policy, and publish the bulk of education policy documents (listed in Appendix 3). Most documents produced by these institutes address formal education. Teachers are not legally bound to follow the guidance in these documents (in contrast to educational standards contained in curricula and organised under State Education Programmes).
The analysed documents reflect the Reform of the Slovak Education System (*Obsahová reforma školstva na Slovensku z roku 2008*) implemented after 2008 and ongoing curricular reform, which suggests that cultural literacy is of emerging importance within the formal education system. They form a non-obligatory part of the State Educational Programme(s), which is produced by the Ministry of Education for different levels of schools and implemented by The National Institute for Education.\(^7\) The documents that address themes related to cultural literacy, cultural identity and heritage thus serve as guidance for teachers on how to employ new topics (such as multiculturalism, tolerance of diversity, and respect for minority cultures) in teaching of their particular subjects. These topics have been identified as ‘cross-cutting themes’ within State Educational Programme (to be integrated across the curricula, rather than taught as stand-alone subjects).

The first substantial finding after outlining the background is that the standard cultural literacy education, as outlined by Hirsch, is not an explicit focus of Slovak policy documents. There is no document that explicitly covers all aspects of cultural literacy education. Instead, subthemes or components of cultural literacy education are covered across different documents, which primarily focus on relevant issues such as multicultural education, traditional culture, regional education, and media education.

In respect of CHIEF’s main research concerns, the documents fall into two broad categories. The first places varying emphasis on the importance of encouraging respect for diversity, multiculturalism, and education aimed at fostering global citizenship. They focus on what is described as the ‘global dimension’ of the present, on teaching tolerance for other cultures, and issues relevant to migration.

These documents also pay a considerable amount of attention to “the education to responsible citizenship”, which translates as an acceptance of basic democratic values and a respect for human rights. In this context, cultural literacy is one of the competences developed through what is described within the documents as “global education”.

The other group of policy documents focus on the importance of encouraging respect for nation-hood, and a sense of national culture, identity heritage, and national values. These generally focus on the importance of the process of self-identification with one’s own culture, rather than on a deeper understanding of what is conveyed by national culture, identity, heritage, and values.

\(^7\) [http://www.statpedu.sk/sk/svp/statny-vzdelavaci-program/](http://www.statpedu.sk/sk/svp/statny-vzdelavaci-program/)
These documents typically refer to the term “cultural awareness”, which includes knowledge, education, communication, and promoting the development of ethnic cultural identity and cultural values in regional and local contexts through the experience of cultural heritage.

In addition, policy documents emphasise the potential within culture as a driver of economic growth. Documents contain strategies outlining the potential commodification of traditional folk culture as a part of a growing tourist industry, as well as the general promotion of Slovakia in Europe. The development of talent across the arts is considered an important part of this process. Students, in this respect, are not simply consumers of culture, but potential producers of culture on a professional level.

Key Discussion Points
The separation in policy documents between multicultural/global education and education that focuses on ethnic identity (often conceived in majoritarian terms) rests on an ontologically false distinction. Non-Slovak ethnic groups have contributed significantly to Slovak culture, a fact acknowledged in few documents. In practice, the distinction rests on a politico-ideological conceit that creates a discursive space for drawing a line between “traditional- dominant us” (Slovaks as an ethnic group rather than a civic category) and “cultural others”. This results in fuzzy, sometimes contradictory, claims within educational policy documents. Although documents about global education are dedicated to human rights and tolerance towards others, in practice, tolerance seems to be primarily aimed at other European cultures, rather than to minority cultures in Slovakia.

Another related point to discuss is the application of the theoretical concept of cultural literacy vis-à-vis the practical development of educational system and environment of education. In practice, this problem connects to the educational programme of multicultural/global education. However, the discussion may also address academic criticism of the Slovak education system, which is said to be bifacial in its application of principles of (inter)cultural literacy. Most significantly, the academic criticism targets the political constructions of cultural literacy, particularly in the context of teaching the cultural values of the majority to all pupils. There is a risk that, although politically comfortable, conceptions of culture that aim to unify and homogenise society ossify existing collective identities, rather than strengthen tolerance and mutual respect amongst various sociocultural groups.

The documents also fail to address important axiological questions. Policy documents present culture as a system of values and privilege the social value of specific cultural practices. The basis of these judgements, however, are assumed, rather than explained: criteria explaining how, according to whom, and why specific cultural phenomena are deemed valuable are conspicuous by their absence.

Conclusions
Contemporary public policy relevant to cultural literacy is framed by efforts to address the challenges of globalisation. This is reflected in recommendations aimed at promoting multicultural and global education, in which intercultural dialogue and an emphasis on awareness of traditional national/ethnic/regional to the fore. Some documents promote a constructivist approach to culture, identity and heritage, whereas others seek to essentialise all three. Our analysis suggests that the documents fail to consider the origin of perspectives on promoted forms of culture, identity, and heritage (whether, in other words they derive from the dominant groups or “from below”). This is also translated to differences between academic approach to culture, identity and heritage and the approach applied in the educational policy documents as is highlighted in the discussion part of this review.
Introduction

Aims of the Review
The main aim of this deliverable is to provide a systematic review of Slovak cultural/educational policy documents. The review aims to analyse how and whether the concept of cultural literacy has been employed in the reviewed documents. The selected documents address how young people acquire knowledge about cultural identity and cultural heritage, how they gain cultural literacy, and how they participate in cultural activities relating to youth education about cultural heritage and identity. All reviewed documents were published by either government ministries or government-associated institutes, which play a key role in implementing government policy. Consequently, documents include expressions of government strategy and guidance and methodological materials which aim to give effect to government strategy. Most documents address the formal, rather than non-formal, educational environment.

Structure of the Report
The report begins with an overview of the Slovak policy context. It then provides details of the methodology for the review, following by a summary of the main findings. The report concludes with a discussion, which situates the findings within the Slovak academic literature on cultural literacy, and conclusion, which summarises the main themes, findings and discussion points of the review.

72 By applying an identical search and selection methods, the systematic approach aims to ensure comparability of data across CHIEF countries.
Policy Context

Since its creation in 1993, the Slovak Republic has been a parliamentary representative democratic republic. Executive power is exercised by the government, led by the Prime Minister, and a President is head of state. During the period under review, 2007-2018, Slovakia has primarily been governed by the SMER ('direction') - social democracy party. After the most recent elections (2016) it has headed a coalition which includes the Slovak National Party and the ‘Bridge’ (Most-Híd) party (an inter-ethnic party that calls for greater co-operation between the country’s Hungarian minority and ethnic Slovaks). Cultural and educational policy is largely driven by the government, with non-governmental organisations advocating amendments in the legislature. The continued dominant role of the state reflects the country’s steady transition from communism. Over the past decade, SMER has placed considerable emphasis on promoting patriotic and tradition-oriented education. This has been reinforced by the inclusion of the Slovak National Party (SNS) in the present coalition, which leads the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport. Tradition centred education sits alongside an emerging emphasis on multicultural education, outlined by The Manifesto of the Government of the Slovak Republic for the period 2010-2014, and manifested in the use of ‘cross-cutting themes’ designed by The National Institute for Education (under the Ministry of Education).

73 June 2010- April 2012. After elections in 2010, the government coalition was led by SDKU-DS; an alliance of the Slovak democratic and Christian Union with the Democratic Party. After October 2011, SDKU-DU and its coalition partners were not able to form a government with a parliamentary majority, which led to new elections in early 2012.

74 "At all (school) levels, emphasis will be put on improving the education of children and pupils in the spirit of national, historical, cultural values and traditions as well as, in the spirit of knowledge and respect for civil, national and Christian traditions and values. Patriotism will be promoted through modern forms and methods of education, and lessons will be learned about Holocaust, racial and ethnic violence.” Declaration of Government (2012); http://www.vlada.gov.sk/znalostna-spolocnost-vzdelavanie-a-kultura/.


76 More on the global education as envisaged for Slovakia see under "Findings".

Two key laws govern how education is organised – (245/2008 - Zákon o výchove a vzdělávání (školský zákon; Education Act; school law) and 596/2003 - Zákon o štátnej správe v školstve a školskej samospráve; State administration in educational institutes and educational self-governing bodies Act). Both are of universal application and apply to minorities’ education. Their primary effect is to vest responsibility in the state (via the Ministry of Education and its Institutes) for setting the terms of curricula for all types of schools (state, church, and private). This extends to textbooks, which are also recommended by the state. Additional textbooks are permitted, provided the core goals of curricula are met. This state-centred organisation of education also characterises the Reform of the Slovak educational system (2008), which has a major influence of how multiculturalism and tolerance towards minority groups are implemented in educational policy documents, curricula and textbooks.

In respect of how the production and management of culture is governed in cultural policy, greater scope is given to non-governmental organisations. Notwithstanding this, the Ministry of Culture has primary responsibility for the governance of culturally-related activities. Relevant legal instruments listed on the Ministry’s website outline how the state conceives culture and, potentially, which areas are prioritised (these include: state language; preservation of historical legacy documentation, cultural heritage and librarianship; art; copyright; cultural edification activities and folk artisanship; relations with churches and religious organizations; media and audio-visual sphere; support for minority cultures). A recently established Institute of Cultural Policy (ICP) has responsibility for: analysing the impact of laws and strategies relating to culture under preparation; evaluating the efficiency of expenditure within the sectors governed by the Ministry; and formulating recommendations for future policy.

Slovakia has been significantly affected by the 2007-2008 financial crisis. However, annual GDP growth of 2.45% in the eleven year period between the years 2007-2018 exceeds the EU-28 average. Despite this, Slovak education is widely regarded as underfunded. A recent OECD report (2016) notes that the salaries of the Slovak teachers (2012) were lowest from among all OECD countries and that the rise in GDP has created space for increased investment in state education.
There are a plethora of projects and programmes regulated by the Ministry. Scope also exists for private entrepreneurship provided that the latter does not violate the general policy of the state and laws relating to culture. Cultural heritage (tangible and intangible) is currently a key Ministry priority, reflected in a considerable number of activities organised during 2018.

84 http://www.culture.gov.sk/posobnost-ministerstva/kulturne-dedicstvo--3e.html
Method

Data Collection
The methodology used for review was based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, 2015). Policy documents were selected according to the following process. We first developed a search string from the three central concepts of the CHIEF project (‘youth’, ‘cultural literacy’ and ‘education’).

This was used to search the general government website (vlada.gov.sk) and those of the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport (Ministerstvo školstva, vedy, výskumu a športu, min.edu.sk) and Ministry of Culture (Ministerstvo kultúry, culture.gov.sk), which have primary responsibility for developing policies relevant to CHIEF’s key themes and central questions. String searches at these sites were conducted between 3rd and 10th September 2018. Ninety-one documents were initially identified for preliminary review (including an eligible document from Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs) according to the eligibility criteria listed below. Later we performed manual searches of both the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Culture websites. There we found links to websites of semi-autonomous ministerial bodies (see Appendix 3), which were also searched manually (twenty-seven documents). Documents selected for preliminary review were then reviewed independently by two researchers applying the eligibility criteria with respect to the date of the document creation (2007-2018) and the explicit or implicit application of categories of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’ within the documents. Duplicates and all documents published prior to 1/1/2007, and applying solely to local, regional or trans-state levels were excluded.

Disagreements on the application of the eligibility criteria were resolved via discussion. Thirty-one documents were selected as eligible and relevant for in-depth review (Appendix 1). In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the following data were extracted from all eligible documents: department of publication, year.

86 See Appendix 2 at the bottom of the document.
Data Analysis
We selected one document from those identified for in-depth review for independent reading and reviewing by the research team. We created initial codes through discussion to create a coding matrix. We repeated this process for all documents, developing the coding matrix inductively through discussion at regular meetings of the research team.
Findings

General Findings
The educational policy documents selected for review are the result of the policies adopted by the Slovak government, which broadly seek to address contemporary global challenges. These challenges derive from the intensification of global mobility and human interactions that, in turn, affect how the cultural identity of Slovak citizens is articulated both within the cultural environment of Slovakia and internationally. Adopted policies comprise a series of strategies and concrete steps for government (for instance, The Reform of the Slovak Education System (2008), National Strategy for Global Education, 2012, or The Strategy for the Development of Culture in Slovak Republic for the period of 2014 – 2020) that provide a framework for instructions and guidance to schools, teachers, educational practitioners and cultural institutes. Policy developed in the result of collaboration between experts at (or under the guidance of) the Ministries of Education, Culture and (with respect to Global Education) Foreign and European Affairs. The involvement of a range of ministries’ underline the importance attached across-government to addressing global challenges relevant to inter-human relations, cultural identity and education.

The documents selected for review cover CHIEF’s key themes (cultural literacy, cultural identity, cultural heritage and youth participation) in the following manner. They discuss the response of formal education to the challenges of globalisation in terms of global education, ethnic/cultural identity, and culture (as expressed through cultural heritage). Non-formal education is discussed in terms of the social participation and creativity of young people.

Finally, they envisage the effects of the new, post-reform, educational policy in terms of economic growth related to cultural activities and education aimed at creating responsible citizenship.

87 A comprehensive outline of the reform and its implementation in the education system is found at http://www.noveskolstvo.sk/.
90 In addition the answer to global challenges is seen also in the laws such as Cultural-Edificational Activities Act no. 189/2015 (Zákon č. 189 z 1.júla 2015 o kultúrno-osvetovej činnosti) that led to creation of National Edification Centre, as well as the The Fund for Promoting Culture of National/Ethnic Minorities Act no. 138/2017 (Zákon o Fonde na podporu kultúry národnostných menšín).
Global Education, Ethnic/Cultural Identity, Culture and Cultural Heritage

Global Education: Targeting the Acute and Actual Problems

The ideas for the Global Education strategy (hereafter the strategy) in Slovakia, outlined in the National Strategy for Global Education (2012), have been developed through a collaboration of the Ministries of Education and Foreign and European Affairs. The methodology governing how the strategy should be taught is outlined in several guidance texts. The most important of these - ‘Global Education - Learning for the 21st Century’ - has been developed by The Methodology and Pedagogy Centre (Institution for Teacher’s Education and Training), a semi-autonomous institute under the auspices of Ministry of Education, and is specifically designed for teachers and education professionals. Overall, the materials illustrate that education is seen as a basic platform for developing civic competencies, which in turn are being progressed through reforms that focus on globalisation. In formal terms, global education (GE), according to the strategy,\(^{91}\) aims to develop an increased awareness of, and critical thinking, on global issues and encompasses global development education (education on developing countries and poverty in the world), environmental protection, multiculturalism, and the socio-politics of peace and human rights. Significantly, it explicitly seeks to change attitudes and encourage students to take responsibility and acquire what are described as the values of active global citizens.\(^{92}\)

Global development education is then particularly relevant to cultural literacy in so far as it aims to deepen understanding of diversity and global inequalities, their causes, and the problems and conflicts to which they are commonly associated. It places an emphasis on confronting stereotypes and developing practical skills that might potentially work towards positive changes both locally and globally. More generally, global education seeks to build on a number of principles relevant to civic responsibility and participation, namely: global responsibility (students’ responsibility for their actions and for others); solidarity (solidarity with people living in difficult conditions, including a willingness to help); participation (active and informed participation in problem solving and conflict resolution); mutual interconnection (awareness of the global interconnectedness of people’s and countries and the relationship between local, regional and international events); collaboration (equal partnership between economically developed and developing countries); social justice and equality (respect for human rights and equal opportunity for all); openness and critical thinking (a critical approach to information and informed decision-making); sustainable development (adapting lifestyle to conservation and improvement of environment for future generations).\(^{93}\)

\(^{91}\) Cf. ‘Definition of Global Education’ of the Strategy

\(^{92}\) Cf. ‘Goals’ and ‘Principles’ of GE of the Strategy. Also, ‘Basis for Global Education at Slovakia’.

\(^{93}\) Cf. ‘The principles of GE’ of the Strategy.
Evaluation how, and to what extent, GE is integrated into formal education is the task of the CHIEF’s second Work Package. Notwithstanding this, policy documents provide some important indicators of how GE will be integrated into formal education. These include methodological guidelines produced by the Ministry of Education and recommendations outlined by the State Education Programme for secondary education, which aim to embed ‘cross-cutting themes’ into curricula.

Methodological guidelines outlined in Global Education - Learning for the 21st Century, suggest the following competencies as GE goals: ‘the ability of pupils to express themselves at the basic level of cultural literacy\(^\text{94}\) in connection to gaining knowledge, respecting, tolerating and acceptance of other cultures; a realisation of the importance of cultural communication in students’ lives as well as in the life of the whole society and in relation to communication with other cultures; an appreciation, respect for, and acceptance of the cultural values, traditions and tastes of other people’; teaching pupils ‘solidarity, tolerance and empathy towards other cultures’.

Furthermore, the text discusses how GE goals translate to the content of ongoing curricular reform following the Reform of the Slovak Education System (2008); emphasising the importance of employing the ‘cross-cutting themes’ in the State Education Programme, and providing critical observations with regard to this employment.\(^\text{95}\)

The Call for the Seminar “Nové výzvy a potreby globalizovaného sveta vo vzdelávaní. Ako odpovedať v škole na niektoré aktuálne témny (New challenges and needs for education in the globalised world. How to address some actual themes at school)” organised under the auspices of The National Institute for Education highlights the value of education on human rights (one of the topics of Global education) and targeting rising extremism the.\(^\text{96}\) The Call emphasises employing human rights as a topic in education and aim to relate the content of education to current world events, thereby promoting the ‘global dimension’ in the schools.

---

\(^\text{94}\) Note that this is one of the rare instances where the term cultural literacy appears in the education policy documents.

\(^\text{95}\) “Also, thanks to the enthusiastic teachers the global education gradually comes to form a part of some education fields, of concrete school subjects, interest groups, extra-school activities, and school projects. However, the whole effort is bereft of the global dimension, reflection of a 21st century citizen needs for living in the globally connected world, as well as, of a systematic conception”. Suchozová , Eva (2013) Globálne vzdelávanie – vzdelávanie pre 21. storočie. Bratislava: Metodicko-pedagogické centrum v Bratislave. [online] http://www.globalnevzdelavanie.sk/sites/default/files/e._sucho_ov_tipove_vzdel_vanie_vzdel_vanie_pre_21. _storo_ie.pdf

\(^\text{96}\) http://www.statpedu.sk/files/articles/nove_dokumenty/aktuality/Program_Nove%20v%C3%BDzvy%20a%20p otreby%20globalizovan%C3%A9ho%20sveta%20v%20vzdelaniu%20vzdelanie%20vzdelania%20vzdelavanie.pdf
The philosophy underlying the seminar is as follows. The global dimension enables students to imagine (and think) how different the future might evolve, and how they might influence the formation of a fairer world; that global issues need to be understood (and made deeply relevant to) in the context of students’ local reality. The instructions note that young people are increasingly confronted with problems of social exclusion, religious, ethnic and national differences and the advantages and disadvantages of growing globalisation. Human rights education helps individuals find ways to address these problems positively and provides guidance in a mix of diverse ideas, convictions, values and attitudes in a modern multicultural society.

Importantly, while placing the ‘development of critical thinking and abilities to cope with the conflicts’ at the core of education on human rights, the Call proposes the ‘experiential teaching through activities’ to give provides a chance to participate in a much broader context. In addition, the document clearly shows that education related to the problems of a globally interconnected world is not only proposed by education policy documents, but also directly implemented by government-related bodies participating in policy-development, and through discussions among the teachers and educational professionals.

This is, for instance, evidenced by an instruction manual for schools from The Methodology and Pedagogy Centre (“Recommendation and inspirations for schools for application of global dimension in teaching, so that children will know and become active actors in making a world a more just place”). This is material for teachers that explains other published methodological materials, introduces teachers to websites exploring the education of global dimension, and provides examples of good practice in education from abroad (Czech Republic). Overall, it highlights a range of issues, such as media representations of the refugee crisis in Europe, to underline the importance of schools working with children to think about the impact of global interconnections. The aim of the recommendations is to use the global education agenda to: sensitise students to accepting the need to participate actively in promoting greater social justice, intercultural dialogue, conflict prevention, and peace; assuage new or unidentified fears that people may have about the processes of globalisation; encourage students to become responsible citizens.

97 “Young people should be offered a chance to change directly the world around themselves”. Ibid.
Another more elaborate methodological guide that addresses global education and at the same time provides methodological insights with regard to implementation of GE ideas to teaching process comes from the National Institute for Education – “Globalisation, human rights, radicalisation, extremism, migration crisis: How to react in schools to these acute and actual themes”.  

The text is divided into conceptual and methodological parts. The conceptual part links the theme of global dimension and human rights to identity formation. Identity is divided into personal and social, the former articulating the individual ‘convictions, values, and interests’, the latter articulating ‘ethnic belonging, beliefs, language and culture’. Identity is seen in plural and liquid terms: composed of identities developing over time and hence prone to change. The formation of identity, furthermore, is introduced as a result of a complex social process of acquiring culture. Culture is said to express itself as a compound of ‘convictions, standpoints and ways of behaviour shared and accepted by narrower circles of society’, as well as, it is seen as most often linked to ‘ethnic belonging’. In the words of the text: “Understanding of one’s own identity and culture means to comprehend how it has been created and changed over time. It means the realisation of that, which we have common/different with others, as well, as understanding that the differences might be beneficial”.

Linking identity, culture and global dimension allows the text to move to ‘acute and actual’ themes of radical advocating of one’s own identity and migration. Put briefly, radical and extreme advocacy of one’s own identity that harms others represents a problem that education helps to resolve. The text in the methodological part offers concrete methods for achieving this during the teaching process (non-opposing approach; dialogue and its cultivation; training to prevent and resolve conflicts; development of social skills of pupils that lead to deeper understanding of identity). With respect to migration, an openly positive approach is adopted highlighting economic development, spread of innovations and mutual cultural enrichment. At the same time ‘migration crisis’ is seen as creating negative emotions and extremist standpoints. In the round, the document concludes that the recognition and application of the global dimension to the teaching process depends on how well the intersecting notions of identity and culture are explained to pupils and how well the acquired knowledge is applied to the current problems of society.


100 Ibid. p. 3.
It seems that in the documents reviewed above, the overarching goal of GE, which translates at the general level to solidarity with and understanding of different cultures, is the prevention of extremism. ‘Extremism’, since it stands as a topic on its own, having its own agenda, and is articulated in the numerous policy documents, is not specifically addressed in this review. However, the documents reviewed indicate that targeting ‘extremism’ has its own educational agenda. This is illustrated, for instance, in the “The Conception of fight against extremism for the years 2014-2019” published by the Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic that recommends education about extremism to particular professionals (e.g. policemen, investigators) under the Ministry. It also calls for greater collaboration with the Ministry of Education, the latter having published its own “Conception”. More generally, the trend within education towards a more intensive approach to targeting extremism, is exhibited in the increased number of history classes designed for the 9th year of primary education.

A peculiar psychological perspective on ‘targeting extremism’ is found among the methodological guidelines published by the National Institute for Education. ‘Too Radical? The Process of Becoming Adult from the Perspective of Development Psychology: The Meaning of Social and Personal Development in School’. This suggests educational alternatives in order to cope with extremist behaviour of students that relate to global challenges and processes of identity creation among young people. The document conceptualises extremist behaviour as a satiation of legitimate wants in an improper manner.

To counter extremism the guidelines suggest experiential learning via several ‘experience blocs’ - ‘getting to know others’ oriented to young people meeting with representatives of different cultures; ‘ethnic diversity’ oriented to acceptance, tolerance and respect towards other cultures, which reflects the current increase of human interconnections as well as shrinking of cultures, local traditions, and regional differences; ‘diversity of lifestyles’ oriented to gaining knowledge about internal diversity of one’s own cultural space via exploring subcultures and contracultures; and ‘religious diversity’ oriented to religious tolerance and acceptance of different customs and traditions while exploring the differences and similarities between the concepts of faith, religiosity and religion. Finally, a somewhat opposing view to global dimension is found the ‘Value education at schools in the context of the Convention on the Rights of the Child’, once again published by the National Institute for Education.

101 https://www.minv.sk/?VRAX&subor=225999
102 https://www.minedu.sk/koncepcia-boja-proti-extremizmu/
103 https://www.minedu.sk/deviatci-budu-mat-viac-hodin-dejepisu/
While endorsing the ‘unchangeability and eternity’ of human rights it calls globalisation into question by contrasting (and emphasising) its disadvantages (‘unequal power, richness and poverty, violence, local conflicts, organized crime, terrorism and migration’), relative to its advantages (‘growth of knowledge, exchange of information, free trade’). The global condition of people is represented as the postmodern ‘liquid’ condition, which leads to ‘loss of identity and fear of others’. The document advocates respect for human rights as a way out of the problems brought by globalisation. It brings a different voice to the global education agenda and problematises its acceptance by education professionals.

Ethnic/Cultural Identity, Culture and Cultural Heritage
In contrast to the focus on GE present in the educational policy documents published by the National Institute for Education and The Methodology and Pedagogy Centre, another set of documents primarily produced by from the Ministry of Culture and regional government bodies highlight the themes of national identity and culture. The accent on these themes articulates another voice relating to the idea of cultural literacy education.  

‘The Strategy for the Development of Culture of the Slovak Republic for the period 2014 – 2020’, published by the Ministry of Culture, offers several insights into how culture is understood and how this understanding can be integrated into formal education. The basic premise of the Strategy is that ‘indicators of progress and prosperity of each nation are state, economy, and culture’ (p. 2). However, national culture, in its current state, is said to be in decline, which is compounded by declining public funding. The goal of the Strategy is to outline ways of arresting this decline, which map onto measures designed for formal education. In this respect, the document highlights the ‘Strategic field 1: the formation of cultural needs and demand for culture by education’ particularly in the part ‘support of collaboration of the cultural and educational institutes in the field of cultural education in accordance with the State education program’ (pp. 15-17). The goal of collaboration has been implemented in the State education programme curricula under ‘Art and Culture’ and ‘Multicultural Education’, the former being designed as a compulsory subject for upper secondary education programmes (gymnasiums), the latter as a specific cross-cutting theme.

106 Although the preservation and development of national, Slovak ethnic, culture, rather than education, is primary concern of these documents, the documents reviewed below devote a significant space to education and call for their major propositions to be implemented in school curricula.


Apart from standard education in schools, the material highlights also the importance of special art schools for pupils. Another important part of the document - Strategic field 2: preservation and access to cultural heritage (pp. 17 – 21) - links the preservation and access to cultural heritage to education, which again translates to particular curricula of the State education programme, namely for the subjects ‘Geography’ and ‘Art and Culture’, as well as for the cross cutting theme of ‘Multicultural Education’.  

Importantly with reference to the goals of CHIEF, and in contrast to social-scientific perspectives which conceptualise culture as a modus of human existence inseparable from humans,110 the Strategy interprets culture as a specific field of human creativity, articulated primarily through art and heritage (i.e. culture as movies, theatre, architecture, songs, dances ..etc). This provides a basis for the Strategy to proclaim culture as a basic ‘factor that creates identity and character of society from within and without’ and that a ‘healthy and rich culture is an important element in the creation of individual and ethnic identity’. The latter statement is linked in the document to the peculiar concept of the ‘state-constitutive nation’,111 which, in practice, is the Slovak ethnic group nationally conceived. This majoritarian and essentialistic concept is employed in the document to project the culture of the majority as a culture that (alongside with its state and economy) helps to forge constructive relations with ethnic minorities, as well as with the ‘state-constitutive nations’ of other countries (p. 2). How this is achieved is not explained. With regard to curricula, however, this potentially ambiguous idea is reflected in calls for ‘national/etnic history’ to be taught alongside ‘multicultural education’. The emphasis on the ethnic (and majoriatian) identity is further seen from the attention the Strategy devotes to the preservation of cultural heritage (identity within society) and its propagation (identity outside the society, see further below).112

111 I.e. the major ethnic group that “creates” the state, in Slovakia hence Slovaks.
112 This conceptual framework is seen also in the documents ‘The Conception of Focus and Support of Research and Development in the Ministry of Culture of the Slovak Republic (2008-2010)” and ‘The Conception of Focus and Support of Research and Development in the Ministry of Culture of the Slovak Republic (2016-2020). These, however, have very little to say on secondary education, which a primary focus of CHIEF.
The preservation and propagation of cultural heritage as an educational goal has been elaborated in other educational policy documents. For example, ‘The Education to Values of the National and World heritage’, methodological guidelines published by the National Institute for Education,\(^{113}\) attempts to enhance understanding of the values of national heritage, which is represented sees as part of the world cultural heritage.

The guidelines promote the protection of cultural heritage as a fundamental educational principle. The importance of knowing ‘the traditions of our ancestors’ is emphasised and themes for classes on heritage suggested (e.g. exploring the differences between the historical regions of Slovakia); recognising the role and importance of museums, archives, and galleries in preserving the intangible and material cultural heritage for further use.\(^{114}\)

A specific take on the relationship between culture, heritage and education is developed in another document produced under the auspices of Ministry Culture, namely ‘The Conception of Manitainance of Traditional Folk Culture till the year 2020’.\(^{115}\) Although basically designed to detail the conception of how to support, document and maintain traditional folk culture (viewed as intangible cultural heritage) ‘The Conception’ also prescribes an educational function to traditional folk culture and calls for efforts to incorporate it further into formal education. This is supported by descriptions of its broader social benefits. Traditional folk culture is said to have an inclusive character on the basis of it being created by ethnic Slovaks and minorities, and people of different religious creeds. This diversity is seen as ‘bringing feelings of fellowship and being culturally beneficial for the quality of life of the society as a whole’. It is also seen as ‘a living heritage, a source of people’s cultural identity, historical consciousness, learning, knowledge about cultural diversity, as well as a tool of tolerance and civic unity.’

The role of the state in maintaining traditional folk culture is presented as preventing social tensions and cultural conflicts among the representatives of different cultural groups. In this context, the document welcomes the decision to incorporate teaching about traditional folk culture within the State educational programme under the cross-cutting theme


\(^{114}\) This material stems from the governmental strategy that fits with the above mentioned document from the Ministry of Culture and has been also articulated in the Cultural-Edificational Activities Act no. 189/2015 (Zákon č.189 z 1.júla 2015 o kultúrno-osvetovej činnosti).

‘Regional and traditional folk culture’. It promotes its understanding at school via activities that lead to exploring regional heritage and invites various stakeholders to give pupils access to traditional folk culture. Regional government bodies also produce policies with respect to culture and education. They document the particular regional situation, analyse regional needs and suggest solutions for a particular region. One such document, produced by Žilina higher territorial unit, is ‘From cultural values to the value of culture – Strategy of the culture development in the Žilina higher territorial unit’.\(^{116}\) This seeks to promote ‘cultural awareness’ of regional cultural identity and cultural values which are deemed to have a positive effect on the relationship of youth and culture (understood as a specific field of human production, namely art). It also outlines how cultural awareness might help the discovery of other cultures, and change perceptions of cultural values, attitudes and worldviews. To this end, the document recommends intercultural dialogue via workshops, cultural events, discussions (in which young people, in particular, are encouraged to participate). A strategic document from Košice higher territorial unit, The Departure points of integration of marginalised Roma communities of Košice higher territorial unit for the years of 2016-2020\(^{117}\), addresses the integration of Roma communities in Slovak society and pays particular attention to education. The document highlights the problem of segregation of Roma communities in schools where the majority population refuse to enroll their children. While citing the law concerning state administration of the education system and school self-governing bodies no 596/2003, it proposes the concept of the ‘allocated school branch’: an educational facility established within a marginalised community to boost access to education. Significantly, the document fails to explain how such a measure helps to fight the problem of segregation.

‘Global’ Versus ‘National’ and the Understanding of the Term ‘Cultural Literacy’ in Slovak Educational Policy Documents

The failure of policy documents to explain how the core concepts of global education, national identity, culture and cultural heritage fit together brings to the fore the two mutually opposed themes that run through educational policy. These themes correspond to what may be called the Global and National aspects of educational policy. The former transgresses the local, regional, and ethnic majoritarian approach to teaching culture, whereas the latter reduces culture to Slovak ethnicity.


Both themes may be drawn on in a single document, creating ambiguity. This highlights the difficulties of employing cultural literacy as a descriptive concept and may partly explain why the term is scarcely used in Slovak educational policy documents. We only identified two examples. One document (Global education – Education for 21st century) applies the term in the Hirschian way.\(^{118}\) In the other (The Strategy for the Development of Culture of the Slovak Republic for the period 2014 – 2020) uses the term to highlights the cultural literacy of nation (e.g. majority ethnic group in Slovak terms); effectively endorsing majoritarian culture as the way to be cultured and educated. Notwithstanding this, the attention paid to global education signals that cultural literacy is of emerging importance within the formal education system, even though it may not be directly articulated.\(^{119}\) Instead, documents refer to specific components of cultural literacy (such as medial, economic, digital and political literacy) under different themes (such as multicultural education, traditional culture and regional education and media education),\(^{120}\) which, in fact, have been steadily implemented in the Slovak educational system as ‘cross-cutting themes’ after the 2008 school reform.

Non-formal Educational Environment: Social Participation and Creativity of Young People
The Need for Non-formal Education

Since 2000, municipalities have taken over responsibility from the national government for working with young people as part a general process of transferring state powers to local governments.\(^{121}\) Although municipalities are responsible for creating their own policies about how they work with young people, these are required to follow government guidelines and recommendations. Many government documents highlight the importance of improving non-formal education, because it is regarded as more flexible than formal education, which some documents consider ill-equipped to help children adapt to the demands of a rapidly economy and labour markets.\(^{122}\)

119 One of the indicators of this emerging importance is for instance the comparison of Slovak and Asian education systems made by the experts from the National Institute for Education, [http://www.statpedu.sk/files/articles/nove_dokumenty/ucebnice-metodiky-publikacie/komparativna-analyza_jul4_na-msvvas-sr.pdf](http://www.statpedu.sk/files/articles/nove_dokumenty/ucebnice-metodiky-publikacie/komparativna-analyza_jul4_na-msvvas-sr.pdf)
The ‘Strategy of the Slovak Republic for Young People for the years 2014-2020’, produced by the Ministry of Education, justifies the need to pay greater attention to the potential of non-formal education in the following words. “Flexibility, transitoriness of the systems, and the partnership of all educational providers form the basic condition of the development of an open system of education, which provides people with the necessary competences throughout their lives. Slovakia attempts to create such conditions for young people that they will be able to make use of the potential of all providers of formal and non-formal education, as well as opportunities for a spontaneous learning in order to gain competences for them being successful in their lives.”

One of the main supports for non-formal education is IUVENTA – The Slovak Youth Institute, a semi-autonomous institute affiliated to Ministry of Education. Among other things, implements national projects in the field of youth work, such as KomPrax (Competence for Practice) and PRAKTIK, which aims to enhance practical skills through non-formal learning in youth work and is supported by the European social fund. It also manages youth programmes, such as Erasmus +, and is the national partner of the European Information Network for Youth - Eurodesk.

‘The Report on Youth 2018’, published by IUVENTA, also emphasises the transitoriness between formal and non-formal education as a strategic goal of government. IUVENTA has published several documents dedicated to non-formal education, which outline various strategies and recommendations to improve non-formal activities. Some of these have been published under ERASMUS+ (e.g. ‘Inclusion and diversity right now’) and within the PRAKTIK project (e.g. ‘It is also our concern’ or "The world is diverse"). The latter promotes youth and student parliaments that should form the "roof" of non-formal youth groups, civic associations or other organisations developing activities for children and youth in the municipality or town.
In addition, IUVENTA manages programmes such as SPOTS that aim to transfer cultural activities from town-centres to the suburbs and settlements, build centres of community development, civic participation, volunteer development centres, support for formal and informal groups of citizens, etc.\(^\text{130}\)

**Social Participation and Creativity of Young People**

The basic document that sets the goal for the government to take measures in order to support participation of young people in the public matters is Strategy of Slovak Republic for Youth for the years 2014-2020.\(^\text{131}\) It sees the participation along the two dimensions: taking part in political life of society and young people being active during their free time. While combining both dimensions the document suggests consideration of electronic polling as motivational for the young people; it suggests taking legal steps to ensure participation of young people in district and local parliaments; creating funding scheme for political participation at schools of all levels, ensuring that young people are informed about the participation opportunities in the language that is closer to their understanding at the websites of the local and regional government bodies; informing young people about the actual local and regional problems and their possible solutions via social media and educational institutions. Youth creativity and social participation are widely discussed themes in Slovak educational policy documents, primarily in connection with the creative industries. The main government documents from the Ministry of Culture promoting activities in cultural and creative industries are the ‘Creative Industry Development Strategy in Slovak Republic’ from 2015\(^\text{132}\) and an action plan for its implementation.\(^\text{133}\) The Strategy urges the development of entrepreneurial skills (e.g., management, marketing, capital raising, and the overall concept of capitalising on individual creativity and talent), the absence of which is identified as a basic problem in developing the market potential of creative professions. Creativity in young people’s education in Slovak policy documents relates to improving cultural skills and social participation.

\(^{130}\) A community garden, a scientific cafe, a scientific room (interactive lectures of children’s scientists to which they are connected with the game), vernissages, exhibitions, etc. [http://www.spots.sk/sk/ospots/o-projekte-spots/](http://www.spots.sk/sk/ospots/o-projekte-spots/)


\(^{133}\) Akčný plán realizácie Stratégie rozvoja kreatívneho priemyslu v Slovenskej republike schválený uznesením vlády SR č. 711 zo 16. decembra 2015.
The links between the creative industry and culture are reflected at the activities of many artistic organisations, for example Folk Art Production Centre (ÚĽUV). One of the main priorities of non-formal educational initiatives is increasing greater participation of young people in local and regional life. Some materials associate the problem of weak participation in local/regional life with youth passivity. Young people are reported to lack belief in their capacity to bring about change and are encouraged to act when given the opportunity to change matters in their town or village.

**PRAKTIK**, managed by The Slovak Youth Institute, – IUVENTA (see above), has prompted increasing demands for more innovative approaches in non-formal education, focusing on improved training for young people (to help them transition effectively from school into employment), strengthening social inclusion, and equal opportunities in the labour market. Documents associated with the promotion of PRAKTIK project consistently link non-formal education to developing cultural knowledge, social participation of young people, and social mobility that can lead to economic benefits in the future. The documents state that many young people are unwilling to engage in activities beyond the narrow requirements of formal education (secondary school and university), despite the importance of non-formal education to developing soft skills.

**Envisaged Effects of the Educational Policy**

**Culture and Economic Growth**

Several documents connect cultural development to economic growth. This partly reflects the fact that culture is defined widely as an area that relates to all the essentials of the society. According to the Ministry of Culture, three indicators represent measures of the maturity and prosperity of nations: “the state, economy and culture in their broadest sense”.

---

134 [file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/strategia.pdf](file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/strategia.pdf)
135 [https://www.iuventa.sk/sk/Publikacie/Neformalne-vzdelavanie/Svet-je-roznorod-2015-podpora-a-rozvoj-vychovy-k-obicanstvu-a-multikulturalite-cez-zazitok.aej; as well as ‘All are different, but all are equal’](https://www.iuventa.sk/files/documents/Publik%C3%A1cie/Metodick%C3%A9%20materi%C3%A1ly/%C4%BDudsk%C3%A9%20pr%C3%A1va/150-kazdyiny_studenske_CB_FINAL.pdf)
The state, culture and economy are identified as a fundamental, interconnected systems of the creation of the material and immaterial wealth of society, which, when equitably distributed, are considered to make a major contribution to the quality of life for both individuals and society as a whole.\textsuperscript{138} To this end the Strategy devotes strategic theme no. 5: ‘Functional model of applying creativity and culture to industrial development of Slovakia.’

In addition to ‘bring[ing] partners together from the several society sectors’, the Strategy notes that, ‘the creative sector contributes to economic growth, supports employment, helps local and regional development and instigates innovation.’ (p. 29). Of all the benefits attributed to youth creativity and social participation, economic benefits are highlighted as the most important. ‘A fundamental precondition for change to improve the state of culture is our "national willingness and ability" to definitively abandon the outdated view of national culture as a “superstructure that consumes resources of Slovak society".\textsuperscript{139}

Education to Responsible Citizenship
The emphasis within Slovak policy documents on encouraging young people to be active citizens is closely bound up with producing responsible, politically literate, and historically conscious citizens. Only active citizens are considered responsible citizens (defined as exhibiting loyalty, patriotism, a sense of equity, and respect for the rule of law).\textsuperscript{140} Political literacy is promoted through formal education on democratic citizenship, which centres on developing knowledge (of, for example, the system of governance, and political rights) and attitudes and skills (thinking critically, independently, and honestly) Policy documents work on the assumption political literacy can only be achieved where young people have a deep understanding of their nation’s history.\textsuperscript{141}


\textsuperscript{140}See for instance https://www.iuventa.sk/files/sprava%20ov%20mladezi%202018_popularizovana.pdf, http://www.globalnevzdelavanie.sk/system/tdf/e__sucho_oveglob_vzdel_vanie_vzdel_vanie_pre_21_storo_je.pdf?file=1&type=node&id=780&force=; but also the above mentioned ‘It is also our concern’ and ‘The world is diverse.’.

Efforts aimed at enhancing political literacy are tied closely to educational programmes aimed at combatting extremism as discussed above. The policy documents outline education programmes relevant to the prevention of extremism and also offer young people activities and experiences that are aimed at encouraging them to reflect on the emotions they are experiencing, and to consider new ways of safe behaviour (cf. for instance the Globalisation, human rights, radicalisation, extremism, migration crisis: How to react in schools to these acute and actual themes).
Discussion

Slovak policy documents which (implicitly) deal with cultural literacy are in most cases related to the thematic framework of multicultural/global education. The same could be said about relevant Slovak academic texts, which are primarily concerned with the topic of multicultural education.

Olga Zápotočná’s representative definition of the term, describes cultural literacy as a knowledge state characterised by the ability to understand concepts which are socially relevant and to communicate meanings in a (socially) adequate way. In practice, cultural literacy is not a state that can exist or be understood in isolation from policy. Zápotočná considers cultural literacy as a useful concept for understanding how policy determines and selects specific sociocultural competencies desired of literal persons (2004). In this sense, cultural literacy is a practical application of political discourses and goals.

Despite the fact that government-organised institutions declare that multicultural education is a reaction of Slovak school system to new challenges posed by a globalised word, educational policy makers are a target of criticism of some Slovak academics, who argue that the educational system transfers the cultural memory and codes of the majority and does not respect the cultural heterogeneity of the country (See Rafael 2009: 75). This criticism highlights how formal education disadvantages children from minority backgrounds. Children gain different forms of cultural capital according to their social and cultural background, but children from non-majority backgrounds are unable to utilise cultural capital acquired in their informal environment, because schools develop cultural literacy based on dominant cultural codes and cultural capital of the majority. Peter Ondrejkovič develops this critique of formal schooling further by exploring the relationship between schooling as an institution, cultural habitus, and social stratification. According to Ondrejkovič, school and family represent environments where individuals acquire their cultural capital. He considers school as an environment where social stratification is reproduced largely because of how formal education privileges the cultural capital of children from higher social classes (2011:233).

142 *Kultúrna gramotnosť v sociálno psychologických súvislostiach* (The cultural literacy in socio-psychological contexts)
143 *Sociálny a kultúrny kapitál ako sociálne hodnoty, normy a ciele vo výchove a vzdelávaní* (Social and cultural capital as social values, norms and goals in education)
Children from lower social or minority backgrounds, by contrast, find school a relatively unintelligible environment, achieve weaker results, and thereafter are predetermined to seek the social class of their parents.

The need to create a culturally relevant educational system is a recurrent theme within the most significant academic texts. Vlado Rafael, one of sharpest critics of Slovak educational policy, claims that Slovak educational system is bifacial. To this end, he notes that although formal education, through the State education programme, directs that pupils are educated to understand, respect and collaborate with other cultures, it also acts as an institutional source of (intercultural) inequalities and social exclusion (Rafael 2009: 74). According to Rafael, with regards to culturally different groups and efforts to reduce prejudice, we can speak about two aspects of the education process.

The first concerns teaching with respect to social, cultural and linguistic differences; the second relates to teaching about social, cultural and linguistic differences (Ibid.). Rafael asserts, that this approach, called “conservative pedagogy”, is not a coincidental phenomenon, but a systematic and historically determined conception of Slovak “traditional schooling” (Ibid. 75).

In practice, this means children are typically taught the culture of the ethnic majority. Similarly, multicultural education reflects the socio-political framework within which it is situated, which underwrites a tendency to homogenise society (Ibid.). Consequently, the political utilisation of “culture” and “collective identities” within multicultural education could lead to politically desired collective identities, rather than enhancing young people’s tolerance and cultural sensitivity (2009:82).

Rafael openly doubts the ability of State School Inspection and the Methodical Pedagogical Centre to successfully and effectively introduce multicultural education to Slovak schools. He proposes that state-organised institutions should renounce their monopoly position and invite research centres, academics and non-government organisations to help redesign of the educational system so that it is culturally relevant for children from any cultural, ethnical, social or linguistic background (2009: 97).

Rafael, along with most other Slovak academics, claims that the need for (inter)cultural relevancy should be not only matter of school subjects but the entire school environment. This implies that schools should also work with the “hidden curriculum” – a term used to describe the everyday life and atmosphere of the school.
To this end, school should firstly develop the atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance to people, irrespective of their culture. As well, schools should organise events to ensure pupils encounter different cultures and participate in projects involving collaboration with people from various cultural and social backgrounds (See Mistrík 2009). Mistrík claims that this approach to multicultural education is contingent on teacher training (Mistrík 2008). Chúdžíková (2015: 13) and Bartková (2014: 74) make a similar point and note that current teacher training is not only deficient, but that older teachers who were trained in universities where conservative methods prevailed represent obstacles to effective multicultural education. General goals, rather than concrete guidance or methods about how to achieve these goals, suggests that current policy is not alert to the changes that need to take effect.
Conclusion

Overall, the documents highlight the presence of multiple voices within cultural literacy policy. This diversity not only relates to the basic division of Global-National/Ethnic, but also its components. For instance, documents relating to GE cover its approval, elaboration, implementation, and warnings about the consequences of globalisation. Similarly, the pro-national take on matters of culture and cultural identity is unevenly distributed across the documents. On the one hand, the texts emphasise the majoritarian classification upholding ethnic Slovak culture, on the other hand one may read that traditional culture is a result of multiethnic endeavors.

Cultural literacy education is not an explicit focus of Slovak policy documents. It is either referred to implicitly through different categories (like global/multicultural education) or avoided altogether. In addition, there are no clear, widely observed, definitions of essential terms such as culture, cultural identity, and cultural literacy. Although the academic literature contains more explicit definitions of cultural identity and cultural literacy, use of the latter term is still rare. Although collectively the documents highlight a number of key challenges and barriers to cultural literacy education in specific areas (and arguably provide a roadmap for future measures relevant to inter-sectoral and sectoral co-operation in youth policy) there is no strategy for cultural literacy education as such: no one document brings the full range of issues affecting cultural literacy together.

Policy documents also discuss ‘education to responsible citizenship’ in the context of references to global citizenship, human rights, and extremism. More generally, a strong emphasis is placed on the capacity of education to uphold democracy and respect for human rights (in which respect, intercultural dialogue is sometimes advocated in the context of taking a democratic approach to civic problems in society).

Youth creativity and social participation in Slovak educational policy documents, are mostly tied to economic growth and improving the positions of young people in the labour market. Young people who fail to participate in non-formal education activities are considered to struggle in finding work. Only in this the context, do the texts refer to efforts to create conditions for young people to benefit from the potential of formal and non-formal education. The significant importance in policy documents discussing non-formal education, is a call to young people, to not be just consumers, but also the producers of culture, cultural identity as well as civic activities.
Overall, in the context of considering the challenges of globalisation, policy documents encourage multicultural (or global) education. In this respect, both intercultural dialogue and an awareness of national/ethnic/regional (i.e. traditional culture) are emphasised. In short, whereas some documents promote a constructivist approach to culture, identity and heritage, others seek to essentialise them. In both cases, little consideration is given to whether the perspectives applied privilege particular (politically/culturally dominant) groups are genuinely inclusive.
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# Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Návrh Koncepcie starostlivosti o tradičnú ľudovú kultúru</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Koncepcia zamerania a podpory výskumu a vývoja v rezorte Ministerstva kultúry Slovenskej republiky na roky 2016 – 2020</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zákon č. 189/2015 Z. z.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zákon o podpore práce s mládežou a o zmene a doplnení zákona č. 131/2002 Z.z. o vysokých školách a o zmene a doplnení niektorých zákonov v znení neskorších predpisov</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strategia Slovenskej republiky pre mládež na roky 2014-2020</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Koncepcia rozvoja práce s mládežou na roky 2016- 2020</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Koncepcia zamerania a podpory výskumu v rezorte kultúry na roky 2016 až 2020</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Národná stratégia pre globálne vzdelávanie na obdobie rokov 2012 - 2016</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ministry of foreign and European affairs</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Východiská pre integráciu marginalizovaných rómskych komunít KSK na roky 2016-2020</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Košický samosprávny kraj</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Od kultúrnych hodnôt k hodnote kultúry, Strategia rozvoja kultúry v Žilinskom samosprávnom kraji</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture, Žilinský samosprávny kraj</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Odvetvová koncepcia odborného vzdelávania a prípravy žiakov na</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Akčný plán k stratégie na roky 2015 - 2017 k Strategii rozvoja kultúry Slovenskej republiky na roky 2014- 2020</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Stratégia ochrany pamiatkového fondu na roky 2017 - 2022, príloha č. 1 , príloha č. 2</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Koncepcia mediálnej výchovy v Slovenskej republike v kontexte celoživotného vzdelávania</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Národný akčný plán pre deti na roky 2013-2017</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour, social affairs and family</td>
<td>Strategic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Odporúčania, inšpirácie pre školy k uplatňovaniu globálnej dimenzie vo vyučovaní – aby žiaci vedeli a chceli byť aktívni pri vytváraní spravodlivejšieho sveta, Lúbica Bizíková</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nové výzvy a potreby globalizovaného sveta vo vzdelávaní</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Príliš radikálny, Vývinovopsychologický pohľad na process stávania sa dospelým: význam sociálneho a osobnostného rozvoja v škole, Lenka Sokolová, Miroslava Lemešová</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hodnotová výchova v školách v kontexte Dohovoru o právach dieťaťa,</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dáša Vargová</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Výchova k hodnotám národného a svetového kultúrno-historického dedičstva, Anna Bocková</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Aktivizujúce metódy výučby v globálnom rozvojovom vzdelávaní, Lubica Bagalová</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vzdelávacie programy pre žiakov s mentálnym postihnutím pre primárne vzdelávanie</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Štátny pedagogický ústav</td>
<td>Educational program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Demokratické občianstvo v každodenné školskej praxi, Klára Vranaiová</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Metodicko-pedagogicke centrum</td>
<td>Methodical recommendations for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bez barrier, bez hraníc</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Iuventa</td>
<td>Guidance for youth civic associations, informal youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Svet je rôznorodý, Podpora a rozvoj výchovy k občianstvu a multikulturalite cez zážitok, Ľuboš Marcinek</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Iuventa</td>
<td>Guidance for youth civic associations, informal youth groups and youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aj nás sa to týka- Podpora a rozvoj globálneho vzdelávania, Martin Boršč</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Iuventa</td>
<td>Guidance for youth civic associations, informal youth groups and youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Každý iný- všetci rovní, Tibor Škrabský, Jana Mihálková</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Iuventa</td>
<td>Guidance for youth civic associations, informal youth groups and youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Občiansky deficit mládeže, Politická a občianska participácia študentov na Slovensku, Ladislav Macháček</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Iuventa</td>
<td>Guidance for youth civic associations, informal youth groups and youth workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Inklúzia a rozmanitosť práve teraz</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport, Iuventa</td>
<td>Promotional material for youth, youth workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education has been constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is out specific interest for this component of the CHIEF project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy(^ {144}), rather than refining by a specific form of document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to our research questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excluded all documents which</th>
<th>Were published before 1/1/2007</th>
<th>See above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^ {144}\) For the purposes of the review, policy is defined as an authoritative statement of a proposed course, principle or codification of government action, which typically states matters of principle and focuses on action (stating what is to be done and by whom).
Appendix 3: List of Institutions

Institutions under the Ministry of Culture:

- Agentúra na podporu výskumu a vývoja
- Výskumná agentúra
- Medzinárodné laserové centrum
- Metodicko-pedagogické centrum
- Národné športové centrum
- Národný ústav certifikovaných meraní vzdelávania
- Slovenská pedagogická knižnica
- Slovenský historický ústav v Ríme
- Štátna školská inšpekcia
- Štátny inštitút odborného vzdelávania
- Štátny pedagogický ústav
- Antidopingová agentúra SR
- Centrum vedecko-technických informácií SR
- Domov Speváckeho zboru slovenských učiteľov
- IUVENTA
- Národný ústav celoživotného vzdelávania
- Výskumný ústav detskej psychológie a patopsychológie
Institutions under the Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport:

- BIBIANA, medzinárodný dom umenia pre deti
- Divadelný ústav
- Hudobné centrum
- Literárne informačné centrum
- Umelecký súbor Lúčnica
- Múzeum Slovenského národného povstania
- Národné osvetové centrum
- Divadlo Nová scéna
- Pamiatkový úrad Slovenskej republiky
- Slovenská filharmonia
- Slovenská knižnica pre nevidiacich Mateja Hrebendu v Levoči
- Slovenská národná galéria
- Slovenská národná knižnica
- Slovenská ústredná hvezdáreň
- Slovenské centrum dizajnu
- Slovenské národné divadlo
- Slovenské národné múzeum
- Slovenské technické múzeum
- Slovenský filmový ústav
- Slovenský ľudový umelecký kolektív/SĽUK/
- Štátna filharmónia Košice
- Štátna opera
- Štátna vedecká knižnica v Prešove
- Štátna vedecká knižnica v Banskej Bystrici
- Štátna vedecká knižnica v Košiciach
- Štátné divadlo Košice
- Štátny komorný orchester Žilina
- Tanečné divadlo Ifjú Szivek
- Univerzitná knižnica v Bratislave
- Ústredie ľudovej umeleckej výroby
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About CHIEF

CHIEF (The Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe’s Future) aims to build an effective dialogue between different stakeholders in order to facilitate a future of Europe based on inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity. The project focuses on the production and transition of cultural knowledge in both formal educational settings initiated from above, and a variety of informal human interactions. CHIEF will contribute to understanding and enhancing cultural literacy for young people, and the project will lead to more effective use of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge. It will also help to recognise existing innovative practices and develop a new organisational model to enhance the cultural and inter-cultural competence of young Europeans.

CHIEF is funded by the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 Programme. It brings together ten partner institutions:

- Aston University, United Kingdom,
- Daugavpils Universitate, Latvia
- Institut Drustvenih Znanosti Ivo Pilar, Croatia
- Caucasus Research Resource Centers, Georgia
- Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
- Universidad Pompeu Fabra, Spain
- Culture Coventry, United Kingdom
- Univerzita Komenskeho V Bratislave, Slovakia
- The Savitribai Phule Pune University, India
- Hochschule Fuer Angewandte Wissenschaften, Germany
Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a systematic review of Catalan (Government) and Spanish State-level policy documents covering education, culture and youth policies between 2007 and 2018. The review includes legislative documents (laws and decrees) relating to education and policy programmes and projects (e.g. the promotion of reading, plans and programmes covering culture, socio-cultural integration, and youth) of the different administrations involved.

The concept of cultural literacy is not directly translatable into either Catalan or Spanish, but is instead captured by other terminology such as “cultural education”, “cultural heritage”, “cultural inheritance” or “public culture”.

Cultural participation is understood in a limited way: as a means of accessing cultural consumption, rather than a form for creation or expression of the own youth in culture.

The documents outline several social goods attached to cultural literacy education, including: economic growth; a basis for social and personal wealth; a stronger commitment to democratic values and institutions; enhanced social cohesion and solidarity; greater respect for cultural differences.

The findings highlight the importance attached to promoting “nationalities’” own culture. This is outlined in the Spanish Constitution and reflected in projects promoting Catalan language and culture. At the same time, the need for an “intercultural framework” has been highlighted and many documents advocate the importance of community cohesion among people from diverse backgrounds.

The school curricula is organised along relatively traditional lines. More recently, an emphasis on teaching through competences has emerged as a key theme. Use of new technologies both within and beyond formal education is emerging as a relevant aspect of the government's cultural plans.

Several initiatives seek to combine formal and non-formal approach to cultural literacy education.
This reflects a consistent reference to the role of families and public institutions, such as libraries, museums and galleries, in education. Political memory (in particular, the Civil War and Francoist Dictatorship) has a presence in formal education in Catalonia and is also a key aim of the Democratic Memorial (an institution that works towards the recovery and historical reparation of the victims of the Civil War and Francoism, and promotes knowledge of the political transition in Catalonia). Cultural programmes have been advocated to develop a more comprehensive sense of culture than currently provided in formal education settings. A major programme to promote reading seeks to bring various stakeholders together including schools.
Policy Context

In Spain, the formulation and implementation of public policies in the areas of education, youth and culture are competence of the Autonomous Communities (Regional Governments) defining the State basic regulations. Therefore, Catalonia, as a nationality recognized in the 1978 Spanish Constitution, has a full competence in these areas, including legislation capacity of the Catalan parliament. The central Spanish government develops a “basic legislation” to provide a common framework for the Spanish state as a whole.

During the current period of Spanish democracy, the field of education has been one of the main political disputes between the Conservative right-wing Partido Popular and the moderate-left wing Spanish Socialist Party (PSOE). Consequently, seven organic laws of education have been approved depending on who governed in each period. The last law was the Ley Orgánica para la Mejora de la Calidad Educativa (LOMCE) (the Organic Law for the Improvement of Educational Quality) approved in 2013 during the government of Partido Popular. The LOMCE establishes the common themes and framework of the education policies but in the case of Catalonia, as other Autonomous Communities of Spain, has to develop its own legislation, always in coherence with the State law. In this area, the most recent Catalan law is the Llei d’Educació de Catalunya (LEC) (the Law of Education of Catalonia) approved in 2009. The LEC has the support of the majority of political parties in the Catalan Parliament (CiU, PSC, ERC and ICV-EUiA) with the exception of the Partido Popular. The parties that approved the LEC are representative of a large ideological spectrum in Catalan politics.

Brief Overview of the Education Framework in Spain

Beyond the specific legislation on education, the Spanish Constitution establishes that public education is provided by two types of schools: those schools depending entirely on public funding and with public ownership (most of them depending on the regional governments but some of them municipalities), and those depending on private institutions but receiving public funding (for instance, the government pays teachers’ salaries directly).

Many of these schools (called “concerted” schools) are owned by religion Catholic institutions – although an important part of the pupils do not come from practicing Catholic families - but not only.
There also few private schools without any type of public support. According the Department of Education, the distribution of compulsory secondary education schools during the course 2017-18 in Catalonia was: 580 public schools (52.8%), 489 (44.5%) “concerted” schools and 30 (2.7%) privates. This division between public and produces a dual school market situation, with the existence of a larger cultural diversity of the families in public ownership schools, and being the concerted schools a refugee for the middle and upper classes and Spanish/Catalan background. Of course, this effect varies depending on the offer of schools and courses in each location and the degree of demographic and social class diversity at the municipal level.

Despite the efforts of public administration to develop strategies on education integration, the inclusion of concepts such as interculturality in the curriculum or the consideration of diversity as a positive value, there exists an important school segregation by socio-economic level (and origin of the families) in Spain - see Murillo and Martínez-Garrido (2018) for a recent comparative study both at the European level and within the Autonomous Communities of Spain.

Young People, Non-formal Education and Cultural Policies
There is an important production of policies in the areas non-formal and leisure education in Spain and Catalonia but it is not so structured as the formal-educational laws and/or policies. These policies are a crossing combination of cultural, intercultural and youth policies in the case of Catalonia. They usually are developed through plans and programs, mainly at the local or regional levels. The Catalan government provides plans, strategies and recommendations that often can be founded in the websites created to disseminate them.

---

145 These schools are completely private without public funding support and they have their own curriculum. Many of them are international schools and, in some cases, schools that focus on the promotion of non-traditional educational methods such as the Waldorf system.
Method

A systematic search for eligible sources examining cultural literacy education, defined as formal and non-formal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage, was carried out using Google search. The policy and legislative document repositories of both Spanish and Catalan institutions (Governments and Parliaments) were searched using a research strategy developed around three constructs (‘youth’, ‘cultural literacy education’, and ‘identity’) to develop the string. Once we selected the final texts they had been analysed using NVivo coding.

Spanish Policy Documents
The research was made during September 2018. A first legal text that we have included in our analysis is the Spanish Constitution (1978), although it is out of the temporal scope (2007 to present). It establishes the basis of how education, culture and youth are considered in the legal system and in the Spanish democracy. It also mentions which competences are for the State, which for the Autonomous Communities and which are mixed competences between them. Apart of this text, a systematic search for the main legal documents related to each of the issues: youth, education and culture produced by the Spanish State has been done.

In the Spanish State, education and culture are actually part of the Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deportes (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports). In the website of this Ministry there is searching tool that lets you search for ‘legislation’ related: https://www.mecd.gob.es/portada-mecd/. From there we found statutory documents for two areas separately: education and culture. We selected those laws or legal text that mention education, culture, youth, young generations or cultural literacy in a broad sense and that can be related to our CHIEF goals.

The documents obtained are referred to the following laws, plans and programmes:

Education and culture

4. Plan de Fomento a la lectura 2017-2020 (Plan to encourage reading 2017-2020):

Youth
At the level of Spanish State, the area of youth depends on the Ministry of Health, Consumption and Social Welfare. We did not find any law or plans related to youth. The organism that is in charge of youth at the country-level is the Spanish Youth Institute (INJUVE):
http://www.injuve.es/

Catalan Policy Documents
The research was made during July to September of 2018. The starting point for the search string was three constructs central to the CHIEF project: youth, education and cultural literacy. A search was done with Google using the strings next detailed in combination with the words “gencat”, “generalitat” [referred to Catalan government]:

- Youth [youth, young, adolescents, youth & adolescent policies]
- Education [education, teaching, participation, school board]
- Culture [culture, creativity, creation, history, memory, art, cultural heritage]

Most of the documents/links obtained were related to local policies on youth, education and culture, because city councils have competences in those areas. Once we have discarded these documents, we choose a group of websites with resources and policy documents of the national/regional Catalan government. Moreover, we found websites that do not provide properly statutory/legal documents of policies, but a set of repositories of activities, resources and recommendations of cultural practices for young people. We did not considered them as a unit of analysis for this report but it worth to take into consideration this information available in Internet as a part of a broader framework of interpretation of how cultural literacy of young people is implemented in policies. These sources are mentioned in Annex 2.

To help develop our understanding of how these constructs are expressed in Catalan policy documents we examined an initial sample of policy documents created in the period 2007-2018. Afterwards, we identified the documents of interest in the official websites of the Departments of the Catalan Government responsible of policies related to youth, education and culture. As for the case of the Constitution at the State level, we included the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia, approved in 2006, as a main legal basis and source.
The documents obtained are referred to laws, plans and programmes:

   http://portaljuridic.gencat.cat/ca/pjur_ocults/pjur_resultats_fitxa/?documentId=423243&action=fitxa
3. Llei 33/2010, de l'1 d'octubre, de polítiques de joventut (Law 33/2010, of October 1, on youth policies):
4. Llei 10/2015, del 19 de juny, de formació i qualificació professionals (Law 10/2015, of June 19, on professional training and qualification):
   http://portaljuridic.gencat.cat/ca/pjur_ocults/pjur_resultats_fitxa/?action=fitxa&mode=single&documentId=696840&language=ca_ES
5. Pla de Lectura 2020 (vol.1) (Reading Plan 2020):
6. Pla de Museus de Catalunya 2030 (Plan of Museums of Catalonia 2030):
   http://cultura.gencat.cat/web/content/sscc/pla-museus-2030/documents/PMC_web.pdf
7. Pla de ciutadania i de les migracions 2017-2020 (Citizenship and Migration Plan 2017-2020):
   http://treballiaferssocials.gencat.cat/web/content/01departament/08publicacions/ambits_tematics/immigracio/Plans_i_programes/06plainmigracio_ang_2017_2020/Pla_inmigracioue_ENG_OK.pdf
Findings

Introduction
As we have already explained, the distribution of competences among State and regions implies that Spanish laws constitute the general framework in which Catalan laws are developed. Therefore, we start from a hierarchy in the approach of cultural literacy education in this context, which does not necessarily imply that public policies are applied in the same way considering the political diversity among governments. Another aspect to take into consideration concerning the analysis of legal texts is that they respond to a generic discourse and political intention but the implementation of any public policy needs an evaluation process afterwards, which is out of the scope of this report.

From a conceptual point of view, it should be noted that the concept of cultural literacy is not used literally in Catalan or Spanish languages. Strictly speaking, we should translate the concept of "cultural literacy" for others as "cultural education"), "cultural heritage" ("cultural inheritance / cultural heritage") or well "public culture" ("public culture").

Due to the wide meaning of the concept in Catalan/Spanish languages, we had to search for several sources to explore how implicitly public education policies are developed. Therefore, those laws and public policy plans that could include other related thematic areas, such as national identity, diversity, immigration, education, language and culture, cultural heritage, memoire, art and literature plans, youth plans, etc. But the fundamental laws that determine the framework of public policies, such as the Spanish Constitution and the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia, have also been included.

The search for sources wanted to establish a sufficiently broad analysis framework that would allow us to explore the different meanings of the cultural literacy concept in the sense of inheritance, culture and education. Most policy documents, except for education laws and laws or youth plans, are not specifically targeted at the young population, but contain considerations and measures that do affect them directly.

In this regard, it must be taken into account that there is a field considered "natural" of cultural education that is the school; while the documents on youth policies include just some section devoted to culture, just as cultural plans include a section devoted to youth. What we have done is to determine to what extent there are cultural policies that promote cultural literacy beyond the school, aimed at young people.
The Components of the National / Regional / Community Culture

Spain is a nation that contains nationalities and regions in its own right. The regions with their own language and culture are considered as nationalities. The Spanish Constitution (1978) establishes that the language and culture of the various Autonomous Communities (as in the case of Catalonia) is a wealth and part of the cultural heritage that must be subject to "respect and protection". The public authorities must ensure this conservation and promotion of the historical, cultural and artistic heritage of the towns of Spain. Likewise, it establishes that the Autonomous Communities will have competences in this field, so that they can act in the promotion of the culture, the investigation and the education of the own language.

Therefore, the cultural heritage is constituted in a heritage that is safeguarded by the different political actors that are part of the structure of the State, distributing the competences between government of the State and autonomous government. In practice, it is often a matter of conflict knowing who is responsible for developing a specific policy and can lead to significant conflicts, for example in relation to the memory and reparation policy of the victims of the Civil War, in which the political criteria – which is also diverse among political parties – and the way to respond to the demands of civil society is different.

Therefore, culture is understood as an element of identity in the Spanish Autonomous Communities, with a relevant role in the language of each community as the basis of this particular culture that must be preserved as a heritage: "The wealth of the different linguistic modalities of Spain is a cultural heritage that will be subject to special respect and protection". This implies, in the case of Catalonia, that the two official languages, Spanish and Catalan, are treated in the same way and conditions. However, this is an issue that has coped with a series of conflicts due to the historical distrust of Spanish nationalism concerning the use of Catalan as an official language. These conflicts have been increased in recent years and have raised numerous litigations to the Constitutional Court.

In fact, references to culture and language are one of the central themes of the text of the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia. The basic language of culture is the Catalan language, as the language of the administration and the public authorities in Catalonia, also as a language of education. It establishes the right and the duty to know the Catalan language and the Spanish language at the end of compulsory schooling.
The Catalan language immersion model was recommended in a 2008 report by the Council of Europe, as a model to follow in all of the Spanish Autonomous Communities who have their own languages other than Spanish. Very recently, in October 2018, the Catalan government presented a new language model for Catalan schools (with involvement and advice from the Council of Europe). This new model introduces ‘pluri-lingualism’: incorporating the first languages of international migrant and diaspora communities present in the region into education, along with English and other foreign languages. The model aims to treat language teaching comprehensively, and to take advantage of the language repertoires that pupils already have in their family environments in a multilingual society. How this new model will be developed and implemented is unknown, as it is a very recent proposal.

Likewise, the Catalan language is understood as a cultural heritage, like Aranese, which is spoken in a small region of the Pyrenees and the sign language, which are also official in the Catalan territory. The three languages that the Statute of Autonomy promotes are, therefore, Catalan, Aranese, and the language of signs as official languages of the autonomous community. Regarding the Spanish language, which is the official language of the State, its knowledge in the Catalan educational system is guaranteed and it is a language with a strong media and social presence, since it is the first language, as we mentioned before, of 55% of the population.

The Catalan language immersion model was recommended by the Council of Europe in a 2008 report as a model to follow in all the Spanish Autonomous Communities with their own languages other than Spanish. Very recently, in October 2018, the Catalan government presented a new language model for the Catalan school, which was advised by the Council of Europe for two years. This new model introduces ‘plurilingualism’ as the basic axis of learning, incorporating the familiar languages of migrant people in education, along with English and other foreign languages. The model aims to treat language teaching comprehensively and taking advantage of the language repertoires that pupils already have in their family environment in a multilingual society. How this new model will be developed and implemented is still not known, as it is very new policy proposal.

With regard to culture, the official Catalan documents define Catalan culture as a national culture, with its own symbolic references approved by the Parliament of Catalonia (the flag, the hymn and the national holiday), which have legal protection as well as the national symbols of Spain. The cultural inheritance is understood, then, as the one of a national culture, with its language and its own referents. This national cultural framework extends beyond the territory of Catalonia, with Catalans living outside of Catalonia or with the territories with which the language is shared (Valencia, Mallorca and South of France).
At the same time, it recognizes the cultural diversity of Catalan society, which includes Spanish language and culture, preserved by the institutional framework of the State. There is no specific policy for Spanish in Catalonia because it is understood to be developed by the State itself, insofar as it is the official language of Spain and that which all citizens know.

This speech on national culture in the Catalan case is matched by the idea of a nation made up of immigrants. In fact, at present, 35.3% of the Catalan population has born outside (17.1% in other regions of Spain, and 18.2% abroad)\textsuperscript{147}. Therefore, this is a discourse very related to the recent demographic changes in Catalan society. The Statute of Autonomy (2006) presents Catalonia as a land of welcome, which "has been done over time with the contributions of energy from many generations, from many traditions and cultures". Cultural diversity is considered as a wealth of the country, at the same time that the cultural tradition of Catalonia is claimed at all times.

Community Cohesion
The 2017-2020 Plan for Immigration and Citizenship of Catalonia establishes its commitment to a common public culture. This common culture is understood to be the result of a process of interculturality. On the one hand, it is understood, as in the Law of Education of Catalonia of 2009, that the Catalan language and culture must be the common trunk. On the other hand, the participation of immigrants, refugees and returnees in cultural festivals is fostered, as well as the promotion of the national holidays of immigrant communities in Catalonia and literature from other countries in the languages of origin through of the library network. In recent years, sports that are practiced in other countries (such as the Cricket of the Catalans from Pakistan), music, poetic festivals or other samples of popular culture (such as the New Year's Eve in Barcelona) have also been part of the cultural events of each year.

As Domingo (2014), deputy director of the Centre for Demographic Studies at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, explains, "interculturality has been defined from local management as that conception in which, once the permanence of international immigration has been accepted and recognizing".

\textsuperscript{147} Població. Per lloc de naixement. Idescat. \url{https://www.idescat.cat/pub/?id=pmh&n=674}
The differences within the diverse ethnic groups present in the territory, question the constraints that these same communities can exert on the individuals. The adopted perspective assumes ‘integration’ as "the process of becoming an accepted part of society", and makes the meeting between immigrants and non-immigrants one of the essential points in both conceptualization and management, focusing on the empowering of immigrants to participate in society and, at the same time, promoting pedagogical action aimed at the autochthonous population to break down the possible barriers and prejudices towards newcomers. It is in the context of the educational perspective carried out by the administration that we must understand the emergence of initiatives that are concentrated on the identification and dissemination of ‘good practices’ by international organizations such as the Council of Europe, Europe or the European Union (specifically with the Intercities program). 

Thus, we also find in the Law of Youth Policies of 2010 this idea of a national policy that has to take into account the richness and the social, territorial, economic and cultural diversity of Catalonia. However, the national culture on which youth policies are based is the Catalan language and culture, and the Occitan ones in the Aran Valley, which also serve as tools for the integration of newly arrived young people.

One of the concerns that of the growing multicultural Catalan society is the possible radicalization of a part of the population, also young people. This worry has become more visible after the Barcelona terrorist attacks in August 2017. In the Immigration and Citizenship Plan 2017-2020 this concern has been shown for a long time, warning that it is necessary to ensure that the newcomers “are not considered as immigrants but citizens of Catalonia”. Social cohesion should serve to manage the processes of radicalization by integrating in the common culture the other cultures in order to threaten social cohesion.

The Catalan government developed from the 2004-2005 academic year a policy of ‘reception classrooms’, which have served to make this first language learning to thousands of students who have arrived at the school with the course begun, in which it is known as "live license plate". It should be noted that in the course with more immigration, this figure reached 24,500 new students from abroad (2007-2008 academic year) and that the minimum volume has been 10,000 students over the years due to family regrouping. The reception classrooms have become a resource of the first magnitude for the integration of the students. This system has been developed mainly in public schools – with some local exceptions.

---

Thus, the educational discourse combines the affirmation of national identity with respect for cultural diversity, considering that “Knowledge and awareness of one's own cultural identity are essential keys to opening up to other cultures and recognizing what makes them unique”.

Transmission of Culture through Formal Education

Regarding formal education, the transmitted culture contains a wide variety of fields, of course. The Spanish Education law establishes that, along with the natural sciences, there are social sciences, languages (it must be remembered that there are three: Catalan, Spanish and a foreign language) and literature, mathematics, or performing arts and dance. It includes as part of the cultural background the religion electively. In addition, it is established that the Autonomous Communities can introduce other aspects in the curriculum, such as artistic education, technology, second foreign language, music, entrepreneurship, etc.

The shared culture is not explicitly defined here. The diversity of languages in Spain is recognized, which education is about to convey. The Organic Law for the Improvement of Education Quality, approved in 2013, postulates: “Students must study the matter of Co-official Language and Literature of the block of subjects of free autonomic configuration in those Autonomous Communities that have said co-official language, although they may be exempt from studying or being evaluated of said subject under the conditions established in the corresponding autonomous regulations. The subject Co-official Language and Literature will receive a similar treatment to that of the subject Spanish Language and Literature.”

Educational contents are organized around the knowledge about the different areas: social, cultural, artistic, environmental, geographical, financial, historical and linguistic characteristics of the nation, and of other nations and communities. Also, the incorporation of the arts and performances as part of the educational curriculum “regulated music studies and regulated dance studies are also classified in professional studies and higher education studies. Regulated studies for the various tracks in visual arts and design are classified into intermediate studies and advanced studies. Regulated dramatic arts studies, regulated studies in conservation and restoration of cultural heritage and regulated design studies are all offered as higher education studies”. This also includes the inclusion in the arts of the cultural and artistic traditions of Catalonia.

Musical studies and professional arts studies, which have a body of specific teaching staff to develop them.

150 See: Ley orgánica para la mejora de la calidad educativa, 2013.
These professionalizing art studies include music and dance studies, dramatic arts studies, studies in the visual arts and design, studies in the conservation and restoration of cultural heritage, language studies and sports education. However, in the Professional Qualifications Law, which includes all the vocational education in Catalonia, the cultural aspect of the training is not taken into account, although it is mentioned that training must be used to participate actively in social life and cultural.

Education is not understood solely as a responsibility of teaching teams, but also of families, which must be involved in the education of children, within the framework of the educational community and including both formal education and leisure education: “The public authorities must promote and have to promote the involvement and participation of the family in the education of children and daughters within the framework of the educational community and should facilitate and promote access to the activities of leisure education”.\footnote{151}

In the Law of Education of Catalonia (2009) it is understood that the school is the central institution of education, but this institution must be accompanied by the educational community, which includes families and institutions and local entities. “The school is conceived as an opportunity to provide new generations with a broader cultural base and improved wellbeing, on both an individual and a collective level”.\footnote{152}

Cultural Inheritance through the Other Formats
In the period studied, new communication technologies have been incorporated into the cultural background that is likely to be transmitted to school, as part of the training to express themselves. According to the Catalan Law on Education: “Notwithstanding its specific treatment in some of the subjects of the cycle, reading comprehension, oral and written expression, audio visual communication, Information Technology and Communication, entrepreneurship and civic and constitutional education will be worked on in all the matters”.\footnote{153}

In the official Catalan texts, emphasis is placed on education for communication and information technologies, which are considered fundamental for the training of people in today's society and for their job placement. Another aspect that has been incorporated since 2007 into cultural literacy education is the memory of the recent past, "as a collective heritage that demonstrates resistance and the struggle for democratic rights and freedoms."

Through the Law of the Democratic Memorial, of 2007, history and memory become a relevant part of cultural literacy education. The Democratic Memorial is an institution that works for the recovery and historical reparation of the victims of the Civil War and Francoism, and promotes the knowledge of the Political Transition in Catalonia. The tools it uses are exhibitions, research and the creation of a memory bank with audio-visual recordings that are testimony to these periods in the history of Catalonia. The pro-Franco repression, the persecution of the Catalan language and culture and the victims for ideological, conscience, religious or social reasons, exile and deportation are the subjects of study and dissemination.

This task is developed, according to the law, taking into account the plurality of memories within the framework of the struggle for democratic freedoms and respecting the different ideological, conscience, social, cultural, linguistic, national, gender and sexual orientation, among others. This preservation of memory is considered the foundation of collective freedom and democratic culture. The Democratic Memorial organizes numerous educational activities in collaboration with schools.154

The cultural plans of the Spanish and Catalan governments allow us to observe to what extent cultural literacy is constituted by aspects that go beyond formal education. Specifically, we can consult this in the laws for the promotion of reading and the intangible cultural heritage of Spain, in the Spanish Culture 2020 Plan, in the Plan for Museums of Catalonia 2030 (from 2017) and in the Plan for the Promotion of reading 2017_2020 of Ministry of Education Culture and Sports and the Reading Plan of the Generalitat de Catalunya 2020 (from 2017).

The Spanish Reading Plan is aimed especially at young people and includes reading promotion activities in digital environments frequented by young people. This plan has as an objective the promotion of the reading and the development of the reading competition between the students.

In the period from 2007 to 2017, we see that reading has been constituted as one of the instruments of cultural socialization of the population, especially in the case of children and young people. Through the Spanish Culture 2020 Plan, the inclusion in the educational context of contemporary visual arts is promoted with the opening of a web space in the Spanish Film Library aimed at young people. Also with the creation of reading clubs in schools as an extracurricular activity and involving young people and the new filmmakers in the cinematographic and audio visual production, and finally incorporating the performing arts into the school context through the participation in European education and cinema projects.

In the Reading Plan of Catalonia, reading is positioned in the context of the expansive waves of European cultural transformations. With reference to the PISA report, students in Catalonia have lost reading comprehension capacity by 2015 compared to 2012, so that a reading plan is justified that helps to increase the reading level among Catalan students.

In the laws and plans of promotion of the reading emphasizes the role of the school, doing it responsible for the attainment of the objectives that imply the promotion of the habits of reading, through its own libraries and curriculum. This is linked to the fact that the Spanish Organic Law of Education provides for the obligation of each educational centre to have a library.

As we said, the use of new technologies is emerging as a relevant aspect of the government's cultural plans. This is the case of the Reading Plan of Catalonia, which raises some online reading initiatives. Likewise, the promotion of reading among young people is channelled through consumer proposals, such as discounts and gifts from magazines and newspapers. The presence of books in the media is also promoted. It is from the few cases where we can say that government plans go beyond formal education.

More specifically, cultural literacy education is implemented in this case through various platforms and channels, such as the Internet, television, libraries, local or school libraries, workshops, meetings with authors, conferences, or the competitions that encourage reading among young people. But, above all, emphasis is placed on reading digital books.

Museums are also one of the instruments for extending culture beyond school, or just accompanying formal education in a complementary way. In the Museums Plan of Catalonia 2030 the aim is to increase cultural consumption regardless the economic possibilities of each person. It also establishes that museums are adapted spaces for all the disabled people. Therefore, the local museum is understood as a resource at the service of a community, through which it can be expressed culturally. Museums, then, are instruments at the service of the local community, of its development and its capacity for creation. Museums must also incorporate new technologies to enrich themselves as a resource and as a cultural experience. Finally, Museums are conceived as active spaces of culture and education, while serving to preserve “the heritage and memory of the country”. 155

155 See the Plan of Museums of the Catalan Government: Pla de Museus 2030.
Culture as an Ideology

What is the policy proposal concerning cultural literacy transmission? In official documents we can find different arguments describing a form of ideological discourse that connects culture with the economic and social progress of citizens and society in general. Both in the Spanish Constitution and in the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia, or in the other official documents analysed.

But there are few explicit allusions about young people. On the one hand, the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia establishes that culture must be a tool for the emancipation of young people, within the framework of equality policies. Culture is also a tool for coexistence in diversity, not only passively but also actively, promoting spaces for relationship and cultural exchange. As a culture to be recognised, Gypsy culture is specifically mentioned: “Public authorities must ensure social, cultural and religious coexistence among all people in Catalonia and respect the diversity of ethical beliefs of the people, and they must promote intercultural relations through the impulse and the creation of areas of mutual knowledge, dialogue and mediation. They must also guarantee the recognition of the culture of the Gypsy people as a safeguard for the historical reality of this people”. 156

On the other hand, in the Statute of Autonomy, the transmission of historical memory is considered as a tool for the tolerance and promotion of democratic values to prevent totalitarianism, and to promote freedom of personal and ideological choices and of conscience. In this sense, culture is linked to an emancipation function, both of people and of groups, strongly influenced by the history of combating cultural assimilation and repression suffered during the Franco dictatorship against freedom, civil rights and culture. It says: “The Catalan government must ensure that the historical memory becomes a permanent symbol of tolerance, the dignity of democratic values, the rejection of totalitarianism and the recognition of all persons who have suffered persecution because of their personal, ideological or ideological choices of conscience”. 157

As far as education laws are concerned, Spanish law states that education must contribute to social mobility and overcome economic barriers, but also to create autonomous and critical people, enhancing the talent of each student. Education must be like a valve of democracy, supported by the cultural development of society.

156 See Estatut d’Autonomia de Catalunya.
157 Ibid.
Therefore, education must serve to convey values: “personal freedom, responsibility, democracy, solidarity, tolerance, equality, respect and justice”. Education, therefore, must be used for the exercise of citizenship and to participate actively in cultural life, being prevented from discrimination.

In the case of the Catalan education law, education in three ways is considered: a) as a tool for social cohesion, b) as a civic value that must be the base to create a common culture, in which the Catalan language plays a fundamental role of social integration, and c) as a way of creating competent people to ensure the achievement of personal and collective progress. “It is the springboard that allows individuals to overcome personal, social, economic and cultural hurdles from the outset. It is the key to overcoming inequalities, making it possible to discover and benefit from all the skills and talents that society has to offer”. 158

Therefore, cultural literacy education is geared towards providing skills for children and young people. In fact, the education system in Catalonia, from primary to university, is geared towards evaluation by competencies, rather than by content. Therefore, the transmitted culture can be defined as the set of competences that allow people to “be able to develop themselves, including social and emotional skills, expression skills using the new technologies and audio visual media, and a basic understanding of the world in the areas of science, society, culture and art, with artistic sensitivity and creativity”.

Finally, it is considered as a basis for the creation of human capital, which contributes to growth of the country and to create equal opportunities “providing students with the cultural, scientific and technical qualifications necessary to fully integrate socially and at work”.

This is considered a fundamental aspect that brings to the Law of Education to establish that it is necessary to incorporate work culture and enterprise culture at school to guide the pupils to labour market.

It is interesting to observe how culture plans insist on the same line with regard to the social value of reading. The promotion of reading is considered as part of the construction of a democratic society, in which citizens have the capacity to discern in the so-called ‘information society’. Thus, reading is considered a basic piece of education and culture in the information society.

158 See the Catalan Law on Education, 2009.
Literature is identified as a referent of culture, especially from the technical and competence point of view. Reading is linked to its value as a market (promotion of the book industry) and as part of the information society. It is not considered only linked to a purely cultural or creative activity. This creative activity, in fact, is considered part of the book industry. To the extent that public policies support this industry, they also do it by authors, translators, illustrators and correctors. But the promotion of creativity is not considered as a form of cultural participation as such.

In the Reading Plan of Catalonia, reading becomes an Anglo-American stone of a free and cultured society. The culture is linked to the wealth of the country and to the acquisition of competences on the part of people, without forgetting “reading as a way of pleasure, as an escape or as a form of leisure”.

Finally, the Immigration and Citizenship Plan of Catalonia argues that the value of cultural diversity is the basis for democracy and pluralism. This diversity has to be managed through interculturalism, a formula that approaches multiculturalism, but rejects the idea of building a society with a separate set of cultural communities. Interculturality is considered a desideratum of a cohesive society around basic common features (Catalan language, for example) and without barriers caused by the diversity of family languages and cultures and religions.

Participation in Culture
Cultural participation is understood in official texts as a right of access, as an obligation for institutions itself to break barriers. Generically, it is also mentioned the promotion of youth access to culture. Culture is understood, then, as a good or commodity, as a value, which must be able to access. Not as a process in which there is creation or participation for young people by themselves. Young people are included in this cultural framework as consumers or as a social sector that needs ‘guardianship’, that is, the advice from the public authorities to access culture.

In the case of the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia, there is a step further by establishing that public authorities should promote access to the culture of those who may have it more difficult, by age or gender. In the case of women, it is explicitly stated that public authorities “must promote the recognition of the role of women in the cultural sphere”. It should be remembered that at the time of the drafting of the Statute of Catalonia was done in 2006, there was a progressive majority in the Parliament of Catalonia, which is reflected in the orientation of the articulated towards the recognition and the fight against inequalities.
In this sense, aspects such as the participation promoted by the public authorities in cultural life is one of the novelties of this new Statute, which replaces the one of 1979. This principle of participation in the cultural life can be considered that it has a high component inclusive in the measure that promotes the inclusion of specific sectors of the population that for different reasons (age, gender) have been excluded from access to culture or have not been recognized, as is the case with women. This desire to make culture a tool for social inclusion is also seen in the idea of cultural coexistence and respect for diversity, which must be promoted in intercultural relations.

Therefore, Catalonia makes a commitment not only for respect but for the interaction between people with different cultural backgrounds, which also includes the Gypsy people, as we have seen. In this sense, the Immigration and Citizenship Plan 2017-2020 establishes that immigrants are also culturally active and that they participate in cultural life with their own traditions and cultural heritage.

The participation of young people in culture is also mentioned in the Law of Youth Policies of Catalonia in 2010, which has as one of its objectives to promote the creation and cultural production of young people, both in the languages of Catalonia and through intercultural initiatives, in spaces of artistic creation and facilitating the participation of young people in the decision-making that affects them.
Discussion

The Role of Cultural Literacy in Spain and Catalonia

In the official Spanish and Catalan documents there is no idea of the transmission of cultural literacy to young people as such. In the revision of the contents in the official documents of education, youth, memory and reading, culture is included as one of the aspects that contributes to the training of people free in a democratic society, but also the concern to make culture is a tool for the creation of social capital and competitions of the new generations.

In the laws of education, especially in the content specification of the Catalan law, a vision that has to do with the consensus and conflicts derived from the Transition to democracy in Spain predominates and that is why the reference to the national culture is explained as one of the pillars of education. From Catalonia, national language and culture are considered as a heritage to be protected in the framework of a composite state, while managing diversity in the territory itself. As we have seen, in the Catalan case, the official documents on immigration and citizenship are oriented towards the inclusion of diversity in a common cultural framework.

Beyond the official documents, in practice the government of the State and the Catalan government share the areas of intervention so that the first one promotes a Spanish national culture and the second one a Catalan national culture, expressed in public institutions, the media and cultural market. This means that young Catalans have two national linguistic and cultural repertoires that are assigned in various ways and intensities depending on the family language, as well as other variables such as the network of friends, age or the place of residence.

One of the relevant factors is also the involvement in civil society organizations, which historically has played a very important role in the preservation of Catalan language and culture and linked them to social movements and the basic citizen demands, from the unions, neighbour associations to cultural associations since the times of resistance to the Franco dictatorship.


The role of memory as a cultural reference is also a very politicized role in this regard, since in the case of Catalonia it emerged from the request of the repressive and condemned entities for the Franco regime, which demanded the Catalan government to compensate for the lack of a policy of memory and repair in Spain at the beginning of the 90s. An initially recognition policy was developed that resulted, due to the pressure of civil society, in what is today the Democratic Memorial, institution which is dedicated to the dissemination of the memory of the victims of the Franco regime and the civil war. The memory of the Transition to democracy has recently been added. At this point, it can be said that the memory spread from the institutions and civil society in Catalonia is quite different from that transmitted by the Spanish institutions, where there has been no explicit condemnation of the Franco dictatorship, despite the law of historical memory approved in 2007. ¹⁶¹

In fact, from international NGOs, such as Amnesty International, but also international institutions such as the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the European Parliament, pressure has been put on the Spanish institutions to develop true memory and reparation policies for the victims of Franco's dictatorship, at the same time that it is necessary to prohibit the exhibition of Francoist symbols.

On the other hand, there is a lack of references to European culture, although in practice we know that linguistic and educational policies in Catalonia always seek the support and guidance of the Council of Europe and the reports made by the European Commission on educational matters and the learning of regional or minority languages. This lack of reference to European culture as a conceptual framework of cultural literacy may be due to the lack of a European directive on the matter. But the fact is that the official documents are often more debtors of past and political contexts than from the present moment. The only exception to this is the teaching of English in a general way throughout the entire Catalan educational system as the first foreign language.

The Importance of Non-formal and Leisure Education
Beyond the formal education area there is a whole non-formal education space, which is paradoxically not very well-known in official documents such as governmental laws and programs, but instead is one of the cornerstones of a more open culture, diverse and participative in the field of youth policies in Catalonia.

¹⁶¹ See: Ley de la Memoria Histórica (Ley 52/2007 de 26 de Diciembre).
We can review it in the set of websites that we find in the portal of the Government of Catalonia on recommendations in the cultural practices of young people and that are mentioned in the Annex 2. For instance, we find websites about culture for young creators, on training of trainers in leisure education and on tools for intercultural practices.

The educational leisure occupies an important part of the activity that, from civil society, takes place in non-formal education and can be achieved in summer in the 7,000 activities organized by young people for children and young people. In addition, the market offers extra-curricular activities (music, dance, sports, etc.) as well. However, in this case we are talking about age groups that correspond to adolescence. In the case of young adults, the Survey 2011 of Participation and Politics of Young People in Catalonia revealed that four types of young people (aged 15 to 29) based on participation: passive 26.5%, multi-activist 10.5%, institutional active 24.3%, and extra-institutional 39%. These data indicate an important involvement of young people in formal and non-formal activities of social and political participation. This is an aspect that we have not seen sufficiently contained in the official documents or in the public policies on cultural literacy aimed at young people.

The counterpoints to the official documents are the local youth plans, of which 88% of the municipalities of Catalonia have one. At the local level, these plans promote the cultural participation of young people in a concrete way and often incorporating all the cultural diversity in the sector of the most diverse society, as we have seen.

At the local level, interculturality plans are also being developed, such as the Barcelona Intercultural Plan, following the recommendations of the 4th Conference of EU Ministers on the integration of immigrants in 2010. At this conference, a commitment was made for the Diversity as a positive resource for cohesion at the level of local policies. At local level, we can find good practices of non-formal and informal cultural literacy for young people.

---

162 For instance the website about culture for young creators: http://jovecat.gencat.cat/ca/temes/cultura.
165 Enquesta de polítiques de joventut a municipis i comarques 2016. In process.
Conclusion

The official documents analysed reflect to a certain extent the approach of public policies of cultural literacy, although they are unrelated to good local practices and policies where the greatest of the initiatives of cultural participation of the young people are developed. We must start from this context in order not to confuse desire with reality, that is, the objectives expressed in official documents and public policies implemented in practice.

Having said that, it is interesting to note how the official documents focus on the country's most internal challenges and largely ignore the changes that globalization is taking, in terms of linguistic and cultural diversity, inequalities, new technologies, audio visual arts, etc. This happens especially in formal education. The exception is a document that has just been presented in October 2018 in Catalonia, which implies a change of paradigm with respect to teaching languages at school, towards an interlinguistic paradigm that values the knowledge that the students bring through their family tongues (therefore, not only Spanish or Catalan). The adaptation of the linguistic and cultural contents to the knowledge that the student has already can represent the connection of the school with the culture that goes beyond the classrooms and therefore a change in the ways of conceiving and transmitting the cultural one literacy education.

Meanwhile, national identity is the dominant paradigm. It is true that the need to respect and integrate students from diverse cultural backgrounds is considered, but it is difficult to see how this is operationalized in the classroom, beyond a theoretical discourse of respect for different cultures. With regard the cultural content transmitted by the school, there is also a clear commitment to culture as a field of creation for the young people themselves. The vision of culture is still very unidirectional and is based on very ethereal principles and very general benefits: democracy, freedom, solidarity, respect. You should see how they are specified in the school curriculum.

The school is, still today, the educational framework par excellence. That is why public policy documents focus mainly on this area to guide reading and cultural promotion policies among young people. New technologies represent a new way of leaving the walls of the school, through the online reading plans or the websites developed by the government and municipalities offering resources for the creativity of young people.
The discourse and objectives aimed at cultural participation of young people are scarce in official documents, but it is clear here that the incorporation of the internet and the audio visual world into cultural literacy will change these passive roles for the most active roles of young people.
Annex 1: Summary of the Policy Documents Analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitución española (Spanish Constitution)</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Spanish Parliament</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley 10/2007, de 22 de junio, de la lectura, del libro y de las bibliotecas (Law 10/2007, of June 22, on reading, books and libraries)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Spanis Parliament</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley Orgánica 8/2013, de 9 de diciembre, para la mejora de la calidad educativa (Organic Law 8/2013, of December 9, for the improvement of educational quality)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Spanish Parliament</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Cultura 2020 (Culture Plan 2020)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, Secretary of State for Culture</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estatut de Catalunya (the Statute of Autonomy of Catalonia)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Catalan Parliament</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llei 33/2010, de l'1 d'octubre, de polítiques de joventut (Law 33/2010, of October 1, on youth policies)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Generalitat de Catalunya, approved by Catalan Parliament</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llei 10/2015, del 19 de juny, de formació i qualificació professionals (Law 10/2015, of June 19, on professional training and qualification)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Generalitat de Catalunya, approved by Catalan Parliament</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pla de Lectura 2020 (vol.1) (Reading Plan 2020)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Generalitat de Catalunya</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pla de Museus de Catalunya 2030 (Plan of Museums of Catalonia 2030)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Generalitat de Catalunya</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pla de ciutadania i de les migracions 2017-2020 (Citizenship and Migration Plan 2017-2020)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Generalitat de Catalunya</td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Websites of the Catalan Government with resources and recommendations on cultural practices for young people

Website about culture for young creators:
http://jovecat.gencat.cat/ca/temes/cultura

E-Joventut: Virtual site with tools for the implementation of youth policies:
http://ejoventut.gencat.cat/ca/recursos/tipus_de_recurs/documentacio/

Cultural audiences. Connecting communities:
http://publicsculturals.blog.gencat.cat

CAFELL. Advisory Board for the Formation on Leisure Education:
http://jovecat.gencat.cat/ca/temes/educacio_i_formacio/formacio_educadors lleure/cafell

Training courses for a leaders of Leisure Education for youth and children:
http://jovecat.gencat.cat/ca/temes/educacio_i_formacio/formacio_educadors lleure/contingut_s_cursos

Guides on youth policies:
http://treballiaferssocials.gencat.cat/ca/ambits_tematics/joventut/centre_de_documentacio_ju venil/serveis/dossiers_tematics

Learning service programme:
http://xtec.gencat.cat/ca/comunitat/serveicomunitari/aprenentatgeservei

Catalan Youth Agency. Tools for intercultural policies:
http://jovecat.gencat.cat/ca/temes/convituer inclusio_social/interculturalitat2/recursos_professionals/
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Executive Summary

The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in Turkey. It aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within official Turkish policy, and to draw out strengths, weaknesses and tensions apparent within this.

A systematic review of 28 policy documents between 2006 and 2018 is examined using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, 2015). Thematic analysis informed by techniques of constructivist grounded theory is used.

While ‘cultural literacy’ is not directly addressed in any of the policy documents examined, matters relevant to cultural literacy and cultural literacy education are covered at length, albeit with a different nomenclature.

The findings show that policies related to cultural literacy education in Turkey have been shaped significantly by socio-economic factors which have driven policy in both inclusive and exclusive directions.

Specifically, the onset of negotiations concerning accession to the EU in 2005 coincided with a wholesale reappraisal of policies and practices within Turkey’s public administration. Governmental institutions collaborating with EU institutions influenced both the form and content of education, youth, and cultural policies. Moreover, programmes implemented in co-operation with the European Commission (such as Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci, Grundtvig, and Youth exchanges) improved opportunities for interaction and dialogue between young people from different cultures and developed non-governmental organizations’ capacity to support youth activities. Consequently, more inclusive policies on cultural literacy, cultural heritage, and cultural interactions were initiated.

However, these inclusive policies became increasingly abstract and ambiguously defined, and were associated with increasingly unambitious performance targets. This suggests that the process of policymaking became a ‘formality’ for institutions interested in gaining accession to the EU, rather than in achieving real change in the field of cultural literacy education.
In 2013, as Turkey began to lean towards more conservative and nationalistic policies and started to place less emphasis on the EU integration process, more exclusive policies on education, youth and culture are evident. Indeed, even policy documents which appear to still be informed by the principles of the EU integration process have been implemented in such a way as to reconstruct prevailing social and political tensions in Turkey alongside more explicitly exclusive, nationalistic policies on cultural literacy and cultural heritage.
Introduction

Aims of the Review
The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in Turkey. It aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within official Turkish policy, and to draw out strengths, weaknesses and tensions apparent within this.

The review (1) critically analyses official forms of cultural literacy education as these are expressed in policy, defined as formal, semi-formal and informal educational activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage; and (2) underpins the design of the empirical components of the wider CHIEF project. More information about this can be found at: http://chiefproject.eu.

Structure of the Report
The report begins with a brief overview of the policy context in Turkey. This is followed by a summary of the method used to undertake the review and then an outline of our findings. These are divided into two sections which reflect different aspects of contemporary policy-making in Turkey. The first section focuses specifically on how Turkey’s efforts to join the EU have influenced policies relating to young people, culture and education, whilst the second examines these policies in light of an increasingly nationalist trend. The report ends with a discussion of these findings in light of salient academic knowledge, and finally with some concluding remarks.
Policy Context

Until the summer of 2018, Turkey was a parliamentary representative democracy. The government, led by a prime minister and cabinet of ministers, was the primary executive power. During the period covered by this review (2006-2018), all seven governments (59th-65th governments) were formed by the Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, abbreviated hereafter as AKP). Legislation originated from within parliamentary committees established for specific issues such as culture and education. Each committee comprised members of political parties from the Grand National Assembly in proportion to their numbers in the Assembly. Once a committee had drafted legislation, it would be voted on by the Parliament, and then sent to the President for approval. Although the President could withhold approval and return it to Parliament for revision, Parliament had the right to send back the bill unamended, whereupon the President was required to grant approval.

Continual transformation of governance structures is an enduring theme of the Turkish policy context. This is evident in transformations undertaken towards EU accession, as will be discussed later in this section, but most recently major changes to the political system have been implemented. Specifically, the system of parliamentary representative democracy described above was replaced by an executive presidential system following the latest presidential election in June 2018. According to the new executive presidential system, the President now has executive and legislative power, which includes the right to appoint the cabinet and senior public officials and to issue decrees. Moreover, if the President rejects parliamentary bills, a further vote on the draft legislation is required before it can be forwarded to the president.

Four government bodies are responsible for policies related to young people, education and culture in Turkey. Firstly, the Ministry of National Education (MoNE), which has overall responsibility for educational policy, is in charge of formal education in Turkey. All public and private elementary, middle and high schools are overseen by the Ministry, and the national curriculum is prepared by sub-departments within the MoNE.

The Ministry is as such responsible for the education of almost 18.8 million students, 14.9 million of whom are in public schools with a further 1.3 million in private schools and 1.5 million in ‘open education’ – registered in the secondary education system but not enrolled in a particular school (MoNE, 2018a).
MoNE also operates through local branches all over the country, in all 81 provinces and 921 districts. The MoNE has the second highest budget of any Ministry for the 2019 term, at 113 billion TRY. This is second only to the Ministry of Treasury and Finance (Ministry of Treasury and Finance, n.d).

Secondly, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism has responsibility for cultural activities, archeological sites and museums, cultural heritage and touristic sites, activities and marketing (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, n.d.-a) The Ministry is particularly focused on preserving cultural sites, manuscripts and artefacts, as well as preserving and teaching Turkish culture for future generations. However, the Ministry’s budget for the 2019 term is much lower than that of MoNE, at 4.1 billion TRY (Ministry of Treasury and Finance, n.d).

Thirdly, the Ministry of Youth and Sports operates through a broad range of sub-departments and services focused on, for example, providing housing and student loans for university students, overseeing sport federations’ activities, and running youth centres (MoYS, n.d.). Some of the main responsibilities of the ministry are directly related to non-formal education and culture, for example in the provision of youth centres and youth camps. The budget of the Ministry is relatively higher than others, and is set at 16.4 billion TRY for the 2019 term (Ministry of Treasury and Finance, n.d).

Fourthly, the Turkish National Agency (TNA) is a public body affiliated with the Directorate for EU Affairs and oversees the implementation of the Erasmus+ Programme in Turkey in addition to wider activities related to youth and adult education, lifelong learning and sport. The TNA was created as part of the wholesale reappraisal of policies and practices within Turkey’s publication administration which was undertaken after the onset of negotiations over Turkey’s accession to the EU in 2005. The Ministry of EU Affairs was also formed at this time, although in 2018 that Ministry was re-badged as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Beyond the structure of government with regards to cultural literacy education, a final important issue in terms of setting the context for our policy review is the situation of minority populations in Turkey, and in particular the situation of Kurds. In March 2009, President Abdullah Gül stated that "very good things’ were ‘to happen" with regards to the Kurdish issue. This is referred to as the “Democratic Opening” or the “Kurdish Opening”. Democratic reforms and ethno political steps were introduced by the government within the context of the Democratic opening not only with regards to the Kurdish issue but also in relation to other minority population such as Alevi, Roma, and non-Muslims.
Due to international and societal support to Kurds, the size of the Kurdish population, and long-standing demands for socio-cultural rights, the Kurdish issue became more visible and undeniable. More specifically from 2009 to 2013, the political agenda of the AKP tended towards more inclusivity, embracing a broader social stratum of ethnic and religious groups. These groups were understood in political terms as disadvantaged members of society. Thus, the government launched initiatives aimed at these societal demands such as a right to education in their mother tongue and the opening of places of worship as spaces to engage in religious practices. These reforms were themselves related to international pressure and the process of EU membership negotiations. However, no firm steps were taken and after 2013, the democratic opening initiative had slowed down and identity-based conflicts have not been resolved especially with regards to the Kurdish Issue. Additionally, religious and ethnic diversity is increasingly ignored and disregarded. (Köker, 2010; Keyman, 2010; Gürbüz & Akyol, 2017)
Method

We conducted a systematic review of policy documents examining cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage, using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher, 2015). Eligible sources (see Appendix 1) were identified via a comprehensive search of the web pages of the following government departments/official institutions:

The Ministry of Education (MoNE, n.d.)
The Ministry of Youth and Sports (MoYS, n.d.),
The Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, n.d.-a),
Erasmus+ Programme Turkish National Agency (National Agency, n.d.).

Searches were conducted on 1-25 August 2018 and limited to Turkish language policy documents published between January 2006 and July 2018. A search string developed around the three constructs central to the CHIEF project (‘youth’, ‘cultural literacy education’ and ‘Europe’) was used:

(Youth OR young OR child OR pupil) AND (education OR learn OR participate OR knowledge) AND (art OR dance OR drama OR film OR music OR theatre OR history OR commemoration OR museum OR galleries OR libraries OR poetry) AND (culture OR identity OR heritage OR creativity)

This search did not deliver any relevant results as a consequence of inconsistencies in both the file formats used for official documents uploaded to government websites and the use of keywords to tag documents. The second stage of the search therefore involved manually searching the websites of these departments to identify eligible sources.

A preliminary search of document titles yielded 251 documents, which were then downloaded for closer review. Six researchers reviewed the documents in greater depth, applying the eligibility criteria (see Appendix 2). Each source was assigned to two researchers to review its eligibility.
The documents of the Ministry of Education were reviewed independently by one pair of researchers, the documents of the Ministry of Youth and Sports were reviewed independently by another pair, the documents of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism were reviewed independently by another pair and the documents of the Erasmus+ Programme Turkish National Agency were reviewed independently by a final pair. After this screening of the titles, 223 documents were excluded and 26 documents were deemed eligible for in-depth review with disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus. In the course of the review process, two further documents were identified and added following discussion and consensus, and as a result a total of 28 policy documents were identified for in-depth review.

According to the eligibility criteria (see Appendix 2), we intended to exclude documents published before 2007. However, we made an exception for one record, Council Decisions, issued in 2006 by the Ministry of Education.

This material was produced after the accession negotiations with the EU that started in 2005, and directly aimed to restructure the education policy of Turkey according to the requirements of the EU. It was therefore particularly relevant to understanding the role of EU negotiations in shaping the policy field.

We used thematic analysis informed by techniques of constructivist grounded theory: systematic conceptual coding, constant comparison, discourse sensitivity, attention to divergent data, and conceptual conclusions. Coding was guided by the review aims and objectives, and informed by a draft coding framework prepared by the partner team at Aston University. To identify further codes specifically related to the policy documents in Turkey, each member of the review team independently read two documents each and then these were coded by a second member of the team in order to ensure consistency of approach, with any disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus. This coding was then discussed at a meeting of the entire research team to agree the coding matrix, and regular meetings of the team were held throughout the remaining coding process to agree the addition of any new codes identified.
Findings

‘Cultural Literacy’ is not directly addressed in any of the policy documents examined. However, although the term ‘cultural literacy’ has not penetrated the processes of policy determination, matters relevant to cultural literacy and cultural literacy education are covered at length in the policy documents, albeit with a different nomenclature, and some also refer specifically to ‘cultural heritage’ to encompass archaeological sites, monuments and artefacts.

4.1. Redefining Education, Youth and Cultural Policies in the Context of EU Accession Negotiations

The onset of negotiations concerning accession to the EU in 2005 coincided with a wholesale reappraisal of policies and practices within Turkey’s public administration, which have influenced both the form and content of education, youth, and cultural policies.

The EU Integration Process and the Restructuring of Public Administration

The series of measures undertaken to restructure public administration as part of membership negotiations with the EU involved governmental institutions each developing a strategic plan (Public Financial Management And Control Law, 2006) comprising a set of objectives aimed at providing solutions to problems in policy delivery identified in conjunction with designated stakeholders. Stakeholders (internal and external) were selected on the basis of the specific responsibilities and services offered by each institution and their involvement was designed to strengthen relationships between the public, civil society and public institutions. Requiring governmental institutions to reach out to stakeholders and, in some cases, reappraise existing relationships with the public and civil society organizations represented an important step in transforming the functionalities of governmental institutions. Strategic planning involved a structured methodology, which included situation analysis, the designation of vision, mission and strategic goals, and monitoring and assessing respective implementations. Each strategic plan was required to be consistent with overall strategic goals set out in high level policy documents (MoNE Strategic Plan, 2009, p. 55; Ministry of Youth and Sports, 2018, p.32-35).

Initial expectations among government officials during the restructuring process were that, once the process was complete, governmental institutions and affairs could operate without the need for external involvement (Şentürk, 2010, p. 355-392).

Not every governmental institution or unit assumed the same level of responsibility in the Programme for Alignment with the EU acquis process.
For example, the National Agency and the Ministry of Education assumed more direct responsibilities compared to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Institutions which assumed more direct responsibilities had a stronger influence over the content of these policies. This meant that the policies developed as a result of negotiations over EU membership lacked coherence and coordination in their implementation in departments which had played a lesser role in the design process. In what follows, we focus on how different institutions approached issues around youth, education and culture in terms of overlaps and partial divergences.

**Institutional Dissemination of Policies on Culture, Education, and Youth**

In this sub-section we now examine how those institutions more directly involved in the EU integration process defined their agendas and policies during this period, before exploring the consequences of this political perspective for policies surrounding education, youth and culture.

In the context of Turkey’s efforts to accede to the EU, two EU programmes have been key to shaping the major themes pursued within youth policy: the *Education and Training 2010 Working Programme* within the scope of the *Lisbon Strategy* (2000); and the *2020 Educational Strategy Programme* (2010). These two programs and the European Union progress reports in particular determine the themes of the work that has been carried out in the field of youth. In addition, concepts focused specifically on the European educational system have come to prominence in the policies of public institutions such as *Directorate for the EU Affairs* and the *National Agency*[^1], which is responsible for liaising with the EU and ensuring the steady convergence of Turkish and EU policies and regulations.

In addition, these institutions have increasingly sought to promote the idea that Turkey is moving towards policies aligned with European ‘cultural heritage’ and the formation of a shared set of values in its negotiations with the EU. For example, it is indicated: “Regarding culture, Turkey shares the fundamental aims of the EU in encouraging the development of culture, promoting cultural diversity, and protecting cultural heritage (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2018)” In a similar vein, a report of the National Agency in 2009 demonstrates Turkey’s inclusive approach to encouraging interaction among cultures while explicating the content of the Lifelong Learning Programme that they maintain within the scope of the European Union:

[^1]: In 2002, in order to undertake the task of “the National Agency,” European Union Education and Youth Programs Unit was established at the State Planning Organization in Turkey. Now the National Agency is affiliated with the Directorate for EU Affairs.
“One of the significant goals of the programme is to improve the environment of understanding and cooperation between societies that live in different countries and different cultural geographies in Europe. Thanks to the many activities included in the programmes, people who come from different cultural backgrounds and lifestyles find the opportunity to work together, find solutions for problems, and above all share their unique experiences. In this way, the European Union goes beyond the political meetings that are carried out between governments and allows the construction of deep ties among socially and individually different nations.” (National Agency, 2009, p.9)

Similarly, this document emphasizes tolerance for different cultures in its discussion of the European Commission’s approach to youth policy:

“The Youth Programme has been implemented by the European Commission and aims to improve young European people’s sense of active citizenship, solidarity, and tolerance and enable them to have a role in shaping the European Union’s future.” 167 (National Agency, 2009, p.79)

These extracts suggest that the priorities of the Directorate for EU Affairs and the National Agency are framed strongly by the EU integration process. This emphasis was also increasingly reflected in the lexicon of other government departments. In particular, the following five key policies and policy programmes reflect this framing: Lifelong Learning and Mobility; Youth Programme; National Adequacy, Assessment and Evaluation in Education; The Development of Vocational High Schools; Equality in Access to Education.

There is also some evidence to suggest that programmes implemented in co-operation with the European Commission (such as Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci, Grundtvig, and Youth exchanges) that fall under the rubric of Lifelong Learning, Mobility, and Youth programmes are improving opportunities for interaction and dialogue between young people from different cultures and developing non-governmental organizations’ capacity to support youth activities (Kurtaran, 2016, p.183-199).

Improving the Quality of Education
When Turkey began negotiations on accession to the EU (2005), improving the quality of education was at the forefront of policy documents on membership and integration. Following decisions and plans during these years, the governments attempted to align Turkish educational policies with EU regulations.
Specific actions that formal educational institutions should take to bring legislation and administration reforms into line with EU standards are outlined, and a significant emphasis is placed on the importance of reconstructing policy with reference to EU membership and globalization.

Issues relevant to cultural literacy and heritage can be traced around five themes contained with the two key policy documents on education, the *Strategic Plan for the Ministry of National Education (2010-2014)* and *17th National Education Council Decisions (2006)*, namely: lifelong learning; mobility in education; improvements in the quality of education and training systems; developing equality, social integration and active citizenship; and creativity and entrepreneurship in each level of education.

**Lifelong Learning**

*Lifelong Learning* in the Strategic Plan is considered in the context of *non-formal education, e-learning and information society*, which are tied to helping Turkey compete with developed countries and to meet changing demands for skilled labour. Non-formal education priorities include closing the gap with EU levels of literacy and organising courses on parental education, domestic violence and women’s rights. The Strategy places an emphasis on increasing access to education among ‘disadvantaged groups’. These are identified as disabled people, girls and people from lower socio-economic backgrounds; minority ethnicity and religious groups are not specified.

Knowledge and skills are reported as key to lifelong learning and an emphasis is placed on increasing the number of socio-cultural based courses, cooperation between stakeholders (including NGOs), and learning a foreign language (in order to meet the demands of contemporary labour markets).

In effect, the tone of this section of the plan can be best described as promoting *neo-liberal subjectivity* by implementing a set of reforms\(^\text{168}\) aimed at catching up with developed countries, and constructing a neo-liberal subject who must learn a foreign language for the logic of profit. In Turkey, promoting private schools or the privatization of schools, learning a language, reaching the international standards such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment), and making technological investments in education are a set of discourses that create the knowledge economy.

\(^{168}\) Especially since the AKP has come to power, the Turkish education system is in a permanent “reforms” process with each changing minister of education.
Lifelong education is intended to be income-generating and is assumed to provide opportunities for idealized neo-liberal subjects to advance their socio-economic capital. Such idealized subjects are thought of as “creative”, “entrepreneurial” and able to learn a foreign language to EU standards. Strategic targets reinforce this by focusing on numbers of courses, individuals, and decision-making protocols with NGOs. For example, strategic target 10.1 involves increasing the number of income-generating courses and the number of field/branch course modules according to the needs of the labour market (MoNE, 2009, p.142) The content of courses are not detailed and issues of quality are ignored.

*Improving Education via Technology*

The STEM education\(^{169}\) report (2016) provides an intriguing example through which to grasp the ideas of “qualified individuals” and “quality education” in the educational context through a focus on technology\(^{170}\).

This report emphasizes that students from kindergarten to higher education need to be encouraged to study in the engineering and science departments of universities, and that they should be exposed to recent developments in science and technology. The report aims at arousing students’ interest in science, technology, engineering and mathematics both for “production, research and development, innovation and the development of technical infrastructure, and closing the gap in the qualified workforce” (MoNE, 2016, p.13). The government also promotes STEM in order to gain “universal literacy skills” and “entrepreneurship” for students in terms of competing with developed countries. It is stated that “[d]eveloped countries gave up content-based education systems after the industrial revolution and they aim to base their education system on STEM education” (MoNE, 2016, p.14).

\(^{169}\) STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) education is modeled by the Ministry of National Education in Turkey based on the U.S. and European educational approaches to science and technology.

\(^{170}\) Many experts purported that the FATIH Project was a misstep considering its technical and financial impossibility. However, tablet computers provided by the FATIH Project were limited only to pilot schools and the project seems not likely to be optimally applicable. After all, in 2017, the government affirmed that it was not possible to supply the tablets for all students and changed the discourse as the government is planning to supply laptops, so it is not wrong to say the project is becoming obsolete and may terminate largely due to economic reasons.
The implementation of STEM education in curricula at the national level is supported by the FATIH (Turcano, 2013) project which supplies technological materials and tools such as smart and interactive boards, tablets, and an Educational Informatics Network (EBA). It is noted that “[t]hat's why we think that the FATIH Project and the EBA set a suitable ground for STEM education” (MoNE, 2016, p.50). By the same token, the 10th Development Plan of Turkey highlights that there is a need to increase employment in the private sector under the heading of “Science, Technology and Innovation” in article 623. (Ministry of Development, 2013, p.97). Implicit within that plan is a technological investment that addresses the resurgence of education via technology by improving technological skills and technology adaptation. It shows that technology is a priority, and this rhetoric is applied to the global education system via technology both for competing with developed countries and for contributing to the advancement of society. It is clear that the discourse of ‘today’s globalized world’, and its potential impact on education, is taken as an economic priority per se, rather than rendering a social and cultural uplift in Turkey’s educational context. In other words, education is instrumentalized in terms of developing humans as economic resources for economic investment.

*Foreign Language and Mobility*

Learning a foreign language is also promoted as a part of the EU integration process and linked with economy and global competition. Although learning a foreign language is promoted and supported by government, “Turkish as a foreign language” appears as another emphasis under the goal of establishing a national language policy. Turkish as a foreign language is directed at individuals who live abroad and are the citizens of Turkic Republics. It involves cultural workshops conducted in Turkic Republics and related communities, focusing on Turkish language and Turkish cultural values. However, this means that popularizing and preserving Turkish culture and language is emphasized in contrast to the wider European emphasis associated with EU integration processes. In this way, ‘international relations’ is limited to Turkic Republics and to activities which present, popularize and preserve Turkish language and culture.

171 The project's acronymic title, FATIH (which stands for Fırsatları Artırma ve Teknolojiyi İyileştirme Hareketi, or 'Movement to Increase Opportunities and Technology'), deliberately recalls the conqueror of Istanbul, Fatih Sultan Mehmet. Speaking at the project's inauguration, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan noted that, “As Fatih Sultan Mehmet ended the Middle Ages and started a new era with the conquering of Istanbul in 1453, today we ended a dark age in education and started a new era, an era of information technology in Turkish education, with the FATIH project.”
These issues are also reported in 17th Council decisions (2006) in a similar manner within the scope of “mobility in education.” Mobility is a key issue within the policy literature of the AKP, although its emphasis is not confined to the EU (“[m]obility is to be intended not only to EU countries but also to all countries considering globalisation and our country’s relations.” (MoNE, 2006, p.7) Significantly, mobility is proposed or redefined in terms of cultural literacy and cultural heritage. Firstly, mobility to EU countries “exclusively” is understood as problematic and so mobility to all countries worldwide to make contact with other cultures is emphasized; however, these other cultures are unexplained by the government thereby rendering the issue opaque. Secondly, mobility is conflated with people who live abroad and conduct their education according to the Turkish language Turkish culture and Turkish beliefs, meaning that it is narrower than the initial globalized definition suggests.

Youth and Social Participation
The Ministry of Youth and Sports has also played a major role in developing policies relevant to young people’s participation in various activities outside of the formal education system. This ministry used to be a directorate operating under the Ministry of Education until its foundation in 2011.

This development itself could be considered as an indicator for the increasing attention directed towards young people in policy-making terms (Ministry of Development, 2013, p. 41). Following the establishment of the ministry more policies focusing on young people have started to be introduced. These policies have sought to introduce a wide range of activities related to cultural literacy education and their development has involved a cross-section of stakeholders. For instance, policies aimed at ‘disadvantaged young people’ have also been introduced in detail for the first time. On the other hand, as is indicated below, the policies and approaches in the policy documents do not overlap and sometimes contradict with each other. During the process in which these policy articles were determined, it seems that different stakeholders were more effective in the determination of certain policy agendas than others.

The Ministry has responsibility for youth centres, youth camps, youth activities, and youth grant programmes, which have opened up new spaces for young people that provide a platform for their participation in civil society (Kurtaran, 2016, p. 191-194).

173 This policy is confirmed in the 10th Development Plan with the following words: ‘New ministries were founded and strategy documents were prepared for the introduction and dissemination of services addressing young people and children with a holistic approach.’ (2013: 41)
The Ministry’s first strategic plan outlined a goal of increasing the number of youth centres and camps as a key target. The initiative is couched in terms of empowerment (MoYS, 2012, p. 41-44), which is to be achieved through a combination of providing greater structure for young people’s leisure time, equipping them with a range of preferred skills, aiding their personal development, and helping them to become outward looking, active and constructive citizens.

“Ensuring that young people become pro-active citizens and use their leisure time effectively; equipping young people with pedagogic, social, cultural, artistic and sportive skills; contributing to their development in individualistic and social terms, making sure that they internalise ethical and humanistic values, preventing their involvement with violent and malevolent habits, organising national and international events, founding Youth Camps and Youth Centers and increasing the effectiveness of these camps and centers” (MoYS, 2012, p.41).

In addition to improving the quality of centres and camps, the strategy aims to roll them out nationwide to ensure that they are widely accessible. Data indicate that the growth in the number of youth centres and camps has been significant and that growth has been widely spread geographically (MoYS 2012, p. 98; MoYS, 2018, p. 214). The number of youth centres alone has increased from 16 in 2011 to 313 in 2017 (MoYS, 2018, p.76-77).

The youth centres are designed to be accessible to disadvantaged young people; however, performance indicators used to evaluate the strategy suggest that the definition of ‘disadvantaged’ is limited to young people who live with disabilities. (MoYS, 2012 p.43). While the camps were initially mixed gender, separate camps for boys and girls were put in place in 2012 (Kurtaran, 2016, p. 192).

174 In addition, mobile youth centers have been deployed for those who live in rural areas and industrial zones without access to the young centers. With the 3 million Euro worth grants provided to the Youth Projects Support Program, youth centers in Eastern-Southeastern provinces and mobile youth centers have been supported . In its initial stage, when the Ministry has provided the first grants, the money allocated for the same grant for the same region was approximately 300.000 Euros).

175 For example, as a performance indicator: ‘PG 1.8.1. Number of camps that are made to be suitable for disadvantaged young people, PG 1.8.2 Number of centers that are made to be suitable for disadvantaged young people’
Institutional goals aimed at including young people in decision-making processes relevant to projects and policies, working with internal and external stakeholders and emphasizing the value of collaboration between public, private and civil organisations which work on issues related to youth indicate a commitment to participatory and collaborative modes of governance (MoYS, 2012, p.45-48). These innovations are consistent with general guidance provided in the National Youth and Sports Policy Document (2013), which is aimed at all stakeholders of programmes, projects and initiatives related to youth and sports. The importance the document places on collaboration is not immediately apparent from its core concerns (education and lifelong learning, ethics and humanistic values, employment, entrepreneurship and occupational training, disadvantaged young people and social inclusion, health and environment’, ‘democratic participation and citizenship awareness, culture and arts, intercultural dialogue among international youth). However, closer inspection of the document’s discussion of one of these key concerns, ‘Ethics and Humanistic Values’, highlights the perceived impact of globalisation in corroding moral and humanistic values.

“Turkey has a rich history and cultural heritage with respect to ethics and humanistic values. Also, with the increasing pace of social change and transformation as a result of globalization in 21st century and the emergence of a chaotic environment in terms of values and issues related to multidimensional socialisation paved the ways for corrosion and degeneration in our moral and humanistic values; and consequentially harmed the social fabric, solidarity and union spirit. Such degeneration in value systems first and foremost affects young people. One of the most important issues of society is the issue of not being able to transmit, adopt and sustain the rich moral and humanistic values which aggrandise human beings and keep society on its feet. Hence, coming up with policies based on ethical and humanistic values is gaining more and more importance.” (MoYS, 2012, p. 12-13)

The list of stakeholders referred to in achieving this core concern includes the Directorate of Religious Affairs, (MoYS, 2013, p.12)176 which plays an organising role in setting and implementing values in Turkey. Although the document places an emphasis on increasing awareness of ‘universal ethical principles and moral values’ among young people, the precise nature of these principles and values are not specified, and the relationship between universal, national, and local ethical principles is, as such, unclear.

The document also provides general guidance on how ‘disadvantaged young people’ is interpreted in Turkish policy documents, and introduces policy recommendations for each subcategory. The fact that young people are identified in various social groups such as disabled people, those convicted of crimes, homeless people, active substance abusers, women, those living in poverty and people who migrated from rural areas, and that particular policies are determined for each social group, is an important development. Significantly, however, people who are in disadvantaged positions as a result of ethnic and religious differences are not included.

_Culture and Arts_ policies for young people are also covered in the document, which outlines recommendations for how Turkish history and cultural heritage should be presented to young people. Cultural Heritage is linked with presenting “historically and culturally important sites and sites on the UNESCO World Heritage List, historical monuments, architectural wonders, museums and important figures from our history” (MoYS, 2013, p.28). Monuments that date back to antiquity and from different civilizations which were once part of today’s Turkey are encompassed within this definition. Nonetheless, culture is primarily circumscribed in nationalistic terms, which is illustrated by the following lower level political goals:

Encouraging the Turkish language to be used correctly, taking measures to prevent further harm to the Turkish language through wider online dissemination.

Via poetry, sagas and other literary works, teaching young people about national history and cultural values so that they are internalized.

Having young people perform and follow traditional arts.

Providing support for the production of television series, movies and cartoons which would be effective in transmitting history and cultural heritage.

Having young people meet those who witnessed history and historic culture (MoYS, 2013, p.27-28).
Thus, encouraging young people to protect their own culture and art is expressed as a means for protecting the country’s past/history and therefore its future. In the Culture and Arts section, discussion of ‘modern art branches’ suggests a more inclusive definition, but even here the word choice of ‘blended’ suggests a cautious attitude: “Proliferating exhibitions, shows and courses addressing modern arts. Organizing events where modern and traditional arts are blended” (MoYS, 2013, p.29). Interestingly, the ‘modern’ is included only on condition of combining with the traditional. In other words, ‘modern’ may be acceptable only in combination with traditional arts.

The document contains a chapter on ‘Inter Cultural Dialogue among international youth’ which provides more information about establishing inter-cultural relations and this policy’s approach to sharing practices. Even though the title sounds promising, the policy approaches inter-cultural relations in a more ‘strategic’ and competitive fashion:

According to Turkey’s rising credibility and strategic importance in the international arena, it is mandatory for our young people to be more active in international platforms; therefore, equipping our young people with skills which would allow them to compete with their peers in an international arena. It is the state’s responsibility to strengthen the ties between our country, culture and values by including our young people who live abroad in the political domain. Within this context, having young people in Turkey interact and organise shared events with our young generation who live abroad and those who live in close kin is very important. Recently, Turkey has made a breakthrough in economic and political terms. In order to make this breakthrough more stable, flows of brain drain need to be mitigated. In this sense, it is important to employ our qualified young people and encourage qualified young people with foreign origins to live and work in our country (MoYS, 2013, p.31-32).

The ‘inter-cultural dialogue’ conceptual framework implies that this strategic and competitive spirit has been let go. However, the range of the dialogue in question also seems limited and unidirectional from Turkey to other cultures, as in the following excerpt:
As a result of different cultures interacting with each other in national and global terms, the conceptual framework of ‘inter-cultural dialogue’ gained prominence. Turkey embodies numerous historical experiences and cultural heritage that is related to peaceful co-existence and it has a unique grasp of the importance of inter civilizational dialogue and inter-cultural tolerance. Within this context Turkey is obliged to conduct necessary work which would bring in the value of tolerance which occupies a key role both in our culture and in universal standards. (MoYS, 2013, p.32)

Two related assumptions have underpinned the approach outlined above. First, Turkish policy actors believe that Turkey is forming its own hinterland and can act as a role model as a result of increasing strength. Second, building on this idea, is the notion of a civilizations alliance, introduced as a counter-argument to “the clash of civilizations” argument of Samuel Huntington (Huntington, 1997). Huntington claims that global politics became bipolar during the Cold War, but that after the Cold War international conflicts have related primarily to cultural, rather than economic or ideological divisions. Against this, the approach examined here suggests that relations with other countries can be strengthened by emphasizing an alliance of civilisations.

Despite this high level discourse within which Turkey is presented as a role model rather than a partner willing to exchange or interact with other cultures, lower level policies contain more open-ended programmes and internationally collaborative practices such as student exchange programs, mobility, project collaborations with youth associations who are internationally active, and participation in cultural, artistic and sportive activities (MoYS, 2013, p.32-35). These practices and programmes give new opportunities and ways for improving the cultural literacy of young people.

_Towards a More Comprehensive Cultural Policy_

The findings of the review also show that culture is viewed from a more inclusive perspective, with reference to multiculturalism, openness toward other cultures, and encouragement of participation in cultural activities.
Multiculturalism and Pluralism
The organising emphasis of the 2011 Annual Administrative Report of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism is that the cultural heritage and values of the country “should be preserved without any discrimination” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2011, p.2). According to this report, “Turkey has an established culture and a pluralist society with the richness of its historical-archaeological heritage and civilizational values that it has brought from the past to the present.” These are seen as richness and cultural diversity and “the state’s adoption of diversity without discrimination as well as preserving and sustaining this diversity” is presented as the very foundation of the Ministry’s policies (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2001, p.2). The report highlights that the Ministry works so as to sustain and preserve this cultural diversity, which is viewed as richness, and even to create “the setting and the opportunities in which this diversity could live and flourish in harmony” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2011, p.2).

Regarding openness toward cultural values, the introductory section penned by the Minister lays emphasis on this issue with two sentences and this section also indicates that Kurds and Kurdish culture are also within the interest and policies of the Ministry: Ahmedi Hani’s Memo- u Zin was published in Kurdish and Turkish with its original text in 2011. This publication is an important development in terms of keeping cultural richness alive, introducing it to wider audiences, and spreading the understanding of tolerance (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2011, p.3). In that context, this was a progressive turning point in Turkish politics via accepting other cultural practices and heritage in addition to Turkish culture. Even though the Kurds and Kurdish culture have been positioned in tension with regard to perpetuating and preserving their culture and cultural identity, they are taken into account as having cultural value for the first time in policies.

Cultural Participation
The report also emphasizes tourism. It states that tourism should not be reduced to sea-sand-sun, and culture should also be at the forefront when it comes to this issue (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2011, p.3). In that context, visiting museums and archeological sites are crucial to create a connection between culture and tourism. For example, a project called ‘Young Evliya Celebis are on the Road’, named after Evlikya Celebi (one of the most famous travellers of the Ottoman Empire) (Kreiser, 2005)177, provides opportunities for young people to visit cities of significance during the Ottomans’ rule, such as Bursa, Afyon, Kütahya, and Uşak.

177 This project in which the young people will be equipped with possibilities for being mobile takes its name from an Ottoman traveler who lived in 17th century.
These cities have come to particular prominence in recent years with the rise of Ottomanist discourse and as cities within which conservative political tendencies are dominant (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2011, p. 216).

Another tourism-related project is called ‘GAP Eco-Tourism’, and could also be viewed within the scope of cultural interaction. It supports young people from different geographical and socio-economic backgrounds to engage in eco-tourism activities taking place in southeastern Anatolia (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2011, p. 131-135). The underlying goal of this project, stated implicitly, is to enable the interaction of young people in the Kurdish demographic with young people from other demographics and with other cultural identities. The impact of the Democratic Opening (Solution Process) with regard to the Kurdish issue, which was gaining momentum at the time, cannot be overlooked while reflecting on this policy.

In the Annual Administrative Report of 2012,178 goals such as diversity and pluralism lay the foundation of a setting in which the Kurdish in particular and cultural diversity more generally could thrive and be preserved, but these goals disappeared. One of the basic policies that was aimed at young people was to open internet access centres in public libraries to use so as to make it easier to reach information, to draw masses of people, and especially young people to libraries, and to ‘save’ young people from the negative aspects of internet cafes (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2012, p.97).

The GAP Eco-tourism project is ongoing at the time of writing. In addition to this, other new projects are being put into practice (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2012, p.139-149). For International Children’s Book Week, events which mainly aim to provide information on important figures and events from Turkish and world history are organized. The week commencing on the second Monday of November is celebrated as World Children’s Book Week in the whole country. (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, n.d.-b). One of the main activities during World Children’s Book Week is to introduce children's literature and writers to children. In addition, during this week children engage with a variety of cultural forms including fairy tales, educational films, puzzles/riddles, painting and children's theatre. Through this special week, children are accustomed to the use of libraries and to underpin an interest in reading. (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, n.d.-c)

---

178 Even though this report was published when Ertuğrul Günay was not the Minister, many of the activities included in this report still date back to his ministerial period.
Exclusive Policies in the Fields of Education, Youth and Culture
It is discussed above how policies in the fields of youth, education and culture were shaped as Turkey’s public administration was transformed after 2005 in parallel to EU accession negotiations. In particular, during the EU integration process, national institutions developed strategic plans which are still in use today. However, when the processes of preparation and implementation of these plans are followed, the limitations of the policy-making process associated with them are evident. In particular, two problematic aspects are apparent:

The process of developing a strategic plan can easily become a “formality” for institutions; policies may be defined with ambiguous expressions or may be transformed into easy-to-reach, and therefore less meaningful, targets.

The policies developed as a part of the EU integration process are easily misused through changes in their content, which was not anticipated by this process.

When the first strategic plans were developed, institutions considered them to be significantly important. They were concerned about how to develop these new plans and how the plans, which were prepared in the long term, would affect governmental institutions (Şentürk, 2010). After the first texts were developed, knowledge about the format of strategic plans started to accumulate which was specific to distinct governmental institutions. However, over time, expressions in these policy texts came to be borrowed from each other. For example, generic vision/mission definitions and objectives are reproduced in the reports. This is evident in the last Strategic Plan of the Ministry of National Education, where the mission is defined in a very inclusive manner:

To provide an environment and opportunity to grow for individuals whose thinking, comprehension, research and problem solving skills are advanced; who are equipped with the knowledge and skills required by the information society; who internalized the universal values of humanity and democracy with national culture; who are open to communication and sharing, whose art sensitivity and skill are advanced; self-confidence, self-esteem, sense of rights, justice and responsibility are high; who are zealous, entrepreneurial, creative, innovative, pacific, healthy and happy. (MoNE, 2015, p.30)
Then, the strategic objectives that will be linked to this mission are listed:

Strategic Objective 1: “To ensure that all individuals have access to education and training under fair conditions.”

Strategic Objective 2: “To provide all individuals with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviours required by the current age, and to provide the opportunity to grow for individuals who are entrepreneurial, innovative, creative, highly skilled in foreign languages, open to communication and education, self-confident, responsible, healthy and happy.”

Strategic Objective 3: “To establish an effective and efficient institutional structure that will increase access to education and quality in education by improving human, financial, spatial and technological structure, and management and organizational structure.” (MoNE, 2015, p.31).

Under these defined objectives, particular goals are specified. For example, the target set for the first strategic goal is:

“To increase participation and completion rates in all types and levels of education and training, especially in disadvantaged groups by the end of the planned period” (MoNE, 2015, p. 33).

The objective underpinning this goal is significant in that it aims to overcome the barriers faced by different social groups in access to education. However, when we look at how this issue is understood in order to achieve this goal, it is apparent that the nature of disadvantage is not explained. While it is explicitly stated that the literacy level among girls is low, and refugee children are not able to read, the issues facing other disadvantaged social groups are not discussed. For instance, the strategy for disadvantaged groups is vaguely expressed as follows: “Projects and protocols for access to education and training of groups requiring special policies, especially girls, will be increased” (MoNE, 2015, p.34). Therefore, the strategy for disadvantaged groups leaves too many questions unanswered, such as the scope of content of the policy and the targeted groups.
Moreover, since there is not enough information about these disadvantaged groups, it remains unclear what has been done and what will be done for these disadvantaged groups in this field, and what the performance criterion will be at the end. In fact, the 12 identified performance indicators do not directly measure the access of disadvantaged groups to education. Rather, this is based on indicators related to participation rates in general.

Over time, the targets of these strategic plans have become both easier to reach and more likely to be “demonstrated” that they have been reached. For example, foreign language education in secondary education is defined as an important factor for increasing international interactions and relations with the EU. After foreign language education in the first strategic plan of the Ministry of National Education had been addressed in accordance with EU integration, the strategic goal 18.3 was defined as

“To ensure the preparation of the curriculum which brings about the ability of secondary school students to understand and speak at least one foreign language until the end of the planned period.”

The performance indicator of achieving this goal was clearly defined as well:

“PG 18.3.1. Number of students who pass the Secondary Education Foreign Language Placement Test.”

In other words, whether the students achieve this goal could be revealed as a net score determined by an exam applied in general. When the next Strategic Plan was developed, foreign language learning was still defined as a goal, but performance indicators were based on internal and institutional criteria that were easier to achieve:

2.3.2 Number of students participating in international mobility programs and projects
2.3.3 “Year-end point average of foreign language course” (MoNE, 2015, p. 50).

To achieve these performance indicators, it is sufficient to include more students in mobility programs and to follow a more flexible grading policy in foreign language courses. But, it is not clear seems that these two practices will provide for the defined strategy. The main point to be emphasized here is that due to the weaknesses of the new public management style, policy definitions are either presented as more de facto and ambiguous goals, or associated with easier to reach performance goals.
The second point is that there is also a process of change in the way the policies have been implemented over time. The EU integration process, together with the political transformation taking place in Turkey in recent times, contain multiple dynamics: a) the breakaway of governments from the EU integration process, b) politically increasing centralization and authoritarianism, and c) strengthening of politically conservative, religious and nationalist tendencies. All these political dynamics have led to the initiation of various practices in the fields of youth, education and culture which have meant that the EU integration process has been pushed into the background. In the following pages, recent transformations in these policies and practices will be discussed in more detail.

Preparing Students in the Future with “the 2023 vision”
One of the most remarkable transformations is the expansion of compulsory education to 12 years (school age ranges from 6 to 13) which was announced and put into practice on 30th March 2012 under the AKP government (Kamal, 2017). The legal infrastructure and preparations of this compulsory education law, which is called also 4+4+4, were declared but not detailed in either the Strategic Plan (2010-2014) or the 17th Council decisions (2006) under the themes of “Institutional Capacity” and “Quality in Education.” Whereas the purpose of 4+4+4 is stated as improving the quality of education and reaching the standards of developed countries, the effectiveness and outputs of the 4+4+4 system still result in conflicts and tensions particularly in relation to imam-hatip (religious) schools, elective courses and their contents, and school enrolments among girls.

The practices and impacts of 4+4+4 on education can best be followed in the 2nd Strategic Plan (2015-2019) and 18th Council Decisions (2010). These two policy documents explain how cultural literacy is constituted. In both of these policy documents, “the 2023 vision” (Presidency of Republic of Turkey, 2017) is iterated as a base for all policy-making processes, and meeting some of the national educational targets. The underpinnings of national education policies are grounded in the 2023 vision.

179. “Until the 2012/13 school year, the Turkish school system was based on a 1997 law, which mandated eight years of compulsory elementary education, followed by three years of optional secondary school (8+3 system). In 2005, an additional year was added to the secondary school option, creating an 8+4 system. In 2012, compulsory education was extended to 12 years, and split into three levels of four years each (4+4+4 system). Pupils now complete four years of elementary education before entering middle school in the fifth grade. Four years of middle school are followed by four additional years at the upper-secondary level”.

180. The 2023 vision is promoted by AKP government consists of sets of goals as political plan not an official policy document and it proclaimed in 2013. In his speech he said “First, we will achieve our 2023 targets, and then will go on to actualize our 2053 and 2071 visions.” The dates were not selected randomly; they emphasize nostalgia for the past with an Ottomanist/ sunni Islamist perspective. They refer to 1453 (Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks ) and 1071 (Seljuk Empire undermined Byzantine authority in Anatolia ).
It is important to note that the 4+4+4 education system has made tensions apparent in regards to the participation of girls in education, the content of elective courses, vocational and technical schools, and imam-hatip (religious) schools. In general, the policies commit to the idea that the educational environment is to be designed considering through a “Lifelong Learning Strategy” which focuses on Turkey and the wider world. However, the economic benefits of education pursued through the promotion of private high schools is accompanied by a conservatizing of education via converting general high schools to imam-hatip schools.

When we review the theme of how cultural heritage is handled in the policies, we find that as a form of culture, it is seen as both institutional culture and also collective cultural values. The policy states that “they should be strengthened by preparing workshops such as well-attended special days and weeks to develop schools’ idiosyncratic identity, memory, and sense of belonging and powerful institutional culture of schools.” (MoNE, 2010, p.5). It can be said that the national identity constructed by educational institutions eliminates diversity. Even though democratic values and developing sensibility for cultural diversity are mentioned in the policies, these two aspects are undefined and unexplained by the government thereby rendering them ignored. The theme of diversity in council decisions is handled abstractly and not articulated clearly and thus it does not correspond to what is actually put into practice; in other words, it is not able to become operational. The policies refer to “universal values” which have no location and the content and the definition of the values is ambiguous.

It can be said that the AKP government resists westernization and rather its discourse is formed on a conservative perspective different from other political parties which favour westernisation. In respect of ‘universal values’, they are redefined as ‘education of values’ which is introduced implicitly and associated with Islamic and religious concepts. It stated that “‘religious culture and moral knowledge’ courses which have an important function in connection with education of values are to be taught “more effectively in a pluralistic understanding in all educational institutions” (MoNE, 2010, p.12).

There is a tendency within the documents to conflate and associate culture, art and sports with religion and nationalism. For example “[u]nder the umbrella of a visual arts course, giving opportunities to apply Turkish traditional arts; calligraphy, the art of marbling, gilding and miniature craft education in high schools” refers to locality, but at the same time universality is being pigeonholed and these types of art are commonly accepted by the conservative segments of the public (MoNE, 2014, p.4).
Further in the 18th council decisions, the emphasis is on a nationalization process in the education system, even in the architecture of schools, as it is stated: “School buildings should reflect the features of Turkish architectural motifs [and] contribute to form a national identity for students.” (MoNE, 2014, p.4). At the same time, it is stated that while the school buildings are being designed, the infrastructure for educational informatics and technology are to be considered and ateliers are to be made fit for a modular system. These two cases show that the education system is both designed to promote and nurture nationalism, and to encourage connectedness with international standards at the technological level.

Another example of ‘education of values’ is linked with the 4+4+4 system and the contents of the curricula. When it comes to operation here, the scope of the elective courses are broad and the government perceives that they are not offering an orthodox (traditional) education, but rather a more secular education. Nevertheless, on careful examination of the content of the curricula, it is seen that the scope of the elective courses (MoNE, 2018b) is being formed in an Islamic/nationalistic way.

These courses are available both in primary and secondary education curricula including courses such as Quran, Life of Hz. Mohammed, Basic Religious Knowledge, Islamic Culture and Civilization, History of Islamic Science, and Ottoman Turkish.

Another claim of the 4+4+4 formulation regarding the extending of the education period to 12 years of age is to increase active participation in education. Statistics show that there is a rising enrolment rate in education. Nevertheless, creating ‘open high schools’ results in school dropout among girls because the policy acts as a barrier to education for girls from conservative families with socio-economic difficulties. The same situation is evident for disabled students. They are also isolated in the school environment and this creates a barrier to their right to education. Therefore, it is apparent that both aims focused on inclusive participation and equity in education in the policy documents lose their legitimacy and validity in practice. Finally, the 4+4+4 formulation in education can be construed as imam-hatipization in schools level, and an islamization process at the cultural-ideological level.
Redefining the Vision for Young People

Since 2014, the impact of conservatism and nationalism on policies and initiatives concerning young people has been more significant outside the domain of official education, too. We see more emphasis on ‘local and national values’ particularly from 2016. In this domain, the Ministry of Youth and Sports has played a pioneering role in the determination of policies. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Strategic Plan (2018-2022) prepared by the Ministry in 2017 aims at sustaining many of the activities that were covered in the first plan but also improving these activities qualitatively and increasing their numbers quantitatively (MoYS, 2018). It is striking to see the changes in the ‘mission’ and ‘vision’ statements in the respective policy documents even though such statements are known to be repetitive across policy documents. The Strategic Plan in 2012 contained the following vision statement:

“Ensuring the upbringing of a youth who reads, thinks, questions, self-expresses, turning sports, arts and science as part of their lifestyle, is open to new developments, respectful to differences, innovative, committed to ethical values, participatory to decision making processes, considers resources effectively, sensitive to the environment, self-confident, happy, healthy and strong for better tomorrows” (MoYS, 2012, p.35).

In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Strategic Plan (2018), at first glance, it seems like similar expressions are being used compared with the first plan, but we also see that phrases such as ‘who thinks’, ‘who questions’, ‘who is open to differences, innovative’, ‘sensitive to environment’, and ‘happy’ are carefully taken out. Rather than an understanding of ‘youth’ based on these principles, then, a vision in which ‘bringing up generations’ which embrace ideas of the nation and country’s increasing power is articulated: Being an institution which adopts, protects and improves national, moral, humanistic and cultural values; loves their country and nation and always strives to aggrandize it; feels responsive for the society and embodies a character which is stable and grown to be healthy in terms body, mind, morality, spirit and emotion levels; raising generations who come to the fore in terms of their activities in social, cultural, artistic and sportive domains. (MoYS, 2018, p.60). This policy shift to nationalism-conservatism does not only stay at a discursive level but it is also observed in the activities organized recently. As we mentioned above, the numbers of youth centres and camps, as well as rates of participation, increased significantly between 2011 and 2017. However, if we look at the activity reports of these events, activities leaning towards more conservative, nationalist and Islamic features have been gaining prominence. The recent forms of training given in youth camps -where the mixed gender policy was put on hold in 2012- are listed below:

There are also additional pedagogical questions surrounding these summer camps. However, if we limit our analysis to youth and cultural literacy, we see that most of the educational activities are shaped by conservative, religious, nationalist and isolationist values. Even the political tendencies of courses with relatively neutral titles such as ‘self-sacrifice’, ‘manners’, and ‘exemplary events from our history’ depend on how content will be interpreted and enacted and by which educators. On the other hand, even though phrases such as ‘our cultural or national values’ sound like they are inclusive of a wide range of values, it is worth emphasizing that not all social groups in Turkey would define these values in similar terms. Therefore, such understanding of policy which seem to move towards ‘local and national values’ means the increasing strength and domination of a set of certain social groups in Turkey with respect to the rest. Consequentially, social tensions are perpetuated, and even though it is likely that gender-segregated youth camps appeal to pious young people and their families, they exclude those young people who do not have such preference or prefer mixed gender camps. Moreover, given the fact that there is no social consensus regarding the education topics listed above, there will be young people who may not participate in these youth camps anymore because of the political tone. This situation shows us that this particular policy cements the transformation of youth camps into sites which are more open for those who carry conservative-pious and nationalist political tendencies and their families.

National Culture, in Need of Protection
The radical transformation of policies and understandings about culture can be traced back to 2013. Before 2013, the AKP had more politicians and supporters from backgrounds other than conservatism and Islamism. Moreover, the aim of becoming a member of the EU was a vibrant political topic and one of the biggest goals of the country. At this time there were also significant changes in Turkish politics.
First, the Gezi Park Protests (or Gezi Occupation Movement), a social movement against the gentrification of Gezi Park (Istanbul) in June 2013, began and spread across the country, and secondly the same year witnessed a change in the frameworks and policies of the ruling party, the AKP, as we discuss below.

Between 2013 and 2017, the inclusive culture policies gradually disappeared and were replaced by a focus on the necessity of, and therefore the defence of, national culture. This situation has radically gained momentum with the future policy plans that emerged within the scope of the 3rd National Cultural Council meeting in 2017. In this period, the goal of the cultural policies was to preserve the national culture, which was seen to be under attack. Approaches focusing on religion, tradition, and family are now accepted as the foundation for the policies that have been introduced and are planned to be introduced. Children and young people come into prominence in terms of following the policies that preserve the national culture and language, and policies that promote national traditions.

In 2013, there was an abrupt change in the activities and policies of the Ministry. In its introductory section, that year’s report states that “the unchanging priority of our cultural policy is the preservation and transition of the works of civilization and cultural property that are found in Anatolian geography” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2014, p.3). The report emphasizes the importance of Anatolian geography and the transfer of its cultural property to future generations. Certain activities are planned so as to achieve this end, including, for example, promotional activities such as exhibitions and workshops historic money production for young people about Piri Reis (Zaimeche, 2002)\(^\text{181}\).

The fact that children are considered to be a disadvantaged group is an important aspect of the report. Children are seen as a disadvantaged group along with women and disabled individuals and it is emphasized that they should be supported in terms of cultural participation. However, there are almost no special programs or policy plans for either women or disabled individuals. On the other side, the youth is seen as more important to preserving and defending the national culture. As a result, the political plans and policies of the ruling party seem more about future political goals and shaping the next generation as the guards of the national culture.

\(^{181}\) Piri Reis, a well-known Ottoman Admiral, was born in 15\(^{th}\) century in the city of Gallipoli. He is known from the Battle of Gallipoli, the emotional and political memory of which still continues. He is remembered as the creator of one of the oldest and most comprehensive world maps and also viewed as part of Turkey’s cultural heritage. For more information about Piri Reis.
The Ministry’s policies for young people are planned mainly through tourism activities. With the implementation of the Museum Card, which was introduced specifically for young people, young people’s access to ruins all over the country was secured through a central ticketing application. One of the goals of the Ministry in this regard was to “make every young person have a cultural card in his/her wallet rather than a credit card” (The Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2014, p.320).

Additionally, youth tourism and outdoor sports (such as paragliding, trekking, water sports, canoeing, and bird watching) are included within the scope of GAP Eco-tourism project. (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2014, p. 164-171) Projects such as these suggest that the Ministry worked more like the Ministry of Tourism during this period.

Nationalistic ideals and policy plans have been given more attention in policy in recent years. In addition to that, an Islamist tone is evident not only the discourse of daily speeches of politicians but also in formal reports and policy texts. 2017 was the year when these changes in the Ministry’s policies and future plans were implemented, and general political transformations in Turkey came to be visibly indicated in the context of cultural policies. The 3rd National Cultural Council meeting and its final report are notable in this regard. The 3rd Council meeting was organized under the title “Turkey for the Good of the World’ so as to ‘revive’ (John, L. 2018) \(^{182}\) (\textit{ihya etmek}) and enrich our national culture on the eve of a new era and create New Cultural Policies that are suitable for the necessities of this era and become a milestone for that end” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.4).

The meeting could be seen as the precursor for an era in which nationalistic policies were dominant and concepts such as culture and heritage were only addressed within this framework. At the very beginning of this council meeting, Turkey is defined “as the place where the brightest pages of the history of civilization have been written’ and which is ‘the most valuable host for the world’s cultural heritage.” It is also states that “protecting this house, our house, our country, our culture, our wisdom with all its riches against all the threats and attacks’ is the major goal” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.3).

\(^{182}\) Here the Turkish word used for ‘revive’ is \textit{ihya etmek}, which is a very important concept both in the Islamic literature and the Islamic movements in Turkey.
Turkish culture, as a culture closed to the outside, and seen as under constant threat, is addressed in particular through language. Apart from emphasizing the fact that Turkish language is under threat, it is also pointed out from an Ottomanist perspective that it is important for young generations to learn old Turkish (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.3).

In this comprehensive meeting held in 2017, the statements regarding language-related heritage, such as that ‘Turkey is the common heritage of humanity’ and ‘Turkish language is one of the most important and valuable treasures’ of humanity are particularly prominent. This emphasis on Turkish language also provides information regarding which geographies are considered to be within Turkish culture when it comes to cultural policies. In policies related to language, the geography from the “Balkans to Caucasia, from Kazan to Sana” is described as the geography of the hearts. (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.4). This demonstrates that there is a new perception of cultural geography beyond official borders related to Turkish migrants living in European countries. In the following pages of the report, it is said that “our language is our home” and this statement illustrates and repeats the emphasis on how the issue of language and its importance are perceived. While the report gives definitions and information regarding future policies on the issue of language, it talks about important figures who lived before the Ottoman era or during the Ottoman era, and who stood out with their Muslim identities (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p. 3). At this point, it becomes quite ambiguous whether this language, to which such importance is attributed, is Turkish or Ottoman Turkish.

One of the policies that is planned for the future in the context of this meeting is elaborated by ‘the Foreign Turks (The Foreign Turks refers to Turkish people who were born and raised in countries other than Turkey and currently have citizenship in those countries.) and Cultural Commission.’

---

183 The texts on the policies in question include this statement. However, what is actually meant by this statement is Ottoman Turkish. It could be said that the phrase Ottoman Turkish is carefully avoided and instead a phrase such as ‘old Turkish’ is used.

184 This phrase is used by Erdoğan to imply societies and cultures which have a closer relationship with Turke, thereby recalling legacy of Ottoman Empire.

185 These figures include Dede Korkut (9th and 10th centuries), Hoca Ahmet Yesevi (11th century), Hünkâr Hacı Bektaş’ı Veli (13th century), Yunus Emre (13th century), Mevlana Celaleddin-I Rûmi (13th century), Hacı Bayram-ı Veli (14th century), Eşrefoğlu Rûmi (14th century), Şeyh Şaban’ı Veli (15th and 16th centuries).
The aim in question is to raise young Turks living in Europe in such a way that they will preserve their language and cultural identity despite not living in Turkey. The report ironically refers to Turkish as a language “with no functionality” and it is stated that Turkish people in Europe will use this language only for “cultural purposes” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.35) seemingly acknowledging the limited utility of Turkish to these new generations. In this context, one of the goals of Turkish cultural policies is not just to teach Turkish language but to also open up spaces for the use of this language. In accordance with this, one of the aims is to prepare Turkish materials for the education of the young Turks in foreign countries and to train teachers which knowledge of both the language of that country and Turkish so as to offer those courses.

Emphasis on religion is also notable in the final report of the council meeting. There is a definition in the report stating that ‘the most important thing’ for Turkish culture is “to protect the dignity of human beings, the most dignified creature among God’s creations.” From this point of view, protecting and defending universal humanitarian values is deemed possible by “exalting human dignity.” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.4).

“Children, young people, family, and social fabric” are described as under a constant threat and it is stated that a new kind of “consciousness, attention, and resurrection” is required so as to protect these people from the constant ‘destructive attacks’ that they are exposed to. For children and young people are, in this context, required to gain “national and spiritual values” against “the modern way of life, which normalizes individuality and selfishness.”

Probably one of the most interesting statements among the decisions taken by the council and the items published in the report is the requirement to provide “the spiritual integrity of children and young people” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.5). This ambiguous statement is quite important given that it was articulated during a council meeting in which the foundation for the cultural policies of the country were laid.

Goals and findings with regard to family and young people are largely included in this report prepared in 2017. The commission members all agree on a comprehensive definition of family. One of the characteristics of family is that it is a “scene for cultural memory” (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p.36). It is also underlined that the transition process from an extended family to a nuclear family still continues and it is implied that the nuclear family is a structure that ‘makes children lonely.’
It is stated that regarding the education of children and young people, contents that will be based on “family culture, social values, and universal humanitarian values” will be aimed to be included in the curriculum of National Education (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017, p. 37). Relatedly, there is also the issue of the caregiver grandmother. This issue has remained on the agenda in Turkey for a while. When children who need care are looked after by their own grandmothers, the state makes payments to them. This practice was implemented in certain cities in 2017.

In the Cultural Council, it was decided that this practice should encompass all income groups and be extended so as to include not just grandmothers but all the other family members. It could be said that this practice aims to encourage the bringing up of children by their elders by two generations; therefore, it is important in this regard.\textsuperscript{186}

\textsuperscript{186} The first two council meetings in the history of the Republic took place in the 1980s – a significant period of change for the country’s policies. The first council meeting was held in 1982 in the aftermath of the coup d’état of 1980 and the other one was organized in 1989. The cultural policies of the 1980s were arranged in accordance with the goal of “investigating our national cultural property in a more comprehensive, profound manner: promoting this cultural property; providing assistance for its being known and adoption, and in this way helping the National Consciousness take root and flourish.”
Discussion

To understand policy developments surrounding young people’s cultural literacy education in the Turkish context, it is necessary to consider the socioeconomic, political, and historical context within which they have been enacted. When the accession negotiations with the EU began in 2005, Turkey took significant steps towards reforming its governmental institutions and their policy-making procedures. Certain ministries and institutions such as the National Agency and the Ministry of Education took on leading roles in the EU integration process and initiated programmes and policies with inclusive interpretations of culture, cultural literacy and cultural heritage, as examined in the first section of our findings. At the same time, these policies constructed neo-liberal subjectivity by emphasizing the need for individuals to compete in a high-skilled global economy (İnal and Akkaymak, 2012). However, policy developments in later years show a shift away from the inclusive cultural education promoted through the EU integration process towards an emphasis on more nationalist, traditional and religious understandings of culture (İnal and Akkaymak, 2012; Lüküslü, 2016).

These findings show that cultural literacy is a complex, cross-cutting issue affected by shifting parameters of inclusion and exclusion. It is also relatively ill-defined, through the discussion of abstract ideas such as ‘universal values’ and European Union acquis with limited application in specified policy programmes (Çayır, 2016; Kaya and Vural, 2016). “Indeed, these notions present an a-spatial view of universal values” (Massey, 1994; 1999).

That is to say that notions of cultural literacy and cultural heritage focused on the international and global levels have been detached from their social, historical and geographical sources. For instance, the policy documents easily embrace “universal values” as something to be taught to young people, but do not explore what these values are, or where and how they have been acquired, therefore rendering them abstract. In contrast, “the locality” and “our own values” are often presented in a protective manner and mingled with nationalization. In addition, the way the local or national values and culture referred to in the policy documents are predicated on the majority culture ignores social diversities within the country too (Çayır, 2014; 2016). In this regard, while some of the policy documents appear to be based on the principles of the EU integration process, the ways such policies have been implemented have given rise to the reconstruction of prevailing social and political tensions in Turkey.

There are further tensions surrounding cultural literacy education evident from the analysis of the policy documents.
Firstly, although an effort is made to increase school attendance, and especially for disadvantaged individuals, disengagement from school is rising among conservative families, in rural and low-income families because of open high schools. Secondly, “values education” was initially introduced as the universal values necessary to integrate into the global world. However, it has come to be focused on the values taught predominantly by the teachers of religion courses (Ural, 2015). Thirdly, promoting and focusing more on elective courses seems well-structured and novel in the education system at first sight; however, these courses tend to include orthodox Islamist and nationalist contents (Lüküslü, 2016). Fourthly, promoting local culture and values are endorsed as an agenda against the standardisation and homogenization trends associated with globalisation, yet the more dominant local culture and values emphasize conservative and Islamic connotations (ibid). Fifthly, collaborating with stakeholders such as NGOs in policy making and implementation of these policies appears as an opportunity to enhance the participation of the citizens within structures of governance. However, policy-making institutions can easily exclude some of the stakeholders criticising their agenda and collaborate only with those willing to approve of their policies. Indeed, when the AKP governments leant towards more conservative and pious policies around in 2013-2014, some of these potential social tension issues were revived, as examined in the second section of the findings.

Therefore, the examination of how policy making on cultural literacy and cultural heritage has changed during this period shows us that close collaboration of governmental institutions with EU institutions had positive effects on the development of inclusive policies on cultural literacy and cultural heritage. However, while this process of defining such policies has been important, how they will be implemented in practice matters too and requires further collaboration of governmental institutions with EU institutions and other well-defined stakeholders. In the absence of this approach, more nationalist interpretations of culture and heritage have become dominant and this has resulted in increasing exclusivity within the field of cultural literacy education (Lüküslü, 2016; Çayır 2016; İnal and Akkaymak, 2012).
Conclusion

The Turkish policy documents systematically reviewed above show that particularly from 2006 to 2012, the EU integration process was an important factor driving the implementation of more inclusive cultural literacy and cultural heritage policies in Turkey. Collaborating with EU institutions, significant programmes and policy were initiated by national institutions leading the integration process with the EU, for example in relation to lifelong learning, mobility, and young people. This policy transformation reshaped the spheres of education, youth, and culture.

Nevertheless, around in 2013-2014 the discourses of the policies and their implementation started to change as Turkey drifted away from prospective EU membership. More nationalistic tendencies accompanying the process of Islamization have been implemented which emphasise national values. Interestingly, some of these policies are rationalized with reference to the principles of the EU. However, as shown above, the way these policies are interpreted and implemented matter significantly.

Finally, in spite of conservatism which has started to show its influence in the cultural sphere more recently, it is also important to note that some of those programs and policies implemented in the areas of lifelong learnings, mobility, and young people are more widely accepted and have been able to prevail without causing significant controversy in Turkey. They bear the potential to transform the sphere of education, youth and culture despite the trend towards conservatism.
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Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Milli Eğitim Şurası Kararları</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The Ministry of National Education</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Milli Eğitim Şurası Kararları</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Ministry of National Education</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı 2010-2014 Stratejik Planı</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Ministry of National Education</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Eğitim Raporu</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>The Ministry of National Education</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Yılı İdare Faaliyet Raporu</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Yılı İdare Faaliyet Raporu</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Yılı İdare Faaliyet Raporu</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Yılı İdare Faaliyet Raporu</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulusal Gençlik ve Spor Politikası Belgesi</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Ministry of Youth and Sports</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı 2012 Faaliyet Raporu</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The Ministry of Youth and Sports</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Eğitim ve Öğretim Bilgi Notu</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ministry for EU Affairs</td>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gençlik Programı Eylem 1.2 “Gençlik Girişimleri” Projelerinden Örnekler</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Türkiye Cumhuriyeti ile Avrupa Topluluğu Arasında İmzalanan, Türkiye Cumhuriyetinin Topluluk Programlarına Katılması Genel İlkeleri Hakkında Çerçeve Anlaşması'nın Onaylanması Hakkında Karar</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakanlıklara Bağlı , ilgili ,ilişkili kurum ve kuruluşlar ile diğer kurum ve kuruluşların teşkilatı hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı kararnamesi</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Presidency of the Republic</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Avrupa Komisyonu Tarafından Hazırlanan İlerleme Raporu</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Avrupa Komisyonu Tarafından Hazırlanan İlerleme Raporu</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Avrupa Komisyonu Tarafından Hazırlanan İlerleme Raporu</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for EU Affairs</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Policy in Turkey</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Chapters (Chapter 26): Education and Culture</td>
<td>May 2018 last updated</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs , Directorate for EU Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education has been constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is the specific objective of this component of the CHIEF project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy rather than refining by a specific form of document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to the research objectives of the CHIEF project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded all documents which</td>
<td>Were published before 1/1/2227</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Cultural/Educational Policy Review (UK)
Katherine Tonkiss

About CHIEF

CHIEF (The Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe’s Future) aims to build an effective dialogue between different stakeholders in order to facilitate a future of Europe based on inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity. The project focuses on the production and transition of cultural knowledge in both formal educational settings initiated from above, and a variety of informal human interactions. CHIEF will contribute to understanding and enhancing cultural literacy for young people, and the project will lead to a more effective use of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge. It will also help to recognise existing innovative practices and develop a new organisational model to enhance the cultural and inter-cultural competence of young Europeans.

CHIEF is funded by the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 Programme. It brings together ten partner institutions:

- Aston University, United Kingdom,
- Daugavpils Universitate, Latvia
- Institut Drustvenih Znanosti Ivo Pilar, Croatia
- Caucasus Research Resource Centers, Georgia
- Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
- Universidad Pompeu Fabra, Spain
- Culture Coventry, United Kingdom
- Univerzita Komenskeho V Bratslave, Slovakia
- The Savitribai Phule Pune University, India
- Hochschule Fuer Angewandte Wissenschaften, Germany
Executive Summary

The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in the United Kingdom (UK). It aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within official UK policy, and to draw out strengths, weaknesses and tensions apparent within this.

The governance environment shaping cultural literacy education policy is complex and multi-faceted. Responsibility for policies relating to young people’s cultural literacy education is divided among the UK Government at Westminster, and the respective devolved administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Educational practices contributing to cultural literacy policy objectives are delivered through school curricula as well as through the work of a range of semi-independent bodies sitting at ‘arm’s length’ from government.

The public funding of cultural literacy education programmes has been reduced substantially over the past decade as a consequence of the programme of austerity-related efficiency savings which was embarked upon by successive governments following the 2008 global financial crisis and subsequent recession. Most recently, the ‘Brexit’ vote to leave the EU highlights persistent dilemmas surrounding immigration and diversity in the UK, and is set to significant shape this policy environment over the coming years, with challenges for the creative industries and for educational programmes – particularly those which rely on international cooperation.

To conduct the policy review, a systematic search for eligible sources was carried out using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework. This process identified 28 documents which were then subjected to thematic analysis using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the aims and objectives of the review.

The findings of the policy review are divided into three sections. The first section focuses on the conceptualisation of cultural literacy education within the policy documents, and finds that this conceptualisation is an expansive one, but also one which contains tensions. These tensions concern what counts as culture and who ‘does’ culture, with the documents constructing a narrower institutional definition of culture in contrast to their stated aims to embrace diversity and encourage participation. They also concern the definition of the nation.
While across the dataset the focus of cultural literacy education is on specifically national culture, the meaning of this – whether it relates to the UK as a whole, or to the specific nations of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, is unresolved. The second findings section focuses on the operationalisation of cultural literacy education, and shows that it is operationalised in a variety of physical and digital spaces by a wide range of providers making use of a diverse range of funding streams. In turn, these findings demonstrate that the role of government as regards cultural literacy education is best conceived as one of ‘aspiration-setting’, providing a direction of travel for policy far removed from its realisation. This is a consequence of the devolution of responsibility for cultural education out of government control, and evidences a retreat from state-sponsored cultural education.

The third and final findings section centres on the value of cultural literacy education. It shows that value statements are a central theme of the policy documents, and that while some of these reflect the intrinsic value of culture in enriching lives, the main focus is on the instrumental value of cultural literacy education in contributing to other policy agendas. This instrumental value is expressed in relation to economic growth, health and wellbeing, educational attainment, community cohesion and regeneration, and international diplomacy. Overall, this section captures the intervention of an economic logic into the cultural education sector which has meant that it has become increasingly necessary to demonstrate the worth of cultural literacy education with reference to these wider objectives.

Collectively, these findings show that cultural literacy education has been conceptualised as a nationalist endeavour, but also that within this nationalist context it is concerned with constructing the ‘neo-liberal subject’ as a resilient and responsible individual capable of contributing to the national economy. This neo-liberal logic has also shaped the ways in which cultural literacy education is operationalised, moving it further out of government control.

Overall, these dynamics demonstrate that cultural literacy education in the UK is shaped by a neo-liberal communitarian form of governance, within which citizenship is understood as both neo-liberal individual responsibilisation and membership of a national community. This idea of national community is mobilised to serve a specific function in delimiting the parameters of inclusion and exclusion in diverse contexts.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEIS</td>
<td>Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Cabinet Office (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (Wales)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMS</td>
<td>Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>Department for Education (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHSC</td>
<td>Department for Health and Social Care (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Education (Northern Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO</td>
<td>Foreign and Commonwealth Office (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO</td>
<td>Home Office (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Aims of the Review
The purpose of this policy review is to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in the United Kingdom (UK). It aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within official UK policy, and to draw out strengths, weaknesses and tensions apparent within this.

The review (1) critically analyses official forms of cultural literacy education as these are expressed in policy, defined as formal, semi-formal and informal educational activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage; and (2) underpins the design of the empirical components of the wider CHIEF project. More information about this can be found at: http://chiefproject.eu.

The report offers three key findings. Firstly, UK policy conceptualises cultural literacy education as a nationalist endeavour, although there are inherent tensions exposed within this over what ‘national’ means within the multi-national UK context. Secondly, cultural literacy education in the UK is concerned with constructing the ‘neo-liberal subject’ as a resilient, responsible individual capable of contributing to the national economy. Thirdly, this neo-liberal logic has also shaped the ways in which cultural literacy education is operationalised, moving it further out of government control as a consequence of delegated governance and financial constraint. Overall, the report argues that cultural literacy education in the UK can be best understood as a form of ‘neo-liberal communitarian’ governance (Schinkel and van Houdt, 2010), where a strong articulation of national community is mobilised alongside the individualising logics of neo-liberalism in order to assert nationalist parameters of belonging.

Structure of the Report
The report first provides an overview of the UK policy context which is designed to give an introductory background to those who may be unfamiliar with the structures and processes of this context, alongside specific information about policymaking in the field of cultural literacy education within the institutions of the UK government and its devolved administrations. The report then gives details of the systematic review methodology used to complete the policy review, including data collection and analysis, before presenting the findings of this analysis. These findings cover the ways in which cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised in UK policy, as well as how its value is conceptualised. To finish, the report discusses these findings in light of salient academic literature before offering some concluding remarks.
Policy Context

The UK is a parliamentary democracy with a monarch as Head of State. It has a UK-wide Government, based at Westminster, and three devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland which share policymaking responsibility with the Westminster Government in their respective jurisdictions (all policies affecting only England are made by the Westminster Government). Over the period 2007-2018, which is the focus of this review, a variety of political control has shaped these governments (see Table 1, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1: Control of UK and Devolved Governments, 2007-2018

Responsibility for policies relating to young people’s cultural literacy education is divided among these administrations.

187 The Northern Ireland Assembly’s power-sharing agreement collapsed in January 2017 as a consequence of disagreements between the Democratic Unionist Party and Sinn Fein (see also Kelly, 2018). This review refers to the devolved government because it reviews policies since 2007, but it should be noted that at the time of writing the Assembly has yet to be reinstated.

188 The UUP is the Ulster Unionist Party and the SDLP is the Social Democratic and Labour Party. Both are small political parties in Northern Ireland.
All policy affecting England is a matter for the Westminster Government, while culture and education policy are formally devolved matters in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Some areas of cultural policy are, however, officially recognised as falling under the remit of the Westminster Government, such as broadcasting (Gov.uk, 2018) and in practice policy related to cultural literacy education is made by some Westminster departments with a UK-wide remit. For example, one policy document included in this review is published by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office which has a UK-wide remit (DOC 4). Documents may also recognise the existence of devolved powers while setting out policy ambitions with a UK-wide remit, as in the *Culture Is Digital* policy paper included in this review (DOC 1).

Finally, cultural literacy education policy is a matter for local authorities across the UK, for example in relation to the provision of community libraries and local cultural events. However, the policy role of these local authorities is beyond the scope of this review.

Learning about cultural identity, diversity and participation occurs within school and in a range of settings beyond the classroom. Focusing firstly on schools, each of the four nations has its own curriculum which means that schools in each constituent part of the UK follow the curriculum particular to their country context. That said, in all of these curricula, subject matter contributing towards cultural literacy is captured within similar areas of each curriculum. Firstly, it is captured in traditional subjects such as history, art and music; and secondly, it is captured in ‘citizenship education’ which was introduced into the curricula at the turn of the 21st century. Citizenship education is focused on the exploration of a variety of social and political topics, including in relation to cultural diversity (cf. Gov.uk, 2013).

The inclusion of learning about cultural diversity within the school curriculum is a reflection of the diverse demographic makeup of the UK, which was significantly shaped by migrations from South Asian and Caribbean Commonwealth countries in the post-war period but has in recent times further diversified such that it is now home to ‘people from practically every country in the world’ (Vertovec, 2007, p.1029). 14% of the UK population identifies as part of a minority ethnic group, and 10% have a non-English first language. The variety of ethnicities and languages present in the UK has itself increased as migration patterns have diversified. Most recently an increase in the population of the ‘White Other’ group was reported in the 2011 census, arising from increased migration from elsewhere in the European Union (cf. Office for National Statistics, 2018).
Outside of the school environment, educational practices that also serve to contribute to cultural literacy policy objectives are delivered extensively by semi-autonomous public bodies that large operate independently of government and are often perceived to offer a more efficient model of governance (Flinders, 2008). These bodies are responsible to the relevant government department for delivering policy objectives. For example, each of the four nations of the UK has an Arts Council\(^{189}\) which sits at arm’s length from government and is responsible for the delivery of major policy programmes as well as the allocation of funding to projects and organisations. Major national cultural institutions are also often semi-autonomous from the governments of the UK; examples include the National Gallery, London, and the National Library of Wales.

Such bodies are sponsored by government departments which oversee their activities and their budgets. In Westminster, most of the bodies are sponsored by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). DCMS is the most extensively delegated department in Westminster, with 91% of its budget spent through semi-autonomous bodies (National Audit Office, 2017). Parallel departments exist in each of the devolved administrations, other than in Northern Ireland where the Department for Culture, Arts and Leisure was amalgamated into the Department for Communities in 2016 as a result of cost-saving measures (Hadley, 2017). DCMS also holds responsibility for the distribution of monies raised from the National Lottery for the funding of cultural activities, including for organisations working under the authority of the devolved administrations (National Audit Office, 2017). As such, the governance environment shaping the cultural literacy education policy landscape is complex and multi-faceted, with structures and powers overlapping one another. It has also faced significant fiscal constraints due to the challenging financial context which has emerged over the past decade. Following the global financial crisis in 2008, the UK experienced a period of recession and since 2010 a programme of austerity-related efficiency savings has been embarked upon by successive Westminster governments (Peters, 2011; Pollitt, 2010).

The effect of this reduced funding is illustrated in the spending power of DCMS. In 2010, the DCMS budget was cut by 25% (HM Treasury, 2010) and then again in 2015 by a further 20% (Clark, 2015). An overall budget reduction of 5.1% has been agreed for the 2019-20 financial year (National Audit Office, 2017).

\(^{189}\) Arts Council England, Arts Council of Wales, Arts Council of Northern Ireland, and Creative Scotland.
Similarly in the devolved administrations, austerity-related cuts (cf. Drakeford, 2010; Scottish Government, 2017) have meant that Welsh funding for arts and culture programmes has fallen by nearly £3 million over the past decade (National Assembly for Wales, 2018), and the governments of Scotland and Northern Ireland have been forced to make exceptional, one-off payments to cultural bodies to make up for budget shortfalls brought about by years of spending reductions (Black, 2015; Scottish Parliament, 2018). Additionally, UK-wide bodies responsible for delivering cultural literacy policy commitments have been affected by an ongoing shortfall in National Lottery funding which is undermining the sustainability of a range of programmes and organisations in the field (National Audit Office, 2017).

Most recently, the defining feature of the contemporary UK policy environment has become the UK-wide vote to leave the European Union (or Brexit), and this is set to significantly shape the policy environment for cultural literacy education. In June 2016 the UK voted by 51.9% to 48.1% to leave the EU after a political campaign rooted firmly in anti-immigration and anti-diversity sentiment which gained support across the country but particularly in England and Wales (Goodwin and Milazzo, 2017; Hobolt, 2016). The impact of Brexit on cultural literacy policy programmes will not be fully known until the UK formally leaves the EU in March 2019, but critical challenges for the creative industries and for educational programmes – in particular, those which rely on international cooperation – have been identified (DCMS Committee, 2018; Department for Education, 2018).

In summary, policies related to young people’s cultural literacy education in the UK are divided among a range of governments, departments and semi-independent bodies which overlap in complex ways and have been shaped by different political administrations over the past decade. During this time, policymakers in the field have also had to grapple with severe fiscal constraints resulting from public sector efficiency programmes.

Going forward, the UK’s decision to leave the EU will present new challenges for the sector but also reflects persistent dilemmas surrounding immigration and diversity which are themselves an important contextual factor when exploring how cultural literacy education is conceptualised in these policymaking spaces.
Method

A systematic search for eligible sources examining cultural literacy education, defined as formal and informal education activities related to cultural identity, cultural practices and cultural heritage, was carried out using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework (Moher et al., 2015). The policy and legislative document repositories of the Westminster Government as well as the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish Governments were searched using a research strategy developed around the three constructs central to the CHIEF project (‘youth’, ‘cultural literacy education’, and ‘Europe’) to develop the string:

(Youth OR young OR child OR pupil) AND (education OR learn OR participate OR knowledge) AND (art OR dance OR drama OR film OR music OR theatre OR history OR commemoration OR museum OR galleries OR libraries OR poetry) AND (culture OR identity OR heritage OR creativity)

Searches were conducted over 8th-24th June 2018 and limited to English language policy documents published between January 2007 and June 2018. In addition, manual searches of these repositories were undertaken to ensure that no relevant documents had been missed (this was necessary due to the limited functioning of the search engine caused by the structure of the repositories). This initial search yielded 508 records. After the removal of duplicates, 162 documents were screened against the exclusion and inclusion criteria (see Appendix 2). A random sample of 10% of all decisions were reviewed blind by another member of the coding team. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus.

After this initial screening process, 126 documents were excluded and 28 documents were deemed eligible for in-depth review (summarised, together with the acronyms by which they are referenced in the remainder of the report, in Appendix 1).

Fifteen of the documents relate to England only, and eight relate to Wales only. Five are UK-wide, and one relates to Northern Ireland only. The process did not return any results for Scotland. The lack of representation of Scottish and Northern Irish policy documents is an unfortunate result of a lack of relevant documents having been published in this timeframe. However, the presence of Welsh policy documents allowed for some analysis of the devolution dynamic within this policy field.
In accordance with PRISMA guidelines, the department of publication and year of publication were extracted from all eligible documents, together with the ‘type’ of document as it was defined by the department of publication (i.e. policy paper, guidance). A thematic analysis of the documents was undertaken using an iterative, inductive approach to the generation of codes and themes guided by the aims and objectives of the review. To create initial codes, four members of the coding team independently read one eligible document. Results were compared, and agreed codes were developed through discussion to create a coding matrix. This process was then repeated until all documents were reviewed in-depth. On each iteration, additional codes were added to the matrix, which was used to guide the generation of codes and identify major themes in the documents. A random sample of 10% of each document was moderated by a second reviewer to ensure consistency of approach, with any disagreements resolved through discussion and consensus.
Findings

Conceptualising Cultural Literacy Education
The conceptualisation of cultural literacy education found in the policy documents is an expansive one, but also one which contains tensions over what counts as culture, who ‘does’ culture, and in particular, the relationship between culture and identity. These findings are explored in this section.

None of the policy documents contain a clear statement of what they take cultural literacy education to be, and indeed this phrase is not used in the document. Only one, Cultural Education (DOC 16), is a direct expression of a cohesive policy agenda for cultural literacy education. All of the other documents contain some elements which are related to cultural literacy education but are not in and of themselves intended as specific expressions of policy in this area. As a result, the constitution of cultural literacy education emerges through the discussion of various cultural practices contained within the documents, which gives rise to a three-pronged conceptualisation: (1) cultural forms, (2), history and heritage, and (3) inter-cultural learning.

To begin with the first part of this, cultural forms, five different sets of cultural expression can be identified from the documents:

1. **Art and Design** (DOCs 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 17, 22, 25, 26, 28) including drawing, painting, sculpture, photography, crafts, fashion, textiles and architecture.
2. **Film and Media** (DOCs 1, 4, 8, 12, 16, 25, 26) including film production, television and radio broadcasting, documentary-making, animation and digital editing.
3. **Literature** (DOCs 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 22, 25, 26) including reading ‘classic’ works of literature, poetry and folk tales, and engaging in storytelling.
4. **Music** (DOCs 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 25, 26, 28) including a range of genres such as classical, folk, hip hop, jazz, musical theatre, pop and rock.
5. **Performing Arts** (DOCs 1, 3, 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, 28) including acrobatics, ballet, dance, drama, opera and singing.

Across these categories, cultural education is understood at once as something that conveys knowledge about culture to young people, and as something which equips young people with the ability to create culture for themselves.
This is reflected in the *Cultural Education* policy paper which notes that cultural education is ‘knowledge-based and teaches children about the best of what has been created and is currently being created’ as well as something that is ‘skills-based and teaches children how to participate in and to create new culture for themselves’ (DOC 16, p.6), providing young people with the ‘skills to experiment, invent and create their own works of art, craft and design’ (p.76).

These concurrent aims for cultural literacy education mean that the documents construct an institutional definition of what constitutes culture at the same time as denying the existence of this definition by placing the emphasis on young people creating culture of their own. This tension is particularly apparent in the *Culture White Paper* (DOC 8). This document sets out a strong view that culture is centrally concerned with creativity, and that the government ‘should no more dictate a community’s culture than we should tell people what to create or how to create it’ (p.13). However, it goes on to state that ‘[k]nowledge of great works of art, great music, great literature and great plays, and of their creators, is an important part of every child’s education’ (p.21). Indeed, many of the documents contain a cannon of British literary ‘greats’ including works by the Brontë sisters, Dickens, Conan Doyle and Darwin (DOCs 8, 16, 19), and a particular emphasis on the work of Shakespeare (DOCs 1, 4, 8, 16). What emerges, then, is an institutional cannon of what counts as ‘high’ culture, which every young person should have knowledge of, and then other cultural forms which young people may choose to engage with based on their own preferences for creative expression.

This narrower, institutional definition of cultural literacy education also sits in tension with ambitions expressed in many of the policy documents to tackle the under-representation of particular groups of young people in cultural education activities, and generally an awareness of the barriers to young people accessing such opportunities. For example, it is noted that ‘[a]lthough there have been some notable improvements there remain gaps with black and minority ethnic and disabled people consistently under-represented in arts, heritage and museum engagement’ (DOC 1, p.20).

Stated ambitions to tackle such under-representation (e.g. DOCs 1, 8, 10) focus predominantly on including young people from diverse backgrounds into the narrower, institutionalised cannon of what constitutes culture, such as classical music or ballet (DOCs 8 and 16), rather than re-defining the cannon as a consequence of demographic diversity. Examples of existing projects which would contribute to this re-definition, such as the Ben Uri gallery which features 21st century immigrant artists and is intended to offer an alternative to ‘establishment Britain’ (DOC 9), are present but do not challenge the mainstream conceptualisation of high culture.
The second theme central to the way in which cultural literacy education is conceptualised is as history and heritage. Indeed, a strong emphasis on history and heritage is present throughout the dataset (DOCs 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28). Activities such as visits to museums, galleries, monuments and historic sites are intended to ‘celebrate our nation’s rich heritage’ (DOC 1, p.8), and heritage is shaped in strongly national terms, as in the following:

All young people should know about our national icons and understand the key points in our history that have shaped our national character and culture. We will support specific programmes to commemorate the events and people that make our nation what it is today. (DOC 16, p.8)

These ‘national icons’ include individuals such as Queen Victoria, Emily Davison and Florence Nightingale (DOC 19), and particular emphasis is also given to commemorating the First World War (e.g. DOCs 1 and 16). In part, this can be explained by the timing of the data collection in relation to the centenary of the war, but it also reflects the way in which history and heritage is conceived of within cultural literacy education with a specific narrative of British history at its centre, where the aim is to:

...know and understand the history of these islands as a coherent, chronological narrative, from the earliest times to the present day: how people’s lives have shaped this nation and how Britain has influenced and been influenced by the wider world. (DOC 19, p.1)

Where the study of other cultures and histories is considered, this is primarily as a means through which to cast the British experience in international perspective, rather than for other cultures to be studied in and of themselves. For example, in England young people study Ancient Greece in school to examine its ‘influence on the western world’ and then study a non-European society ‘that provides contrasts with British history’ (DOC 19, p.5). The local experience of national histories, such as Anglo-Saxon and Roman cultures, is also emphasised (e.g. DOCs 8 and 19), alongside internationally recognised world heritage sites. For example, National Parks are understood to be ‘the soul of Britain. They are the centre of our imagination. When people think of Britain, wherever they are, they imagine these landscapes’ which ‘tell the story of our nation’ (DOC 10, p.2). Returning to the institutional definition of culture identified above, the focus of history and heritage expressed in the documents shows that this definition is also first and foremost national, with learning about specifically British histories and cultures the main priority for cultural literacy education.
It is apparent from these findings, then, that to conceptualise cultural education is also to conceptualise the relationship between culture and particular forms of collective identity. Through statements both about ‘great’ works of art and about national history and heritage, the analysis suggests the importance of a particular expression of British culture sitting at the heart of cultural literacy education policy. However, this expression is distinctly different in the Welsh policy documents, where mentions of ‘Britain’ are far less frequent. Rather, the emphasis is specifically on Wales and Wales’ place in the world, as a ‘unique country, with its own culture, language and government’ (DOC 6, p.5). The aim of cultural literacy education is to ‘celebrate and conserve Wales’ outstanding heritage’ (DOC 25, p.11) through visits to local museums and Welsh heritage sites, and engagement in traditions specific to Welsh culture (DOC 26). Particular emphasis is placed on religion as a part of the national culture, ‘allowing learners to appreciate the significance, value and impact of the rich Christian heritage and dynamic multi-faith composition of Wales past and present’ (DOC 21, p.8) contributing to the uniquely Welsh focus of policy ambitions for cultural literacy education in contrast to those discussed previously.

While the institutional definition of culture embedded within cultural literacy education is still understood, in the Welsh documents, in strongly national terms, and as such the function of cultural literacy education – to educate young people about the national culture – remains the same, the expression of what counts as national is different. These multiple understandings of the national are a direct consequence of the multi-national character of the UK.

There are also substantive differences resulting from the multi-national character of the UK in how the documents conceive of inter-cultural learning, which is the third theme in the conceptualisation of cultural literacy education found in the documents. In the Welsh data, greater emphasis is evident on how, through cultural literacy education, young people develop knowledge of other cultures. For example, it is ‘[t]hrough engaging, practical and integrated activities’ that ‘children can learn more about themselves, other people and the world around them and develop an understanding of their rich cultural and religious heritage in Wales’ (DOC 21, p.12). This engagement with diverse cultures is framed both in terms of the cultural diversity to be found in Wales (DOCs 21 and 27) and in terms of diverse cultures around the world (DOCs 7 and 22). It is aimed at developing ‘in every learner a sense of personal and cultural identity that is receptive and respectful towards others’ (DOC 24, p.6).
A similar emphasis on inter-cultural learning is also evident in the one document related to cultural literacy education in Northern Ireland (DOC 28). Here, learning about history and heritage aims at conveying ‘...how our identity, way of life and culture has been shaped by influences from the local and wider world’ (p.89). However, mentions of a distinctly Northern Irish collective culture are sparser than in the Welsh or British cases, with the main emphasis placed on understanding cultural differences within communities in Northern Ireland. For example, this involves ‘knowing about aspects of their cultural heritage, including the diversity of cultures that contribute to Northern Ireland’ at the same time as ‘discussing the causes of conflict in their community, and how they feel about it’ (p.95). This distinct emphasis has arisen from the distinct context of Northern Ireland as a country which has experienced significant, recent, civil conflict and here inter-cultural learning therefore has taken on a specific meaning and purpose to build understanding between communities.

Returning to Westminster, inter-cultural learning predominantly appears in English and UK-wide policy documents in relation to ‘fundamental British values’. Guidance (DOC 14) introduced in 2014 placed a duty on all schools and other providers of educational activities to promote these values as part of the wider ‘Prevent’ strategy which aims to stop the radicalisation which is seen to underpin the occurrence of terrorist acts in the UK (Gov.uk, 2011). One of the values is ‘mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs’ (DOC 14, p.5), with schools required to ensure that young people ‘...be encouraged to regard people of all faiths, races and cultures with respect and tolerance’ (p.4). This emphasis is found also in the conceptualisation of citizenship education in England, where young people explore ‘diverse national, regional, religious and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual understanding’ (DOC 20, p.3). This emphasis on tolerance and mutual understanding can be understood in light of the emergence of these agendas from securitised concern about radicalisation following a rise in terrorism in major English cities as well as from a longer standing perception that, as a result of multiculturalism, these cities were becoming increasingly divided and that this was driving social exclusion (see also Cantle, 2012).

Overall, the conceptualisation of cultural literacy education in the policy documents is on the one hand expansive, embracing individual cultural expression, but on the other hand narrow, with an institutional cultural cannon shaped around a particular understanding of ‘high’ culture and of a particular expression of national identity. This expression of national identity is different depending on which nation of the UK is under consideration as a consequence of the devolved character of policymaking in this field; however, across the UK the focus is distinctly on the national, with the scope of cultural literacy education understood as specifically national and the role of the international a source of comparison and contrast with the national experience.
Operationalising Cultural Literacy Education
Analysis of the policy documents shows that cultural literacy education is operationalised in a variety of physical and digital spaces by a wide range of providers making use of a diversifying range of funding streams.

In turn, these findings demonstrate that the role of government as regards cultural literacy education is best conceived as one of ‘aspiration-setting’, setting a direction for policy far removed from policy implementation.

The main way in which cultural literacy education policy is operationalised within the public sector with direct funding from government is within school settings. Indeed, schools are seen to ‘…have an essential role to play in introducing cultural experiences to their students as part of a broad and rich curriculum’ (DOC 16, p.13; see also DOCs 6, 7, 8). Beyond schools, the documents show that cultural literacy education policies are also operationalised in a variety of quasi-public settings. Indeed, operationalisation within schools is also enhanced by this wider environment; for example, Artsmark is an accreditation awarded by Arts Council England to enhance cultural educational activities within school settings (DOCs 9 and 16) and school programmes are also run by major cultural institutions such as the Royal Shakespeare Company (DOC 8) and the South Downs National Park (DOC 10).

Museums, galleries and heritage sites, at both local and national levels, are central to this, with the vast majority of the policy documents identifying them as key institutions that ‘…enable young people to gain new perspectives on their studies inside the classroom’ (DOC 16, p.6) through engagement with ‘artefacts from a variety of historical and contemporary cultures and contexts’ (DOC 22: 12; see also DOCs 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 25, 26, 27, 28). Central too, to the operationalisation of cultural literacy education, are libraries. Libraries, run locally under the purview of local authorities, are understood to ‘empower people with access to resources’ (DOC 13). They are seen to offer young people the chance ‘…to discover, have fun, to learn and to share’ through a range of programmes and activities (DOC 5).

A wide range of bodies and organisations additionally make up the policy delivery landscape for cultural literacy education, often through partnership-working including public and private organisational forms.
For example, ‘Classical Hundred’ is a partnership between the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, Classic FM (a privately-owned radio station) and Decca (a record label) to produce classical music resources for young people (DOC 9) and the ‘Huge History Lesson’ was a collaboration between Arts Council England, TES Global (a digital education company), the British Museum, the Victoria & Albert Museum and the Royal Shakespeare Company designed ‘to deliver cultural education teaching resources online’ (DOC 1, p.24). Arts Council England also funds Bridge organisations which build relationships between schools and a range of different cultural providers (DOC 8). This partnership working is central to the perceived need to develop a more coherent cultural education offer through collaboration, given the sheer diversity of different organisations working in the field (DOC 9).

These findings show that governmental control over the delivery of cultural literacy education, beyond school curricula, is limited as a consequence of the ways in which policy delivery is devolved away from direct government control and, in many cases, out of the public sector altogether. This approach to cultural literacy education might be best understood as one of aspiration-setting, where government sets out an ideal vision for cultural literacy education which is then operationalised by organisations which either sit at arm’s length from, or are fully independent of, national government.

Government has in this sense retreated from a state-sponsored approach to cultural education to embrace a collaborative approach, and in emphasising museums, galleries, heritage sites and libraries as core to operationalising this agenda suggests that it sees its role as one of providing the space for cultural literacy education, rather than educational programmes themselves. Yet this role in providing physical space is itself shifting, as the documents reviewed resoundingly endorse the value of online, digital access to cultural education opportunities. Indeed, providing access to culture is ‘one particular area in which cultural organisations’ are understood to ‘have the potential to add value for young people’ (DOC 1, p.23). The digital is understood as a means to explore creative ideas, to view live performances outside of theatres and opera houses, and to engage interactively with a range of media (DOCs 1, 8, 9, 10, 16, 22, 25, 28).

The retreat from state-sponsored cultural education is further reflected in the policy documents in relation to the funding of programmes associated with cultural literacy education.
Funding streams are vastly varied, combining public funding provided directly by government with funding obtained through partnership-working with private sector bodies – for example, the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra’s Schools Partnership is funded by Deutsche Bank (DOC 16), self-funding through earned income (such as from ticket sales) and fundraising (DOCs 8 and 16), philanthropic giving (DOCs 5, 9, 16) and even crowd-funding, which is understood as an ‘innovative way of funding cultural projects’ (DOC 8, p.54).

This combination of income streams is understood to provide ‘…the basis for a thriving and resilient cultural sector’ (DOC 8, p.11), yet it is also a further reflection of the distance between the aspiration-setting activities of government and the diverse organisations involved in the construction of cultural education activities in the face of increasingly restricted public funding. This is explicitly recognised in the Cultural Education policy paper, which states that:

Our ambitions are stretching. Achieving them will require the prioritisation of existing budgets and ongoing contributions from non-government sources and partnerships. These partnerships will need to pool resources and expertise to design and provide a coherent cultural offer. (DOC 16, p.9)

The distance between policy ambition and policy implementation is further reflected in the emphasis placed on the local delivery of cultural literacy education. Culture is understood here, in contrast to its overtly national character observed in the preceding section, as ‘rooted at the local level’, and government wants ‘…more local leaders to grasp the potential of culture to achieve their vision for their community, and to put culture at the forefront of their strategies’ (DOC 8, p.30). Yet limited funding at the local level means that few local authorities are able to prioritise cultural education in this way. This is reflected in documents which consider the funding of libraries, which in the face of cuts to local authority budgets are encouraged to ‘…be more commercially minded and work with a range of partners’, as well as to make more use of volunteers, in order to be able to deliver educational activities (DOC 5).

Finally, the aspiration-setting role of government with regards to cultural literacy education is further exemplified in the approach that the documents take to access and participation in cultural learning activities. Barriers to access are a central theme of the Cultural Education policy paper and the Culture White Paper, among others (see also DOCs 1, 4, 13, 25). These documents emphasis that ‘[a]ccess to cultural education is a matter of social justice’ and that ‘young people from disadvantaged backgrounds’ should have ‘meaningful relationships with culture’ (DOC 8, p.21) because [p]upils with exceptional talent should have the opportunity, irrespective of background, to develop their skills to the highest levels (DOC 16: 11). Yet these ambitions are not to be carried forward by government.
The documents setting out these aspirations make reference, for example, to programmes offered by privately-funded orchestras and theatres aimed at reaching out to young people living in deprived areas, and to programmes run by arm’s length and third sector bodies to increase the participation of young people from diverse backgrounds in cultural learning activities. While government has set an agenda to increase the participation of young people from diverse and disadvantaged backgrounds and to reduce barriers to access, the realisation of this agenda has been delegated to semi- or fully independent organisations.

To summarise, this section has analysed the diverse organisational landscape responsible for operationalising cultural literacy education. While cultural literacy remains central to school curricula, the ambitious agenda put forward by government for cultural literacy education is to a significant extent to be delivered by organisations beyond its control. This means that government takes on a primarily aspiration-setting role with regards to how cultural literacy education is operationalised, as a consequence both of devolving responsibilities out of the public sector and of reducing the public funding of cultural literacy programmes.

The Value of Cultural Literacy Education

Statements of the value of cultural literacy education are a central theme of the policy documents. The prevalence of statements of value are themselves a further indication of the ways in which the documents conceive of government’s aspiration-setting role in the field, focusing in on what government aims to achieve through cultural literacy education. Expressions of value take two forms. The first, which is less prevalent, is an intrinsic view of cultural literacy education which understands its value to lie in its potential to enrich the lives of young people. The second, and considerably more prevalent, is an instrumental view which emphasises the value that cultural literacy education brings to the economy and society. This tendency towards the instrumental view found in the documents is, it is argued, rooted in the intervention of an economic logic into the cultural sector.

The intrinsic value of cultural literacy education is expressed as the ‘…enriching value of culture in and of itself’ (DOC 8, p.15). Cultural literacy opportunities are understood, in this framing, to develop ‘…a generation of well-rounded and culturally enriched young people’ (DOC 16, p.6) who are able to ‘…explore feelings and express themselves’ (DOC 28, p.32). The concept of ‘enrichment’ is central to the intrinsic definition of value that the documents take cultural education to bring.
This enrichment is understood both to be rooted in the consumption of culture through ‘[e]xploration, appreciation and enjoyment’ to enrich ‘learners’ personal and public lives’ (DOC 22, p.10, see also DOCs 10, 22, 28), and to result from an interactive, creative engagement with culture which is seen to ‘ignite the imaginations of young people’ through the exploration of their ideas, feelings and beliefs (DOC 8, p.6). This intrinsic value is conceptualised at the level of the individual, rather than the collective. It is through culture that young people ‘not only make sense of [themselves] and the world’ but ‘also make [their] lives enchanted’ (DOC 16, p.3).

The more dominant instrumental understanding of the value of cultural literacy education, on the other hand conceives of value in terms of its contribution to other primary aims of government. This instrumental value is expressed in four main ways. Firstly, it is conceptualised in terms of the contribution that culture makes to the national economy and the importance, therefore, of investing in cultural literacy education to building economic growth (e.g. DOCs 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 22). Within this view, culture is seen to ‘provide the fuel for the wider creative economy’ (DOC 1, p.13) as an investment in the future growth of the national economy:

The UK’s future will be built at the nexus of our artistic and cultural creativity and our technical brilliance. The Centre for Economics and Business Research 2018 World Economic League Tables identify this particular blend of creativity and technology skills as the driving force behind the UK’s strong economic prospects over the long term’ (p.4; see also DOC 2).

Many of the documents further emphasise the importance of culture to economic growth through statistical statements which serve to monetise this value (DOCs 1, 2, 3, 10, 16). For example, the Culture White Paper states that:

In 2014, the economic contribution of museums, galleries, libraries and the arts was £5.4billion, representing 0.3% of the total UK economy. This is up 59% (in nominal terms) since 2010. (DOC 8, 16)

Setting the context of cultural literacy education in such strongly economic terms means that cultural literacy education policy is then viewed through the lens of the value-added that it brings to the UK economy.
For example, it is noted that ‘[t]he creative industries… are at the heart of the nation’s competitive advantage’ (DOC 2, p.2) and National Parks are seen to be ‘cherished’ for their ‘natural beauty, opportunities for open air recreation and cultural heritage’ but also to offer ‘tremendous economic benefits’ (DOC 10, p.10).

Conceptualising the value of culture as economic means that the purpose of cultural literacy education then is understood as to produce citizens who can contribute to this economic value, ‘…creating the workforce of the future in a sector that continues to help to drive forward the UK’s growth agenda’ (DOC 16, p.5). Workforce creation is thus a central theme across the documents (e.g. DOCs 1, 2, 3, 8, 22). This is expressed primarily through the language of ‘skills’ to be developed for use in the cultural economy. For example, the documents set out plans for programmes aimed specifically at building skills to work in the cultural sector, from an Arts Management Professional Development Programme (DOC 4) to a ‘creative careers programme’ aimed at increasing the number of skilled professionals available to work in creative industries (DOC2), new apprenticeship programmes on built heritage conservation (DOC 10), and filmmaking programmes designed to enable young people to gain ‘valuable and practical skills, increasing employment opportunities’ (DOC 12).

The second way in which the instrumental value of cultural literacy education is expressed is with reference to the benefits it brings to individuals’ lives beyond the enrichment identified in the intrinsic view. Cultural literacy education is seen, firstly, to make a significant contribution to the health and wellbeing of young people (DOCs 1, 5, 8, 10, 16, 22, 28). The Culture White Paper sets out this conceptualisation of value particularly clearly, rooting it in scientific research:

There is considerable evidence of the beneficial effects of the arts on both physical and mental health. This includes improvements such as positive physiological and psychological changes in clinical outcomes; decreasing the amount of time spent in hospital; and improving mental health. (DOC 8, p.15)

The role of cultural literacy education, then, is framed in terms of enabling people to live healthy lives. This conceptualisation of value is evident in schemes such as the Dartmoor National Park ‘Europarc’ Junior Ranger Programme which was piloted in 2015 to enable young people to ‘reconnect with the natural world and their cultural heritage’ and is seen to have demonstrated ‘clear social, health and wellbeing benefits for participants’ (DOC 10, p.7).
However, there is also evidence of the intervention of the economic logic, as described above, intervening within this health and wellbeing focused conceptualisation of value. This is evident, for example, by the ‘Reading Well Books on Prescription’ scheme (DOC 5). Through this scheme libraries offer books ‘curated and endorsed’ by health professionals for those suffering from common mental health conditions. The benefits of this scheme are framed in strongly economic terms, with the scheme helping to ‘reduce the need for costly interventions’ by medical services, meaning that ‘the predicted medical cost savings associated with library use of £1.32 per person per year’. So while the value of cultural literacy education here is understood primarily in relation to the health and wellbeing of the individual, underlying this interest is an economic logic to reduce public spending through engagement with cultural resources.

The individual benefits that cultural literacy education brings are also understood in relation to educational attainment (DOCs 1, 5, 8, 10, 16, 25). The *Culture White Paper* notes that ‘[e]xperiencing and understanding culture is integral to education’ (DOC 8, p.21), referencing research which shows that young people who participate in culture are more likely to go on to higher education. This framing of the value of cultural literacy education is then used to underpin arguments that schools should ‘promote cultural education as a means of raising the educational attainment of disadvantaged pupils’ (p.23) and that wider cultural organisations have a responsibility to provide ‘quality cultural experiences’ to young people to supplement ‘formal education’ (DOC 5).

Cultural literacy education is also understood, in this framing of its value, as the space in which ‘talent’ for a particular form of culture is identified. Good cultural literacy education is conceptualised as that which ‘supports talent early on’ (DOC 11) and plays a significant part in ‘nurturing young people’s talent’ (DOC 16, p.29) by ‘supporting a strong and sustainable talent pipeline’ into the creative industries (DOC 2, p.18). Once again, this individualising emphasis on identifying particularly talented young people can be understood with reference to the economic logic discussed earlier. For example, in the *UK Digital Strategy* document, it is explained that ‘[as] we leave the European Union, it will be even more important to ensure that we continue to develop our home-grown talent’ and to ‘up-skill our workforce’ (DOC 3). Once again, then, the value of cultural literacy education in enhancing educational outcomes is linked to the skills and talents needed to underpin future economic growth in a post-Brexit UK.

The third way in which the value of cultural literacy education is expressed instrumentally within the dataset is with reference to its potential impact on local communities.
This is expressed, firstly, with reference to community cohesion (e.g. DOCs 5, 6, 8, 12, 28), where it is noted that:

There is evidence to show that cultural participation can contribute to social relationships, community cohesion, and/or make communities feel safer and stronger. Research has found positive links between cultural participation and improved social skills and engagement with the wider community, and evidence that culture can play a role in tackling crime. (DOC 8, p.15)

Participating in culture, then, is framed as having value in its potential to build safe, strong and ‘resilient’ communities (DOC 5), and to ‘address social isolation and foster community engagement’ at an individual level (DOC 1, p.20). Part of this involves recognising cultural difference and supporting conflict resolution (DOCs 6, 12, 28). For example, a campaign run in Manchester by a charity which used various cultural activities to engage young people in the potential of conflict resolution to foster community cohesion is referenced as an example to illustrate the value of cultural literacy education to communities (DOC 12). It is also evident in the Northern Irish policy document which frames cultural literacy education in terms of the appreciation of similarity and difference within reference to local community, ‘recognising and valuing the culture and traditions of one group who share their community’ (DOC 28, p.95).

Culture is seen to have further community-based value in its role underpinning local level regeneration, where culture ‘has the potential to transform communities’ (DOC 8, p.9), and this framing returns us to the intervention of the economic logic in ascribing the instrumental value of cultural literacy education. Under this logic, ‘[t]he development of our historic built environment’ is seen as driving ‘regeneration, job creation, business growth and prosperity’ (p.36). Cultural literacy education, then, is contextualised within reference to the value of culture in driving regeneration to secure future local economic growth, linking this regeneration-focused understanding of value back to the perceived need for cultural literacy education to build a culturally competent workforce with the skills to carry forward this agenda.

The fourth and final way in which the value of cultural literacy education is conceptualised instrumentally is with reference to the international. Primarily, this value is understood as ‘soft power’, or the ability of the UK to exert influence internationally (DOCs 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 16, 25). The Culture White Paper frames culture as a matter of soft power:
The UK is a leader in soft power. We are respected for our strong and stable democracy, our belief in individual liberty, our diversity and our freedom of expression. Our culture celebrates these values. (DOC 8, p.42)

Here, UK-sponsored international cultural literacy programmes are seen as a way in which to pursue liberal values, and this is pursued through a range of programmes which intersect with international development and foreign policy ambitions. For example, as part of the Olympic and Paralympic Legacy programme following the 2012 London Games, many UK led cultural and educational activities which promoted peace and conflict resolution were delivered in countries around the world (DOC 12). These events were seen as a means through which to promote values of liberty and reconciliation.

This framing of the value of cultural literacy education also has an additional economic aspect. Here, cultural education programmes based in the UK are valued because they produce citizens who will be ready to maintain and build upon the UK’s international reputation and influence within the context of a globalised economy.
This is expressed particularly in relation to the UK’s departure from the EU, as in the following:

The UK is a global leader in culture and creativity and, as we leave the European Union, we are committed to maintaining our position on the world stage, to driving creative innovation, and to producing talent that is recognised the world over’. (DOC 1, p.43)

The way in which cultural education is linked to Brexit is a further indication of the intervention of an economic logic into the cultural sector.

In summary, this section has shown that the value of cultural literacy education is a central concern of the policy documents, but that this value is expressed concurrently in a number of different ways. Culture is framed as having intrinsic value in enriching individual lives through enjoyment, appreciation and exploration, but is more dominantly understood in instrumental terms as delivering on a range of agendas covering the economy, health, education, community cohesion and regeneration, and international diplomacy. While it is posited, therefore, that cultural literacy education should inspire and enrich individuals’ lives, the intervention in particular of an economic logic into the cultural sector means that such aspirations sit side by side with those for which cultural literacy education is intended to build a resilient workforce capable of developing the cultural sector for economic growth and international influence.

As the UK’s economic future, as well as its place on the international stage, has become less certain as a result of the decision to withdraw from the EU, there are indications that the impetus to demonstrate the value-added that cultural literacy education programmes provide are becoming more important, both in terms of justifying public expenditure on such programmes and in framing the objectives that such programmes are designed to achieve.
Discussion

The findings presented in this report highlight the ways in which cultural literacy education has been conceptualised within UK policy over the past decade. This section discusses these findings, and argues that the functioning of cultural literacy education within UK policy can best be understood with reference to a ‘neo-liberal communitarian’ model of governance.

This neo-liberal communitarian model combines two seemingly contradictory threads: the individualising logics of neo-liberalism which emphasise responsibility and self-regulation (cf. Clarke, 2004), alongside the collective focus of communitarianism on shared culture and values (cf. van Leeuwen, 2015). These threads exist in a ‘double helix’ (Schinkel and Van Houdt, 2010) through which they are deployed simultaneously to responsibilise citizens in order to reduce the perceived burden they present to the state, and to police the nationalist parameters of inclusion and exclusion in diverse contexts (Schinkel and van Houdt, 2010; van Houdt et al., 2011; van Houdt and Schinkel, 2013; see also Antonsich, 2016). The focus of this existing research into neo-liberal communitarianism has focused on the integration of prospective citizens through citizenship tests and other integration policies; however, the findings of this policy review suggest that this model is also shaping cultural literacy education for existing citizens.

The neo-liberal strand of the neo-liberal communitarian double-helix is strongly evident in the cultural literacy education reviewed in this report. The intervention of a neo-liberal economic logic into the cultural education sector is apparent in the lengths that the documents go to in order to demonstrate the ‘value-added’ that cultural literacy education brings to the economy and society. This is explained in direct terms, with reference to how educational programmes can equip young people with the knowledge and skills they need to fill gaps in creative industry labour markets, and in indirect terms, for example with reference to boosting the health and wellbeing of young people and thus reducing public healthcare costs, and in articulating a vision of culture as an individual pursuit.

It is through these mechanisms that the policies express an aim for cultural literacy education to construct ‘neo-liberal subjects’, responsible for their own choices and capable of self-regulation to become productive contributors to the national economy with little dependence on the state. Within this responsibilising process, the risks associated with growing uncertainty are individualised and removed from state responsibility (Clarke and Newman, 2012; 2004; Hammett, 2014).
This focus on neo-liberal governmentality has its roots in longer standing trends associated with the new public management which date back to the late 1970s and seek to reconceptualise the role of government as one of steering policy rather than directly managing its implementation, but also reflect more recent attempts to reduce the size of the state in response to financial constraints imposed on the public sector in the wake of the post-2008 recession (Skelcher et al., 2013). Alongside the emphasis on constructing neo-liberal subjects through cultural literacy education, the impact of these trends is also evident in the ways in which the mechanisms which operationalise policies are increasingly far removed from government to the extent that government’s role in this policy field is one of aspiration-setting at far remove from implementation.

In addition to this focus on neo-liberal governmentality, the findings also demonstrate that UK policy conceives of cultural literacy education as related to specifically national expressions of culture, and it is through this framing that a communitarian form of governance is also evident from the findings. While policy discusses local, sub-national cultures to a more limited extent, the primary thrust of focus is on the national culture with scant mention of cultures as they exist internationally or globally. Cultural literacy education, then, is understood to instil in young people an awareness and understanding of national culture and national identity. To the extent that UK policy refers to inter-cultural learning, this is posited as a means to achieve community cohesion, rather than a way to develop global, cosmopolitan outlooks (see, for example, Hartung, 2017; Nussbaum, 1997).

This nationalist conceptualisation of cultural literacy education can be understood in light of British policy trends over the course of the early 21st century which have emphasised the need to strengthen national identity as a source of binding sentiment in diverse, multicultural communities. This is embodied in the language of ‘British values’ which began to gain political salience in the early 2000s as a result of the perceived need to strengthen the integration of diverse communities in light of the threat of home-grown terrorism and civil disorder (Cantle, 2012; Crick, 1998; Ragazzi, 2014) and which then later was articulated as ‘muscular liberalism’, positing that a stronger sense of national identity was needed to combat communities becoming isolated from society, and thus – it is claimed – more vulnerable to terrorist radicalisation (Basham and Vaughan-Williams, 2013). Commentators have interpreted this as a ‘backlash’ against the perceived failure of multiculturalism to provide a focus of belonging in diverse societies (Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2010; see also Joppke, 2014; Starkey, 2018).
References to cultural practices beyond the nation are treated primarily as ‘other’ cultures to be compared against ‘our’ culture. While on the one hand this could be understood as a kind of ‘global orientation’ (Parkekh, 2003) within cultural literacy education, whereby young people are encouraged to explore and examine international cultures while remaining grounded in their own national culture, on the other hand it can also be understood with regards to the ways in which a sense of exceptionalism has long pervaded British identity. Here, Britain is imagined as advancing liberty and justice both at home and internationally (Atkins, 2015) and this notion of British exceptionalism appears central to how the international is treated in the policy documents, with a particular focus on advancing soft power to promote core liberal values.

Within this focus on national culture, tensions are also evident over the meaning of the ‘national’ as a consequence of the multi-national character of the UK. While in the Westminster policymaking space the primary focus is on Britain and Britishness, and British national identity is primarily defined in terms of fundamental liberal values, in the nations that make up the UK the picture is quite different. Policy in devolved administrations has remained quite distinct from concerns about multiculturalism and diversity discussed above (Rhys and Mycock, 2007). For example, in Northern Ireland the focus has been on education to underpin democratic peace in the context of national division (Smith, 2010), while in Wales and Scotland policy has articulated more explicitly distinct national identities over and above a centrally imposed Britishness (Rhys and Mycock, 2007). The co-existence of these understandings of national identity in cultural literacy education policies points to the enduring and unresolved tensions surrounding the meaning of the ‘national’ in the context of British devolution (see also Black and Whigham, 2017; Silk, 2011; Winter, 2013).

These dual strands of neo-liberalism and national communitarianism found in the data are reflective of the neo-liberal communitarian model of governance which is shaping cultural literacy education policy in the UK, and demonstrate the salience of this model with regards to policies aimed at existing citizens in addition to the integration of new migrants. Cultural literacy education in the UK functions to construct the parameters of belonging by culturally defining the national community, while at the same time placing expectations of self-responsibility and self-regulation on existing citizens in an era of neo-liberal governance and small government.
Conclusion

The aim of this policy review was to deliver a systematic analysis of official policies relating to the cultural literacy education of young people in the UK. It aimed to offer a comprehensive understanding of how young people’s cultural literacy education is constituted and operationalised within UK policy, and to draw out strengths, weaknesses and tensions apparent within this. The policy review utilised the PRISMA framework to systematically analyse 28 policy documents containing content relevant to the cultural literacy education of young people published by both the UK government and the devolved governments of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland from 2007 until 2018.

The review found, firstly, that young people’s cultural literacy education in the UK is a nationalist endeavour, although it also found tensions within this over what ‘national’ is taken to mean within the multi-national UK context. Secondly, it found that cultural literacy education functions to construct the ‘neo-liberal subject’ as a responsible individual capable of contributing to the national economy. Thirdly, it found that this neo-liberal logic has also shaped the ways in which cultural literacy education is operationalised, moving it further out of government control as a consequence of delegated governance and financial constraint.

Based on these findings, the report argued overall that cultural literacy education policy in the UK can be best understood as a form of ‘neo-liberal communitarian’ governance, through which a strong articulation of national community is mobilised alongside the individualising logics of neo-liberalism in order to assert nationalist parameters of belonging. While the observation of the co-existence of neo-liberalism and communitarianism may appear contradictory, they function together as a means through which to shape young people’s cultural literacy education towards the production of self-regulating national citizens.
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## Appendix 1: Summary of Policy Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Art and Design in the National Curriculum for Wales</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>History in the National Curriculum for Wales</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Personal and Social Education Framework for 7-19 Year Olds in Wales</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wales, Europe and the World</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding of the World</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Moving Forward - Gypsy Traveller Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>DCELS</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Eligibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include all documents which</th>
<th>Were published since 1/1/2007</th>
<th>To allow for the ways in which young people’s cultural literacy education has been constructed in policy documents over time, delimited to when all relevant partners on the CHIEF project had become members of the EU.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are national level policy documents</td>
<td>To focus in on the national level which is the specific objective of this component of the CHIEF project. In the UK, this includes the Westminster Government as well as the devolved administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are an expression of policy</td>
<td>To capture all documents which contain expressions of policy(^{190}), rather than refining by a specific form of document. In the UK, this includes policy papers, statutory and non-statutory guidance, and legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>To focus specifically on documents with relevance to the research objectives of the CHIEF project.(^{191})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{190}\) For the purposes of the review, policy is defined as an authoritative statement of a proposed course, principle or codification of government action, which typically states matters of principle and focuses on action (stating what is to be done and by whom).

\(^{191}\) Education is defined here to include formal, semi-formal and informal activities and practices designed to develop knowledge, understanding and skills. ‘Cultural literacy’ is defined as competence in understanding cultural references (defined as embodied and enacted knowledge of values, behavioural patterns and socially constructed meanings of what is considered as ‘heritage’), enabling active cultural participation in society.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excluded all documents which</th>
<th>Were published before 1/1/2227</th>
<th>See above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are policy documents which apply at local, regional or trans-state levels</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not express policy</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are irrelevant to the combined constructs of ‘young people’, ‘education’ and ‘cultural literacy’</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are duplicates</td>
<td>To ensure that the analysis is not duplicated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Cultural/Educational Literature Review (Croatia)
Ivan Hrstić, Dino Vukušić

Summary

The report presents and discusses studies published on the topics of the education of youth in the Republic of Croatia as regards cultural literacy, their cultural identities, and cultural interactions. The aim was to identify the main theoretical approaches, as well as empirical findings. For the purpose of the research, a search of online catalogues of the National and University Library in Zagreb and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb library was conducted. Additionally, the Croatian Scientific Bibliography, Researchgate, Academia.edu, and Google Scholar were surveyed. In the end 26 studies were selected and analysed.

The main findings are grouped into three major topics: national identity and interculturalism, intercultural education within the formal education system, and social distance towards national minorities. The analysis revealed that cultural literacy as such has not been dealt with in Croatian academic outputs and research so far. However, similar concepts such as multiculturalism and interculturalism have attracted more attention, especially from 2000 onwards, primarily under the increasing power of the process of Croatian accession to the EU. Croatian scholars most frequently argue that the intercultural aspects of education must be introduced into the formal education system in Croatia, although they also stress the simultaneous importance of education in preserving the Croatian national identity. In line with this, the empirical studies analysed in the review indicate that national identity is more pronounced than supra-national identity among Croatian youth. This is a consequence of a number of factors that arise from the overall social context, which is characterised by pronounced societal homogeneity (religious and cultural) and a strong sense of national identity as a post-Communist nation that fought a war for independence in the 1990s.

These circumstances have reflected on the national curriculum as well, which mainly features a monocultural perspective that insufficiently acknowledges the contributions of national minorities to Croatian culture. Multicultural policy in formal education, which has attracted significant attention from Croatian social scientists, has mainly focused on providing the necessary conditions for preserving national minorities’ identity and culture through special school programmes for minorities. However, some research findings show that this type of approach to multicultural education policy can result in even more pronounced social distance towards national minorities.
Introduction

Aims of the Review
The purpose of this academic literature review is to reveal and summarise key theoretical contributions and empirical findings on the topics of the education of youth in the Republic of Croatia as regards cultural literacy, their cultural identities, and cultural interactions. This will allow conclusions to be drawn as to how young people’s cultural literacy education is assessed, conceived, and presented by Croatian scholars. In discussing the findings, particular attention will be paid to the demographic and political situation in Croatia. This will allow the findings to be contextualised in terms of the content of the studies under review, as well as in terms of general trends in interest shown in the topic over an extended period of time.

The review (1) analyses academic studies in the national language, as well as studies published in international journals that discuss forms of cultural literacy education, cultural identities, and cultural interactions of Croatian youth, and (2) underpins the design of the empirical components of the broader CHIEF project. More information about the project can be found at http://chiefproject.eu.

Structure of the Report
The first chapter provides an overview of the method used to search academic studies. The main findings are then presented within three major themes: national identity and interculturalism, intercultural education within the formal education system, and social distance towards national minorities. These are identified according to interest in concepts related to cultural literacy shown by Croatian authors. Interest in these points is particularly shaped by the overall Croatian social context, which is characterised by pronounced societal homogeneity (religious and cultural) and a strong sense of national identity as a post-Communist nation that fought a war for independence in the 1990s. Globalisation and accession to the EU pose major challenges to cultural literacy policy, which is reflected in academic literature on the topic, as will be shown in the discussion. Final concluding remarks are presented at the end.
Method
The primary search for academic studies related to the concept of cultural literacy was carried out manually using search terms relevant for the subject of review (see below). A supplementary search was carried out based on the names of key authors/contributors in the field (as these were identified through the initial search) in order to identify further outputs.

The main sources were the online catalogues of the National and University Library in Zagreb (http://www.nsk.hr/) and the library of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb (http://knjiznica.ffzg.unizg.hr/), the two largest and best equipped Croatian scientific libraries. In the second phase, a search was conducted on the website of the Croatian Scientific Bibliography (https://bib.irb.hr/), an online bibliography consisting of over 500,000 entries of all types of scientific publications published by Croatian scientists since 1997. In the third phase, social networking sites for scientists and researchers such as Researchgate (https://www.researchgate.net/), Academia (https://www.academia.edu/), and Google Scholar (https://scholar.google.hr) were also searched. In addition to the main searches, the bibliographical references of the analysed studies were also used to identify other potentially relevant studies that were missed in the initial search.

The search was conducted from 1 July to 1 September 2018. It was limited to publications written in Croatian or English, with no limits in terms of time frame. The search was intended to locate studies published in Croatia (books, book chapters, and research papers), as well as studies published in international publications that refer to the situation in Croatia regarding the topic.

The initial search with cultural literacy as the search term did not identify any relevant studies, thus additional searches were conducted using the concepts of multiculturalism, interculturalism, multicultural education, intercultural education, cultural heritage, culture, AND youth as search terms. These searches resulted in a larger number of hits than the initial search. Out of all identified publications, on the basis of relevance to the key themes, 26 studies were selected (listed in the bibliography at the end of the review). Most of them are book chapters (12) and research papers published in academic journals (8), but they also include four books, one master’s thesis, and one doctoral dissertation. Nearly all of them (24) are empirical studies.
Findings

National Identity and Interculturalism

As a concept, cultural literacy has not been the subject of much discussion in the Croatian academic literature. Scholarly focus is more often placed on the related ideas of interculturalism and multiculturalism, particularly in terms of formal education. Most studies relevant to the topic are underpinned by the assumed importance of preserving national identity in a globalising world, which results in an increasing emphasis on national heritage, culture, and identity. Accordingly, on the theoretical level, Croatian authors often address the role education plays in preserving national identity, along with the need to implement intercultural education. This theoretical type of study is supplemented by empirical research on the place identification of young people in Croatia, which confirms the strength of national over supranational identification, as will be shown later.

In dealing with the issues of multiculturalism and interculturalism, Croatian authors rarely try to create an original theoretical approach or to propose a new definition of some of the key terms. In most cases, foreign authors like Perotti (1995), Byram (1997), Deardorff (2004), Berardo (2005), and Lafraya (2011) are cited. Accordingly, multiculturalism is usually interpreted as a condition within a plural society characterized by the presence of different cultural groups with different identities (Mrnjaus, Rončević & Ivošević, 2013; Borovac-Pečarević, 2014; Piršl, 2016a; Piršl, 2016b). On the other hand, the same authors usually define interculturality as the dynamics between these cultural groups. Regarding both concepts, Croatian social scientists most frequently stress the need to introduce an intercultural approach in formal education due to the globalization process, especially in reference to the process of Croatian accession to the EU (Ninčević, 2009; Paar & Šetić, 2015). However, these claims do not imply moving beyond a focus on national identity. As Ninčević (2009) concludes, Europe must conceptualize its identity as the sum of all languages, religions, and other affiliations of all Europeans. In his viewpoint, the only way forward for Europe is to incorporate all elements of European history into the common European identity and to clearly state that strengthening the European identity does not necessarily signify a lessening of the national identity.

Thus, this approach does not perceive the EU as opposed to national identities and nation-state sovereignties. In turn, the implementation of intercultural education in the formal education system on the basis of particular national identities is thus seen as the main prerequisite for a better future at both the European and the national (Croatian) level. Mrnjaus, Rončević & Ivošević (2013) confirm this reasoning by concluding that only students who are familiar with the values and characteristics of their own cultural and national identity are capable of successfully embracing intercultural communication.
In a similar manner, Vrgoč (2005) states that children in Croatia must know about language, history, culture, and religion as essential component of the Croatian identity. In line with this, empirical findings show that the national identification has become increasingly more important among Croatian youth since the 1990s. This process could be explained through a consideration of the broader social context in Croatia, marked by the breakup of Yugoslavia and the war for independence (Baranović, 2002). Sekulić and Šporer (2008) also confirmed that Croatian youth is more attached to the national or even sub-national identity than to supranational identities such as European and south eastern European. Moreover, Sekulić and Šporer (2008) found that the national identification is stronger among the more conservative part of the population. Drawing on their findings, the authors argue that national identity has stronger ideological foundations compared to supra-national forms of identity.

Similarly, the findings of Ross, Puzić and Doolan (2017) suggest that the majority of young people identify themselves primarily in terms of national and sub-national (regional, within Croatia) identities. They do not see themselves as full Europeans, but rather define their identity as “almost European”. On the other hand, they consider themselves more inclined towards the “Balkan” identity. Ross, Puzić & Doolan (2017) conclude that both the European and Balkan identities coexist despite their mutual perceived opposition. Furthermore, as regards cultural literacy, it is particularly interesting to note that the respondents in this research recognized Europe primarily as a political rather than a cultural construct, unlike the Balkans, which seems to be more often understood in cultural terms.

Intercultural Education within the Formal Education System
All academic papers reviewed in this analysis support the implementation of intercultural education in the Croatian formal education system; all of them also provide some indication as to how it should be implemented. Two issues are identified as the most important to be addressed in this regard: 1) the need to implement intercultural education in the curriculum; 2) the development of intercultural competence among teachers. On the other hand, the education of national minorities has been found to be the most developed aspect of intercultural education in Croatia, however there is still a great deal of room for improvement.

Curriculum
All authors consulted in the review stressed that education plays an important role in identity formation. However, some claim that the formal education system is still often used primarily to enhance the political literacy of students with the goal of increasing loyalty to their nation-states (Diković, 2016). Thus, elements of intercultural education, which are supposed to be an important curricular element, frequently fall into the background.
In his analysis of a number of European curricula, Puzić (2009) considers the Finish, Swedish, Austrian, and Schleswig-Holstein (German federal state) curricula to be both multicultural and intercultural, as they pay attention to protecting and preserving minority cultures and identities while also emphasising the importance of mutual understanding and common values among students with different cultural backgrounds. On the other hand, the Irish and English curricula represent more liberal visions of education (Puzić, 2009); they emphasize the importance of cultural diversity in general guidelines and goals within particular subjects, however these are not further operationalized. The same analysis assessed the Croatian teaching curriculum (teaching plans and programs) as monocultural. Thus, Puzić (2009) concludes that, although there are identifiable intentions to implement elements of the intercultural approaches in education, the most weight is still placed on the preservation of the national identity, which results in only a basic presentation of cultural diversity and the dominance of the monocultural perspective. Policymakers have been working on changes in formal education since the 2000s, but their implementation has been slow (see: Deliverable 2.1 Croatian curriculum review).

Hrvatić and Sablić (2008) accentuate that an intercultural curriculum should encompass various social, cultural, historical, economic, political, and pedagogical factors. Furthermore, the authors claim that the content and learning methods included in the curriculum are especially important; they ensure that the school becomes the catalyst in the process of enculturation, rather than a source of contradiction in the socialization process of children and youth. In this context, Hrvatić and Sablić (2008) stress the importance of culturally responsive pedagogy and intercultural pedagogy. They state that culturally sensitive pedagogy highlights the development of an individual, because only culturally aware individuals are in a position to construct a culturally conscious community.

On the other hand, Piršl (2016) identifies four categories that constitute intercultural education: empathy education (learning to understand and identify with others), solidarity education (greater sensitivity to inequalities and social marginalisation/exclusion), respect for diversity (respect for different life styles), and education against ethnocentrism, nationalism, racism, and other modalities of discrimination (fostering the development of intercultural sensitivity, as well as an awareness of oneself and others). The same author states that the first goal of intercultural education is to encourage the development of critical thinking towards global culture and the consumer mentality, to raise awareness of the need to fight against discrimination, injustice, and manipulation, and to teach about different cultures (Piršl, 2016).

Teachers play one of the most important roles in teaching and implementing intercultural education, and as such, they have attracted significant attention from Croatian scholars.
Teachers are considered facilitators and the most important factor in encouraging the development of intercultural competency among children and youth (Drandić, 2013). In this regard, Hrvatić (2009) points to the crucial competencies of an interculturally competent teacher: verbal and non-verbal communication; knowledge of his/her own culture as well as other cultures; respect, understanding and acceptance of students with different cultural backgrounds; interactive relationships with members from different cultures; continuing education, flexibility, critical thinking; an understanding of the consequences of discrimination; an ability to develop non-stereotyped comprehension among students. However, as noted by Diković & Piršl (2013), teacher education in Croatia does not include systematic education in interculturalism, human rights, and civic education. Despite this, some studies have shown that students of pedagogy and teachers are familiar with the basic concepts of intercultural education and are culturally sensitive (Piršl, Benjak, Diković, Matošević & Jelača, 2016).

Education of National Minorities
Most studies that deal with intercultural education in Croatia stress that its focus has been on the education of national minorities in terms of multilingualism, while frequently neglecting education in understanding and respecting diversity (Blažević-Simić, 2013). Bužinkić (2014) found that national minorities are very rarely mentioned in Croatian textbooks; if they are, it is usually only in textbooks for upper classes. This is in line with the conclusion of Puzić (2009) that intercultural education is not yet a part of school programmes. Some concepts and themes have been incorporated, but without any significant structural changes. Therefore, Lukić (2010, according to Mrnjaus, Rončević & Ivošević, 2013) defines the Croatian approach to the issue of minorities and intercultural education as ethnocentric multiculturalism, which is a very narrow form of multiculturalism. Similarly, Spajić-Vrkaš (2002) concludes that the Croatian educational system implements cultural pluralism only on the theoretical level.

One of the main goals of policymakers has been to help national minorities preserve their identity and culture through special formal education programmes in the language and script of national minorities. In this context, Blažević Simić (2014) recognises significant progress within the Croatian formal education system in recent years. This is evidenced in an increase in the number of minority students enrolling in minority education programs, as well as in an increase in public funding for minority school materials, the employment of advisors for minority languages, the offering of national exams in minority languages, etc. However, Blažević Simić questions the efficiency of this approach in terms of cultural literacy and interculturalism. To this end, she analyses three models of education in national minority languages and scripts.
According to Model A, all classes are taught in the language and script of a national minority, but students are also obliged to learn Croatian. Model B represents bilingual teaching, within which science is taught in Croatian, while subjects in the social sciences and humanities are taught in the language of a national minority. Within Model C, the language and culture of the national minority are fostered, but most classes are taught in Croatian. Blažević Simić (2014) suggests that Model A education does not contribute to intercultural tolerance in some cases; they draw this conclusion based on the example of eastern Croatia, which suffered heavily during the Croatian War of Independence (1991-1995). This model actually results in practices that separate these groups and contributes to a feeling of social distance, in this case towards Serbs as the largest national minority in Croatia, some of whom were involved in aggression against Croatia. However, the most common type of minority education is Model C due to a lack of resources for most minority groups. This model can also cause separation and social distance as only minority students are motivated to enrol. Therefore, the author considers Model B the best solution, but only in cases where all classes are taught bilingually and non-minority students are also included in bilingual teaching; this is not yet being implemented in Croatia (Blažević Simić, 2014).

Social Distance towards National Minorities
Studies on the social distance of youth towards members of national minorities affirm the aforementioned criticisms; this is one of the most commonly addressed issues involving intercultural education in Croatia (Previšić, Hrvatić & Posavec, 2004; Sablić. 2004; Čorkalo Biriški & Ajduković, 2007; Blažević Simić, 2011; Mrnjaus, 2013). We consider this issue relevant for review, as the findings on social distance provide some insight into the level of tolerance towards diversity among young people; consequently, this enables the drawing of conclusions (at least indirectly) about the degree of cultural literacy of Croatian youth. Research findings have shown pronounced social distance towards the Serb minority, but also towards Bosniaks, Montenegrins, Slovenians, Roma, and Albanians to some degree (Blažević Simić, 2011). On the other hand, social acceptance has been attested towards Americans, Western European nations, and the neighbouring Italian and Hungarian nations. In discussing the findings, Blažević Simić (2011) suggests that the main reason for social distance towards some of the largest national minority groups and all nations from ex-Yugoslavia lies in the political and social context in general, but specifically in the events of the war for independence after the collapse of socialist Yugoslavia in the 1990s. Stereotypes have been transmitted intergenerationally (Mrnjaus, 2013). However, levels of social acceptance are consistently much higher than levels of rejection/distance. Therefore, some authors conclude that respondents did not display ethnocentrism towards national minorities despite high social distance results in some cases (Blažević Simić, 2011).
These studies have also revealed the relationship between type of education and social distance. Gymnasium students consistently show a higher degree of tolerance and a lower level of social distance than vocational school students (Sablić, 2004). This is interpreted as a result of gymnasium students’ deeper knowledge of the differences between social groups and acquaintance with various aspects of different cultures. Classes on human rights, tolerance, and democracy are included in gymnasium curricula to a greater degree than those of vocational schools. Also, gymnasiums pay more attention to the development of critical thinking than vocational schools (Sablić, 2004).

In terms of the education of national minorities, the Roma minority has been a particular area of research interest for Croatian social scientists. Roma education has been burdened with stereotypes and insufficient cultural knowledge, (Hrvatić, 2004). In some parts of Croatia with a higher Roma population such as in Međimurje County, schools are still the only locus of meaningful encounters between Roma children and the majority population. Therefore, Šlezak and Lapat (2012) posit that schools have the potential to shape new generations in terms of their knowledge of democracy, as well as in terms of developing inter-ethnic relations. Their research findings suggest that teachers have a positive attitude towards the need for an intercultural approach towards Roma.

The vast majority of respondents agree that teachers should be trained to work in a multicultural environment (86.6%), as well as that they should be familiar with the Roma way of life (92.6%), have knowledge of Roma history and culture (61.7%), and that schools should encourage cooperation between Roma parents and other parents (89.9%). However, the respondents had a negative attitude towards the real implementation of the multicultural approach and the introduction of elements of Roma culture into education, especially regarding Roma language and history. 62.4% of respondents believe that "Roma History and Culture" and "Romani Language" should not be non-compulsory courses in their school, and that Croatian students should not attend these classes (84.6%). It is even more worrying that nearly 40% of teachers surveyed have never visited a Roma settlement where their students live. Respondents themselves are aware of this problem, while 56.4% think that they have not been sufficiently trained to carry out intercultural education (Šlezak & Lapat, 2012).
Discussion

Cultural literacy is a relatively new concept in Croatia that has not yet been specifically discussed or investigated by Croatian social scientists. However, closely related issues such as multiculturalism and interculturalism have been analysed. A search of the literature shows an increase in studies in the field after the year 2000, a trend that can be associated with the increasing power of the globalization process, as well as the process of Croatian accession to the EU. As an illustration, a subject search of the catalogue of the National and University Library for studies on multicultural education showed 49 hits. Of these, only nine were published before the year 2000. Among these studies, empirical research dominates over theoretical approaches, while Croatian social scientists usually try to apply influential foreign theoretical concepts to the Croatian context. The most widely used concept in Croatian academia related to cultural literacy and youth education is interculturalism.

The lack of interest in the topic is a consequence of a number of factors arising from the overall social context, which is characterised by pronounced societal homogeneity (religious and cultural) and a strong sense of national identity as a post-Communist nation that fought a war for its independence in the 1990s. According to the 2011 Census, 99.41% of the population of Croatia have Croatian citizenship, while 90.42% of the population are ethnic Croats and 86.28% of the population are declared Catholics (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). Considering the broader context over the last decades, during the war and after Croatia gained independence, the dominant atmosphere within the society favoured an emphasis on the importance of the Croatian national identity, which to some extent contradicted the basic principles propagated in Europe at the time, as noted by Sekulić and Šporer (2008). However, the authors also note that identification with Europe was popular as well, particularly in the early 1990s, primarily as it was interpreted as an expression of an anti-Yugoslav and anti-communist standpoint. They continue their analysis by stating that the Croatian public was disappointed with the EU’s slow and ineffective attempts to help Croatia to free occupied territories and to end the war. This contributed to the further empowerment of the national identification (Sekulić & Šporer, 2008). The popularity of the European concept declined further during long negotiations about EU accession, which officially lasted from 2003 to 2013, when Croatia finally became a member of the EU, as Ilišin, Bouillet, Gvozdanović and Potočnik state (2013). Their research findings suggest that, during the negotiation process, Croatia had to meet a number of unpopular requirements and to implement legislative changes that were seen by a segment of the public as unfair to and disrespectful towards Croatia.
All of these factors possibly contributed to lower attachment to the European identity than the national identity, as documented in the reviewed studies. However, the majority of the population, and youth in particular, greeted accession, expecting faster economic development and better life opportunities (Ilišin, Bouillet, Gvozdanović & Potočnik, 2013). This is in accordance with the dominant perception of Europe as a primarily political and economic project, and not a cultural one, as Ross, Puzić, and Doolan suggest (2017). An awareness of the common European identity and culture based in cultural heritage shared by all Europeans is not widespread, or not yet very influential at the least.

The analyses conducted enable the conclusion that the Croatian academic literature shows a consensus on the need to implement elements of intercultural education in school curricula. However, it has been noted that structural changes have been taking place very slowly; curricular changes have also become a public political issue (see Deliverable 1.1. Croatian policy review).

Multiculturality within Croatian society is primarily reflected with regard to 22 national minority groups who are guaranteed the right to organise education in their own languages and scripts. These regulations ensure national minorities the necessary conditions and basic prerequisites to preserve their particular national identity and culture. However, the question of how to include minority cultures and identities into the national identity without the presumption of assimilation in the long-term has yet to be answered. A number of authors approach this issue by analysing the extent to which majority pupils and students are taught about minority cultures, as well as about the contributions minorities have made to the development of the majority nation and its culture (Puzić, 2009; Blažević Simić, 2013; Bužinkić, 2014). This type of education would enable all students to contextualize historical events and processes more thoroughly and to interpret them critically, allowing them to finally understand and respect diversity, which should be a basic principle in cultural literacy and intercultural education.

Again, the implementation of this approach to intercultural education as regards some of the major national minorities is burdened with historical context. The Croatian War of Independence was fought against rebel Serbs, who represent the largest national minority in Croatia. The war was fought in Bosnia and Herzegovina simultaneously. Croats are one of the constitutive nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and there were confrontations between Bosniaks and Croats at one point. Bosniaks also represent the second-largest minority in Croatia. All these events took place only 25 years ago; these wounds are still fresh for many people, which complicates the implementation of intercultural education.
However, as Blažević Simić (2013) notes, significant progress has been made in recent years in terms of official policies. However, a number of authors conclude that this has yet to be operationalized in terms of curricula and teaching programmes (Puzić, 2009; Bužinkić, 2014). In line with these findings, research on social distance shows the highest levels of distance in the specific case of the aforementioned national minorities (in addition to Roma). Additionally, an important finding of studies on social distance is the established relationship between the type of school respondents were enrolled in and the level of social distance they showed towards minorities. Since gymnasium students show lesser social distance towards minorities than vocational school students, these findings indicate the potential influence of even very limited intercultural education.

However, as several authors have stressed, changes in curricula with the goal of increasing youth levels of cultural literacy would not have any significant effect if the teachers responsible for implementing them are not trained and educated to do so. School teachers have not been systematically educated regarding intercultural education, and their intercultural competency has not been thoroughly developed. Thus, in addition to the importance of the curriculum, Croatian authors have identified teacher education as an important practical aspect relevant to the successful implementation of intercultural education.
Concluding Remarks

Cultural literacy is an understudied topic among Croatian social scientists. However, topics related to cultural literacy, such as multiculturalism, interculturalism, multicultural/intercultural education, identity studies, youth culture, etc., are discussed and investigated with relative frequency. This is particularly true for the period after 2000, which displays an upward trend in theoretical and empirical interest in these topics. In more developed democracies and more accentuated multicultural societies, dealing with these issues has a much longer tradition. Croatia, however, is one of Europe’s “new” democracies, having only won its independence in the 1990s. Due to these circumstances and the pronounced ethnic homogeneity of the population, there have been no strong incentives to deal with the issues of multiculturalism, interculturalism, and cultural literacy for a long time. The importance of such topics began to increase with Croatia’s European Union accession process. Also, as time passes, the Croatian public’s attitudes towards some national minorities, with whom the relationship has been quite complex through history, has been slowly normalizing.

According to the authors of the reviewed studies, the formal education system plays the key role in further developing intercultural competence and tolerance. However, based on the analysed studies, it can be concluded that the Croatian formal education system still cannot be considered either multicultural or intercultural. In terms of its role in the identity formation process, its focus remains on the national identity, while the intercultural perspective is being implemented very slowly. Since some findings reveal that the majority of Croatian students perceive Europe as a primarily political and institutional framework, it can be speculated that they lack knowledge about shared European cultural heritage and the contextual interpretation of the relationship between Croatia’s historical development and that of the rest of the continent. This is also reflected in the empirically established relatively low attachment of young people in Croatia to the European identity and the dominance of the national identity over the supranational identity.

The analysed studies stress the monocultural perspective of formal education, which is reflected in the low inclusion of national minorities in general curricula, as well as their rare representation in school textbooks and programmes for the majority. According to the authors consulted, multicultural education policy in Croatia has been primarily focused on enabling the fulfilment of national minorities’ right to education in their own language and the preservation of their national identity, but not so much on intercultural competence and tolerance. Some findings indicate that this approach can be counterproductive and result in even more pronounced separation and social distance.
To sum up, the analysed literature suggests that the first crucial point in the implementation of intercultural education in Croatia is to change curricula, which should focus more on teaching the majority about the idiosyncrasies of different cultures and point out their contributions to Croatia’s development, rather than simply providing them the conditions to preserve their national identity and culture. The second crucial point identified is the education of teachers, who must become the bearers of reform.
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National Cultural/Educational Literature Review (Georgia)
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Summary

The aim of this report is to provide an overview of research on young people’s cultural identities, cultural interactions, and cultural literacy in Georgia. Several articles and reports published in recent years on these topics are summarized and discussed.

While talking about cultural identity of youth, it is important to take into account how national identity has taken shape in the recent past in Georgia. The transition from ethnic to civic national identity was complemented with another and probably the most important transition from future oriented secular nationalism to past-oriented religious nationalism. Today, Orthodox Christianity is an important marker of Georgian national identity and Georgian culture (at least a great deal of it) seems to be appropriated by the Georgian Orthodox Church. According to some scholars, this amalgamation of religion and culture supports homogenization and generates overall intolerance towards different groups in Georgian society (Zedania, 2011; Ladaria, 2012). This concerns young people in Georgia and probably to a greater degree than others, since unlike other western countries, the younger generation in Georgia is more religious than older generations (Sumbadze, 2012; Mestvirishvili & Mestvirishvili, 2014). Trust in the church and religious leaders is quite high among young people as is religious practice. Young Georgians view atheism as counter to Georgian culture (MYPLACE, 2014; FES, 2016).

The preservation of Georgian identity, culture, and traditions is very important for Georgian youth. Some young people see EU integration as a threat to Georgian culture and traditions, which can be partially explained by the lack of information or misinformation about EU related issues and European values and culture (FES, 2016). Interestingly, the perceived importance of Georgia history and culture is not directly translated into behaviour among young people in Georgia, whose participation in cultural/heritage related activities remains very low (UNICEF, 2014; MYPLACE, 2014).

The instable socio-economic situation in the country and stereotypes about certain professions limits the professional choices of young people in Georgia. “Parents knowing best what is best for their children” is a widespread cultural belief which has a significant impact on young people’s professional and personal lives. Georgian society does not encourage living apart from one’s parents until marriage. Family members influence the most important decisions in young people’s lives as well as their lifestyles.
As a result of globalization many young people in Georgia face the dilemma between being ‘modern’ and thus materially and emotionally independent from their parents on the one hand, and on the other hand, enjoying the security and comfort their families can provide (Tsuladze, 2012).

Recent surveys demonstrate that young people in Georgia are inclined toward traditional values. However, there is a tendency towards self-expression and secular-rational values, especially in the capital and urban areas (Sumbadze, 2012; FES 2016; Khoshtaria, 2017).

As for intercultural education, the context is quite specific in Georgia: the absolute majority of ethnic minority children go to non-Georgian (ethnic minority) schools with non-Georgian teachers. (Obviously this does not contribute to integration of ethnic minorities in Georgian society. Moreover, existing studies show that most textbook fail to develop intercultural sensitivity among primary school children and school teachers have very limited understanding of intercultural education, expressing selective cultural sensitivity towards different ethnic and religious groups (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013; Malazonia, et al., 2017). The situation is not much different in secondary school, where ethnic Georgian students have a feeling of superiority over other cultural groups living in Georgia (Malazonia, et al., 2017). The role of school as well as family in intercultural education remains quite limited (Malazonia, et al., 2017).

In truly multicultural settings (e.g. while studying abroad), Georgian young people realize differences between collectivist and individualist cultures, start to critically evaluate their own culture, and become more tolerant towards other cultural groups (Javakhishvili et al., 2013).
Introduction

By analysing various literature and studies about youth and culture in Georgia, this report aims to presenting existing knowledge about youth and their cultural identities, cultural involvement and interactions, cultural education and values in Georgia.

Georgia is considered as a collectivist culture with strong cultural embeddedness, respect for social ties, and guidelines for behaviour (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; S. H. Schwartz, 2006). Close relatives and family ties are strong and important for Georgian youth (Nijaradze, 2001; Surmanidze, 2001; Tsuladze, 2003). As students, and sometimes even after marriage, young people often live with their parents. Thus, the family structure can be considered traditional, consisting of three generations. Often, grandparents are involved in bringing up the children (FES, 2016). A 2016 survey showed that for 62% of youth (aged 14-29) financial support from their parents is their main source of income (FES, 2016). Sexual relationships before marriage, and even cohabitation without being married, is not acceptable for most parents or society in general, and especially for women (Surmanidze & Tsuladze, 2008; Tsuladze, 2003). These restrictions and norms partially contribute to the problem of early marriage: 17% of women living in Georgia married before they were 18 (UNFPA, 2012).

The collapse of the Soviet Union and civil war afterwards greatly affected not only Georgia’s economy and politics, but also social and cultural life (Roberts, Pollock, Manasyan, & Tholen, 2008). As a transitional economy, Georgia does not have many employment opportunities and/or offer much stability for young people, who want to plan their career in Georgia. Young people usually start working after secondary or higher education and quite often their employment sphere differs from their education, due to a lack of employment opportunities and the mismatch between labour supply and demand (Rudaz, 2012; Nicol, 2013; Pleines, 2014).

Globalization has led to tensions between post-soviet and “western” values and lifestyles. Georgian youth (aged 19-24) were born after the collapse of the Soviet Union and do not hold communist and socialist ideologies or practice related lifestyles. They are perceived as more westernized, preferring autonomy and a goal-orientation (Sumbadze, 2012; FES, 2016). Still, their participation in cultural, social, and political life remains still low.
Methodology

Since the literature on cultural literacy in Georgia is quite limited, a review of most of the literature that deals with the identity of Georgian youth, Georgian culture, youth values and attitudes towards minorities, intercultural education, and intercultural sensitivity was conducted. Georgian and English published sources are used to discuss these topics. Some literature reviewed in this report may not be directly related to youth, but is helpful in understanding the general context or culture of Georgia in which young people develop their cultural literacy, identity, knowledge, and values. The literature search was conducted using google scholar. Some literature are reports from non-government organisations or universities that are available on their websites and could be easily found via google search. After the first search results, bibliography of each source was thoroughly explored in order to find more literature on these topics. If the publications were not freely accessible for us, the authors were contacted directly and asked to share their articles/reports with us. Working definitions of concepts provided by the work package leaders, and presented below, were used to search for relevant literature:

Cultural literacy - competence in understanding cultural references, enabling active cultural participation in society. Unfortunately we were not able to find literature about young Georgians cultural literacy and replaced it with intercultural education.

Cultural heritage - whatever acquires significance as valuable for a group in providing it with an authentic sense of past (Rowlands 2002) resulting from power relationships, and is transmitted, internalized and enacted by members of the group.

Cultural identity - way of representing existing individual and collective differences as being historically inherited and closely associated with established forms of cultural heritage.

Cultural practices - forms of engagement in production, reproduction and consumption of culture (e.g. cultural heritage) which can be seen as a manifestation of cultural identity.

Cultural interaction - all forms of interactions between individuals and groups who are represented as being different in terms of their cultural heritage, practices and identities.

In terms of defining ‘youth’, age was intentionally not restricted strictly to prevent the limitation of an already limited literature. The studies discussed below define youth differently. Some are primarily focused on youth, while others discuss youth in the context of the whole population. The age range considered youth in the studies discussed below varies from 14 to 35 years of age.
Findings and Discussion

The literature, findings, and discussion are divided into three thematic areas: 1. **Identity literature and studies** 2. **Cultural participation and cultural interactions** 3. Intercultural competences and education (cultural literacy). These three broad topics are divided into several subtopics (subchapters) that are related to these broad themes.

Identity Literature and Studies
History of National Identity Development: Ethnic and Civic National Identities
Historically, the process of developing a Georgian national identity was a turbulent one. Between 1801 and 1918, Georgia was part of the Russian Empire, and fell subject to the influence of Russian imperial policies. During the Soviet period, attempts to develop a “Soviet” national identity in Georgia enjoyed questionable success at best. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, ethnic nationalism based on the principles of blood, kinship, and ethnicity, came to the fore. Slogans such as “Georgia for Georgians” were widespread at the time.

The attempt to overcome ethnic nationalism and, instead, initiate an extensive state-building or modernization process promoting civic national identity, is seen as one of the major achievements of the Rose Revolutionary government, which came to power in 2003. The national identity model, which politicians promoted at that time was no longer based on ethnicity. Rather, they emphasized citizenship as the primary factor defining national identity: “The State, on the levels of both policy and official discourse, stopped differentiating between its citizens according to their ethnic background and elevated citizenship to the only principle according to which it defined Georgian identity” (Zedania, 2011, p.121).

According to the Memory Youth Political Legacy and Civic Engagement (MYPLACE) survey,192 Georgian youth has similar views towards ethnic and civic citizenship. A majority agree that being born in Georgia and having at least one Georgian parent is important for being a citizen of Georgia while also considering respect for political institutions and laws similarly important (MYPLACE 2014).

---

192 17,000 young people, aged 16-25 from 14 countries in Europe took part in the MYPLACE survey. In Georgia 579 young people from Kutaisi and 588 – from Telavi were surveyed in 2012.
Nationalism, Religion and Culture in Georgia

Religion and the role of the church have been important in defining national identity in the recent history of Georgia (e.g. Tevzadze, 2009; Andronikashvili & Maisuradze, 2010; Zedania, 2011; Ladaria, 2012; Vachridze, 2012). The literature suggests that the turn from ethnic to civic national identity can also be characterized as a replacement of secular nationalism oriented towards the future by a national-religious model rooted in the past, with Orthodox Christianity as an important marker of Georgian national identity.

In the late 1800s, the work of two organizations proved crucial for building Georgian national identity. The first was a Georgian newspaper, *Iveria*, founded in 1877 by Ilia Chavchavadze, a public figure, publicist, and writer who propagated his ideas of a national liberation movement. *Iveria* sparked debates among members of the Georgian intelligentsia at the time, which shaped transformative narratives of Georgian identity (Tevzadze, 2009). The second but equally important institution was the *Society for Spreading Literacy among Georgians*, in which Ilia Chavchavadze was an active member.

The main actors behind both *Iveria* and the *Society for Spreading Literacy* were young, primarily Russian-educated Georgian intellectuals who introduced progressive ideas of scientific progress, equal rights, and nationalism. Their writings suggest an understanding of the nation-state wherein language, culture, and history play a much more pronounced role than religion (Khvadagiani, 2015). As Ilia Chavchavadze wrote in 1877 “neither the unity of language, nor the unity of religion and kinship can fuse the people with each other as the unity of history.” This secular nationalism is now seen as a decisive factor for the development of Georgian culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, without which the cultural integration of the linguistically and religiously diverse population of Georgia would have been much more difficult (Zedania, 2011).

After the Rose Revolution of 2003, the state’s declared will to promote a plurality social groups, ideologies, and lifestyles through human rights and rule of law, threatened the doctrine of Georgian Orthodox Church. The church had been, one of the leading actors, possibly the most decisive one, in the Georgian ideological landscape following independence. It advocated a homogenization that could only be accomplished through the subordination of different groups: “This system of subordination is controlled by a Georgian Orthodox male — women have to submit to his orders, non-Orthodox Christians will not achieve salvation, and sexual minorities do not possess any rights” (Ladaria, 2012, p.113). However, as Zedania argues: “The conflict between the Church and liberal circles was not about ethnicity. It was the religious factor which played a decisive role in it, linked with the issue of the interpretation of the national cultural heritage. It was a question of the appropriation of Georgian culture by the Georgian Orthodox Church” (Zedania, 2011, p. 123).
The lack of trust in state institutions was compensated for by the high trust in the church and that way the church turned into the cultural leader of the Georgian nation (Zedania, 2011; Ladaria, 2012). Consequently, Georgian identity became closely related to orthodox culture, which as Ladaria argues prevents not only religious pluralism, but also cultural rights: “[The] Amalgamation of religion and culture, with the implication that the former gave rise to the latter, generates overall intolerance” (Ladaria, 2012, p.113).

Today the church is still the most trusted institution in Georgia among people aged 18-35 years old) (FES, 2016). However, recent survey data shows that both the share of Orthodox Christians in Georgia that trust the Church and the degree to which they trust the Church is on the decline (CRRC, 2018).

Georgian versus European Identity
The late Prime Minister of Georgia, Zurab Zhvania, famously stated, “I am Georgian, and therefore I am European” at the Council of Europe in 1999. This sentiment has been consistently voiced in pro-European discussions over the last two decades. According to the 2017 survey on Knowledge of and Attitudes toward the EU in Georgia, over half of the population (58%) and youth aged 18-35 (56%) agreed with Mr. Zhvania’s claim, a share that has remained almost unchanged since 2009. However, as the answers to a different question from the same survey show, a far smaller share of Georgians report perceiving themselves as European when they are asked: “In your opinion are you… (Answer options: 1. Georgian only, 2. European, 3. Georgian and European, 4. Caucasian, 5. Georgian and Caucasian, 6. Asian, 7. Georgian and Asian)”. Only 15% claim to be solely European or both Georgian and European, while the large majority (70%) identify themselves as Georgians only. There are no major differences between different age categories in this regard (EF/CRRC 2017).

As the MYPLACE survey showed, a majority of Georgian youth are proud of being citizens of Georgia. When young people in Kutaisi and Telavi were asked: “How proud you are to be a citizen of your country?” (Answer options were: ‘very proud’, ‘quite proud’, ‘not very proud’, ‘not proud at all’) 84% in Kutaisi and 82% in Telavi reported being proud of being Georgian citizens.

Recent surveys show a fear among Georgian society, including young people, that joining the EU could threaten Georgian culture and traditions. An FES study (2016) showed that for some young people, the EU is associated with a loss of values and traditions. There is a fear of assimilating with the EU and accepting views that are contradictory to Georgian culture. According to the study, this fear is stronger in rural areas compared to urban ones (FES, 2016).
The MYPLACE study also showed that young people in Telavi and Kutaisi are against Georgian national identity converging with other nations. This phenomenon was explained by a focus group participant from another study who says misperceptions occur because of disinformation: “[Information] is not sufficient. On the contrary, information is wrong, for example, if we enter the EU, we will lose our traditions and culture, we will be blended with Europe” (FES, 2017, p.71).

This fear is not specific to young people. It is shared by an important part of Georgian society. According to the EU survey data, the fear that the EU will harm Georgian culture and traditions has increased in Georgian society over the past years, and especially after 2013. In 2017 almost half (49%) of Georgia’s population agreed with the statement, “The EU threatens Georgian traditions” (EF/CRRC-Georgia, 2017).

In her research, Tsuladze (2012) looks at how youth identities are constructed through global and local cultural elements. She concludes that Georgian youth aspire to maintain and preserve some traditional cultural features that distinguish Georgian culture from others (such as Georgian polyphony, Georgian folk songs and dances, Georgian table traditions, and even ‘Georgian relations’ mostly implying close emotional relationships and support among in-group members), while also achieving some freedom. They do this as Tsuladze argues through more ‘modern’ representations of Georgianness: “that is via adapting the old system of toast-making, listening to modernised versions of Georgian folk music, and even inventing a modernised version of traditional ‘Georgian relations.’

The latter is quite complex as it entails retaining the traditional system of young people’s subordination to elders while gaining a considerable amount of freedom from them, and even a more complex aspiration to become freer in the sphere of sexual relations while retaining the traditional religious-normative perception of the Georgian woman as rather desexualised” (Tsuladze, 2012. p.95).

Influence of Cultural Context on Youth Identity Formation

A qualitative study, using focus groups with youth aged 18-25 showed that three main themes are crucial contextual influences on identity formation: socio-economic conditions in the country, strong social norms, and authoritative parenting approaches (Skhirtladze, 2015).

The unstable socio-economic situation in the country makes youth more oriented towards the present rather than the future and limits their professional choices. Existing stereotypes about certain professions (e.g. cleaner, waiter, etc.) make youth less likely to take any job. At the same time they believe that to obtain a reputable job, social network and connections are crucial. In turn, they think they would be more successful in other countries (Skhirtladze, 2015).
By strong social norms young people mean the influence of others’ opinion while defining their self. They think that this is very specific for Georgians since their friends who live in other countries are more independent and care less about what others think or say. Romantic relationships are also affected by societal norms that condemn cohabitation with partners without marriage, especially in case of girls (Skhirtladze, 2015).

An authoritative parenting approach also influences youth identity formation. Georgian parents, who are very caring, are also controlling towards their children, making them passive and dependent on them in the future. Living apart from parents is not encouraged or viewed as positive in Georgia. This further contributes to the practice of youth living together with their parents until they get married or travel abroad. As a result, Georgian young people hardly take any responsibility or make decisions without parental consent. Personal as well as professional decisions are often negotiated with parents. There is a belief that “parents know better what is best for their children”, which defines identity formation of youth in Georgia. Cultural norms in Georgia are also expressed in different proverbs and expressions, which explicitly demand that Georgian young people consider their parents’ expectations while making important decisions in life (Sumbadze, 2012).

Such authoritative parenting approaches come into conflict with young people's desire to gain freedom of choice and action. On the one hand, young people’s narratives demonstrate that they feel comfortable getting emotional and material support from their families. On the other hand, the same people express their desire to be materially and emotionally independent from their parents (Tsuladze, 2012). Young people in Georgia face the dilemma of choosing between the safety provided by their parents and the uncertainty associated with independent living: “and although they acknowledge that being modern has largely to do with the freedom of choice, they still appreciate the tradition of reciprocal emotional and material dependency, which is beneficial to both younger and older generations” (Tsuladze, 2012, p. 96).

Cultural Participation and Cultural Interaction
Attitudes towards the Past and Cultural Participation
Remembering history and transmitting Georgia’s history to the next generation is very important for Georgian young people (MYPLACE, 2013; FES, 2016). The most important events in Georgian history for young people include independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Rose Revolution in 2003, and the 2008 war between Georgia and Russia. The perceived importance of preserving Georgian history and traditions is linked with a high importance on religion. Young people believe religion was preserved by their ancestors of whom they are very proud (MYPLACE 2013).
On the MYPLACE survey (2014), 49% of young people in Kutaisi and 45% in Telavi reported being very interested in the recent history (last 100 years) of Georgia and the vast majority find it very important for Georgia to commemorate its past. The latest nationwide survey of youth also shows that for 81% of youth (aged 14-29), preserving the past is important (FES, 2016).

However, this interest and the perceived importance of history is not directly translated into behaviour. To measure how interested the respondents were in history, the MYPLACE survey asked them how frequently they did the following in the last 12 months:

- Played a video game that re-enacts events in the 20th century;
- Watched a film that was set in recent historical circumstances;
- Watched a documentary about events in the 20th century;
- Read a novel set in recent historical circumstances;
- Read a non-fiction publication about the recent past;
- Visited a museum with an exhibition about the recent past;
- Participated in a discussion about history at school or in college;
- Talked with your parents about the past;
- Talked with your grandparents about the past;
- Attended a veterans’ parade or showed support during a remembrance day;
- Researched family history;
- Visited a webpage with historic content / discussions.

On the index constructed with these 12 statements, Georgia scored the lowest among 14 countries.

Moreover, according to a UNICEF study, in 2013 only 57% of young people (aged 15-29) attended cultural activities on at least one occasion for the purpose of entertainment, recreation, or acquiring knowledge. This share increases in urban areas to 72% and decreases to 41% in rural areas. The latter can be explained due to the small number of cultural events taking place in rural areas (UNICEF 2014). Only 12% of young people participated in cultural/heritage-related activities over the past 12 months before the survey and most of them (9% out of 12%) participated in activities that were mainly related to obtaining information about objects of cultural heritage (UNICEF 2014). As for the overall lifestyle and leisure activities of youth in Georgia, listening to music (70%), watching films (61%), going out with friends (57%) and watching TV (50%) are the top activities practiced by the youth on a regular basis. Much smaller is the group of youth who read books/newspapers (23%), do sport (21%) or hiking (7%), write, paint or play music (13%) often (FES, 2016).
FES survey (2016) asked youth to categorize their expenses and indicate their average monthly expenses per category. The results show that the largest share (nearly GEL 190 monthly) of expenses is taken by paying off debt (paid by 20% of young people). The second largest expense (GEL 110) is spent on travel, while shopping for clothes and shoes take GEL 80 monthly. Cigarettes take the same amount of money. For entertainment, including cultural events and gatherings with friends, Georgian young people spend about GEL 60.

Cultural Interaction – Attitudes towards Different Social Groups
There is not much literature available about the intercultural interaction of Georgian youth. Instead most available studies capture attitudes of youth towards different social groups.

FES survey (2016) measured social distance felt by Georgia youth towards different social groups by asking them a question about different social groups or individuals as desired or undesired neighbors. 35% of youth reports negative attitudes towards ethnic minorities (Azeri, Armenian) as potential neighbors, and slightly less 31% towards refugees. Young people’s attitudes towards a family from Europe or USA (would feel very good or good - 77%) and a family from Russia (would feel very good or good – 75%) are almost the same. The greatest social distance is exhibited towards homosexuals – 44 %of Georgian youth would not be happy if a homosexual person or couple moved into their neighborhood, while 45% reported they are not interested. Importantly, social distance towards homosexuals increases with age (While 39 % of the youth aged 14-18 state that they would feel either bad or very bad if a homosexual person or couple moved to their neighborhood, this share increases to 41 % in the 19-24 age group, and increases further to 51 % in the 25-29 age group). Moreover, a greater social distance is prevalent in rural areas compared to the capital and other urban areas and among those who identify themselves as religious and go to liturgy regularly or often, compared to those who go to church services sometimes or never (FES, 2016). The fact that Georgian youth trust and accept the LGBT community least of all groups is confirmed by MYPLACE survey results, according which among 14 countries Georgian youth expressed the lowest mean values for tolerance towards homosexuality (MYPLACE, 2014).

According to an FES study (2016), 46% of youth express negative attitudes towards homosexuals and only 16% think that homosexuals are either completely or mostly acceptable. According to the same survey, 44% of Georgian youth would not be happy if a homosexual person or couple moved into their neighborhood. However, it should also be noted that the share of young people stating that they would not care is also quite high (45%- not interested). Attitudes towards homosexuals are more negative in male respondents and in youth residing in rural areas.
Qualitative research provides further nuance to this unacceptance. While discussing the LGBT community young people speak about “a fear of “other” and a fear of “different”.

“In most cases, young people are not able to name any particular argument in support of their fear and cannot explain exactly what are they afraid of. The most concrete argument named by some FGD participants is the fear of influence of LGBT propaganda on the young generation, and on their current or future children” (FES, 2016, p 105). For some young people in Georgia, this issue is related to Georgia’s EU integration process as they believe that in this process, Georgia will be asked to allow same-sex marriage via legislation, which is unacceptable for them.

A nationally representative EF/CRRC Georgia survey (2017) showed that the younger population (18-35 years old) is more open towards foreigners owning land in Georgia compared to older generations. Still, their attitudes towards foreigners owning land in Georgia are still quite negative. In 2017, 58% of young people believed that only citizens of Georgia should own land in Georgia no matter how they use this land rather than the land should be owned by those who will use it in the most profitable way, irrespective of their citizenship. Notably this share increased by 22 percentage points since 2015 (EF/CRRC-Georgia, 2017).

This is in line with MYPLACE survey findings, which also show that an important share of youth (47% in Telavi, 44% in Kutaisi), think that foreigners should not be allowed to buy land in Georgia (2014). Moreover, 43% of youth in Telavi and 32% in Kutaisi think that there should be stricter border controls and visa restrictions to prevent further immigration. On an exclusionism scale, which consists of three questions/statements (1. Foreigners should not be allowed to buy land in Georgia; 2. Migrants should have the same rights to welfare (health care, housing, education) as people from Georgia; 3. When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to Georgian people over foreign workers) Georgia had the third highest score of 14 countries, after Hungary and Russia (MYPLACE, 2014).

Such xenophobic attitudes can be partially explained by the lack of intercultural experience. The recent Caucasus Barometer survey (2017) showed that 70% of Georgia’s population has never had any form of contact with foreigners in Georgia who have stayed in Georgia for longer than three months. This share decreases to 58% among the younger generation (aged 18-35). Still only 13% of young people reported having often been in contact with foreigners coming and staying in Georgia for longer than 3 months. Interestingly they clearly differentiate between politics and culture saying that they are consumers of Russian products, including art, despite the recent political tensions between Georgia and Russia.
On the other hand, young people talk about Georgians being “irritated” by Armenians. Young people protested Yuri Mechitov, an ethnic Armenian photographer, becoming Deputy Minister of Culture, asking what did an Armenian have to do with Georgian culture. The attitudes towards foreigners and especially people who come for work from China, India, and African countries are worse.

When it comes to consuming foreign goods and especially cultural products, Georgian youth are more accepting. The MYPLACE survey shows that the share of youth who think that the state should protect the national economy by limiting the import of goods is only 38% in Telavi and 40% in Kutaisi. Importantly, a higher share of young people in Kutaisi (52%) and Telavi (45%) agree that the availability of foreign films, music, and books contributes to the development of national culture (MYPLACE 2014). According to FES survey (2016) 73% of youngsters watch foreign films at least once a week (16% watches them every day). In contrast, only 43% of youth watches Georgian films and TV series’ at least once a week (6% does it daily) (FES, 2016).

Young People: Trust, Religion and Values
Georgian youth express the highest level of trust towards their immediate families. According to FES (2016) survey immediate family members (9.7 on a 10 point-scale), friends (average score – 8.9) and relatives (average score – 8.4) are the most trusted groups for young people in Georgia. These groups are followed by religious leader and interestingly while the trust towards religious leaders is higher among those who identify themselves as religious and go to liturgy regularly or often (average score -8.3) the other part of youth also expresses a high level of trust (average score - 7.3) towards religious leaders. Young people in Georgia express lower level of trust towards ethnic minorities (average score – 5.4), people with different political persuasions (average score – 5.2) and people of other religions (average score – 5.2). The lowest level of trust is expressed towards LGBT people (average score – 3.4) with males reporting lower trust compared to female young persons (FES, 2016). In general, among 14 European countries, Georgian youth score lowest on a scale assessing perceived trustworthiness and helpfulness of other people (MYPLACE, 2014).

The role of family and relatives in the life of young people was discussed above, in the identity chapter. Religion and the Orthodox Church specifically is a second important institution after the family for young people.

According to the MYPLACE report, Georgian young people (in Kutaisi and Telavi) score the highest of the 14 countries in the study on the religiosity scale in terms of perceived religiosity and also in terms of frequency of attending religious services, with 86% of Kutaisi youth and 74% of Telavi youth reporting attendance at religious services at least once a month. Moreover, 89% of youth in Kutaisi and 81% in Telavi think that there is only one true religion.
The study showed that the more religious diversity of an individual’s primary social network, the less likely he or she is to identify as strongly religious (MYPLACE, 2014). The FES survey (2016) also showed that the absolute majority of young people in Georgia identify themselves as Orthodox Christian (85%), followed by Muslim (10%). The majority of youth believe in the existence of God (97%) and in the creation of the world by God (91%). Qualitative data indicate that atheism is viewed as something against Georgian traditions (FES, 2017, p 112). Qualitative research with young people (MYPLACE 2013) showed that while most clearly favour orthodoxy, their attitude towards religious minorities is split. Some young people argue for the superior status of the Orthodox Church, while others promote tolerance and inclusion. (MYPLACE 2013).

According to the MYPLACE survey in Telavi and Kutaisi, young Georgians reported the lowest mean values for agreement to a positive attitude towards women’s roles in society and agreement to women having access to abortion. Young Georgians perceive Georgian culture as the main reason for gender inequality in Georgia. Due to the culture, mothers tell their girls to “bow down to boys,” and women having less rights than men in the family is common in Georgia (MYPLACE, 2013). The FES survey (2016) also showed that a large share of young people in Georgia think that abortion should be completely banned by law (42%). The survey results suggest that low acceptance of diversity and equality and conservative attitudes are more prevalent in rural areas.

Several scholars have talked about a values shift among young Georgians. In contrast to the older generation, which are more oriented in traditionalism, family coherence, and bringing up obedient children, the younger generation values independence and self-determination as well as self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism. Young people in Georgia are characterized as more open to change and tolerant towards different minority groups, although tolerance towards religious and sexual minorities is still very low (Sumbadze, 2012; Khoshtaria 2017). Interestingly, this value shift has not affected youth religiosity. On the contrary, young people in Georgia are more religious than older people (Sumbadze, 2012; Mestvirishvili, 2014). These findings lead to the conclusion that emancipative, self-expressive, or post-materialist values (except with the issue of religion) are becoming more widespread among the younger generation in Georgia compared with the older generations.

---

193 This was measured through two questions: 1. When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women. 2: Women make as good political leaders as men. Answer options were ‘Strongly agree’, ‘Agree’, ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, ‘Disagree’ and ‘Strongly disagree’.
Intercultural Competences and Education
Intercultural Education in Georgian Schools

The intercultural education context is quite straightforward in Georgia. There are about 72,000 non-Georgian (ethnic minority) students in Georgia; 67,953 of them (approximately 94%) go to state-funded non-Georgian schools. In these state schools the language of instruction is different from Georgian. Since ethnic minority Armenians and Azerbaijanis compactly populate two regions of Georgia – Samtskhe-Javakheti and Kvemo Kartli, non-Georgian (that is, Azerbaijani, Armenian and Russian-instructed) schools, are mainly located in these two regions. More than 95% of the teachers of those non-Georgian schools are non-Georgians (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013).

A study from 2013 focused on primary school students to identify challenges and problems related to multiculturalism through interviews with teachers, focus groups with parents and students, and textbook analyses. The textbook analyses showed that the majority of textbooks fail to develop intercultural sensitivity among children and encourage and perpetuate stereotypes among the students in different directions, namely by territorial settlement, socio-economic status, health and abilities, gender, etc. Also, it should be noted that most of the textbooks do not reflect ethnic, religious, territorial settlement diversity of Georgia and are written with ethnocentric perspective” (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p.89).

Focus groups with 5-7 graders and their parents showed that in primary grades, students are quite interested in different cultures and notice inequality and inappropriate attitudes towards different cultural groups better than their parents (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p. 152). The study found that teachers’ multicultural sensitivity and tolerance towards different ethnic groups are quite low and selective towards different ethnic groups.

Teachers’ cultural sensitivity is different towards various different aspects of cultural identity: “Tolerance towards social status, disabilities or gender does not exclude intolerance towards racial, lingual, religious, ethnic or civil differences” (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p. 123);

According to the report, primary school teachers have a limited understanding of multicultural education and its goals. Most have not participated in any multicultural education programs or courses and find it hard to talk about specific strategies for multicultural education. Religion is perceived as most problematic in terms of multicultural education. The study shows that teachers sometimes see 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, is the best strategy (Tabatadze and Gorgadze, 2013, p. 139).
A recent, and perhaps the most comprehensive, study on cultural education in schools used a students’ survey, interviews and focus groups with teachers, and textbook analysis to understand intercultural education. The research focused on secondary schools and 10-12 graders (16-18 years old) in public and private schools in Georgia. The study showed that student’s intercultural knowledge is very limited and stereotypes about other cultures are quite common. Ethnic Georgian students have a sense of superiority over other cultural groups living in Georgia. Out of 1045 surveyed students only 40% reported that family members talk to them about different cultures (Malazonia, et al., 2017).

According to the same survey, 81% of students agree that different cultures have different rules, values and behaviours, while slightly less (78%) agree that all cultures should be equally respected and even less (72%) agree that knowledge about different cultures facilitates relationships between humans. Only 35% agree that they can detect incorrect opinions (prejudices) about cultures. However, more (69%) think they can detect similarities and differences between cultures. Interestingly 63% agrees that there are connections between different cultures and languages, and even more (89%) report that representatives of different cultures can have different behavioural norms and rituals. While 72% agrees that they respect people from any culture and 70% are ready to share their culture with others, fewer (61%) are ready to help people from another culture. Only 28% are ready to live in a different cultural environment.

The study showed that the role of school in intercultural education is rather weak, with a highly limited number of in class and extracurricular activities aimed at improving intercultural knowledge and the sensitivity of students. This can be explained partially by the lack of experience of teachers and partially by the curriculum and textbooks, which sometimes foster negative attitudes towards other cultures (Malazonia, et al., 2017). These findings are supported by the students’ survey: Only 35% agree that intercultural relations are taught only in the classroom (65% disagrees), and almost the same share (34%) agree that teachers use diverse materials to teach them different cultures. Less than half (46%) agree that teachers tell them about different cultures at school. Moreover, only one third (33%) agree that the school prepares them for living in a culturally diverse society and less than half (46%) agree that different norms and traditions are respected at school.

The study found that girls have higher intercultural competences compared to boys and that the main factors defining intercultural competencies are school culture, diversity of school environment, content of curriculum, and teacher-student relationship style. The textbook analysis revealed that while textbooks contain some materials which foster intercultural knowledge, other components of intercultural education (skills and attitudes) are hardly addressed by the textbooks (Malazonia, et al., 2017).
Educational Exchange Programs and their Impact on Youth

Another research by Javakhishvili and her colleagues (2013) aimed at studying the impact of international educational exchange programs on identity formation in early adulthood (18-25). The study used a quasi-experimental design, in which 30 young adults who were selected by international study programs to continue their education in various countries of Western Europe were interviewed before the departure and after their return to Georgia. The results were compared to a control group, where interviews were conducted with short-listed candidates who did not participate in the exchange programs.

Qualitative analysis of life interviews showed that young people accentuated their own culture after contact with another culture representatives. As the authors state, “Thus, our participants compared individual host culture with the collectivistic home culture and realized differences clearly, giving more critical thought to their own culture” (Javakhishvili et al., 2013. p.41).

Another change in the narratives of those who spent a year abroad was increased tolerance to others, which can be regarded as a result of the international experience. When it comes to students coming from neighbouring countries to study in Georgia and their impact on Georgian youth, the situation appears to be different. A quantitative study on intercultural sensitivity among Georgian, Armenian, and Azerbaijani students in Georgia concluded that there is the social-psychological distance among Georgian, Armenian, and Azerbaijani students. While Armenian and Azerbaijani students clearly expressed the desire to reduce this distance, Georgian students seemed to be less motivated to reduce it (Tsereteli, 2015).
Concluding Remarks

The report has reviewed and analysed the main theoretical contributions and research findings related to Georgian youth and their identities, cultural involvement, norms, values and intercultural knowledge. Cultural literacy is a new term for Georgian academic literature. In recent years, a few studies have dealt with intercultural education, focusing on different aspects of intercultural education in primary and secondary public schools. Most literature that somehow connects the concepts of “youth” and “culture” are focused on youth values, identities, and attitudes.

Religion appears to be a very important determinant of young peoples’ cultural identity. Being Georgian is closely related to being orthodox Christian, and young people in Georgia tend to be more religious than the older generations. A high level of religiosity does not encourage tolerance towards minority groups. Young people in Georgia are quite intolerant towards sexual minorities. As for ethnic and religious minorities, their attitudes are rather mixed.

Georgian students have a sense of superiority over other cultural groups in Georgia. Schools and families do not appear to be sufficient for fostering intercultural sensitivity and knowledge among youth. Available studies suggest neither textbooks nor the knowledge and skills of teachers are sufficient for intercultural education. Thus intercultural education in primary and secondary schools requires significant improvements in order to raise tolerant youth.

Young people in Georgia are very proud of their nationality and report high perceived importance of Georgian history, culture, and traditions. For them the significance of preserving history and traditions are quite high. However, when it comes to cultural practices, their participation in cultural events remains quite low, especially in rural areas.

The role and importance of family is also large for young people. This limits their independence in most spheres in their lives, but provides physical and emotional security, which creates comfort for them. This comfort coupled with existing social norms, discourages young people from living separately until they get married or move abroad for study or work. This experience of studying abroad is often their first experience of independent living, which seems to greatly affect their identities and attitudes, making them more critical towards their own culture and more accepting towards different cultures.
Last but not least, studies show some difference in value-orientation of young people by demographic characteristics. There is a considerable disparity between young people in the capital and those living in rural areas in terms of their values, acceptance of diversity, and belief in equality. There is a similar gap between boys and girls, with girls being more tolerant towards sexual minorities and. On the whole, young Georgians are more inclined towards traditional values, with a tendency towards self-expressive values, especially in Tbilisi.
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National Cultural/Educational Literature Review (Germany)
Louis Henri Seukwa, Elina Marmer and Cornelia Sylla

Introduction

A thematic review of academic literature relating to cultural literacy education of young people in Germany was undertaken, aiming at compiling the state of the art of academic findings and debates in the field. In the German context, this proved to be a challenging task, since a large body of literature touching the issues of youth, culture and education has been published in recent decades and within different academic disciplines. Here one example: A large-scale research project reviewing academic literature in the field of “cultural education”, here defined as artistic/aesthetic education/production/consumption, published between 1990 and 2012, found some 2000 relevant publications, 1200 for the years 2008-2012 alone (Liebau et al., 2014), with rising tendency. If we extended a similar search to the present day, additionally broadening our search to encompass historical political education, cultural identities and informal youth cultures, we would expect many more.

In addition to this generally wide field of academic literature, it is not always easy to capture the variety of the German discourses in the English language. For example, in the German language there are two main concepts of education “Bildung” and “Erziehung”. The first one focuses more on knowledge and the second on behaviour. Both terms, “Kulturelle Bildung” and “Kulturelle Erziehung”, have slightly different aspects but also many similarities in the ways they are used. In addition to these two basic terms there are more (e.g. “Vermittlung” and “Pädagogik”) with very specific connotations. They are all linked to each other but are usually used to differentiate one concept from another. Subsuming them all under the notion of cultural education makes it quite difficult to capture these slight nuances.

“Cultural education is booming”, states the cover of yet another volume on cultural education research (Fink et al., 2015). This recent “boom of cultural education”, could be partly explained by what is widely called the “PISA-shock” in 2000, and again in 2006 – when the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) ranked Germany below the international average.

PISA results received a lot of public and political attention, and were apparently hurtful to Germany’s self-image as Kulturnation (Barz, 2012). The studies also indicated that Germany especially underperformed in providing educational equality – most pronounced in terms of socio-economic status and geographic origin (of students or their families up to the third generation).
The “PISA shock”, as it is widely called in academic literature and public discourses – initiated various activities in the field of education: initiatives, programs, policy and research projects mainly directed towards pre-schools and schools. The idea that access to cultural literacy can increase chances for disadvantaged groups gained popularity. Therefore, cultural education received increasing attention and the wake of educational reforms followed.

In this context, it was mostly defined as artistic/aesthetic education/production/ consumption. Cultural education in Germany has its origins in movements for democratisation (of consumption and production of aesthetic culture) in the 1960s and 70s. Only more recently, since the 1980s, the concept of cultural and aesthetic education began to include international/intercultural dimensions (Liebau, 2013). Different historical developments enhanced the public interest on the issue of national cultural identity as we summarize in below. German identity was burdened with negative connotations of nationalism and the responsibility for the Shoah after 1945. Discourses on German identity experienced renaissance since the unification of BRD and DDR in 1990: Before 1990, Germany was widely assumed to be white and homogeneous, considered to consist of “Germans” and “foreigners”, whereby “foreigners” were seen and treated as “guests”, i.e. those who will eventually leave. Nevertheless, in all these discourses, German identity was never touched upon explicitly to avoid nationalistic tendencies. As Germany was officially committed to anti-nationalism, the official tone was that guests must be treated in a friendly way and all kind of hostility was condemned. Whiteness, however, was assumed to be the norm, and patterns of systematic privilege and discrimination along the line of belonging and non-belonging were widely ignored by the dominant public discourses (and the majority population). In the meantime, millions of youth with the so-called Migrationshintergrund (migration background), many second and third generation German born and mostly citizens, graduated from schools and universities and pursued all kind of careers, increasing their visibility in the society, demanding equal access to participation.
These developments had significant impacts on public perception, media discourses and politics: Numbers claiming 20% of the German population to have *Migrationshintergrund* began to appear everywhere; in 2000 the citizenship was extended from the law of blood only to the law of soil, opening access to it for numerous people; finally, in 2005, Germany officially declared itself a “country of migration”. At the same time, unification also boosted controversial racist debates, which began to dominate German media – for the first time after the Shoah, fears of “*kulturelle Überfremdung*” (cultural infiltration) and claims of German “superiority” (for example, over the so-called “Turks and Arabs”)\(^{194}\), began to be openly expressed on publicly funded TV, full spectrum of news-outlets from right over centre to left (for example white feminist) and even in a bestseller\(^{195}\). What was considered unspeakable until then, suddenly took over the hegemonic discourses. In 2010, the Federal Chancellor Angela Merkel pronounced “multi-kulti” (an idea of a pluralistic society based on mutual tolerance) as failed\(^{196}\), while the then President Christian Wulff declared in the same year, that Islam belonged to Germany\(^{197}\).

All these developments contributed to heated discussions on culture and identity causing the shift from multicultural education over intercultural education to cultural integration. After the large influx of migrants in 2015, the debate intensified. Cultural education as a school of democratic values is expected to foster integration by countering radicalization on various ends of the society.

\(^{194}\) One of the leading actors, Tilo Sarazin, published a bestseller “Germany Is Doing Away With Itself” in 2010, where he perpetuated a racist evaluation of contemporary German society, mainly targeting populations originated from Turkey and the Arab countries

\(^{195}\) ibid.


Method

As stated above, a comprehensive literature review would involve reading thousands of academic publications, which lies beyond the scope of the CHIEF project. Instead, we decided to focus on standard works published in the last 10 years, as well as on the most recent publications, which offer new and different findings and perspectives.

We performed a manual search on the website of our university library (https://www.haw-hamburg.de/hibs/recherche/opac.html#c160832), using the keywords “cultural education” (“kulturelle Bildung” and “kulturelle Erziehung”), “cultural identity”, “cultural heritage” and “youth”.

Two researchers reviewed the literature selected this way; during this process more publications have been added to the list following references found in the reviewed bulk. The researchers regularly exchanged and discussed their findings and the new selections. The first screening of the selected literature, mostly standard works, revealed that the issue of youth was not explicitly addressed. An additional search was performed on the website of Deutsches Jugendinstitut (German Youth Institute, https://www.dji.de/nc/medien-und-kommunikation/publikationen.html) to close that gap. To capture the most recent developments, we have searched the websites of the Project Kulturelle Bildung Online (Cultural Education Online, (https://www.kubi-online.de), Deutscher Kulturrat e.V (The German Cultural Council https://www.kulturrat.de/publikationen) as well as the Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung/bpb (Federal Agency for Civic Education, http://www.bpb.de/shop/publikationssuche/, http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/bildung/kulturelle-bildung/59985/literatur).

Similarly to our findings in the policy review, we found only very few references to postcolonial perspectives on cultural education in the literature of the last ten years. Since the review of policy papers revealed that the lack of these perspectives seem to be one of the greater problems in the German discourses on culture, we added two more slightly older texts by authors who cover these approaches (Mecheril, 2003, Messerschmidt 2006).

The review is structured as followed:
We begin with summarising theoretical approaches to cultural education and literacy in academic literature. We then focus on the four prevailing paradigms in German academic literature: cultural education as artistic/aesthetic education, normative culture, intercultural education, commemoration culture, and explore the topics of cultural identity and participation.
We finalize the review with publications on the research and evaluation in the field. In our conclusion we identify areas where more research is needed.

Theoretical Approaches
In a historical review, Zirfas (2013) identifies three stages of cultural education in Germany. Initially, cultural education was especially a topic of the humanities, more or less a philosophical question; later it became an emancipatory concept and therefore rather a political question; lately it turned to be a specific educational field, which Zirfas calls “the reflective stage”. According to his analysis, cultural education appears to be a phenomenon of crisis; concepts of cultural education had always been a reaction to modernisation processes and therefore reflected social changes (32).

In general, the conceptualisation of cultural education depends very much on the understanding of culture. In a very broad and basic definition, culture means everything that was created by humans, thus every education is cultural education (Fuchs, 2013). In this understanding, culture is always pluralistic, always intercultural, and dynamic (48). It also means that culture can be destructive and it therefore needs normativity/values. Thus, one dimension of culture is the symbolic representation of values (48–49). Since Bourdieu, the political dimension of culture can also no longer be denied; social hierarchy is established and reproduced through aesthetic-cultural consumption (50).

Also other social and educational scientists agree that cultural education in a broad or even in the narrower sense of aesthetical education is a key concept of education in general, since learning different ways of living and coping is considered as important as vocational qualifications (e.g. Liebau, 2013, p. 253). Ermert (2009) conceptualizes cultural education as education towards cultural participation. Since creativity is a key competence in many vocational branches, he sees cultural/aesthetical education also relevant for the economic development (ibid).

Cultural Education as artistic/aesthetic education
A growing number of academic work has been published on the topic of cultural education in the recent decade.
The Handbook Cultural Education (Bockhorst et al., 2012), assembles more than 180 contributions from nearly as many authors to present its theory and practice. This is the first collective overview in Germany aiming to present a compilation of central concepts, discourses and perspectives (in Part I). Based on different approaches to and understandings of “culture”, various concepts of cultural education in their relation to pedagogy, art and society – topics like globalization, participation, migration, economy, collective memory, democracy – are discussed by different authors. Despite covering a large spectrum of topics, the over 1000 pages volume failed to include important approaches, ideas and (critical) voices in the field. Post-colonial, post-socialist and feminist perspectives, for example, cannot be found among the contributions, same can be stated about diasporic authors. The handbook’s claim to represent the “universe cultural education” (21) could not be fulfilled. (From the post-colonial view, such a claim in itself deserves a critical attention).

Part II is dedicated to data and empirical developments in the field – contributions address policy frameworks, cultural spaces, professionalization, research & evaluation and target groups. Only three of 180 contributions tackle the issue of youth as a target group – the disadvantaged youth (Treptow, 2012), youth sub-cultures (Schmidt, 2012) and youth at the crossroad between school and Beruf (here understood as vacation or rather vocational training) (Braun, 2012); and one is dedicated to target groups of inter-generational cultural education (Fricke, 2012). In order to facilitate inclusion for all groups and individuals, Bockhorst (2012) advocates for participatory pedagogy approaches considering specific cultural knowledge, needs and ideas of the youth. Although it is often mentioned that cultural education in Germany is predominantly aimed at young people, youth is not specifically discussed anywhere else in the handbook.

Sustainability of the state initiated cultural education projects is discussed by Berghaus (2012). She admits that there has been little research that far on long living effects of these model projects. Their model character might contribute to general structures through generation and transformation of knowledge, creation of networks and visibility in public discourses. A sustainable structural impact, however, remains somehow limited due to the project character of interventions constrained in terms of time, target group and resources.

As a positive example, Berghaus presents the FSJ Kultur Program\(^\text{198}\), which has been structurally implemented after the model project phase. In general, state initiated cultural projects are presented in a rather positive light in this handbook, which by the way is introduced with the forward from Bernd Neumann, the then Federal Commissioner of Culture and Media (BKM).

---

\(^{198}\) FSJ Kultur is a state program for youth volunteering for one year in a field of culture, usually after graduating from school. [https://freiwilligendienste-kultur-bildung.de/en/](https://freiwilligendienste-kultur-bildung.de/en/)
The new volume by Josties and Menrath (2018) introduces the perspectives of young people, educators and artists on the previously less considered field of cultural education in the open settings – youth cultural centres, cultural initiatives and urban spaces of learning. Those working with young people in open settings encounter groups with diverse cultural practices. The diversity of places and participants poses a particular potential, but also a challenge, for instructors of cultural education. The volume is concerned with places and actors, professional backgrounds and practical approaches – from youth culture work over urban learning to creative biography work. Current discourses as well as results of a pilot project provide impulses for this intersection of pedagogical and artistic theories and practical approaches.

Mecheril (2015) discusses the approach of migration pedagogy (*Migrationspädagogik*, Mecheril et al., 2010) to cultural/aesthetic education. He warns that overemphasizing on migration in the field of cultural education can lead to culturalisation and aestheticisation of the social as well as to manifestations of the othering processes. Migration pedagogy understands a critical engagement with the system of cultural attributions and affiliations as a central issue of cultural education. How those processes affect and construct cultural identities is further discussed in the paragraph on Cultural Identity and Youth. In clear distinction to intercultural approaches (see Intercultural Education), which aim at increasing learners’ tolerance through exploring their own and others’ spaces, practices and narratives, Mecheril’s vision is a creation of an aesthetic framework in which every learner can create spaces to try out, transform or reject these patterns of cultural identity production (Mecheril, 2015).

According to Fuchs (2013), cultural education in practice is performed in many different settings, formal, non-formal, informal; educational staff ranges from volunteers, to artists, trained educational practitioners and academic professionals, social workers, teachers, educational scientists, etc. but mainly takes place outside of schools. It was therefore often considered part of the cultural sciences rather than educational sciences (*"Kulturvermittlung"* instead of *"Kulturpädagogik"*) (37–38). Cultural education in schools is only on the rise since the 1980s due to fall in attendance experienced by the institutions of high culture (theatres, operas, museums) as well as the general dissatisfaction with schools’ focus on cognitive education (39).

Reflecting on the theoretical approaches and paradigms to cultural education, Liebau (2014) criticizes prevailing assumptions that ignore schools as cultural places per se. As a practical consequence, most cultural projects are implicitly designed to introduce culture to school in the first place, from an external, non-formal cultural space.
In his view, school is “the decisive space of cultural perpetuation in the society, the curricula are the central part of cultural memory” (20). In this sense, cultural education is currently being promoted by the federal government (“Kultur macht stark, BMBF”199) with the intention to get more young people interested in literature, music, art, theatre, film and other fields of aesthetic production. Cooperation between schools and non-formal cultural institutions is seen as an important means to achieve this goal. In the context of this programme, Ackermann et al. (2015) are analysing how the implementation of a state-funded programme regarding cultural education, impacts schools’ practices and identities.

Normative Culture
The German debate about common cultural values that hold the society together is currently polemicized and politicized: What is allowed and what is common, who and what is German, who has to do what in order to belong?

The book by Geißler and Zimmermann (2018) summarises contributions from Politics & Culture, the newspaper of the German Cultural Council, from over ten years, which show many facets of the debate: the notion of Kulturnation (nation of culture or cultured nation, see Discussions in the Policy Review), the responsibilities of the state in issues of culture and cultural literacy, the freedom of art, the discussions about the cultural canon and Germany as a country of migration, but also topics like cultural integration and employment, cultural integration as a task for cultural institutions as well as the special role of religion in the integration debate.

One of the most controversially discussed topics is the notion of Leitkultur (leading culture) with normative values and virtues. The term Leitkultur, which can be translated as „guiding/leading culture” or “core/basic culture”, is a contested concept in Germany, coined by Tibi in 1996 (Tibi, 2016). The term, originally meant to define European values, has been appropriated by populist discourses, to signify nationalistic normative culture. In this context, Habermass (2017) makes a simple distinction between the "majority/minority culture" and the "political culture”. In his view, a normative leading culture is inconsistent with the Constitutional Law, which itself is at the core of political culture and protects the minorities cultural rights. As Habermass observes, this political culture is subject to constant change, not least because of the influence of immigrants and refugees (2017).

199 https://www.buendnisse-fuer-bildung.de/
Meyer (2018) analysed and evaluated curricula textbooks and educational practice in vocational classes for migrant youth on so-called German cultural values. She found that the curricula picture an idealized German society, which is in contrast to an imagined deficient “migrant culture”, whereby inequalities and diversity within the German society are completely ignored. Using the New-Year’s-Eve-2015-incident in Cologne, where migrant men have allegedly harassed German women, she demonstrates the fragility of democratic participatory approaches to cultural education of common (German) values: The incident that has marked German migration debate as a turning point, has not just reversed it from propagating the Willkommenskultur (welcome culture) to implementing more restrictive migration and asylum policies. It was also instrumentalised to hurriedly change the curricula for new migrants and especially for refugees. Before this event, didactic experts agreed, that cultural values should be taught through discussion and negotiation. However, this democratic approach was abandoned in favour of authoritative teaching of normative culture prescribed from above (Meyer, 2018).

Other authors, like Hallitzy (2018) for example, also state that dealing with "foreignness" is a major educational challenge of this century. Hallitzy especially stresses the difference between scientific approaches to cultural education and educational practices in schools. While qualitative research tries to show shortcomings due to normative affirmation of unreflected concepts like "culture" and "foreignness", schools cannot and are not allowed to avoid normative affirmation (100). Education in schools is supposed to provide orientation towards enlightened self-determination, to educate towards democratic values. But at the same time, according to the values of openness and pluralism, it has to accept diverse (also ambiguous) opinions to a certain degree (105).

Referring to several qualitative studies on foreignness in the educational system, Hallitzy provides some suggestions on introducing reflective components in teacher training curricula (113–115). Another interesting insight into the normativity of cultural education in schools is provided by Schneider (2018). Her qualitative analysis (videography) of bilingual (English immersion) classes contradicts the broadly accepted expectation that in bilingual classes cultural education can be facilitated, and that cultural negotiations, as expected in these classes, allow students to (re-)consider and (re-)construct their cultural identities (401). Cultural education in the sense of transformation of cultural identities of young people does not initiate itself just by teaching politics in English. More often these transformation processes are constricted through dominating exercises (402). Teachers tend to act as representatives of organisational power, which disables cultural education in the stated sense (402–403).
Commemoration Culture

German cultural identity is strongly related to history and dominant historical narratives. In the FRG, commemoration culture and education, originally based on Adorno’s “Education after Auschwitz” (1966/2005), have since been central to the country’s self-concept. Adorno suggested that political historical and cultural education should be “centred upon the idea that Auschwitz should never happen again”, emphasising on self-reflection of individuals and society and rigorous scrutiny of “societal play of forces that operates beneath the surface of political forms”. The current state of German commemoration culture is critically reviewed by (Piepenbrink, 2016).

How does remembrance change with increasing time, and how can historical learning look like in the future? With the imminent end of direct contemporary witnessing, the question of how to deal with and learn from "unacceptable history" (Imre Kertész) is a new one. Should Holocaust be "historicized" in the future and included in a broader history of violence, or can it be used to derive a kind of "universalized" morality that is reflected in human rights education?

Since the 1990s, educational discourse on “Holocaust education” suggests that learning about the NS-regime must be conceptualized differently, in order to reach out to the so-called “migrant youth”, explaining to them the role of the Holocaust, in order to integrate them into the German society. This discourse places migrant youth outside the NS-commemoration, and suggests that there is a specific German way of learning about Nazism.

The discourse analysis by Fava (2015) points out the constructed “migrant-German” dichotomy, based on either lack (migrant) or presence (German) of biographic involvement and guilt. German national identity is constructed as a community that has already learned its lessons from the horrors of the NS-history. Messerschmidt (2016) suggest that “responsibility” as opposite to “guilt”, offers less personalized and more abstract possibility of relating to NS-crimes without emphasizing on national identity and origin.

Some aspects of national history, however, do not play any role in the German commemoration culture. The debate about German colonial legacy and the colonial amnesia, for many years a marginalized topic addressed mainly by Black and diasporic communities200, dedicated civil society groups201 and political and academic activists202, gained more attention in the mainstream research in recent years (Zimmerer, 2015).

201 see http://www.no-humboldt21.de/ initiative for decolonisation of German museums by berlin postcolonial, 2013
202 see https://www.kolonialismusimkasten.de/ (Colonialism in the Box, postcolonial audio-guide to standing exhibition of the German History Museum in Berlin, 2013)
Here, Zimmerer looks at the involvement of museums that collect and exhibit colonial objects in depicting and popularizing the colonial worldview.

First of all, the possession and exhibition of these objects fuelled the ideology of the "civilizing mission", which legitimized violence and concealed colonial barbarism. Secondly, colonial objects have usually been unlawfully acquired. Therefore, he argues that decolonisation of museums must also include the debate on provenience and restitution of looted objects.

The Handbook "Museum Pedagogy - Cultural Education in Museums" (Commandeur et al., 2016) claims to address museum professionals, teachers, students and decision-makers. Museum education is defined as the most comprehensive and multifaceted task of all museums; collecting, preserving, researching and exhibiting alone are considered incomplete without the educational component to it. Contributions deal with museum development, their own perspectives on their tasks, structural issues as well as target groups, formats and methods of cultural educational theory and practise. Neither the issue of decolonization nor the participation/discrimination mechanisms operating in and through museums are touched upon.

In the context of “suppression of colonialism from the German cultural memory” Messerschmidt reminds us, that “the possibility of ignoring the crimes is not one available to everyone. As with the aftermath of all historical crimes, only the descendants of the offender's side can choose whether they want to remember or not. For the descendants of the colonized this option does not exist, because for them colonialism is a much deeper cut in their history, culture, their self-image and their position in the world” (Messerschmidt, 2006, p. 1).

Intercultural Education

*Intercultural competence* has become a buzzword in all educational fields and also in the field of economy, which makes the term rather unspecific (Auernheimer, 2010a, p. 7). He observes a tendency to culturalisation in the discussion on intercultural education (Auernheimer, 2010b, p. 35). Cultural differences are often socially constructed as ethnical, but they are usually intersected with other forms of differences. Therefore, it is important to always consider “that the other might be different from what you thought he/she was” (Auernheimer, 2010b, p. 60).

Within this narrowed logic of cultural differences as ethnic differences, and based on the premise that migration is increasing due to globalisation, different authors suggest that schools and other educational institutions have to react. Lanfranchi (2010) states that increasing heterogeneity within German schools leads to a need for intercultural competence of teachers.
This demands from teachers to change their perspectives on the school as a monolingual, monocultural space (256). Berndt’s (2013) analysis of the concept of “Global Learning” takes similar direction: "Global Learning" seems to be the didactical answer to societal changes through globalisation. In theoretical discussions on this concept, pedagogical thinking in general is criticised for being founded in national and territorial dimensions (126). “Global Learning” in this sense is a cross-sectoral topic for all fields of education (126), but curricula usually state normative goals in the form of competences that are not founded in scientific research results (127). Berndt in conclusion opts for spatial foundation of the competence model: a space-sensitive pedagogy that is reflecting on different perceptions of spaces and developing competences of orientation and action (133).

In contrast to that, Tiedemann (2018) sees a philosophical universalist approach as the solution to the challenges caused by “cultural differences”. He states, that Huntington's prognoses of a clash of cultures have come true to an alarming extent. The theory of "one world" as optimistically promoted after the end of the cold war has proven naive. Anyway, according to his analysis, this view on current phenomena is not the only possible one: Philosophical analysis could evaluate any theory's consistence and coherence (40–42). Defending a "soft" universalism, Tiedemann states that participation in epistemic discussions is independent from cultural backgrounds, therefore, philosophy can be seen as a key cultural practice of human kind (48). He then elaborates on the differences between tolerance and acceptance, between concepts of permission or respect and other related key concepts (50–55).

Mecheril (2010), taking over another perspective, argues that it is the social construction of foreignness in the first places that leads to the stated need of special competencies for educational professionals. In the educational setting, the professional actor is usually assumed to be a member of what is constructed as cultural majority, while the client can be "foreign".

Resulting concepts of intercultural education towards enhancing intercultural competence are thus usually designed for members of the majority. Mecheril designs a concept, which he calls "Kompetenzlosigkeitskompetenz" that could be translated as "competence in lacking competence". It promotes a type of education that is based on observation of categories of difference being transported through performance and tries to reflect on the interplay of knowledge and not-knowing and the relations of dominance and difference within the educational setting. (Mecheril, 2010, p. 32). Bender-Szymanski (2010) concludes that intercultural competence of teachers is presupposed in German curricula, although it is neither clearly defined nor comprehensively taught in teacher training.
Youth and Cultural Identity
During our search for “cultural identity and youth”, most of the academic work we found was directed towards cultural identity of the “natio-ethno-culturally others” (Mecheril, 2003), i.e. young people, who are perceived to be different and whose cultural identity is often questioned by the majority population. We hardly found any work on cultural identity of the majority populations themselves, or else, “cultural identity” framed outside the natio-ethnic categories.

(Dannenbeck, 2002) carried a study on cultural identity in “heterogeneous milieus”, funded by DFG focus program. His theoretical background is informed by Cultural Studies (especially UK Stuart Hall), post-colonialism, gender studies and post-structuralism.

The author pursues the question, when, how and why natio-ethnic identities are assumed by young people and/or attributed to others, and when, how and why this specific category is chosen over many other types of identities (family clan, political orientation, gender, sexual orientation, religion, class, hobbies, preferences or dislikes etc.). To achieve this end, ethnographic studies with young people have been carried out in an ethnically heterogeneous district in Munich in informal settings, under the assumption that activation of natio-ethnic self-attributions and othering is interlinked with social space. He understands identities as “a cultural positioning within a difference”, which are always temporary, contextualized and situated e.g. within an interview. The interview processes themselves are made subject of analysis – they are spaces of an ongoing "struggle for meanings", the constant shifts of (cultural) positions, interactive cultural identity work by all parties involved, including the interviewers.

A typology of cultural identity is deliberately avoided; instead, attention is directed to the ideas and meanings of cultural identity and how it affects young people’s behaviour.

Theoretically, the work offers an important counterpoint to essentialist assumptions of cultural identity differences. The author suggests that the “identity crisis” commonly attributed to youth with the so-called “migration background” could as well be produced by the essentialist frame work of the researchers themselves. Cultural essentialisations expressed by the interviewer through insisting questions like “Where do you really feel at home?”, “Where are your true roots?”, “Where do you feel you belong?”. Or through dialogues like:

– Do you feel German or Turkish?
– Both
– More German or more Turkish?.
Dannenbeck encountered little resistance to classifications offered by the researcher.


Contrary to the prevailing “between two chairs” narratives, as the assumed identity crisis of youth with “migrational background” is often visualized, he shows how young women produce their own meanings of identity and belonging in extremely difficult conditions of the BRD. He appeals to finally recognize these forms as really existing “multiple” natio-ethno-cultural affiliations. Mecheril coins the term “natio-ethno-culturally other”, to describe the interlinked othering processes these young people are facing in Germany. The idea of hybrid identities was picked up since and is currently being controversially discussed in German academic and meanwhile dominant public discourses on youth and migration.

As mentioned above, independent of their theoretical, political or ideological orientation, most authors on youth and cultural identity write about the “natio-ethno-culturally others” and rarely is “cultural identity” framed outside national and ethnic categories. One interesting contribution in this direction is the book of Eder (2000) on new socio-cultural forms of identity that emerge within social movements and replace, shift or relativize ethno-national notions of identity. Eder, however, does not address the issue of youth. Cultural identity formation in affiliations with youth sub-cultures is analysed by Farin (2011), according to whom some 20-25% of young people are a part of a sub-culture, with extended influence on the rest. In retrospective observation of youth sub-cultures in Germany since 1950, he finds that the boundaries between the scenes have become more permeable. Hardly anyone remains affiliated to only one sub-culture. In his view, a growing group of young people adapts ambivalence and flexibility, a kind of neo-liberal cultural pattern, in their search of cultural identity.

Another problematic aspect of the dominant German cultural identity is what Kollmorgen (2010) calls the subalternity of East German perspectives in the mainstream discourses. West German standards are used to measure everything East German, preventing an adequate representation of East Germans in science, culture and media.

203 see the contribution on cultural competence of hybrid youth by Ahmet Toprak in Deutsche Welle, 2018 https://www.dw.com/de/metwo-zwei-kulturen-in-sich-zu-vereinen-ist-eine-kompetenz/a-44822674
Participation
The issue of participation is often raised in the context of cultural literacy and education, and has partly been discussed in the paragraphs above. Multifaceted exclusion and inclusion processes from/to cultural participation are examined by in the volume by Fiedler et al. (2014). While inclusion is considered a central goal of cultural education work, it can also become a means of exclusion. The contributions discuss among others, exclusion mechanisms of a working-class child (Mauerer, 2014), people with mental health issues (Anklam, 2014) and youth in custody (Zaiser, 2014). Authors invite the reader to reflect on their professional repertoire and methods, their artistic means of expression. Patterns of exclusion in the offers, projects and programs of cultural education are reflected upon and practical impulses from theatre, dance, music, etc. are presented, which should help recognize and overcome exclusion in cultural education practises.

The volume on “promises and reality” of participation (Hübner et al., 2017) contextualizes what has been achieved and what has not, how effectiveness of cultural education in terms of access and participation can be continuously reflected and evaluated.

The issues of discrimination and diversity in cultural education are addressed by the volume “White spots in cultural education” by Schütze and Maedler (2018). They claim to fill void spaces of hegemonic cultural knowledge production and knowledge production about culture, by having diverse authors examine structures, practices and methods of cultural education in reference to reproduction and creation of unequal power relations. Contributors range from cultural studies to social work, from cultural educators to artists and activists. They analyse and discuss the issues of racism (Varatharajah, 2018; Bytyci, 2018) classism (Abou, 2018; Theißl, 2018), ableism (Judith, 2018), adultism (Ritz, 2018), heteronormativity (Seeck, 2018) and other mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion as well as the intersectionality (Aukongo, 2018; Diallo and Erni, 2018) in the context of cultural education theory and practice. Adultism – discrimination of children and youth by adults – is hardly discussed or even explicitly mentioned in the reviewed academic literature on cultural literacy. Youth, more than any other groups, is the specific target of cultural education, albeit it is designed by adults for the youth, but often without their participation and recognition of their knowledge and interests (Ritz, 2018).
Beyond that, authors show the potential of cultural education in the context of empowerment, resistance and social transformation and give recommendations to reach this end – improved access (Micossé-Aikins and Sharifi, 2018), decolonization (Tran, 2018), critical cultural pedagogy (Auma, 2018) and human rights perspectives on inclusion (Maedler, 2018).

A shift of the recent German political and public discourses to the topic of “refugees” did not spare cultural education and was put into practice by many ambitious projects. Critical review on refugees and cultural education offers the volume with the same title (Ziese and Gritschke, 2016). The contributions examine the question of how people fleeing hardship and violence can exercise their rights to education and social participation in Germany as well as discusses what are the appropriate formats of cultural education to draw attention to the reality of refugees.

Refugee’s presence and involvement is putting cultural education programs, institutions and paradigms at a test challenging their suitability for diversity and inclusion. The persistence of colonially (defined by Quijano as the continuity of colonial epistemes and power relations in the post-colonial era) in German cultural institutions is the topic of the critical revision of cultural integration paradigms by Micossé-Aikins and Bahareh (2016). Despite the attempts to include “refugees” in projects of cultural education as equals, considering their agency and creativity, projects often fail to live up to this claim due to power inequality between “predominantly white middle class (paid) creators of the projects and the participating refugees” . The overall recommendation is to use this opportunity to re-evaluate prevailing concepts of culture and education and review established routines, informed by the postcolonial critique.

The question of relationship between power and participation in cultural education and artistic practice and what to do against participational bluff, empty promises and illusions is raised by the authors of the volume edited by Braun and Witt (2017).

In their Handbook on cultural education for deprived young people, Braune-Krickau et al. (2013) try to react in an adequate way to these challenges by giving an insight into all the different theoretical and practical perspectives on the topic. More than 70 authors give different theoretical approaches, present several fields of action and name examples of “best practice”.

Literacy is understood as one of the general problems in the context of social inequalities (Kaminski, 2013). Reading abilities and interests vary widely between social milieus. Literature is more and more being made accessible through other means than script on paper and through the use of an easier language. Before the late 18th century literature for young people did not even exist. But ever since, young people are considered to lack enthusiasm, which has been addressed by special educational programmes (321).

Theory, Research and Evaluation
Several publications are dedicated to theory, research and evaluation of cultural education (e.g. Fink et al., 2015; Konietzko et al., 2017; Liebau et al., 2014).

Konietzko et al., (2017) present a collection of contributions from the 7th conference of the Network Cultural Education Research offering empirical case studies and new research perspectives to analyse and better understand the processes and impacts of publicly funded cultural education programs. Fink et al., (2015) are concerned with research methods newly adapted specifically for this apparently growing field. Rittelmeyer (2014) discusses appropriateness and methodological reliability of transfer studies in the field of aesthetic education in order to evaluate its impact on personal development, professional and educational achievements, solidarity and empathy, social and political participation etc., benefits often promised by public funding programs in the field.

In introducing international concepts of cultural education, Liebau (2014) attributes different concepts to different parts of the world. In his view, neo-liberal approaches to cultural education justified and motivated by economical considerations – as means to enhance cognition, communication and cooperation skills – are rather found in the western modern societies in Europe, the USA and Australia, as well the “eastern type modern societies in Asia” (p. 22). The heritage approach to cultural education – as formulated by the UNESCO tangible World Heritage List205 and the program for preservation of the documentary heritage, Memory of the World206 – are in his understanding closely related to high culture, something that Liebau also assigns to these modern societies.

206 https://en.unesco.org/programme/mow
Additionally, there is what he calls the “old-european” approach to cultural education for the sake of further developing art and culture themselves. On the contrary, what he calls the diversity approach, in relation to the UNESCO Conventions on the Intangible World Heritage\textsuperscript{207} as well as on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions\textsuperscript{208}, seems to him to be rather relevant for “indigenous groups in Africa, Central-Asia and South America” but also for minority migrant populations in the modern societies (p.22).

By dividing the world in “modern” and “indigenous”, Liebau produces differences which obviously lack evidence, because tangible world heritage and notions to high culture are not at all restricted to the societies of the Global North, while also the protection of intangible heritage and diversity is an intrinsically global issue. Such dichotomic approach leads to a construction of hierarchy of societies and cultures, which, from the postcolonial view, is at the core of perpetuation of coloniality of knowledge\textsuperscript{11}, i.e. the production of knowledge (here academic knowledge about culture) based on the colonial hierarchical division of the world, people, cultures, needs, ideas etc. High culture is seen as western achievement, while social developments that happened outside the (post)colonial centres are widely ignored or diminished. Diversity on the other hand is reduced to an issue of minorities in and outside these centres. These Eurocentric approaches to culture and cultural education are very common in the mainstream literature.

\textsuperscript{207} \url{https://ich.unesco.org/en}
\textsuperscript{208} \url{https://en.unesco.org/creativity/convention}
Summary and Conclusions

We summarise that very much like the German policy papers, academic literature on cultural education is using three different basic concepts of culture: Culture in the sense of aesthetic production and consumption, culture as a set of shared values and practices, and culture as commemoration of the specific German past.

The first concept leads to educational attempts that aim in two directions, which could both be subsumed under the participation paradigm: first, young people are supposed to participate in broad culture as producers and second, their consumption of high culture (visiting museums, theatres etc.) should increase.

The second concept has a strong normative aspect, which is seen as very problematic by some educational scientist, as it leads more to exclusion than to inclusion. If one set of values and practices is considered the norm and others as foreign or minor in comparison, identities along the lines of belonging and not belonging are constructed and manifested, leading to division instead of cohesion: Those who are constructed as culturally belonging, are not motivated to reflect on their power and privileges.

Those who do not belong are not encouraged to participate.

Commemoration culture in Germany is seen to be in a kind of a crisis. On the one hand, the Holocaust education does not bring the expected results in eradicating anti-Semitism and racism, which are both on the rise. It also does not address the youth who cannot claim familiar roots on the side of the former perpetrators. On the other, the colonial amnesia prevents a critical engagement with the persistence of colonial knowledge production in cultural institutions (for example, in museums), which keep reproducing unequal power relations.

Youth being the main target group of cultural education is overseen by most publications. One example is the absence of the topic of adultism in most publications, even when specifically addressing exclusion/inclusion and discrimination/participation. Here, we see a clear need for more research. In order to reach the target group, cultural literacy and education cannot be conceptualized for the youth without the youth.

Hardly anything is being said about the marginalization of the DDR culture and identity along with westernization of what is understood to be the mainstream German culture. In our view, this topic needs to be further explored.
The tendency to nationalistic and exclusive German identity especially in the East calls for a serious academic engagement with this topic and especially in the context of youth. Essentialist views on culture subtly prevail throughout the main body of academic literature while numerous studies representing postcolonial perspectives are often overlooked by the mainstream. It is these critical perspectives that offer in-depth analyses of cultural hegemony, tools to deconstruct essentialism and culturalism, which is necessary for democratic development and social transformation.

Finally, more and larger studies on sustainability and impact of various cultural education programs are needed to be able to access the effectively of cultural policy and funding.
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National Cultural/Educational Literature Review (India)
Chandrani Chatterjee, Swati Dyahadroy

Introduction

In South Asia, histories of colonialism, orientalism and development actively shape and inflect the complex relationship that the region has with culture especially as concerns the loosely defined category of ‘youth’. In our review of literature from India, we had to engage with the phenomena of globalisation, alternative modernities, migration, consumerism, gender, the politics of the nation-state and counter ideologies of grassroots movements to understand the place of Culture in Indian social and political life. Culture had to be placed firmly within one or more of these frameworks, interacting with them in various ways. The Indian subcontinent, which holds a dominant position within South Asia, has competing conceptions of culture even within the region so of course culture and cultural studies emerges among widely different contexts and circumstances here than it does in the Global North. It was therefore in our interest to keep these notes in mind while reviewing the literature.

We began by taking a note of some key contributions to the field of cultural studies from Indian scholars. Their particular disciplinary locations as well as their geopolitical location provided us with some foundational arguments, concerning cultural literacy and cultural studies. We were able to place these arguments within a larger global context against and alongside scholarship that emerged from the West. This rich body of scholarship that focused on multiple areas and sites of Indian life, also threw light on how culture is understood in the mainstream Indian context and how often this construction of culture falls under the weight of its own dissonances and contradictions. Discourse around culture in India is often a response to powerful ideologies and agendas of the conservative Right that positions culture as static, unchanging and emerging from a ‘glorious’ Vedic past. Culture is not viewed as fluid and dynamic and dissonances within its traditions and practices are blamed on corruption from the West or from the impact of the colonial and Mughal rule.
Studies of particular sites and micro-contexts such as cricket, popular Hindi Cinema, classical Hindustani Sangeet, feminist activism and beauty pageants in Kerala provided an illustrative backdrop against which we could view some of the larger debates about culture in India.

Though coming from widely different locations and standpoints, all the Indian scholars in this academic review emphasized the discursive nature of culture. Participants or artists, consumers and producers of the culture continuously imbibe it with new meanings even while the aspects of globalisation – the market, migration, the media and transnationalism – impact and inflect it in different ways.

When it came to placing the youth within the framework of these arguments and contexts, we felt the need to conceptualise the category of youth in India. Though most nations use an age-group to categorise the youth (Sinha-Kerkhoff, 2011), this categorisation does not take into account the diverse nature of the Indian youth, nor their changing and shifting aspirations across wide social and economic divides.

However, we were able to look at the relationship of the Youth and nation-state (how they were viewed by the State and how they defined their relationship with the state), their position as rights-bearing engaged citizens and how they negotiate spaces of consumption post-liberalisation. Through ethnographic work by scholars like Ritty Lukose and Arjun Appadurai, it became possible for us to disrupt the category of youth as we understood it and see them as ‘children of liberalisation’ who navigate complex genderscapes, institutions and environments in their exploration of culture, cultural practice and identity.
Methodology

This review was conducted by first creating a list of Indian scholars who document and explore how developments in the Indian context impact culture and the youth, who have contributed to ongoing transnational theoretical debates about culture, heritage and identity in the age of globalisation or who have conducted ethnographic work or scholarship that deal particularly with Indian youth after liberalisation. The scholarship is academic in nature and is recent. Once we identified the list of readings, we found ourselves being guided by the question of how we could bring this literature from different disciplines together.

From an earlier set of readings, we had already identified key search terms like globalisation, nation-state, culture, modernities, consumer cultures, youth, gender and neo-liberalisation so we kept these areas the focus of our engagement with the literature. After engaging with the literature we read and wrote detailed annotations of the papers and books that were relevant to the aims of the academic review. This required a process of elimination and prioritising readings based on how key they would be for a foray into this kind of scholarship. With written annotations on hand, we then further organised the readings and texts into a few broad areas. This proved to be difficult, as some would address several areas and some would defy organisation altogether. We settled on three key themes and identified discussion points within each, to outline a set of inquiries that we would keep in mind for later stages in the project. These discussion points were not formative arguments, but our speculations, interpretations and engagement with the literature that we hope to sharpen with further reading.

The next section will expand on the key themes.

Key Themes

Globalisation in a Post-Colonial Context

In recent decades, globalisation has had a great impact on how culture is shaped, exchanged, shared, received and produced across the world.
Though Cultural studies scholars like Tejaswini Niranjana, Uma Narayan and Arjun Appadurai have argued that borders have always been porous and there has always been an exchange of cultures across borders, they agree that globalisation has sped up the process as well as changed the very ways in which cultures travel. There are several ways to conceptualise globalisation, but Arjun Appadurai’s elementary framework of the five scapes (Ethnoscapes, Technoscapes, Financescapes, Mediascapes and Ideoscapes) brought many aspects of globalisation under one thematic umbrella (Appadurai, 1990). Using this framework as a guiding tool, we undertook an exploration of the multiple ways in which culture is discursively produced in a post-colonial context like India by examining specific sites – Hindustani Sangeet, Cricket, Popular Hindi Cinema and feminist campaigns. Globalisation played a key role in all of these sites and was deployed in interesting, complex ways.

Arjun Appadurai’s *Playing with Modernity: Decolonisation of Indian Cricket* (1995) studies the dimensions of decolonization through the site of cricket, an embodied cultural practice and popular sport in contemporary India. Cricket in India has its origins in the colonial encounter, where it was used as an unofficial state instrument to socialize Indians into a Victorian moral and value system. Somewhere along the way and after several matches played on Indian soil and abroad, the sport assumed new meanings and values. Appadurai is able to show how cricket was effectively indigenized, despite its establishment as a hard cultural form. Larger political, social and development moments in India’s colonial and post-colonial history contributed to this indigenization. Today, it is a sport very far removed from its Victorian elite origins and a site upon which Indians participate in a “means to modernity” and enjoy a feeling of Indianess.

Modernity, or rather the search for a kind of modernity, was also present in the journey of Hindustani Sangeet in 20th century India (Niranjana, 2013). Hindustani Sangeet flourished in the Dharwad region alongside the Kannada identity movement, a movement which was premised on the unification of Kannada culture, language and history. The journey of the cultural form in the region shows us how cultural configurations and acts, embody themselves in national and regional identities.
In her paper *Music in the balance: Language, Modernity and Hindustani Sangeet in Dharwad*, Tejaswini Niranjana argues that cultural labour (the work involved in practicing, performing, teaching) is responsible for social transformation and processes (new ways of living, thinking and creating). Hindustani Music was a part of cultural labour undertaken in Dharwad during the rise of Kannada nationalism and was a site where one could aspire to be modern in the 20th century.

Hindustani Sangeet is established in India today as classical music, a term that denotes a static, unchanging nature. Yet, through Niranjana's interpretation of anecdotes and other archival material, one connects the ways culture can and must interact with other movements and identities. One can extend these interactions to the conversation culture has with globalisation today.

In his article, *The ‘Bollywoodization of the Indian Cinema: Cultural nationalism in a Global Arena*, Ashish Rajadhyaksha examines the role of globalization, modernism and the rise of Bollywood culture in the reconfiguration of cinema today (Rajadhyaksha, 2003). Rajadhakshya claims that the Bollywood culture industry exports Indian Nationalism, now commodified as ‘our’ culture. However in so doing, it unwittingly exports the inherent conflict of nationalism – the divide of democracy versus modernity. In recent years, Bollywood has pulled off the export of cultural insiderism to places outside Indian borders and has made sure it is far removed from the political move to create a category of citizen. Rajadhyaksha urges theorists and practitioners of Bollywood culture to rewrite the trajectory of modernism itself especially as concerns the historical linking of India to the West. He also urges a closer examination of the cultures that resist economic and political resolution.

These three sites proved to be very insightful in understanding the ways in which culture in India settles itself within crucial conversations the nation-state is having with globalisation. However, in the process of understanding the nuances of this conversation, all the scholars, highlighted how globalisation, whether present in financescapes, technoscapes, mediascapes or ideoscapes, also brings with it some crucial anxieties on the part of the nation-state. These anxieties run from questions about nationhood to an emphasis on marking ‘our’ culture as different and superior from that of the West.
Alongside these anxieties, there is a continuous production of a new kind of citizenship that is very much informed by new markets, advertising, the quick access to and spread of information through the internet and new, evolving tastes and aspirations. This leads to a sort of conflict, essentially a conflict between modernity and culture, between the consumers of culture and those that try to package it as something unique to Indians (the nation-state and other stakeholders). Tejaswini Niranjana discusses this conflict through a discussion of the Pink Chaddi Campaign held in Karnataka, an internet-fuelled feminist campaign against Hindu Right wing organisation in 2009 (Niranjana, 2010). By discussing this campaign, Niranjana is able to highlight how a post-colonial context like India is different from the Global North in the way it tussles with the culture question through and within ‘ideoescapes’ of globalisation - what is seen as corrupting western influence, shifting citizen identities and changing gender and social norms.

**Reframing Culture from a Global South Location: Power as a Centre of Analysis**

Both of Uma Narayan’s papers included in this Academic review provide an excellent starting point to this section, which despite reservations, necessitates a drawing of lines between the Global North and the Global South, Narayan urges that cultural studies Scholars and theorists should disrupt the ‘package picture’ of culture and guard against cultural essentialism. Cultural essentialism poses two kinds of challenges for third world feminist agendas: a) Norms and practices affecting the social state of women are central to the efforts of resisting westernisation. This makes any resister a traitor to nation and culture, b) Cultural essentialisms are used to justify the oppression and exploitation of minorities and marginalized groups since any political advocacy or demand for rights is seen as brought on by Western ideas of culture. She marks relativism as a danger to feminist agendas and argues that a truly anti-essentialist position would acknowledge the plurality, dissonances and contestations of cultures and work to disrupt airtight pictures of culture.

In keeping with her line of argument, we see that it will not do to draw binaries between the North and the South. Yet, in our review we saw that many scholars necessarily had to disrupt hegemonic notions of cultural theory/cultural studies which emerged from the Global North.
We see their work as disruptions, because coming as they did from their location in the Global South, they had to re-define much of what was seen as given and cemented in Cultural studies.

Sarah Josephs book *Interrogating Culture Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Social Theory* (1998), argues that Culture has not been conceptualised as being rooted in the material dimensions of social life. It is understood as happening independent of crucial power hierarchies that exist within a society. The reason for this is that competing definitions of power exist across various schools of thought. Joseph makes a case for bringing political theory back to Cultural Studies and exploring a more *inclusive universality*, instead of abandoning the goal of universality altogether. Political theory needs to be guided by humanist ideals and more committed to liberatory goals. As far as concerns the political in India, Sarah Joseph attempts to address power and knowledge in relation to culture. She does this by trying to establish a dialogue between debates in Western Social Science and contemporary debates in India.

The anthology of essays *interrogating modernity: Culture and colonialism in India* by Niranjana and others (1993) also foregrounds a Global South location by foregrounding the genealogy of the world culture and emphasising the role of Orientalism in the journey to its present position in academic and political life. In an introduction to the volume, the authors argue that Culture is a site of the political and cultural interpretation becomes a political activity implicated in the process of meaning making. The essays in this book all stress the material nature of culture, the connection of culture and ideology and the relationship between knowledge and power.

Each of them attempts to break the boundaries of their respective disciplines and create a new object of study. The essays foreground the ‘impure’ beginnings of various cultural practices, forms and institutions thus helping us come to terms with our own modernity. In a sense they contribute to analysing culture in a politically sensitive mode, which the authors argue, is crucial to charting a new post-colonial future.

Both books highlight an engagement with power in the process of knowledge production and brings to mind other divides between the South and North when it comes to knowledge production. South Asian scholars have no choice but to position power in their analysis given their position within the knowledge economy.
The relationship of power is crucial to scholarship that comes from the South, but can be a valuable tool for scholarship from any democratic modern nation-state in an age of globalisation. For instance, GN. Devy’s paper *Culture and Development, an Experiment with Empowerment* (2013), draws from initiatives by the Adivasi Academy, Tejgadh (Gujarat state, India) that works to empower Western India’s Adivasi or tribal communities by restoring their cultural contributions and traditions (subordinate to mainstream culture) to a more prominent place. The kind of initiatives undertaken by the Academy places material realities within histories of marginalisation and discrimination and involves the community in realising the value of this twin perspective. Devy argues that cultural parameters have to work in tandem with development initiatives in order to sustain empowerment of historically disenfranchised communities. Such an argument only works because it actively engages with power and in fact, Devy’s work shows that this model of empowerment can work for any disenfranchised group in any national context.

His paper showed us that there is a path for such an engagement and opened up our imaginations to what the world of cultural studies would look like if it centred power as a point of analysis and inquiry.

**Indian Youth and Culture: Citizens and Consumer-citizens**

Ritty Lukose calls the young people of India ‘Liberalisations Children’, a reference to Salman Rushdies 1981 novel ‘Midnights Children’. Rushdies term marked the youth that grew up along-side the newly formed nation-state, born in 1947 and bred on the promises of Nehruvianism. Lukose’s term talks about a category of people who are coming of age or are young adults at a political juncture when a new economically liberalised nation-state is grappling with globalisation and the rapid rise of consumer culture. It is this category of people that we call ‘the young in India,’ though the category itself is not homogenous and is viewed with much anxiety by the Nation-State.
Sinha-Kerkhoffs paper *Seeing the state through youth policy formation: the case of the state of Jharkhand* (2011) looks at how the State constructs itself in relation to the youth, especially when it comes to involving the youth in the project of Nation building. Her ethnographic work shows that the State views itself as an adult and the youth as the ‘intimate other.’

The State is at once anxious that the youth embodies what they themselves have lost and hopeful that the restoration of the idyllic State of their nostalgia can only be achieved by the youth. As an adult, the States development initiatives are designed to provide an enabling environment for young people so that they get a sense of social sense and civic duty.

What is interesting about this theory, is that it contrasts strongly with Ritty Lukose’s (construction of the youth as consumer-citizens navigating formal institutions, public spaces, culture and social life in highly gendered ways. Lukose shows how anxieties over globalization manifest in multiple kinds of gender politics. Women’s place in public and sexual exploitation occurs within an expanding world of commodity culture.

Her paper *Consuming Globalization: Youth and Gender in Kerala, India* (2005) showed how the conditions under which young people negotiated sites of consumption are often determined by post-colonial categories like ‘modern/traditional’ and ‘public/private’. Later, her book *Liberalisation's Children* (2010) expanded on this theme by tracking the various forms of masculinities and femininities through which young people navigate public spaces of education and a wider commodity culture.

However Lukose’s work shows that despite the assumption of the State that the Youth are disengaged from civic and social life, culture or cultural forms are in fact a means by which the young assume the identity of citizen. The impact of the blockbuster film Rang de Basanti on the youth is telling because it shows the ways in which a section of the youth (middle-class, urban) seek to refashion the Indian state and its politics for the new middle class.
In another context, Appadurai makes a case for a rights-based definition of research by highlighting the work of PUKAR (Partners for Urban Knowledge and Research), a Mumbai-based organisation that engages the youth in research and documentation. This study also emphasises the way the youth have the potential to become civically engaged citizens. PUKAR aims to centre the importance of research in the arts, humanities, media and films. Non-English speakers are active in PUKAR and use unique strategies to document and research parts of their lives and so engage with what it means to be young and living in a fast developing cosmopolitan urban India. There is an emphasis on the potential of research and documentation as an intervention. In fact, the research tools acquired through work with PUKAR are used by citizen groups and the wider community to make material interventions in housing, sanitation and so on. PUKAR is able to imbibe young people with the confidence to become active participants in a process of change, it enables them to view their city and lives as an object of study.

Since the youth in India live across a wide social, economic and cultural divides it becomes too difficult to theorise them as a group. The Dalit youth in Jeffery and others examination (2004) of the impact of formal education on Dalit men and masculinity live very different lives from the Kerala-based youth in Lukose’s work or the low-income but educated urban Mumbai youth working with PUKAR.

However what is common to all these sections of the youth is that they occupy spaces of globalisation that are itself in constant production in India. They assume global, regional and national identities when they participate and navigate culture and globalisation. These identities are a part of their self-hood and inflects how they consume and receive culture (film and television), participate in culture (beauty pageants) and the way they navigate public and social life in an age of globalisation.
Conclusion:

Globalisation and consumer cultures are crucial to the discourse of cultural heritage and literacy. The youth need to be positioned within the framework of globalisation and the shifting politics of the nation state when it comes to their engagement with culture.
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Summary
The purpose of academic literature review is to have an overview on key theoretical contributions, research insights, academic commentary and debates in Latvia in relation to young people’s cultural literacy, cultural identities and cultural interactions in the context of cultural policies of Latvia. By way of a cultural historical analysis, critical content analysis, structural analysis, and semiotic analysis, the issue of cultural literacy in general and young people’s cultural literacy in particular has been researched in the main sources of academic literature. Since the end of the twentieth and especially since the turn of the centuries, the number of studies on the subject of culture, cultural literacy, and youth in Latvia has grown rapidly, but the problem has been addressed in a fragmented manner. In the discourse of the theoretical discussions and conceptual debates on cultural literacy, Latvian scholars are relying on the ideas and approaches of West-European scholars that were descriptively reproduced. Initially, the research was rather policy oriented as it was commissioned by the responsible governmental body, thus, it was included in the broad historical context and viewed in the context of the most important periods of the development of the country to allow cultural and other sectoral policy makers at national and local levels to assess the need of supporting cultural developments and activities. Taking into consideration the fact that the historical domination had played a crucial role in the development of cultural policies, in Latvia culture is not only the target, but also the means to build and maintain the national statehood and identity.

The review analyses the studies on the importance of cultural literacy for the transmission of the traditional cultural heritage and discusses the issue of young people’s national and cultural identity, national self-respect, and sense of belonging to the Latvian community. It also turns to young people’s education and intercultural communication in the context of modern world multiculturalism, transformation, communication, and diversity.
The analysis of academic literature regarding culture, cultural literacy and youth in Latvia has revealed that the key approaches used by the Latvian scholars are the content analysis of policy documents and qualitative and quantitative methods that provide evidence-based material for further elaboration of recommendations by policy makers. Bearing in mind the fact that Latvia’s policies still outline only a general vision of cultural literacy and the introduction of a purposeful cultural literacy education has not been defined yet, the scholars are oriented towards attracting the attention of professionals involved in the implementation of cultural policy and desire to bring issues relating to cultural heritage and cultural education into sharp focus. Scientific works by Latvian scholars are interdisciplinary studies that explore tradition and traditional culture from the point of view of several research disciplines, among them social sciences, education, art, and humanities, including history, history of culture, anthropology, folklore studies, sociology, choreography, and musicology. Researchers conclude that education of the society and work on the content of cultural literacy education for the curricula of general and professional secondary level education must be more active. Having analysed the studies, we may conclude that the academic literature interprets the significance of culture and cultural literacy as an important guarantee for the existence of statehood and development, as well as offers opportunities for a creative expression. In Latvia, it is exactly traditions and other informal activities, which function as the means for raising one’s self-awareness and a motivating force for enhancing cultural participation and cultural literacy.
Introduction

Latvia is a state with a strong national and European identity that is striving to cultivate and preserve its rich cultural heritage, to promote creative processes and develop a diverse cultural environment. Being incorporated in the European and global cultural space, culture in Latvia is seen as a complex of values and knowledge, distinctive intellectual and emotional features that characterize an individual, community, and the country. One of the most significant national development priorities defined by the “Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030” is the “development of cultural space of Latvia because the identity of a strong and creative nation lies in our unique, inherited and newly created material and spiritual values. It joins and unites society for the creation of new economic, social and cultural values, which are appreciated and known around the world” (VARAM, 2010). To reach this vision, among the main cultural policy objectives are preservation and development of cultural capital involving community members in cultural processes, a creative life-long learning and cultural education system oriented towards labour employment, cultural and creative industries with high export potential, and creative territories and accessibility of cultural services (Ministry of Culture, 2014) – the themes that are also discussed in academic literature.

Research on the issues of culture, cultural education, and youth in Latvia has initially been rather policy oriented and included in the broad historical context and the most important periods of the development of the country. Theoretical discussions and conceptual debates on the issue of cultural literacy have not been developed and in most cases the ideas of European scholars are descriptively reproduced. The basic task of scientific research into Latvia’s cultural policy and cultural education is to promote the development of cultural policies at national and regional levels, as well as at the level of specific institutions, which allows responding to audience’s wishes and demand. The creation of evidence-based cultural policy in which research and statistical data play an important role in ensuring effective cultural management is essential.

The term “material” or “tangible” cultural values refers to the physical aspect of culture and its objects, resources, and spaces that people use to define their culture, i.e., those values, which can be seen and touched, e.g., architecture. “Spiritual” or “nonmaterial” and “intangible” culture refers to the non-physical ideas that people have about their culture, including language, beliefs, values, traditions, folk art, rules, norms, morals, etc. Although there are many definitions and aspects of culture, in Latvia’s cultural policy there is division between the material and non-material cultural values and/or heritage is
One of the tasks to be performed within the framework of the “Cultural Policy Guidelines 2014–2020 ‘Creative Latvia’” is regular exploration of cultural processes and audience, as well as cultural policy monitoring (Ministry of Culture, 2014), thus giving the cause to hope that regular cultural research traditions will be established in Latvia.

The aim of academic literature review is to obtain an overview of key theoretical contributions, research insights, academic commentary and debates in Latvia in relation to young people’s cultural literacy, cultural identities and cultural interactions, as well as to review key academic approaches that may contribute to the development of a theoretical approach to cultural literacy.
Methodology

Within the defined framework of the review of academic literature aiming at the analysis of the main sources on cultural literacy and youth in Latvia, a synthesis of several methods was used: cultural historical analysis, content analysis, structural analysis, semiotic analysis. Since there are no open-access electronic databases in Latvia, the catalogues of Latvian libraries and international academic social networking sites were searched focusing on such constructs as ‘youth’, ‘cultural literacy’, ‘Latvia’ a. o. Searches were limited to the Latvian and English languages and research papers, books/book chapters, academic commentary. The main sources were: 1) the website of the National Library of Latvia https://lnb.lv/; 2) E-resource repository of the University of Latvia (https://dspace.lu.lv/dspace/), which contains publications (published articles, doctoral theses and abstracts, conference proceedings, administrative, scientific and funded project reports and other electronic documents) by the staff members of the University of Latvia, as well as the webpage of the Institute of Literature, Folklore and Art of the University of Latvia where the full-text issues of the journal “Letonica” (http://lulfmi.lv/zurnals-letonica-numuri) can be found; 3) the webpage of an international peer-reviewed journal published by the Research Centre of the Latvian Academy of Culture “Culture Crossroads” (http://www.culturecrossroads.lv); 4) social networking sites for scientists and researchers to share papers, ask and answer questions and find collaborators, such as Researchgate.net (https://www.researchgate.net/), Academia (https://www.academia.edu/), Google Scholar (https://scholar.google.lv). Full texts of these studies were obtained, read closely and assessed. The reference lists of each included article were also searched by hand to identify full-text articles missed in the initial search. The critical analysis of the material was carried out.
Findings

Following the restoration of Latvia’s independence, raising the profile of cultural policies and cultural education in Latvian academic literature began at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries (Garleja, 1999), i.e. a few years before the adoption of relevant Latvian policy planning documents related to the cultural policy and cultural education. However, the number of such studies is small and they are based on the analysis and reassessment of the past, including the Soviet period (Bleiere, 2000, 2002; Dreimane 2000; Butulis, 2004; Bodnarjuka, 2007) rather than on the assessment of the existing situation and the outlook for future prospects, thus crystallising the examples of good practice witnessed in the past.

In the public space, analytical studies on modern Latvian cultural policy as a whole, including cultural education and youth, are rare until roughly 2007 and 2008; the number of academic studies (Tunne, 2005) is also small. Consequently, the first discussions on cultural policy and cultural education can be found in the mass media only. These few studies published at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries use synchronic, diachronic and retrospective methods as well as those of updating, comparison and modelling, thus starting the process of evaluating culture and education by highlighting culture as a prerequisite for the existence of national identity and the nation in Latvia. In bibliographies of academic studies by Latvian scientists, titles of working papers by scientists from Western Europe and other countries prevail suggesting minimal presence of this topic in studies carried out by scientists in Latvia.

The reason behind that is in the 1990s, especially in 1995, when the Saeima approved the Guidelines of the Latvian state cultural policy, the Latvian economy was in the lowest point of recession. The first most extensive study exploring the cultural policy in Latvia before its accession to the European Union (2004) is the “Cultural Policy in Latvia: Policy for Cultural Development in the Countries of the Council of Europe: National Report; Report of the Council of Europe Experts” (1998) (Pēteris Laķis is the author of the Latvian section and Jānis Stradiņš – of the historical introduction). (Laķis, Stradiņš, 1998)
The report gives a general overview on cultural policy legislation, and highlights cultural responsibility on different levels – the Saeima, Ministry of Culture, other ministries and local governments; it also considers the structure and scope of financing the culture, characterizes cultural education and participation of the society in culture activities as well as analyses the place of cultural values in the hierarchy of public values. The report provides an insight into the development of minority culture and international cultural relations as well. However, priorities and tasks are just listed in the study without any in-depth analysis, exactly as they appear in policy-planning documents and express the political will only. At the end of the report it is acknowledged that theoretical studies in the field of Latvia’s cultural policy and cultural literacy have not been done as yet and are just being shaped, since Latvia being a restored independent state is in the transition period. Although the report was rather a general overview and expression of a political will, it was positively assessed by the European Council experts who stated the fact that “the principles of Latvia’s cultural policy are close to modern, democratic developments and agree with the logic of modern cultural policy, which is oriented towards four major goals: achieving cultural identity and cultural diversity, and providing for the creative potentials and cultural participation” (Nacionālā programma “Kultūra”, 2000).

Overall, in academic literature of the beginning of the 21st century, challenges are addressed in a fragmented manner and included in the context of historical events and decisions. The first cultural consumption survey obtaining data on the population’s attitude to culture in general and people’s activity rates attending and participating in various cultural events in Latvia was conducted only in 2006. It was concluded there that more than 2/3 of the population of Latvia were culturally passive (Ķīlis, 2006).
The following years, cultural consumption studies were commissioned by the Ministry of Culture and they allowed cultural and other sectoral policy makers at national and local levels to assess the need of supporting artistic and cultural developments from the state budget. Two recent cultural consumption surveys supported by the State Culture Capital Foundation and carried out by an independent non-governmental organisation “Culturelab” 210 (founded in 2005) are as follows: 1) “Cultural Consumption and Participation of Latvian Population in Cultural Activities 2007–2014: Research Data and Statistics” (Klāsons, Tjarve et. al. 2014), which summarises the data of the representative surveys of the Latvian population on cultural consumption and participation conducted over the past seven years; 2) a study on the impact of Latvian cultural consumption and participation “Cultural Audience in Latvia: Situation, Processes, Trends. 2016” (Klāsons, Tjarve et.al., 2016).

The study on cultural audience in Latvia (2016) theoretically approaches the concept of “audience development” and describes the means of audience development in Latvia mentioning, for example, the then planned national initiative “Latvian School Bag”, which since September 2018 has started to provide an opportunity for all school-age children and youth (including vocational programmes) to experience Latvia, to explore its values, cultural heritage, professional art, and culture relationships as such through dynamic and meaningful activities thus strengthening their sense of belonging and civic identity. In the framework of Latvia’s centenary, the state guaranteed equal access to cultural events and processes (activities with invited artists, creative professionals etc. to schools promoting cooperation among education and culture specialists and developing local involvement and ownership) and ensured the opportunity for all pupils’ regular acquaintance with cultural values and contemporary manifestations of professional art, as well as with Latvian statehood, values of cultural expression, creative industries, and cultural landscape (Tūna, 2018).

Culture is not only the target, but also the means. Nowadays culture has become an indispensable fourth pillar of the sustainability along with ecological sustainability, economic sustainability, and social sustainability (Hawkes, 2001). The topic on cultural participation in a wider context of national identity, preservation of traditions and intangible cultural heritage are discussed in international peer-reviewed journal published by the higher educational establishments, one of the most specific ones being “Culture Crossroads” published by the Research Centre of the Latvian Academy of Culture. Many investigations published in the journal were carried out within the framework of the project “Critical Heritages: Performing and Representing Identities in Europe (CoHERE) funded by Horizon 2020 (involving the Latvian Academy of Culture in a consortium of 12 countries) and within the framework of the state research programme “Sustainability of Latvian Cultural Traditions in an Innovative Environment (Habitus) (LAC 2014–2017, funded by the Ministry of Education and Research), which implied research in collaboration with the Baltic governmental organisations, local authorities and NGOs involved in sustaining the Song and Dance Festival tradition.

Both the academic studies carried out within local or international projects by university academic members and investigations by non-governmental organizations reveal that the fields of cultural policy and cultural literacy are quite new in Latvia. Based of Finnish scholar Reijo Savolainen’s definition, the term “cultural literacy” in J. Daugavietis and A. Leiškalne’s chapter “Self-assessment of Cultural Literacy and Inequality in the Society” published in “Human Development Report. Mastery of Life and Information Literacy” is defined as a natural part of daily life and seen as not only “an individual’s ability to find and use the information on culture (e.g., events, facts, works of art), but also as orientation that compels the individual, possibly even subconsciously, to do so” (Daugavietis, 2017, p. 64) (“orientation” by Savolainen). The highest degree of cultural literacy is “cultural mastery” where “an individual has taken this literacy to the next level, changing from an ordinary information user into a skillful information manager” (ibid.) (“practice” by Savolainen).
By synthesizing Pierre Bourdieu’s developed concept of “cultural capital”, Savolainen’s understanding of literacy, and other types of capital, the researchers of the University of Latvia Advanced Social and Political Research Institute argue that the bigger an individual’s capitals (individual’s physical and mental health, economic welfare, social, local traditions) are, the greater that individual’s cultural literacy and mastery of culture (Daugavietis, 2017, p. 65). Drawing predominantly from the survey of the study, the self-assessment of cultural literacy and participation of the adult Latvian population (from age 18), is defined as high, i.e. people in Latvia are generally very satisfied with their own cultural literacy and cultural mastery – including their awareness of cultural and entertainment opportunities, and their own cultural participation and consumption (choices, habits, taste). At the same time, a comparatively large number of population is still passive (in some social groups 33% do not attend cultural events, retired people and men are the most passive) (Daugavietis, 2017). Thus, in order to have a successfully measured cultural policy people’s involvement in various cultural processes, starting from a passive consumption of culture and arts to a proactive participation in culture should be enhanced.

The concept “audience development” has also been offered as an alternative one. The study “Cultural Audience in Latvia: Situation, Processes, Trends. 2016” describes it as a strategic and interactive process that helps cultural organisations make culture widely accessible. The objective of audience development or cultural literacy is to involve individuals and society/communities in cultural processes, offering opportunities to fully experience, enjoy, participate and evaluate culture and art. The development of audience is based on the use of a range of strategies for increasing the cultural audience as a whole and for educating an individual target group of audience. Particular attention is paid to the audience segments such as children and young people, ethnic minorities and the elderly. Although narrower concepts, e.g. “cultural education”, “art marketing”, “inclusive culture”, “access to culture”, etc. are used, authors believe that “audience development” is a more comprehensive concept (Klāsons, Tjarve et.al., 2016).
Based on the conclusions of the studies, Latvia’s cultural organisations have significantly increased activities related to the development of audience in recent years. It is more evident at national level: various special programmes have been drawn up for children and young people, bearing in mind the role played by the audience development in a sustainable society growth.
Discussion

Cultural Literacy

Since Latvia’s cultural space is open to diverse cultural and educational current affairs and developments, new impetus is gained from different sources. One of the most powerful sources of influence is the theoretical thought of Western Europe. In 2008, Latvian translation of a German book dedicated to cultural policy issues was published for the first time since the restoration of Latvia’s independence. The book “Kultūrpolitika” (Cultural Policy) has been written by Armin Klein, Professor of Cultural Management and Cultural Sciences of Ludvigsburg Pedagogical High School (Germany) (Kleins\(^{211}\), 2008). The book is a symbolic and political fact, since the translation of the book was published in a crucial period of time for Latvia when the issue of the importance of the cultural policy and cultural education for preserving the nation and national identity was recognized by the Latvian government. It appeared also in the final years of the so-called transition period (1991–2010), when after the collapse of the Soviet Union and restoration of the independence of Latvia the cultural sector had gone through substantial changes and transformation processes (Tjarve, 2013).

After 2008, the number of the policies discussing cultural literacy steadily increased. The Latvian translation of the book confirms Latvia’s readiness to analyse this topical European-level theme and get acquainted with both kindred developments and very different processes, thus enhancing knowledge, experience and competitiveness of Latvia in Europe. The book provides systematic background knowledge of culture as a policy area, i.e. its structure, instruments, practical expressions and theoretical aims.

It is notable that the translation of this book shows the official position of the Latvian government in the cultural and educational spheres, since specialists of the Ministry of Culture and Latvian Academy of Culture participated in its preparation. The then Minister for Culture of Latvia Helēna Demakova (2004–2009) wrote an expanded epilogue “Latvia’s Cultural Policy as a Successor of the Traditional Process and (Non-) Pragmatic Battlefield” to the book, addressing the widest range of cultural practitioners, students and interested parties (Demakova, 2008). This epilogue was a landmark document: it not only provided a focused but sufficiently detailed insight into Latvia’s most important cultural policy-building aspects and indirectly focused on the importance of young people’s cultural education, but, most importantly, depicting the tragic past of Latvia emphasized the significance of cultural policies as means for preserving the national statehood, nation identity, and national language. All decisions of culture policy makers in Latvia, as noted by Demakova, are in essence existential for the country itself, “[…] it should first of all be noted that the backbone of all decisions [of policy makers] is an absolute desire of the majority of Latvian citizens to have their own sovereign country and one official language – the Latvian language” (Demakova, 2008, p. 216) (the author’s emphasis).

One of the most essential aspects of relevance to Latvia highlighted in the epilogue is the historical domination or the historical “fatality” of the cultural policy (the author’s emphasis), which most directly affects decision-making processes involving cultural policy-makers. The historical domination includes the interaction of Latvian traditional culture and Christianity, the impact of the German yoke and the Russian empire, the period of national self-awareness and Neo-Latvians in the 19th century, the establishment of statehood, the exposure to the threat of Russification during the Soviet period, the regaining of independence and the accession to the EU. Thus, cultural education in Latvia is designed with the aim of updating historical memory and preserving the Latvian language and culture as cornerstones of the nation’s identity.

Cultural policy decisions involve care for both intangible and tangible cultural values – a set of certain cultural institutions (National Theatre, the National Opera and Ballet, the National Museum of Art, etc.) founded soon after the independent Latvia was established and “symbolizing the country itself” (Demakova, 2008, p. 216).
In Demakova’s epilogue, other studies including those commissioned by the Ministry of Culture (Tisenkopfs, Pisarenko et al., 2002; Tisenkopfs, Daugavietis et al., 2008; ), as well as in Latvia’s cultural policies in general, the Nationwide Latvian Song and Dance Celebration (1873) is singled out as crucial for the preservation and continuity of the intangible cultural heritage. According to H. Demakova, the cultural education system, particularly musical education, is a cornerstone of Latvia’s cultural policy. This implies that an essential part of Latvia’s cultural policy is focused on giving support to traditional culture, folklore, including folk art groups (also children and young people’s choirs, dance groups, brass bands, applied art studios) (Demakova, 2008; Bula, 2000; Rasa, 2008). It is in this section of Demakova’s epilogue where the importance of cultural literacy is highlighted. Cultural literacy is seen as the unifying element between various cultural and historical periods, e.g. the preservation of music and art schools founded during the years of the Latvian Free State (1918–1940) to the present day is linked directly to the adoption of cultural policy decisions. Although cultural literacy was limited during the Soviet period, its nature was, however, “deep, thorough, unhurried […]” (Demakova, 2008, p. 221). Cultural education, inherited from the Soviet time, is the one that should be credited (ibid, p. 224), and its existence is linked directly to the adoption of cultural policy decisions (Kruks, 2008).

Similarly, the significance of cultural literacy during all three historical periods of the 20th century related to musical education has been summarized by Guntis Šmidchens,

“Performances today also hearken back to the first wave of creative energy which blossomed and flourished during the first Independence epoch: public musical skills moved to a new level after 1918, when universal public education was established and national singing curricula were cultivated by teachers, composers and performers who themselves were educated at the newly-founded National Conservatories. The Soviet epoch expanded on these earlier foundations, adding music-focused primary- and secondary schools where thousands of children acquired specialized musical literacy and performance skills. Two and a half decades into the epoch of renewed independence, there is little reason to elevate one of these epochs above the others.

212 The Nationwide Latvian Song and Dance Celebration was included on the UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage List in 2003.
The truest heritage of the Song Celebrations is not institutionally based, but rather, it is a heritage of charismatic singers, teachers and creators of songs who have inspired younger generations to continue singing an ever changing and expanding repertoire of songs in all epochs” (Šmidchens, 2016, pp.16-17).

Cultural practice, such as, for example, amateur arts, can serve more than one aim, and can perform several tasks, basically referring to the dimension of the individual and the collective (Daugavietis, 2013). Organization of public cultural activities, festivals among them, not only enhances a qualitative culture offer, but also enriches cultural life, broadens young people’s mental outlook (Siliņa-Jasjeviču, 2011). “Cultural Policy Guidelines 2014–2020 ‘Creative Latvia’” mention festivals within the context of culture literacy education [Cultural Policy Guidelines 2014–2020 ‘Creative Latvia’]. Thus policy documents maintain that there is a necessity to create a support system for discovering talents and striving for excellence, and that this could be done via organizing regular national and international level festivals, competitions, exhibitions, creative residences and workshops, which would be oriented towards assessing excellence, towards monitoring and analysis of education quality.

The epilogue of the book “Kultūrpolitika” also covers the connection of the cultural policy of the renewed Latvian state with the political course and emergence of civil society, the linkage of the cultural policy and national budget with policy planning documents, the cultural policy in the context of the new economic challenges; cultural self-sufficiency and access to culture, Latvia’s cultural policy in the international context. Information about the cultural sector and cultural policy in Latvia important for a Latvian reader is summarised in a series of annexes that conclude the book, e.g. “National Policy Planning Documents Important for the Cultural Policy” (Demakova, 2008, pp. 243-244), “Major Laws in the Field of Culture in Latvia”) (ibid., p. 245), “Useful Sources of Cultural Data and Facts (selection)” (ibid., pp. 247-252), etc.
The issues of cultural policy and cultural literacy have been studied in PhD theses. In her PhD thesis “Regional Traditional Culture for Local Cultural Identity in Primary School”, Gunta Siliņa-Jasjukeviča analyses international and Latvian legislation on culture and education policy and offers recommendations to specialists of the education policy, authors and reviewers of study tools, as well as teachers on the implementation of regional traditional culture studies in primary school. In addition to policy reviews, the author describes the experience of Latvian teachers in the implementation of traditional culture studies and analyses the study tools for grades 1 to 6 in the context of traditional culture studies (Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, 2011). As a result of the analysis of Latvian and international legislation, the empirical part of the study concludes that education plays an essential role in ensuring cultural sustainability and that Latvia is obliged to carry out activities in the field of culture and education by facilitating the identification, documentation, research, preservation, safeguarding and promotion of the cultural heritage of the native population and ethnic minorities, as well as to strengthen the value of cultural heritage and its transfer through informal and formal education. Several recommendations to policy-makers included in the study remain topical, e.g.,

- In order to prevent fragmented cooperation between the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Education and Science in addressing cultural and educational issues, it is necessary to coordinate responsibilities and competences of both ministries.
- It is necessary to develop laws and regulations for the implementation of the management and support systems for the inclusion of the regional traditional cultural content in the education process.
- To provide those who implement the educational process with regular and comprehensive information on the opportunities of traditional cultural education and activities of traditional culture offered by cultural institutions, it is necessary to establish a common system containing information on the offers to acquire traditional culture in different regions of Latvia. The promotion paper offers a model to be used for the acquisition of traditional culture. It includes three structural components: 1) the spatial and material area – nature of the specific region and the socio-cultural environment which have an impact on the implementation of the factual and procedural parts of the model;
2) the content of the regional traditional culture or the factual part of the model, which is implemented according to the calendar year (seasonal traditions related to the specific season and society, and individual human life transition rituals, i.e. family celebrations, as well as the acquisition of and respect for daily traditions during the cycle of the calendar year); 3) interpersonal communication implemented through the process of multiple interactions and cooperation between teacher ↔ pupil ↔ family ↔ society (the procedural part of the model) (Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, 2011).

However, as the result of the economic growth and influence of the global market new priorities and new value criteria have emerged in the relationships between the individuals (especially young people) and education in the society of Latvia as well as of other European countries. After regaining its national independence, Latvia gradually ceased to be an industrial country. In the situation when intensive production is being replaced by the services of supermarkets, and entertainment and tourism industries, the population in its activities started to rely on relations based on a consumer society model (Stepčenko, 2006). Compared to the previous generation, the priority of traditional values in thinking of contemporary youth was being replaced by utilitarian values of an economically thinking person.

Scholars (Austruma, 2014) claim that the information obtained from the collaboration with a school environment, and with leaders of methodological associations of humanitarian subject teachers shows that economy as the subject is now being introduced into school curricula more and more frequently. The summarization of education policy documents and a qualitative data analysis of the research “Young People’s Values in a Consumer Society” (Austruma, 2014) indicate to the fact that “in a school environment the interest in pragmatic issues, especially in money as a value, has considerably grown (Austruma 2012, p. 174).

The development of consumer culture has greatly contributed to the standardization of culture (ibid). Young people are constantly in the state of assessing value changes, and the government would have to invest more money in maintaining general human values, which is possible by giving cultural activities a greater support, by providing cultural education and involving young people in activities of creative self-expression.
One of the main conclusions is based on the topicality of the acquisition of amateur arts and cultural traditions. This topicality is defined in the strategic Latvian education policy planning documents. The above conclusion is also built on the requirements laid down in the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The requirements include the need to improve legislation for the transmission of the traditional cultural heritage through the formal, informal and non-formal educational process, with greater emphasis on the preservation of the regional socio-cultural environment and society’s lifestyle. Thus, it is possible to conclude that values held in the traditional culture are activated and preserved among young people’s audience only if young people take part in the processes of traditions themselves. If their interest in these values is created and stimulated, then they themselves preserve these traditions.

**Young people’s education and intercultural communication**

Multiculturalism, transformation, communication, and diversity are among the main concepts of the current modern world. Openness to different knowledge and experience, which can be acquired in a multicultural environment, increases human’s socio-cultural capital (Daugavitis, 2017). These are the factors that are also important for setting aims in education, including those of cultural literacy. As stated by Andrejs Mūrnieks in the conclusion of his research “Influence of Social Culture on Developing Aims in Education Management in Latvia”, the trends of social culture should always be taken into consideration: to reach the goals of a sustainable development and to formulate educational aims, it is necessary to observe specific principles, among them being hierarchy of values, respect of culture and a dialogue (Mūrnieks, 2011).

In Latvia, a new approach to education aimed at developing students’ competences – competence-based education – was first piloted in 2016 and is currently being gradually introduced. The new competence-based framework curriculum is aimed at modernising teaching methods in general education. Among the core skills of lifelong learning or key competences needed by EU citizens for their personal growth and development, as well as for social involvement, public activity and employment, are cultural awareness, cultural intelligence, and creative abilities (European Commission /EACEA/ Eurydice, 2012).
“Criteria and indicators of life quality include the social life and culture aspects of a personality as well as the higher mental [spiritual] values that simultaneously are the promoters of the development of a personality. [...] It is manifested in a student’s capacity-adequate, purposeful activities, where students use their full potential and given possibilities” (Pridāne, 2017, p. 378). This will allow students to have the capacity to develop strategies for achieving their life goals. Language competence and cultural awareness are also among several key competences being implemented at schools in Latvia.

In the framework of the new competence-based education, the debate on youth education is underway among the policy makers, educators and public, but so far there are few studies in academic literature. Among the most discussed themes is that regarding the kind of knowledge, skills and attitudes that may be developed via focusing on one of the key competences, i.e. cultural awareness and cultural participation. If skills and attitudes are related to an individual’s self-expression, cultural awareness and sense of identity, as well as participation in cultural life, respect for the diversity of cultural expressions, then knowledge is directly related to “understanding European public, multi-cultural and socio-economic dimensions of the national cultural identity and interaction” (Pridāne, 2017, p. 381), such as local, national and European cultural heritage. Aimed at evaluating the content of the school subject of Home Economics and Technologies and determining which key competences can be developed in the subject in the framework of competence-based learning, the scholar describes the characteristics of key competencies defined by European Parliament, among them, cultural awareness and expression: ability to appreciate the creative importance of ideas, experiences and emotions in a range of media such as music, literature and visual and performing arts. Based on the analysis of the study and the results of the survey by Pridāne, social, cultural awareness and creativity expression competences alongside technological and digital competences are the most developed ones in schools of Latvia (Pridāne, 2017).

From a rather broad approach to how to develop the competence of cultural awareness, a narrower aspect analysed in scientific literature is one’s own cultural awareness, cultural heritage and the sense of identity via the binary opposition “one’s own” and “other / different”.
In the paper “Own and Other: Content and Methodology of Traditional Culture in Primary Education”, Gunta Siliņa-Jasjukeviča and Aīda Rancāne dwell upon the fact that “the traditional exists in a post-functional situation – many traditions are not getting inherited from generation to generation” (Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, Rancāne, 2016, p. 102), which constitutes a risk related to the endangerment of a certain cultural space, as well as disappearance of traditions if they “are not transferred by acknowledging the old ones and by expressing them anew” (ibid.). The best way of strengthening one’s local and regional cultural capital, as stated in scientific studies, is by learning the traditions of other regions of Latvia. The article aims at drawing the attention to the issue of learning the traditional culture within the margins of primary education in all regions of Latvia. Learning about traditions and cultural heritage is analysed in the framework of binary opposition “one’s own – alien/ different” where the “alien” should not be seen as the opposite to one’s own or as the destructive, but rather as a component of the multiculturalism and the basis of intercultural communication. Thus, being “different”, the “alien” can become either useful and applicable or rejectable. The importance of elaborating contemporary teaching aids for the acquisition of the traditional culture and language within different primary school subjects (languages, basics of technology and sciences, art, man and society) cannot be overestimated as they would assist the young members of the future society to integrate into the multicultural society. The content of different subjects of basic education where the margins of subjects disappear can become a meaningful tool in the reflection of not only life as a whole, but also culture as a whole.

Critical thinking has been emphasized as indispensable constituent of thought in modern society: “It is important for the modern person to understand the traditional mechanism of thought, the system of perceptions and rituals, the reason behind them by using critical thinking already before beginning to learn about traditions, thus approaching the spiritual horizons of the archaic.” (Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, Gunta; Rancāne Aīda, 2016, 103). Among the most important and unchangeable concepts and principles characterising society, as mentioned by researchers, are time, space, participants, traditions and rituals. The same as in policy documents on cultural literacy, traditional festivities are seen as a systematic possibility of absorbing the diversity of cultural traditions. Theoretical and cognitive way in obtaining cultural literacy is not the most productive.
Cultural awareness is best developed when the individual actively participates in different celebrations and learning by cooperating takes place, thus ensuring intergenerational exchange.

Among the competences necessary for a teacher to work in a multicultural society the research considers cross-cultural competence, which has developed as a cross-cultural educational conception under the impact of global economy, mutual contacts and migration. In Latvia, the changes in the cross-cultural tendencies start taking place in about 2000, when in Latvian higher education institutions new study programs for a successful inclusion of the representatives of different culture into the educational process are designed and courses for enhancing the development of cross-cultural competence are provided. This fact testifies to the support for multiculturalism on a national level, however, as concluded by Ieva Margeviča-Grinberga in her research “Cross-cultural Education of Young Teachers in Latvia: Assessment of Opportunities and Practice” “great differences can be spotted between the offers made by teachers’ education and the needs of a multicultural society. […]. Young teachers’ incomplete knowledge and poor skills in work with immigrants, negative stereotypes and preconceptions cause fear and disinclination to work with learners different in respect of culture. Attention should be paid to the fact that teachers make division between local pupils and pupils-newcomers” (Margeviča-Grinberga, 2015, p. 66). Consequently, a cross-cultural competence for a successful work and life in a multicultural society is still not achieved at an adequate level. To promote the inclusion of the content of cross-cultural education into the study process of those higher education institutions which implement teacher training programs, recommendations are offered to the professionals involved in teachers’ education as well as to the planners of education policy about how to promote teachers’ cross-cultural competencies, and also how “to develop teachers’ skills of cross-cultural communication which would promote a professional cooperation with learners different in respect of culture and with their families as well”, “to develop future teachers’ experience of communication with people of different cultures, at organizing, for example, different field trips” (ibid.) a.o.
Young People and their National and Cultural Identity

One of the most essential issues relating to the significance of culture and highlighted in both the academic literature and policy documents is the issue of national identity, since there is the opinion that a unitary political nation does not exist in Latvia. When national identity is studied and analysed in the academic literature, the attention is focused on language, social and cultural memory, peculiarity of cultural heritage, cultural diversity, as well as on the development of the sense of belonging. Research supported by the State Research programme “National Identity” (language, history of Latvia, culture and human security) (2010–2013) reveals a relatively weak awareness of history, which testifies to the fact that the foundation of national identity among the population of Latvian (especially among the youth) is not particularly stable.

The research carried out in the framework of the State Research programme “Latvian Studies (Letonica): History, Language and Culture” has initiated a wide-ranging discussion on the issues of national identity, European identity and regional identity in the context of Europe, and on the aesthetics of identity (literature, folklore and art, a. o.) as well, however the research works on the problems of youth within this context are very few.

The research relating to the national and cultural identity of the youth indicates that the space of family is the primary source that provides communication with culture for children and young people. It is in the family where the child’s first encounter with traditional culture takes place, which is later supplemented by the environment of school. Home and family are seen as one’s own space, which is fundamental in the process of self-identification and in the formation of self-awareness. Simultaneously, it is also a unique place for “recovering one’s own identity” (Silina-Jasjukeviča, Rance, 2016, p. 102) in the world of rapidly growing globalisation tendencies and transformations in society.

Admitting that a family is quite a strong source of individual and communicative memory, scientists accentuate the fact that a common social memory for the purpose of national and political memory has to be shaped by the education system of Latvia (Petrenko, 2011).
Following the examination of policy documents and analysis of case studies, it has been concluded that traditional culture is the core of individual, family, group, community and national identity as well as of developing the sense of belonging. The acquisition of traditional culture affects the development of a pupil’s cultural belonging. The components of the traditional cultural content important for shaping young people’s sense of belonging and which need to be reinforced in the pedagogical process at school are as follows: the exploration of nature, the acquisition of the Latvian language and its dialects, discovering the cultural environment, as well as the acquisition of regional folklore and traditional skills (Siliņa-Jasjukeviča, 2011).

The issue of passing down culture is essential in the cultural space of both Latvia and home countries. In compliance with Latvia’s political-ideological standpoint that the diaspora is an integral part of a unitary Latvian nation, the issue of youth cultural education has been widely explored in research relating to the diaspora. Latvia has experienced several large-scale geographical mobilities, therefore life in exile is seen significant to social, economic, political, and cultural change. One of the methods for strengthening national identity of diaspora children and youth is creating opportunities for “a positive change in society” (Lulle, Kļave, 2015, p. 21), i.e., creating opportunities for the development of an open-minded, tolerant personality who is also well aware of his own national identity and sense of belonging. Nowadays many families experience transnational links and affiliations, nevertheless the experience by parents and grandparents differ greatly from the experience by their children and grandchildren. In the collective monograph “Creating Opportunities for Development: Diaspora Children and Youth” dedicated to diaspora children and youth, among the basic needs of diaspora children and youth in the field of education the authors of the papers mention the following: the acquisition of the Latvian language, familiarisation themselves with history, geography, culture, and the Latvian way of life (Lulle, Kļave, 2015) The book includes 18 research papers by 16 authors whose aim is to evaluate, both synchronically and diachronically, how to create better opportunities for the education of diaspora children and youth as well as for strengthening the links of belonging to Latvia.

The ways for preserving Latvian identity and strengthening the links with Latvia via improving their cultural literacy have been discussed both in Latvia and abroad (Bolšteins, 2004, Pētersone, 2014, Ungure, 2015).
Such studies discuss the aspects relating to education and culture, which help to inculcate the youth with a deep sense of Latvian identity, national self-respect, and sense of belonging to the Latvian community, as well as teach them the language and give knowledge about their historical heritage. A professional teacher-training module offered by Liesma Ose in her paper “A Teacher’s Factor: Educators in a Dialogue with Children and Youth who have Returned to Latvia” testifies to the teachers’ need to acquire cross-cultural competence to be able to work with young people whose changing identities are in an active process of development (Ose, 2015).

Within the context of a contemporary inclusive multiculturalism policy, passing down the Latvian language, cultural and Latvian heritage to the coming generations has been analysed as the opportunity for preserving the nation. Consequently, in scientific literature, the same as in policy documents, it is emphasized that a shared value of a unitary nation is preserving and developing the Latvian language and culture across the territorial borders of the state, and though “practicing language and culture does not make one a Latvian, nevertheless one’s knowledge can enhance interest in Latvia and what is Latvian, encourage keeping relations with Latvia and developing the facet of one’s Latvian identity” (Ungure, 2015, p. 78)

As shown by the analysis of policy documents, in Latvia it is mainly the traditional culture and its cornerstone – song and dance festival – that are essential for developing the national and cultural identity, since they bring together both people of Latvia and those of the diaspora.
We can find a number of research works on the importance of the traditional music and dance for the existence of Latvia as a nation and for the development of youth’s sense of national belonging and their creativity (Ekmanis, 2016; Šmidchens, 2016; Lače, Vinogradova, 2016; Spalva 2011, 2014\(^{213}\)).

On the basis of family traditions and the materials collected by the tradition researchers, we can maintain that to inherit or reconstruct unique manifestations/expressions of a traditional culture, such as everyday-life habits, rituals of annual customs and holidays as well as family celebrations, is still possible.

The contemporary cultural identities are changeable. The lasting process of developing identity involves integrating different aspects of identity as well as an active individual’s participation. In the research by Latvian scientists, the concept of cultural identity is viewed as a communicative process within the context of different types of culture, including that of popular culture, since self-perfection and cultural identities of contemporary Latvian adolescents are developed in the contexts of popular culture and via media and social networks (Sūna, 2014).

S. Austruma notes, “As to the cultural heritage, typical of this generation is seeking a compromise between preserving and passing down nation’s historical and national heritage to future generations. This generation wants to create a link between a popular-mass culture and a traditional one; in sociology this generation is characterized as builders of economy for whom social belonging and professional status are especially important.

However, we cannot avoid mentioning also the significance of inheriting traditional values, which is reflected by, for example, such a culture study competition for school children as “Jaunais kultūras kanons” [A New Culture Canon] organized in 2013 and 2014” (Austruma, 2014, p. 176). This allows concluding that the compromise between popular-mass and traditional culture in the epoch of cultural globalization and cross-sectoral education is an acute necessity and, although it is being addressed now, it might become even more challenging in the future.
Concluding Remarks

The analysis of academic literature regarding culture, cultural literacy and youth in Latvia reveals that the key approaches are as follows:

1) the content analysis of both studies by foreign scholars and Latvian policy documents, often compared with those of earlier cultural-historical periods of the country, for example with the period of Soviet Latvia, (historical analysis of cultural policies, document analysis etc.);

2) qualitative and quantitative methods which provide evidence-based material showing the statistical data, the results of case studies, observations, semi-structured in-depth interviews with experts, cultural workers, cultural participants, surveys of inhabitants and experts, questionnaires on young people's participation in cultural activities a. o. The obtained empirical material provides the basis for drawing theoretical conclusions and/or elaborating recommendations for policy makers. Research carried out in the cultural and educational sectors enhances not only a better understanding of the target audience of a particular organisation or area, but also explores the specific nature of the sector’s activities and management, development challenges and topical issues, and can therefore be used when adopting cultural policy decisions.

The academic literature interprets the significance of culture and cultural literacy as an important guarantee for the existence of statehood and development, which not only encourages the development of citizens’ (especially the youth’s) sense of belonging to this state and offers opportunities for a creative expression, but also develops their national and cultural identity. Bearing in mind the fact that Latvia’s policies still outline only quite a general vision of cultural literacy and the introduction of a purposeful education of cultural literacy is not yet defined, several research authors offer recommendations to the professionals of the respective fields.

In their essence, researches do not fully represent the theme of culture and youth cultural literacy as a whole, they are rather general, descriptive, and outline the issue in many cases concluding that deeper analysis of the theme is necessary.
At the same time they are oriented towards attracting the attention of professionals involved in the implementation of cultural policy and desire to bring issues relating to cultural heritage and cultural education into sharp focus, thus, for instance, the themes and role of a culture canon are discussed among young people in the context of different cultural processes and problems.

In scientific literature, just like in policy documents, the concept of identity is specially emphasised. National identity is viewed as a component of European identity, and Latvian culture, in turn, as a part of European culture. The academic literature tends to analyse the existing and to provide new mechanisms for the preservation and transmission of cultural traditions taking into account the rapid changes in the value system and cultural environment of the contemporary society.

The authors of the research works have come to the conclusion that the education of the society and work on the content of cultural literacy education for the curricula of general and professional secondary level education must be more active. Also, the education and value needs of the “new culture agent” of the 21st century, namely, a learner, must be respected. Competences defined in the framework of the new competence-based education must be coordinated with the education content and adapted to the value system of a contemporary society and the new generation. Research works discuss aims and impact of festivals on the cultural environment, as well as their classification, however they lack the analysis of significance and actual influence of such activities on the level of youth’s cultural literacy.

The interest in the preservation and transmission of culture is based on the presence of tradition in individual or group cultural activities and practices within the context of globalization and / or glocalization. Scientific works focus on the multi-layered and interdisciplinary explanation of tradition and traditional culture from the point of view of several research disciplines, among them humanities, art, education, social sciences, including history, history of culture, anthropology, folklore studies, sociology, choreography, musicology a. o.
Tradition is seen as not only the way of artistic expression and means of participation, but also as the instrument for continuity that is able to provide uninterrupted transmission of cultural values to the representatives of younger generation. Tradition is a carrier of intangible values that functions with the aim to construct and preserve national identity, sense of belonging and patriotism. Thus, traditions and other informal activities are the means for raising one's self-awareness, they function as a motivating force for enhancing cultural participation and cultural literacy.
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National Cultural/Educational Literature Review (Slovakia)
Matej Karásek

Summary

The aim of the report is to present and analyze Slovak academic discourse referring to cultural literacy. The report introduces the ways Slovak academics approach the term and the thematic framework in which they operationalize it. The first part of the findings refers to academic discussion about cultural literacy or alternative concepts and their definitions. The second part of the findings shows that in Slovakia multicultural education is the topic, which is most relevant to cultural literacy. The presentation of key approaches in Slovakian research the discussion is then followed by a critical discussion. The concluding part of the report is an attempt to contextualize Slovak academic approaches within the wider scope of dominant political and social conditions.
Introduction

Throughout the search of academic literature it appears that cultural literacy, as a concrete term, is not used in Slovak academic literature with the exception of two documents: Olga Zápotocká’s book *Kultúrnagramotnosť v sociálnopsychologickýchsúvislostiach* (2004) and Peter Gavora’s study *Gramotnost vývinmodelov, reflexiaprze a výskumu* (2002). Although the term ‘cultural literacy’ is not widely used, we have identified various concepts with analogical meaning. We focused our search on terms related to cultural literacy in texts, which did not explicitly dealt with the cultural literacy itself. The terms analogical to cultural literacy were mostly implicitly “covered” under the topics as multicultural education, cultural diversity or identity. Initially we had to abstract these terms from the texts, which are thematically oriented primarily to the aforementioned issues. Finally we have identified several concepts, which are used in the Slovak academic literature and could be understood as the most frequently used synonyms or signifiers of issues related to cultural literacy: *cultural competences* (e.g. Kadlecíková 2009; Chúdžiková 2015); *cultural capital* (e.g. Ondrejkovič 2011; Kadlecíková 2009; Rafael 2009). In some other, less frequent, cases we identified the concepts *cultural memory* (Rafael 2009); *cultural code* (Rafael 2009) or *cultural awareness* (Mistrík 1999). After the school reform in 2008, which included the multicultural education to school curricula as a cross-cutting theme, many academic texts dealing with intercultural/multicultural competencies have appeared (e.g. Alenová 2009, Mistrík 2009). The above concepts are meant to describe the set of knowledge and skills, which are necessary for successful cohabitation and communication in multicultural settings.

Current academic discussion related to cultural literacy or cultural competencies is mostly connected to the topic of multiculturality/ interculturality. This report has multiple objectives. The first of them is to describe the frameworks of academic discourse where the concepts analogical to cultural literacy appear and to trace the theoretical sources of Slovak academic discussion about these concepts. The second aim of the report is to identify above mentioned concepts in its specific context and to explain them within these particular contexts.

---

214 The Cultural literacy in the socio-psychological contexts
215 Literacy: the development of models, reflection of research and practice
The main attention would be paid to contexts, which are focal points of the CHIEF research interest (e.g. youths, identity, cultural diversity and multiculturalism etc.). The last goal is to evaluate the academic criticism, discussion and negotiation with the official educational policy and consequently to show the specific problems of Slovak educational policymaking and the Slovak society in general.
Methodology

At the very first heuristic phase of the research we collected academic books and studies from various scientific disciplines (pedagogy, history, anthropology, youth studies), which we inductively considered as potential sources for the purposes of WP1. Collected publications were written exclusively by Slovak academics and were focused on the problems relating to Slovakia. Academic materials were collected from digital databases and libraries. The next methodological step was the identification and consequent selection of appropriate academic texts. The texts were selected according to main criteria, which was the presence of the concept of cultural literacy. In the course of the search for texts according to the above criteria, it appeared that there are very limited texts deploying the concept of cultural literacy. The texts we identified mainly dealt with issues of ‘literacy’, in terms of reading and writing ability, rather than ‘cultural literacy’ as such. Texts were often concerned with technical and methodological aspects of teaching children how to read and write during the educational process. These texts were excluded from our research, because they did not discuss the concept of culture. We have found only one book and one academic paper, which literary dealt with the cultural literacy (Zápotočná 2004; Gavora 2002).

Since cultural literacy is not a widely used term in academic research, our search was structured around relevant themes. We conducted an initial scoping of the field and identified a wide range of academic texts. After their initial reading we excluded the ones that were not related to youth and/or education. As an example our search raised a number of documents regarding cultural heritage. Yet, several of these texts dealt with the practical aspects of its preservation; possibilities or consequences of integration of particular Slovak cultural artifacts to UNESCO; or they discussed specific conditions of people (with no concrete mention about youths) who are living in the village, which is under UNESCO’s protection.

A significant criterion in the selection process was the discussion of issues related to cultural literacy in connection with other key themes defined in CHIEF proposal (e.g. youth, cultural heritage, identity, cultural diversity and multiculturalism etc.). Throughout this scanning process we found that research relevant to cultural literacy, fell within the key concepts of the CHIEF proposal. As a result we selected approximately 20 texts. We will describe and analyze the most representative ones in the section below.
Findings

Theoretical Approaches to Cultural Literacy

The use of the term of cultural literacy is not frequent neither in Slovak academic documents nor policy documents. We have found only two significant academic publications, which explicitly use with this concept. In contrast to very vague definitions of cultural literacy in policy documents, academic texts define the term more precisely. The first of the two texts is a study written by Peter Gavora. Gavora in his study Gramotnosť: vývinmodelov, reflexiapraxe a výskumu\(^{216}\) (2002) introduces the perspectives of social and economical sciences, which connect literacy with the development of human resources. Literate person should be equipped with knowledge, skills and abilities which enable him/her to work with information; to know how to communicate effectively, to be flexible and ready for changes; to know how to work in the team; to spent work time and leisure effectively and to be able to participate as a citizen (Gavora 2002: 171).

The economical approach to cultural literacy as the mean of economical benefits is present in numerous policy documents. As we have already noticed in Findings, policy documents advocating state support of culture (and cultural literacy) with the argument that the view of culture abandons the outdated view of national culture, which is understood as the “superstructure that consumes resources of Slovak society” is already outdated. Gavora refuses cultural literacy as a universal category and he accents that literacy has many forms. There are more kinds of literacy (e.g. basal, functional or e-literacy).

Olga Zápotočná’s book Kultúrna gramotnosť v sociálnopsychologických súvislostiach\(^{217}\) (2004) is elaborated analyses of the modern perspectives to cultural literacy. Zápotočná herself represents contemporary theoretical approach to the matter. She does not consider cultural literacy as a neutral, once and for all defined individual psychological ability independent from dynamics of historical, social, political and cultural circumstances. Zápotočná’s understanding of the term is based on the political nature of cultural literacy.

\(^{216}\) Literacy: the development of models, reflection of research and practice
\(^{217}\) The cultural literacy in socio-psychological contexts
She considers cultural literacy as a certain kind of policy. This policy determines and selects which sociocultural competencies of literal person are inevitable parts of cultural literacy. The cultural literacy is socially constructed and due to linguistic turn it became the crucial human competency (2004: 25).

In fact, Zápotočná introduces the social constructivist and relativist perspective to Slovak academic (and especially pedagogical) discourse. Her statements and arguments imply that cultural literacy cannot be reduced to the ability to write and read.

However we should add that the concept of cultural literacy in sense of writing and reading ability is also not very frequent in Slovak academic text. The texts about these abilities refer only to literacy itself without the adjective of “cultural”.

Zápotočná also recognizes wide variety of “literacies” (e.g. functional literacy; numerical literacy – numeracy; document literacy; etc.) She, along with Harris and Hodges, writes about the multiliteracy (Zápotočná 2004: 42). Zápotočná’s relativism and constructivism is based on her conviction that all concepts are constructed and negotiated in the vivid social dialog and in the specific sociocultural context. She claims that the cultural literacy is the ability to understand all concepts in the way which is social relevant on the one hand and on the other hand it is the ability to communicate the meanings in (socially) adequate way.

Vlado Rafael belongs to academics who insist on practical implementation of the principle of social relevancy in schools (Rafael 2009: 76). According to Rafael, the social relevancy is the inevitable precondition for effective educational process in ethnically, culturally and socially heterogeneous Slovakia. Rafael criticises the setup of Slovak educational system, which is based on conservative foundations. The schools remain institutions which provide the transmission of cultural memory and cultural code. Thus educational system has (politically motivated) tendencies for cultural homogenization and do not respect the cultural and ethnic heterogeneity of the country. Schools have to create an environment which would be culturally relevant also for pupils from any cultural, ethnical, social and language background (Rafael 2009: 75).
The schools are described as institutions with insufficient sense for creating culturally relevant environment by Peter Ondrejkovič in his study *Sociálny a kultúrny kapitál ako sociálne hodnoty, normy a cieľového výchova a vzdelávania* (2011). However Ondrejkovič does not work with the concept of cultural literacy but instead of cultural literacy he operates with the terms as social, symbolical and above all cultural capital. Ondrejkovič claims that the most important goal of education is an achievement of economical, cultural and social capital. The concept of social capital is primarily based on Bourdieau’s theory, but Ondrejkovič introduces also authors who were in discussion about the concept. One of the most crucial points of presented discussion focuses on the relation between cultural and human capital. Ondrejkovič quotes Czech andragogist Miroslav Dopita’s definition of this relation: “While human capital is the ability to be engaged in some work, cultural capital is the knowledge how to do this work.” (Dopita quoted in Ondrejkovič 2011: 231).

Ondrejkovič’s argumentation is founded on Böhm-Bawerk’s “positive theory of capital” which was introduced in 1889. According to Böhm-Bawerk, the capital could not be reduced only to economical sphere. The term should be rather understood as an ability to bring the surplus value. Author, drawing on Rober Putnam, defines the human capital as knowledge and skills which increase individual’s potential productivity and brings him/her salary in change for his/her work.

Ondrejkovič claims that the concept of cultural capital refers to knowledge, abilities, skills, empathy, ability to understand others, ideal of beauty, the way of wearing or free time activities. School and family represent environments where individual gains his/her cultural capital. Children from higher social classes have higher level of cultural capital than children from lower classes. Cultural capital could be inherited. Ondrejkovič recognizes following forms of cultural capital: incorporated cultural capital (intellectual and physical dispositions achieved during the process of socialization); objectivised cultural capital (cultural artefacts in the household e.g. paintings, sculptures, books, etc.); institutionalized cultural capital (e.g. academic degrees).

Author claims that it is impossible to lose cultural capital and uses example of heroic individuals or whole nations who kept their cultural capital even in critical times and almost unbearable conditions.

218Social and cultural capital as social values, norms and goals of education
Author works also with Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of social capital, habitus and symbolical capital. For the last one he points to Fukuyamas definition of symbolic capital (“the set of values or norms common for the members of particular group which enables their mutual cooperation”). Based on presented theoretical academic discussion about the social, cultural, symbolical or economical capital the author claims, that deficits in pupils education are not the matter of pupils (or their parents) choice. It is primarily school and teachers who should develop pupil’s desire for knowledge and to develop their sociability. Reaching of the cultural capital has to become the part of education. In case that the education will be reduced to institution which only reacts on needs of the marked, we will live in “self-confidently uneducated” society. According to the author in pedagogical practice social capital must be seen in much wider sense than as the mean for reaching economical advantage (Ondrejkovič 2011: 228-241).

Jana Kadlečíková also works with Pierre Bourdieu’s contribution to the academic discussion about the cultural capital. Kadlečíková, along with Bourdieu, asserts that schools play an important role in reproduction of dominant cultural capital because educational programs are predeterminate for children with certain cultural capital who reach better results in school than those who do not have such capital.

“This means that the school is not the democratic institution for which it has been long time considered, but on the contrary, it is involved in legitimizing inequalities and thus contributes to their reproduction.” (Kadlečíková 20011: 25).

Erich Mistrík is a prominent academic amongst Slovak scientists occupied with topics of multiculturalism, intercultural competencies and in certain way also with the cultural literacy. He approaches to the cultural literacy in broader sense accordingly to his definition of culture. Mistrík defines culture as “a set of human activities, subjects, values, ideas and institutions that are specific to a particular community. It contains objects, signs and symbols, values, customs, institutions, rituals and traditions. These elements do not pass through the genetic code, but through the community and education and make the social learning possible.” (2008: 21).

Based on his understanding of role of the culture in the educational process, in 2004 he had submitted proposals for curricular reform of subjects concerning humanities and civic education219.

---

219We draw from the final report of Mistrík´s research project, which he has published on his profile on academia.edu.
The culture is the crucial domain which should be implemented to curricula. This domain is dedicated to structure, function, history of the culture, meanings of cultural artifacts, development of culture and understanding of cultural processes. This domain would increase pupil’s knowledge, attitudes and skills to understand current culture and its roots. It will help them to respect their culture and avoid consumerism. Pupils will obtain awareness about the cultural aspects of life and they will know how to use means and meanings offered by culture to increase the quality of their lives (Mistrík 2004: 18).

(Inter)cultural competencies, cultural diversity and multicultural education

Our research of academic literature has shown that academics from Slovakia who are engaged in cultural literacy are most concerned with the mutually interconnected topics of intercultural competencies, cultural diversity and multicultural education.

An important prerequisite for effective set of methods for the process of multicultural education is undoubtedly the collection of data reflecting pupil’s attitudes toward cultural diversity. Such a research was realized by Elena Gallová-Kriglerová and Jana Kadlečíková. Their quantitative research combined with structuralized interviews was conducted among elementary schools pupils. The research was focused on their perception of cultural differences, diversity, migrants and minorities. The results have shown that almost 2/3 of respondents do not have a priori negative attitudes towards cultural diversity. According to results, the presence of minorities or immigrants in the surrounding areas of questioned children did not affect their answers in positive neither in negative way. Answers were positively determined in case when children had personal experience with cultural differences through someone from their family or friend.

Children who learn about cultural diversity in schools offered 70% of positive answers while children from schools without implementation of cultural diversity topics to education process offered only 50% of positive answers. Children from urban areas have shown more positive attitudes toward “others” than children from rural areas. At the same time, most of children understand Slovakia as a country of Slovaks (Kriglerová-Gallová and Kadlečíková 2009: 30-32).

Authors assert that personal experience with “others” is prior to memorising the facts about them. Moreover, Gállová-Kriglerová criticises the discourse which defines any culture as stable and discrete entity with clearly marked borders.

---

220 We have to notice that authors did not ask for the EMIC definition of who is Slovak himself/herself.
Consequently people “within” those cultures are perceived as passively captured in given culture. Reproducing of above mentioned discourse during education process bring more risks than benefits, because it rather marks borders between groups than creates the space for mutual interaction and coexistence. Her arguments are on theoretical level based also on Roger Brubaker´s suggestions to understand ethnicity, race and nation in practical categories, cultural idioms and institutionalised forms instead of thinking in terms of substantive groups (2009: 12).

Therefore multicultural education should not be considered as a universal solution which could erase negative stereotypes towards minorities and “others”, but they admit certain role of such education which could help youths to critically reflect the statements of politicians and information from media.

Gallová-Kriglerová also introduces the reader to academic discussion about the influence of cultural diversity on the social cohesion. On the one hand she mentions Gordon Allport who claims that diversity can strengthen social cohesion and on the other hand she introduces the Putnam´s counter theory which is in direct opposition to Allport. However she does not reject Putnam´s approach, she adds that the weakening of social cohesion could be the result of ethnocentrism (Gallová-Kriglerová 2009: 19). Most of academics agree with the claim that teaching general and theoretical facts about culturally different groups do not change children´s attitude in considerable rate. They suggest complementary methods which are based on personal experience.

Zuzana Alenová recommends the implementation of interactive forms of learning about cultural diversity which would by focused on personal experience as is for example the pedagogy through drama methods (Alenová 2009: 87). Erich Mistrík claims that it is important to teach about culturally different people in the neighbourhood of children and to concentrate the teacher’s attention to work also with the community and families. (Mistrík 2009: 92). We have to notice that Mistrík does not offer suggestions how to motivate teachers to work with community after their working time. Nowadays in Slovakia it is not easy even to motivate capable young people to become teachers since they know their monthly salary will be 600 euros...
Mistrík proclaims that multicultural education should not be reduced only to presentation of information about other cultures also in his publication called *Multikulturnavýchova v škole: Akoreagovat'nakultúrnurôznorôzdosti*? (2008). Multicultural education should be rather the development of pupil’s “broader competencies for intercultural understanding and collaboration.” (Mistrík 2008: 19).

Mistrík operates also with the concept of cultural identity. He understands the term as an individual’s representation of the cultural specifics of his/her culture. At the same time through cultural identity an individual frames himself/herself within particular society. Thus, cultural identity, is not considered by the author as a static entity system, but rather, as an ongoing process.

Mistrík sees the goal of multicultural education in terms of developing of intercultural competencies that is, abilities for effective communication and collaboration between the members of various cultures. These competencies contain: abilities to communicate with people from other cultures (it is possible to learn them); habits and skills to communicate (e.g. patience; it is possible to strengthen them by training); attitudes and motivations to perceive other cultures (it is possible to systematically strengthening however it is a long-run process); the set of information about other cultures (it is possible to gain this information through study or through personal experience with other culture).

According to Mistrík, an inevitable prerequisite of understanding another culture is to understand one’s own culture. Along with developing intercultural competencies it is necessary to develop general cultural competencies (ability to understand to signs of own culture and to work cope with own traditions); social competencies (abilities to interact with other people); citizen competencies (abilities to active and responsible participation in society).

Mistrík suggests that multicultural education should be taught as a cross-subject topic, which should be included to more school subjects as a partial topic. Multicultural education should be the part of non-formal school curriculum, thus multicultural education activities would take place during occasions, which are not directly connected with school classes (e.g. evening programs, commemorations of holydays of other cultures, excursions, etc.).

---

221 Multicultural education at schools: How to react on cultural diversity?
222 The school reform from 2008 really introduced multicultural education as a cross-subject topic as suggested by Mistrík in the same year. Year 2008 was declared as a year of intercultural dialogue.
Schools should work also with the “covered” curriculum in the sense of implementation of multiculturalism to the everyday life and the atmosphere of the school (Mistrík 2008: 54).

Alena Chúdžiková characterizes multicultural education as an instrument for managing cultural diversity. Its aim is to strengthen social cohesion in pluralistic societies and prevent inter-ethnic and other conflicts. Introducing of multicultural education as a crosscutting theme into the national education program is a response to the growing cultural diversity in society and to the political efforts to homogenize society. The purpose of multicultural education is to develop the knowledge of various traditions, new cultures and to attain the acceptance of cultural diversity as a social reality as well as to develop tolerance, respect and pro-social behavior in relation to cultural diversity (Chúdžiková 2015:5).

Chúdžiková works with the theoretical contribution of J. A. Banks who has formulated five key dimensions that should be part of an effective multicultural education: 1. an integrated curriculum that should not be based only on dominant groups, but should also include other social groups (for example authors of literature with origins in ethnic minority, history of different groups on the territory of the country); 2. creating knowledge about the formation of human experience by its cultural framework. 3. reducing prejudices by actively promoting equality in the school environment; 4. equal approach of teachers to all pupils and improvement of the education for those groups that are in the educational system discriminated. 5. strengthening school culture by hierarchical change with purpose to eliminate institutionalized inequalities (Zirkel quoted in Chúdziková 2015: 12).

Chúdžiková affirms that effective multicultural education should not be reduced to frontal teaching about various cultures (what could result in unwanted stereotyping of those cultures). Multicultural education has to facilitate the experience of cultural diversity. Chúdžiková is, along with Bačová, very critical against the Slovak policy and its way of dealing with the problem of ethnic minorities. Long-term strategy of political elites is rather homogenization of society than the strengthening of respect for cultural diversity. Official ethnic ideology in Slovakia has a predominantly primordial character promoted mainly in the early 1990s, during the creation of the independent Slovak Republic (Bačová in Chúdžiková 2015: 6)
Chúdziková asserts that Slovaks still believe that cultural diversity is an obstacle for social cohesion and politics tends to create the homogenous society whose constitutional element would be the common national identity built on the principle of sameness. Immigrants and minorities are to be assimilated, despite dominant policy rhetoric on inclusion. The condition for the acceptance among members of dominant group is to renounce the part of minority member’s identity, which is considered as culturally different (Chúdziková 2015:8).

Chúdziková argues that ethnic minorities often belong among groups with the lowest socioeconomic status.

She points to Natalie Letki’s research in UK (2008) which has shown that the socioeconomic status of ethnic minorities (and not the ethno-cultural diversity) was the reason why people from those communities disposed with lower social capital (Chúdziková 2015: 8).

Chúdziková asserts that schools act as mechanisms that reproduce discourses of dominant culture. The reason why the educational system is anchored in the culture of the dominant group is related to the partitioning power of the society and of the groups that have access to the (re)production of rules, standards and formal practices. Dominant groups tend to apply their standards and rules on other groups. From this point of view, multicultural education could be an opportunity to deconstruct such system. It can introduce into education the elements that make it possible to create a climate, which is relevant for people from every cultural group. Students should be guided to the reflection of the multiplicity of their own identity, which is based on their identifications with more social groups (Chúdziková 2015: 11).
Discussion

Despite the variety of the concepts used for the description of issues related to cultural literacy and the different definitions, we can identify a general agreement across Slovak academics working in this field. The need for creating a culturally relevant educational system appear -either explicitly or implicitly- across a number of the most significant academic texts. We can interpret the academic discourse related to cultural relevancy through the cultural and educational environment arranged by the school or the whole educational system. The culturally relevant environment is the environment, which provides the distribution of the cultural means and meanings accessible for pupils with all sorts of cultural capital regardless of their social, linguistic or ethnical background.

As discussed in the presentation of the literature, many authors reasonably claim that culture cannot be depicted as a stable and unified entity and they emphasize the vivid dynamics of cultural processes. Academics highlight that approaching culture as an isolated entity, often contributes to the construction of stereotypes, which are consequently reproduced during the educational process. Yet, academic debate very often deploys and therefore reproduces the division between dominant and minority cultures. Also there are voices problematizing multicultural education based on an intercultural approach, arguing that highlighting the differences between cultures can have stereotyping effects on minority cultures. Considering these points, we argue that, while understandings of culture in terms of a dynamic process, are important, they nevertheless have inherent limitations. For example, the term ‘interculturality’ assumes already existed borders between cultures. A step further would suggest a critical engagement with assumptions regarding boundaries and a focus on existed interconnections between cultures. That is, an emphasis on identifying points, which on daily base cross through the fluid borders of identities and cultural codes.

Since 2013, the conception of multicultural education draws from the Slovak cultural environment and pupils are taught about the traditional cultural diversity of Slovakia (Bartková 2015: 73). Such approach appears as potentially effective because it shows Slovak culture as traditionally and historically multicultural and thus cultural diversity is depicted as an inherent part of Slovak history.
Although Slovak academic documents recognise the contribution of minorities to the culture of the country, they do not seem to clarify how the historical perspectives of minorities could be incorporated to the teaching of the history at schools.

There are also academic voices, which are very critical towards the conservatism of educational system in Slovakia, which does not transfer only the “cultural memory” but also the dominant “cultural code” of the majority (Rafael 2009: 75). Thus, children are taught the culture of the ethnic majority. Critics claim, that multicultural education is introduced in concrete socio-political framework with tendency to homogenise the society. Rafael (2009) openly doubts about the ability of State School Inspection and Methodical pedagogical centre to successfully and effectively introduce the multicultural education to Slovak schools. According to Rafael, the state-organized institutions should renounce their monopoly position and should invite research centres, academics and non-government organizations to help with the design of such educational system which could be culturally relevant for children from any cultural, ethnical, social or linguistic background (Rafael 2009: 97).

We share the opinion of many Slovak academics, which we have shown in our findings, that while the Slovak educational system does not aim at developing schools, which are culturally relevant for all, the children from culturally dominant backgrounds will reproduce their cultural capital while children from other groups will remain in disadvantageous position.
Concluding Remarks

Although protagonists of Slovak school reforms assert that their conceptions are reactions to new trends and challenges of today word, many NGOs, journalist, academics and teachers themselves remain critical and sceptic. There is a lot of academic criticism towards the Ministry of Education and authors of the reforms. Critics claim that reforms are often only half-done and pro-forma; the conceptions are vaguely formulated; ideas of people from ministry is cut off from everyday reality in schools; the realization of the reform goals is without any material, technical nor methodical support; etc. Many teachers point to the effects of never-ending reforms in terms of increasing their administrative burden. Additionally, teachers do not seem to receive appropriate training and support in order to enact the reforms and bring their idea into educational practices. Indicatively, in Petrasová´s research (2010), respondents highlighted that they miss systematic set-up, teaching materials, methodic and necessary skills for the effective application of multicultural education policies to educational practice. More than 70% of respondents have expressed that they need to know approaches for intercultural conflicts management. Respondents were aware of their limited knowledge about other cultures (26,4%) and of the lack of empathy toward cultural diversity and other cultural traditions.

According to Petrasová´s research on pedagogical faculties in Bratislava and Prešov district, teachers are expected to implement multicultural education to pedagogical process, but they do not get relevant support since their pedagogical training on universities. Defenders of the declaring that there are available programs of continual education for teachers, which are provided by Methodical- Pedagogical Center. However academics arguing that in 2015 there was available only one program named as Multicultural education for the first grade of elementary schools. These programs are only short-run courses (present program is only 32 hours long). According to some academics, such format of continual education cannot substitute systematic preparation for students on pedagogical faculties (Chúdziková 2015: 13).
We can see the attitudes of some university pedagogues on the following material from Chúdziková’s qualitative research:

“The core of the problem with implementation of multicultural education is that national educational program did not define the multicultural education at all. Teachers have to manage work, which they have to manage. And then when they have to do something else, they do not understand why they should do it. They do not have any motivation. They need to understand where these topics belong and where they can work with them. Because they are told that they have to implement the multicultural education to all subjects, but nobody tells them how, when and why to do it.” (Chúdziková 2015: 13).

Another university pedagogue has expressed his skepticism in following words:

“In Slovakia, the multicultural education was reduced to mediation of facts about other cultures. I think that if we would teach children to respect other people, they do not need to know everything about their culture. Our multicultural education is only the presentation of other cultures. Let teach them Roma’s flag and now they will better understand Romas. /…/ Such education is not based on values but on knowledge of typical things. It does not lead to understanding other cultures or to understanding why we should live with them. It is just the stereotypization.” (Ibid.: 18).

Academic criticism uncovers that probably the voices of experts from the academic institutions are not always taken into consideration in policy documents, creating the curriculums and in teaching process itself. Considering the gap that emerges through the review of the literature, one of the objective for the Slovak team in the context of CHIEF will be to explore and develop ideas, which will bring together, while also cutting across the boundaries of academic debate, policy initiative and the everyday lives of the school classroom.
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National Cultural/Educational Literature Review
(Spain/Catalonia)
Marta Rovira, Mariona Ferrer-Fons and Roger Soler I Martí

This report presents an overview of the academic literature in Catalonia and Spain on three main topics: education and intercultural competence; national identity and cultural diversity among young people; and cultural heritage, cultural participation and cultural consumption. We have focused on these subjects and not only in ‘cultural literacy’ itself as it is a topic scarcely used in the Catalan and Spanish literature. The exploration of academic literature has included articles, books and research papers, many of them published from 2007 onwards.

In relation to the literature focusing on formal education, we have found some results about how historical knowledge could enhance cultural literacy among pupils and teachers. Historical knowledge has two main implications: a) the understanding of the past plays a role in the creation of a certain understanding, and b) it is a framework to put in practice the competences and skills for the evaluation of evidence when collecting information, reasoning and problem solving, and the analysis and construction of historical narratives.

The other aspect that academic literature has often analysed in the process of enhancing formal education is the role of intercultural education. The literature consulted argues that a new intercultural framework of education should be based more on competences than in contents. Moreover, new technologies and Internet constitute a new area of study of literacy and in formal education – which is understood by some authors as ‘digital literacy’. Several projects, books and articles develop research on this topic in Spain, making this question one of the most relevant considering the connection between formal and non-formal/informal education among the youth.

The context of the transmission of culture through education has suffered an important change from the beginning of the XXI Century in Catalonia and Spain. In Catalonia, 15% of young population has born abroad. That means that cultural diversity is a relatively new but increasingly popular subject in the academic literature. On the one hand, the study of hybrid and intercultural identities has provided an abundant literature about youth identities.
On the other hand, the existence of two national identities in Catalonia (Spanish and Catalan), in some cases, combined with other national identities in the case of young migrants or second-generation ones, create a quite complex context from the point of view of national identities among young people. Considering the growing diversity of cultural backgrounds of the youth, the academic literature proposes interesting contributions about cultural diversities and national identities.

There is not much research available about how cultural practices are transformed by this process of cultural hybridization of identities among young people. However, a broad overview about cultural practices of the youth exists thanks to the official surveys conducted about cultural consumption and cultural participation. The results of the surveys waves have been analysed in different articles, books and rapports extensively. The most relevant empirical findings are about the influence of class and gender in cultural practices of young people.
Introduction

Cultural literacy is a field of study that has been scarcely studied in Spain. Considering the area of literacy, preliminary studies started analysing the literacy of the Spanish population and their levels of literacy, territorial differences and explanatory factors. Even so, literacy studies were limited until the 1990s (de Puelles Benítez, 1997). In the early 90s, one of the first academics researching basic literacy acquisition in Spain was Viñao (1990) who understood literacy as a historical process. He studied the historical evolution of the level of knowledge of written and/or oral languages among the Spanish population. According to Viñao, the advancement of literacy in Spain has been much more dependent than elsewhere on schooling and on urbanisation through migration from rural areas. A most recent example of studies on literacy is the research of Macías Gómez-Estern et al. (2010) that problematizes on the concept of literacy and cultural identity. In this work, the authors relate literacy and the way people discursively construct their cultural identity which is linked to cultural activity settings. For them, cultural identity is a flexible process that is constructed in relation to social settings (such as formal education) in which people participate. Empirically, they analyse the acts of identification performed by various groups of Andalusians.

Due to the lack of research on the specific field of cultural literacy, we searched on different related areas of investigation in order to give an overview of the academic literature and debates related to CHIEF’s aims in Spain and Catalonia. The objectives and theoretical approaches of the CHIEF project take a stance for an open and dynamic conceptualization of cultural literacy that is not evident in the Spanish literature. This is reason we adopted the strategy of reviewing different academic fields that do not explicitly deal with cultural literacy but that are core for the CHIEF conceptualization like intercultural dialogue, educational and civic competences, cultural identities, youth cultures, cultural participation or cultural heritage and memory.

In the next pages we start with the section on methodology where we explain the strategy we followed for identifying fields of academic literature and the search of references is presented. In section 3 the existing literature in various fields is presented and in section 4 there is a discussion of the main findings related to CHIEF’s goals and challenges. Finally we present some concluding remarks.
Methodology

The first search on academic search engines of CHIEF key concepts was completed based on the three areas suggested by WP1 leads: education and intercultural competence; national identity and cultural diversity among young people; and cultural heritage, cultural participation and cultural consumption.

The characteristics of the CHIEF research questions opens the exploration of several spheres of research, and consequently, it makes difficult to focus on the academic literature review in only few research fields. Hence, our strategy has been to identify multiple research areas related to CHIEF’s goals and later on to try to identify common trends and evidence and literature gaps.

In the first review we identified specific research areas linked to the ones suggested that have had a particular development in the Spanish literature; these are: Education/Pedagogy, Youth Studies, Cultural Studies, Cultural Policies, Values and Identities. Other relevant subareas identified are: historical knowledge, teaching through competences, intercultural education, education using ICT, transnational and national identities, cultural practices, leisure and participation, ICT as a new form of cultural consumption, media literacy and cultural policies.

The search for the available literature has been done via search engines of general academic platforms such as Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, Dialnet, Academia.edu or ResearchGate. We have also examined the websites of some institutions that work in youth and create youth-related publications such as the INJUVE (withe Revista de Estudios de Juventud and other monographs), the Centro Reina Sofía sobre Estudios de Juventud, and the Catalan Youth Observatory, among others.
Findings

Cultural Literacy and Education
The role of historical knowledge as a background for cultural literacy
As we already point out above, we have not been able to identify Spanish academic literature that uses the concept of cultural literacy specifically. Consequently, our approach for discussing the research done on cultural literacy and young people in Spain has been to deal with related topics such as historical literacy, historical and/or cultural competences, intercultural education and so forth. In this sense, a positive finding has been to look for examples of research that have analysed how cultural and social issues, understood broadly, are treated in education, for instance, starting from the content analysis of curriculums or subjects, textbooks or teaching through competences.

Among the studies that focus on the teaching of culture in different educational stages, we highlight the work of Zabalza (1996). Zabalza has studied the relationship between cultural content and early childhood education in Spain. This level of education is integrated and there are many cultural themes present in the classrooms. She mentions, for instance, education for peace, equality between the sexes, health, environment, consumption, the European dimension and multiculturalism. The author explains that the themes of the European dimension and multiculturalism were a constant demand of teachers and institutions at that time. The main reasons were to increase awareness of the new international status of Spain and what its integration into the EC implied. Zabalza already argued more than 20 years ago: “A better knowledge of the European reality should lead to the formation of open, though critical attitudes about Europe. It is important, not only that Spanish children know more about Europe, but also that they consider themselves as European. The idea of Europe appears to be related to a deeper and richer notion of multicultural education (Zabalza, 1996, p.56).”

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in studies focused on historical teaching and learning (Carretero and López, 2009).
An assumption that appears often in the literature is that historical learning has the disciplinary goal of fostering critical citizens capable of informed and effective participation in increasingly complex global societies, and the short-term and long-term problems facing the 21st Century. The idea is that a full understanding of these problems from social, economic and political points of view implies a historical point of view (Carretero et al., 2012). Based on such an idea, there are several educational studies about how learning about history or culture takes place in school settings.

For instance, Carretero and López (2009) gathered the most relevant studies that have been carried out on the cognitive psychology of the knowledge and skills that characterize history experts. The authors believe that greater knowledge about the characteristics of said experts is a fundamental aspect of understanding what objectives should be promoted to achieve adequate historical literacy. These characteristics revolve around three major capacities related to historical knowledge: the evaluation of evidence when obtaining information, reasoning and problem solving, and the analysis and construction of historical narratives. This is a relevant issue as teachers, as experts, are intensively involved in the process of students gaining an adequate level of historical literacy.

Later, Carretero et al. (2012) discussed how students construct their historical narratives and concepts about the nation as a theme that, again to learn the background for understanding the past in a complex manner and the complex historical multiple causality, being able to relate the past with the present and the future. Their empirical research is based on individual semi-structured interviews to analyse the concept of nation and the evolution of the Spanish state among 12-18 year old students. According to these authors, in the case of Spain, the concept of nation is not understood in a proper historical manner: “Students have a rather essentialist idea of nation, closer to a romantic than to a disciplinary conception (Carretero, 2012, p.167).” The nation, as appears in their analysis, is more ‘essentialist’ – using their terms- and linked to a territory, ideas that are more supported than before in the intense process of globalisation.

Another approach of the academic literature has been to analyse the contents of textbooks or the historical narratives that students learn, especially in high school.
In this context, we can mention several works. A piece of research to highlight, is the work of Pousa and López-Facal (2013), which examines the presence of Eurocentric bias in mainstream Spanish textbooks used to teach history in secondary education. Using the analysis of a sample of six textbooks, and their written information, pictures and maps, the authors reached the conclusion of an important bias towards the old colonial propaganda – for instance, minimising or ignoring colonial violence - and reproducing many stereotyped images of the colonised and colonisers. The conclusions bring forward some proposals that could improve the teaching and learning of the history of colonialisms to avoid reinforcing the Eurocentric bias that already exists among secondary students.

Sáiz Serrano (2013) also analyses a sample of activities of Spanish history textbooks in secondary education (12-18 years old) and levels of historical learning of students from a sample of exams Test Access University of History of Spain. He argued that the approach and problem solving, analysis of historical sources, and the construction of narratives, are historical thinking skills to be used to study levels of historical literacy among young people. He concluded that there is a low level of learning of historical literacy skills and that these need to be reinforced in secondary education and its curriculum. These skills are related to critical thinking and creativity and the analysis of social and identity conflicts. Furthermore, he argues the need to use material other than textbooks to increase historical thinking skills.

The study of the competences of historical thinking has gained popularity in recent years, likely due to the introduction of the concept of competences in the official curriculum of compulsory education in Spain. There is an understanding of the curriculum, as a process of learning several competences and skills, more so than traditional disciplines. However, a tension exists in this process because the educational curriculum based on disciplines has been the dominant approach for decades in Spain.

Following the research on educational competences, Saíz-Serrano and López-Facal (2015) examine the competences of historical thinking of high school students and pre-service teachers in Spain, as well as their narratives about Spanish history using qualitative methods. The findings show that most secondary school students do not use meta-concepts.
The degree of complexity of historical thinking among pre-service teachers is related to their use of substantive content. The results point to the need to improve history education, including substantive knowledge and the development of specific historical competencies critical to the weight of transmissive routes and memorisation in teaching. They argue a need of more transversal knowledge.

Gómez-Carrasco et al. (2015) posit the need for a new cognitive model of historical learning. They discuss the link between the historical formation of students and the development of democratic, critical and responsible citizenship. To achieve this, they suggest that it is necessary for historical knowledge to be conceived of as the acquisition of complex cognitive abilities and social and educational competences. Hence “students must learn, from early ages, how the narratives of the past are constructed, as well as the disciplinary tools to interpret them appropriately and critically” (Gómez-Carrasco et al., 2015, p.11)”. For them, the introduction of the competences can be an opportunity for the students to acquire a specific ability to interpret and confer new meanings to the reality on which they act. It is also an opportunity for the democratisation of evaluation and not using the examination as an exclusive tool.

The Competences as a New Model for Cultural Transmission
The competences defined as transversal are those directly related to cultural diversity. They include, among others, artistic and cultural competence and competition communication. Cultural education is still not understood in a transversal way in Spain and Catalonia, where it is often strictly associated with artistic competence (Carbó, 2015). Another example of the interest in social and cultural competences is the work of Tiana Ferrer (2011), who presents an analysis of the key competencies of the core curriculum of compulsory education in Spain. The author relates the 8 basic competences with each one of the areas and subjects of the curriculum, emphasising the integrating character that their development should have. The development of these competences involves reviewing other aspects of the curriculum: the teaching and learning methodology and the evaluation of the students. In addition, it means paying special attention to non-formal learning and to the influence of the organisation and school environment. She argues that in the case of historical literacy, learning cannot be conceived only as the acquisition of disciplinary knowledge; students must be able to apply this knowledge to new situations and in their daily lives.
Digital literacy and the impact of new technologies in the learning processes of young people is another area of study. For instance, García-Carrasco (2009) describes the different processes in which literacy as a pedagogical project has been transformed with the appearance of new technologies. He uses the concept of multiple literacy that is related to the reconstruction of the historic process of cultural integration. He talks about three cultural processes: the introduction of oral language and cultures of orality, the introduction of reading-writing literacy and the emergence of cultures that correspond to the introduction of digital technologies and the emergence of the so-called information society. According to him, "when digital technology enters different scenarios, it modifies the living conditions in vital domains (....). Literacy (...) can never be understood as a process of learning to read and write because it has passed to the need to be a process of reading to learn, a process of personal training to deliberate, a basic process to learn to live." (García-Carrasco, 2009, pp.72-73). A very recent book written by Pérez Escoda (2017) describes the challenges of educational processes in the context of a digital society. The author posits that students should achieve ‘media literacy’ in formal education, a concept related to the use and knowledge of ITC and digital competences. She explains several examples of the increasing use of ITC tools in schools.

Cultural and Intercultural Education
Intercultural competence is an aspect of cultural literacy. Intercultural education has also been an area of increasing interest among both teachers and academics. Some authors consider the development of competences in the educational curriculum as an opportunity for cultural and intercultural education (for example, Arroyo González, 2013; Carbó, 2015; Escarbajal Frutos, 2015). Intercultural education "is based on diversity as a positive value, not centred on the difference and the static nature of cultural identities, but on the process of permanent dialogue between individuals and groups" (Carbó, 2015, pp.15-16). In this context, we found the study of Arroyo González (2013) that discusses two concepts: intercultural education and educational incorporation. She argues that intercultural education (a dimension of cultural literacy) is, today, one of the best ways to obtain educational incorporation. It focuses on the specific needs of each student and not individual groups, emphasising the diversity of each school.

Another good example of academic work on intercultural learning is the book edited by Escarbajal Frutos (2015) who collected several proposals on how to implement intercultural education, in response to the challenges of inclusion in increasingly diverse societies, and how to create more intercultural and democratic communities.
The difficulties and opportunities to face intercultural education between students and teachers are analysed. In this regard, it should be noted that the book aims to go beyond formal education in schools. The learning process of intercultural competences goes through the school, the community, the neighbourhood and the family. Another thesis of the book is support for the implementation of policies of inclusiveness towards immigrant students, respecting their uniqueness at the same time.

Escarbajal Frutos and Morales Cánovas (2016) published research about the intercultural skills in secondary education teachers. The authors posit that to respond to the demands of the multicultural and changeable Spanish society of the 21st century, it is important teachers are properly trained and have the necessary intercultural skills to properly perform their educational work. Therefore, the target of study of their research was to analyse intercultural competencies of secondary school teachers and their involvement in the development of interculturality in their schools, in order to, when necessary, suggest some alternatives that promote inclusive education. They conducted a survey among teachers whose results show the lack of training of the analysed teachers and the need to implement training in intercultural skills, both in initial university training and in continuing education.

Another type of study goes beyond the formal education sphere and focuses on the cultural learning of young people outside of formal education. Solé Blanch (2006) proposed a phenomenological frame for the investigation about the different models of enculturation of youths. He related these processes with the main elements of youth cultures in the 21st century. He posits the need that youth pedagogy incorporates cultural materials, forms of consumption and spaces of creativity in which youth develop their processes of construction of cultural identities. These spaces include: groups of peers, the Internet and new technologies, music, film, commemorative centres, series culture, etc. In short, including the daily life of young people in their educational processes.

Other authors question the division among formal, non-formal and informal education. In that way, Vidiella (2016) explains how the terms formal, non-formal and informal education, no longer respond to the traditional excluding division due to the complex and hybrid situation of the current educational processes (Vidiella, 2016, p.59). In her work, she presents the challenges facing culture and education policies for this potential and hybrid space in Catalonia. She suggests many actions and measures that, in some cases, could be related to cultural literacy dimensions.
Finally, a PhD thesis, written by Carbó (2015), is one of the most elaborated texts reflecting on cultural education in Spain. Carbó, an expert on cultural and educational policies, recognises that the school constitutes the basic guarantee institution, and universal access to culture beyond formal education, non-formal learning (outside school) and informal education is a decisive contributor to cultural 'literacy'. She also draws attention to informal learning inherent in all socialisation experiences, including learning activities that are carried out in the workplace, in the local community and in daily life (self-taught) or in the family or in society. According to her, “in our society, there is an increasing awareness of the fundamental role that citizens have as creators, producers and cultural consumers, especially young people, and how their critical capacity in relation to knowledge and diversity is vital to guarantee the bases of public and democratic government systems (Carbó, 2015, p. 4).”

Cultural Identity and Young People
Youth Cultures Research and Identities
From the end of the II World War, the study of youth cultures, as an analysis of the norms, values, practices and symbolic systems of young people, have developed quickly in some Western countries. However, in Spain we needed to wait until the decline of the Francoist dictatorship to find the first research on youth cultures (Feixa and Porzio, 2004). As a relevant precedent, it must be mentioned the contribution of Ortega y Gasset in the 20’s that, beside Karl Mannheim, has been one of the first thinkers in conceptualising the sociocultural singularities of youth as the fundamental engine of social change (Ortega y Gasset, 1923).

In two different articles, Carles Feixa and his colleagues, offered an exhaustive review of the studies in youth cultures in Spain from its beginnings in the late 60’s until today (Feixa and Porzio, 2004; Feixa and Sánchez, 2015). In this review the authors show the relation between the academic (but also mediatic and popular) visions of youth with the general political, social, economic and cultural context. For that purpose, they analysed the different labels used to define youth and youth groups and describe the state of the discipline (theoretical frameworks and methodological perspectives) at that time. The dominant discourses on youth highlight the social transformation of Spain. The first studies on youth cultures coincided with the decadence of the Francoist regime and the democratic transition.
Thus, with uncertain times of growing social and political changes, cultural modernisation processes and openness with the exterior. In this context, the academic studies are closely related with the ideological and mediatic discourses that try to face the issue of the “problem of youth” or “youth as a problem” (Feixa and Porzio, 2004, p. 23). This worried vision on youth is present in the very first studies that have focused on the new consumption habits and countercultural trends that were still there during the 80’s, a democratic period. The interest is in analysing the emergence of urban tribes and a certain careless attitude (“pasotismo”) that the Transition generation assigned to their next generation.

Within this period, the quantity and quality of studies have increased, but in the mid 90’s there is a turning point in the production of studies on youth cultures: Feixa and Porzio (2004) identify this moment, quantifying the scientific production on youth cultures in Spain, reporting books, articles, PhD thesis, reports and press monographs. This period corresponds with the emergence of subcultural groups such as the “okupas” (squatters) or the skinheads. Even though, in this period there is still a lack of a more transversal research putting together the analysis of different groups or the links of these youth subcultures with more general trends on youth identity, attitudes and social patterns, and there is still a very weak relation with more consolidated international research on youth cultures (Feixa and Porzio, 2004).

However, in the new Century, studies of youth cultures in Spain have undergone exponential growth, both in terms of number and contributions of scholars from other disciplines - the international integration mainly through European projects but also with a productive exchange with Latin American scholars (Feixa and Sánchez, 2015). From this period, Feixa and Sánchez highlight three crucial subjects in the study of youth cultures: (1) the impact of the ICTs and the emergence of the so-called cyber cultures, (2) the study of the Latin gangs (“bandas”) within the new phenomena of foreign immigration in Spain and transnationalism and (3) the incorporation of the analysis of social movements from the hand of the anti-globalisation movement and, particularly, the indignados movement from 2011.

In terms of identities, the recent literature on youth cultures develops three approaches of new insights that tackle the complexity of youth identities. First, the idea of migration and transnationalism. The phenomenon of foreign immigration is relatively new in Spain: In 2000 the percentage of young people with a foreign nationality was 2.2% whereas now it is around 21% across the whole country, but significantly higher in the main urban areas.
This phenomenon has attracted the attention of many researchers from many fields. Youth culture studies have focused on the practices and subjectivities of young people from minority migrant groups, specifically from Latin America and Northern Africa. This research, that has taken into consideration the impact of migration both in Spain and in the countries of origin, has contributed to rethinking the foundations of identity in a global world with the idea of hybrid cultures and decentralised subjectivities (Sánchez, 2010; Romaní et al., 2012).

Another area of research has placed the emphasis on the effect of changing living conditions on youth and their transitions into adulthood and their subjectivities. In line with globalisation trends in Western democracies during the past decades, Spain has experienced a process of deregulation of the labour market with a specific impact on youth. Among other socioeconomic transformations this process has led to more lengthy, uncertain and vulnerable youth trajectories. Andy Furlong and Fred Cartmel (1997) in his influential book “Young People and Social Change” explain how these transformations impact young peoples’ identities. A summary of the book was translated by the Catalan Youth Observatory in 2001 with a significant influence on youth studies in Catalonia and Spain (see, for example, Miret et al., 2008 or Serracant, 2012). In the same approach, several studies in Spain have aimed to analyse the impact of those general social changes into youth and their identities and the role of inequalities, adapting the thesis of the great thinkers of the late modernity like Beck, Bauman, Lipovetsky or Sennett, to the particularities of young people.

An example of this orientation is the research of Bernat Albaigés (2003) or Isaac Gonzalez (2010) that analyse the complexity and the reconstruction of common references on youth identities.

Finally, we identify another contribution from youth culture studies to the understanding of youth identities that comes from the analysis and problematisation of the relationship between youth, power and politics. The financial crisis and the indignados movement in 2011 represent a turning point in the dominant social discourses and academic perspectives of young people as agency and their own political identities. From that point, this line of research tries to combine the classical discourse on the individualisation, political apathy and disaffection of youth with a new view of the young generation as a political agent with a great capacity of indignation and spontaneous mobilisation (Benedicto, 2013; Feixa and Nofre, 2013).
From this new perspective, the literature in Spain devotes a lot of effort to incorporate the role of ICT as an indivisible component of new political identities (Fernandez-Planells et al., 2014; Anduiza et al., 2014). Even before the global crisis and the appearance of the wave of youth mobilisations initiated by the Arab Spring and followed up by the *indignados* and the occupy movement among others, the Mexican anthropologist, Rossana Reguillo, had developed an original approach to understand these sociopolitical identities of youth. Young generations look for political and moral meanings in traditional institutions, but these are too distant and do not make any sense. It is from this disenchantment that new forms of organisation, political participation and peer solidarity arises (Reguillo, 2000 and 2012).

National, European and Global Identities of Youth in Spain
Due to the plurinational nature of Spain, the issue of national identity has been largely addressed by different disciplines (for instance, History, Political Science, Sociology or Social Psychology). In addition, the national conflict between Spanish nationalism and the so-called peripheral nationalisms (mainly Catalan, Basque and Galician ones) has been one of the main political cleavages since, at least, the last century. Thus, there is not only an academic interest on identities, but also a social and political debate. In line with CHIEF’s interests, during recent years with the independentist process in Catalonia, it is remarkable that debates are taking place regarding the role of Catalan schools in the transmission of a Catalan national identity.

Ciudadanos and Partido Popular (the centre-right wing Spanish party) has denounced an indoctrination strategy by Catalan public schools for young citizens to take a stance against Spain and rising secessionism. Even if this has been a repeated discourse from some political and mediatic actors, the pedagogic sector and academia has, in general, defended the democratic and pluralist orientation of the Catalan school system (Lomas, 2017; Casanovas and Caño, 2018).

In the academic field there is much literature on national identities leading with the complexity of identities in plurinational societies. For example, the impact of the new cultural diversity in plurinational contexts (Kleiner-Liebau, 2009), the formation of identities in different levels (Vicente and Moreno, 2009), the evolution of nationalism and Spanish identity (Muñoz 2012, Balfour and Quiroga, 2007), or the role of identities in the political preferences (Tormos, Muñoz and Hierro, 2015).
Focusing on youth, the quantity of studies on national identities is significantly lower, some of them analysing the role of education or, in the case of Catalonia, the centrality of language in defining and transmitting national identities (Pujolar and González, 2013; Rovira and Solà, 2008). Twenty years ago, the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, surveyed young people on national identities and European attitudes in Spain (see Moral and Mateos, 1998). However, this survey hasn’t had any continuity. Thus, the empirical quantitative information on youth national identities must be found both in age analysis of surveys not oriented to youth or in the political attitudes questions from youth surveys. This is the case for a very recent study from a survey on political orientations of youth in Catalonia in the context of the rise of the independentist movement. In terms of national identities, the study highlights that young people tend to use few identitarian arguments to explain their position both in favour of or against independence. In other words, young people’s national identities are less of a determining factor in their political positions than for other age groups (Guinjoan, 2019).

In relation to European identities, Spain has been one of the member states with a more enthusiastic population to the European project. During the 80’s and 90’s the integration process was seen by younger generations as an opportunity for economic and social modernisation.

However, the standstill of the integration process and the perception of a growing bureaucratisation with little democratic control has led to an increasing scepticism of the European project. The economic crisis, and its severe effect on Spanish youth has been a turning point in the perception of the European Union among young people. The result is that EU institutions now have lower levels of trust among Spanish youth than ever. Besides this disenchantment with the formal European process, European integration has offered new opportunities for the emergence of a common European identity. The Revista de Estudios de Juventud devoted an issue in 2016 on the effect of European mobility on transnationalism that addresses, from different cases, the impact of European mobility politics and intra-European migration into transnational and European identities (Navarrete, 2016). The growing mobility of youth, favoured partially by EU policies, is generating new transnational identities that interact with traditional national and territorial identities (Malaina, 2016), although this transnational identification is not always perceived as an attachment with European institutionality.
Ricardo Zúñiga (2016) argues that the European identity, understood as an identification with the EU and their institutions, only appears as a consequence of a mobility experience when this experience is between two-member states and when it is successful in terms of labour or educational integration.

Youth Studies in Spain have also devoted attention to the emergence of a global identity among youth (see Espin, 2015). Pam Nilan and Carles Feixa’s (2006) book relates, through different case studies around the globe, how economic and cultural globalisation impacts youth local identities. The thesis is that the “global youth” must be understood as hybrid as their subjectivities and identities are constructed through hybrid materials that come from local and global cultures, consumptions and resistances.

Cultural Participation of Young People
From consumption to cultural participation
In the late 1990s and especially at the beginning of the 21st century, different waves of official surveys on cultural practices of the population have been carried out in Spain and Catalonia. Therefore, the Ministry of Culture of the Spanish government has a Survey of habits and cultural practices in Spain. The latest edition is 2014-2015, the fourth edition since 2002. The segmentation of the survey sample by age allows us to obtain some results on the cultural practices of young people. According to the results of this survey, young people have the highest cultural participation rates in practically all cultural areas: they visit more museums, monuments, attend stage or musical performances, read more, go to libraries, and perform more active cultural practices. In fact, these cultural practices decrease as age increases. On the other hand, the level of studies is the most determining variable to explain the intensity of the individuals in cultural participation. For its part, the Catalan government has carried out a series of surveys on practices and cultural consumption (2001, 2006, 2013, 2014), which in recent years has adopted the concept of "cultural participation". This survey also allows segmenting the results referred to the young population and analysing them specifically. We have a set of studies based on the results of these surveys for the young population. Through them, we highlight the study of Ariño and Llopis (2016), who adopt a more complex perspective towards the cultural participation of young people, regarding the differences between cultural practices among generations, on one side, and among different ages on the other.
They start from a critical perspective of the concept of cultural consumption, which was used in the official surveys in Catalonia. For the past few years, the concept of "cultural participation" has been introduced as a paradigm of understanding the cultural practice of young people as a non-passive process, but considering the subject and its intentions, and recognising that in any cultural practice there are processes of creation, recreation and interaction. Therefore, the central question does not lie in knowing how many different practices young people do, but how they articulate their interests and practices according to certain rules. That is, how they form a pattern of cultural practices.

Thus, through the study *Cultural participation of Catalan youth 2001-2015*, conducted by Antonio Ariño and Ramon Llopis (2016), we can have an in-depth analysis of the evolution of the cultural practices of young people from this perspective. The authors make the distinction between generation and age, as a factor to explain the variability of cultural practices between young people and older ones. Age is a very important differentiation factor in the results of surveys, in all cultural practices.

It is also a factor of social stratification. If we observe the dynamics of the labour market in Catalonia, where half of the contracts for young people do not last more than one month. In the study we can also discover that gender influences cultural interests. For example, women are less user-friendly of the internet for cultural practices than men.

On the other hand, we can observe the effect of public policies on cultural practices. We do not refer to the campaigns, as its difficult to evaluate their impact, but to what has been the universalisation of formal education and its extension to 16 years. One of the consequences has been that with the new generations there are more potential readers. This may explain the fact that the level of reading books on paper is higher among young people than adults, but this is a basically motivated reading of the studies. We can also see the emergence of a new culture among people under 35, framed in the digital world. This would also explain why among young people cultural consumption practices are more intensive. Thus, in the digital era, where a good part of the culture that young people consume is free, the problem of cultural exclusion would not be so much due to lack of access as to the importance given to the culture of a personal reference framework (or if you want, a *habitus*). In short, cultural taste is modelled by social class, as Pierre Bourdieu (1979) said.
In reality, according to Ariño and Llopis, the educational capital and the social class maintain a direct correlation with all the cultural interests and practices of young people, as can be seen in the same native concept of culture. There is a humanistic and creative conception (art, literature and museums) that are significantly defended by people with the highest educational level. Also, the educational capital is related directly to the importance that is granted to culture: the more capital, the more relevance is granted to him. While in lower educational levels, less personal cultural life is given (Ariño and Llopis, 2016).

Therefore, public policies that do not consider this weight of educational capital and social class may be producing what is called the “Mateu effect”, which means accumulating cultural resources in people who already have the ease of access. Basically, middle and upper middle classes. This is an unwanted effect of cultural policies.

Moreover, if we consider that the youth conception of culture is essentially the legitimate culture since it reproduces the prevailing canon in which it has become socialised; but, it is also more open, varied and secular (in the sense of subtracting sacredness from practices and conferring it on others), and the entertainment function is of relevance.

Roger Martínez (2013) has gone further and pointed out that class is not only a determining element of cultural practices, but rather an element of its production and reproduction. This approach is framed, undoubtedly, by the research of Paul Willis (1990) on common culture. Martínez's study is based on the relationship between social class and musical tastes as an experience of authenticity. "Authenticity" means the belief in an individual (or also an artist or cultural artefact) not corrupted by social influence; that is to say, the absence of deformation of a supposed "essence" or "truth" individual or artist because of the influence of money, modernisation, fame, technology or social pressure.

Through this search for authenticity, social hierarchies and differentiations are a central aspect in the lives of young people and their cultural practices. Thus, young people, like adults, separate, exclude, and differentiate in a multitude of totally trivial and imperceptible practices, as unreflective, of their everyday life.
In other words, young people are constantly producing social boundaries and distances through language, practices and tastes: for example, whenever a discotheque is chosen or evaluated, judged or labelled, an individual or a group of young people from the photo of their Facebook profile or their way of talking, dressing and dancing. In this regard, Martínez combines the contributions of Pierre Bourdieu in his analysis of the strategies of cultural distinction and the look of Paul Willis in his perspective of a working class that develops its own cultural strategies to emancipate from the encotillaments that it imposes legitimate culture through the construction of authentic forms of expression.

From the same survey as Ariño and Llopis, in the 2014 edition, Laporte and Bobes (2015) draw the classification of young Catalans into four groups of cultural practices: the first group is more oriented to the use of internet, video games and listening to music. In fact, the younger ones are those who use the internet more (100% in the 14-19-year olds), listen to music (98% in the 14-24 year olds) and play the most in video games (58% in between those who are 14-19 years old).

The other side of the currency of these practices is observed in the reading of newspapers and television consumption. Young people are increasingly substituting the content of television and the internet press. Indeed, 89% of young people aged between 14 and 34 declare watching TV, a percentage that is high due to their magnitude, but which is decreasing in time and lower in relation to other age groups.

A third group is constituted to visits to the cinema, concerts and spectacles, as well as reading books. Apart from reading books, which we will discuss later, all the practices have a strong negative correlation with age, although lower rates are observed in the first section of 14 to 19 years.

Leisure as a Cultural Learning Context
Part of the Spanish and Catalan academic literature has been devoted to studying cultural practices that are closely linked to leisure. Cebollada, García and López (2012) propose an analysis of the leisure activities of young people as forms of cultural learning, based on data from the Youth Survey of Catalonia 2012. The Catalan Youth Survey is an official statistic of the Government of Catalonia that focuses on living conditions among young people and on processes of transition to adult life every 5 years. The work of the referred authors, is one of the chapters of analysis of the results of the survey.
The conclusions of their analysis suggest that youth leisure activities are influenced by the relationship needs, approximated by age, and the expression of gender differences and the social position of the family. They also show that technological change influences ways of doing traditional leisure activities, which are partially replaced by their technological variants. The economic crisis accentuates this effect.

On the other side, the habit of doing relational activities is associated with privileged social indicators, gender (women) and age (young people). Instead, the habit of doing recreational and digital activities is associated with non-privileged indicators. Young people with a lower social position, specifically of immigrant origin, are those who attend more religious activities and at the same time those who have more isolated cultural practices as a social group.

In this study, the authors find that the leisure practices of other social groups are more influenced by age or gender, than by social class. This differs in part from what Ariño and Llopis point to when they observe cultural practices beyond leisure, therefore taking into account the most traditional cultural practices (museums, theater, etc.).

For his part, Caballo, Varela and Nájera (2017), present the relationship between the forms of socialisation and leisure of young people in Spain. The study "From educational times to social times: the daily construction of being young in a network society. Specific problems and social-pedagogical alternatives", analyses the use of free time through a questionnaire applied in the course 2015-2016 to a sample of 2,694 students in Post-Compulsory Secondary Education. The predominance of practices associated with leisure, cultural and festive entertainment aspects, with the solidarity dimension being residual. Of particular note are temporary barriers and the literacy deficit in leisure activities.

Once again, class differences emerge. Socialisation in valuable leisure experiences generates differences in the construction of youth identities. The set of know-how, skills and interests that can be developed in disadvantaged contexts differs widely from the opportunities with which they are counted in educatively enriching scenarios. The differentiated roles that boys and girls assume in this stage of life limit the possibilities of women to participate in leisure activities they wish to undertake.
The results obtained show that young people who study Post-Compulsory Secondary Education, in their free time, develop practices linked to playful (sport, digital leisure), creative (cultural activities) and festive dimensions (Caballo, 2015). Notable is the lack of civic involvement of young people in volunteer work or through associationism. The authors considered that the solidarity dimension of leisure is fundamental for the construction of youth identity by reporting important personal and social benefits. Because the time being shared voluntarily and disinterested is oriented to the exercise of active citizenship. However, the internet and social media are changing the ways of exercising the solidarity dimension, giving rise to virtual volunteering (Herrán and Viñals, 2011). New forms of citizen participation in online modes modify the ways that people have to interact (Subirats, 2011), generating links and horizontal ties that suppose a deep change in the conception of solidarity leisure.

Other studies seek to guide policies and pedagogies towards entertainment, as a basis of cultural learning for young people. This is the case of Ricoy and Fernández-Rodríguez’s study (2016), which uses a qualitative approach to understand how young people develop good leisure practices. Therefore, the study seeks to guide adolescents through the practice of leisure activities in order to facilitate healthy behaviours, which are considered to have a positive impact on their academic performance.

Activities associated with sports, music and the digital world were especially highlighted as relevant. Among the latter activities, the subject sample mention watching TV, chatting, surfing the net and playing video games. Using social networks is not rated as an especially relevant activity. On the other hand, they show preference for activities carried out individually and with other people within their age group. Activities carried out with family members and indoors are not frequently reported. Consumerist habits do not have a relevant role.

Informal Cultural Practices
The most creative cultural practices of young people have also been analysed in different projects based on qualitative techniques, such as Ricart and Saurí (2009) on the artistic projects of community intervention carried out by young people in Catalonia. According to the conclusions of their study, many of the activities offered to young people to participate in creative cultural processes are largely conditioned by the organisers and determined by pre-established meanings. On the other hand, they observe that art and artistic expression remain practically annulled in the context of formal education and only find space to develop in very informal areas.
For the authors, it is necessary to extend the concept of art to the existence of creative manifestations of the youth field, and away from the most orthodox and elitist concepts of art. Creativity expressed through art is related to cultural practices, to particular contexts and social structures. Awareness of the artistic fact as a social construction is the key to achieving greater democratisation of art while at the same time approaching young people from a new perspective.

Media Literacy
The studies on the use of ICTs by young people have received much interest in recent years, as we have seen. So is the study of Bernete (2007) about the use of ICTs and the cultural, linguistic and informative practices that are derived from them. The study of Bernete put on the table the fact that young people nowadays have their own spaces for cultural creation thanks to ICT. However, the elements that take part of this youth culture are quickly consumed and expire immediately. This rapidity in the consumption and the expiration of the language and the cultural contents of online communication contrasts in an extraordinary way with the cultural transmission model of formal education. For this reason, the use of ICT as a cultural practice arouses distrust from experts, other adults, and above all by teachers.

As Ariño and Llopis (2017) pointed out, new technologies (or as they say, socio-technologies), are changing ways of generating culture. Therefore, it is not just about cultural participation of young people, but about creating and producing cultural practices through networks and mobile applications.

Reig and Vilchez (2013) claim that the extension of the use of mobiles as a source of information is changing the way young people learn. Self-learning, new educational contexts and non-formal learning that ICT facilitates and empowers should be aspects to be considered by teachers, parents and policy makers. They are often reluctant to recognise the educational possibilities in non-formal contexts of non-controlling means. To do this, it is necessary to consider the different components of education that ICT imply: cognitive development (sequencing, spatio-temporal schemes and cognitive structures), individualisation (emotional-affective, ethical and moral consistency) and socialisation as to person and as a citizen. They understand that smartphones have not invented or created the problems of today's teenagers. They simply offer a new scenario of and for the lives of young people, at a stage in which the processes of socialisation and of opening to the "other" are fundamental for the construction of their personality.
On the other hand, media literacy has been consolidated as a relevant concept in Catalonia, but it is closely linked to the international studios compass about media and the new communication formats. Some studies address the question of how media can contribute to the cultural literacy of young people.

One of the featured works are the ones by Pérez Tornero. In his latest book (2017), he proposes how new communication environments make new forms of literacy necessary and have a direct impact on the social contexts of education. Technology poses a strain on the distribution of traditional educational resources (classrooms, spaces, and time). It is a factor of changes in the educational panorama, but it exist an important gap between the spatio-temporal configurations of formal education and the ones that provide the new communication environments, created by the convergence between media and digitalisation. A situation that will undoubtedly lead to processes of innovation.

In fact, according to Brazuelo and Gallego (2011), the emergence of mobile technologies (MP3, PDA, iPad, eBooks, mobile phones, etc.) is causing the emergence of a new educational paradigm: Mobile Learning. They are committed to integrating mobile devices, especially the telephone, as educational tools inside and outside the classroom, considering that the mobile phone has become the most widespread media in the world, especially among young people.

Cultural Policies as a Form of Cultural Democratization
Ariño (2010) distinguishes between the concepts of ‘cultural democratization’ and ‘cultural democracy’. The first concept refers to the capacity of cultural policies to facilitate access to cultural assets in large areas of society. The second concept refers to the recognition of the various cultural expressions existing in society as part of legitimate culture. According to Ariño, changes in access to cultural devices such as television, telephone, computer, etc. have produced a transition in the meaning and legitimacy of cultural policies. They undermine the historical nexus that associated reading to high culture. That is why he believes that the most effective cultural policy would be a powerful and modern educational policy that would combine access paradigms (cultural democratization) and recognition (cultural democracy). But this cultural policy should also consider inequalities. Therefore, its action should be based on correcting these inequalities through educational policy. In fact, Ariño is talking about how cultural literacy should be based on the connection between school cultural socialization and the informal and diverse cultural practices that young people practice in their sociability spaces.
Regarding cultural policies in Catalonia, Xavier Fina (2010) discusses how these have been implemented since the National Youth Plan of Catalonia in 2005. There is a change in the cultural space that puts more emphasis on the dimensions of creation and dissemination. It reinforces the democratizing role of culture and connects with the processes of the construction of youth identities. This model is reflected in the Local Youth Plans of the Catalan municipalities, which have included new areas of action in youth policies over the last decade. Specifically, cultural programming is the field of action that concentrates more efforts on the part of town halls, with a heavy supply of young people in the major festivals and local leisure activities. The co-responsibility of programs shared with the councils of culture is an extended and consolidated fact.

Memory Policies as Part of Cultural Policy
The European research Myplace (2012), which included 14 European countries and 17 research groups, had an objective to investigate how today’s young Europeans are involved in the processes of transmission of memories of the recent past, considering conflicting stories that take part in it, and how this influences them in their civic-political involvement in their environments. This study shows that there is an explanatory relationship between having received knowledge about the past through family memory and the political involvement of young people. The family is a framework of first-class political socialisation. That's why memory plays such an important role. This is, in turn, a demobilization factor for those young people who are socialised in the context of fear of the past, and in return for conflicts.

Since the end of Franco's dictatorship, there is an important gap between the institutional memory policies and the action carried out by associations which represent the repressed people of the dictatorship. Historically, the two major Spanish parties (PP and PSOE) have had little interest in carrying out a memory policy about the victims of the civil war and the Franco regime. In fact, the Popular Party has adopted a hostile position in any act of reparation or recognition of the victims of the Franco regime from the government of José María Aznar.

In this sense, memory policies differ substantially in Spain and Catalonia, as shown in the Rovira study (2014) on the construction of the memory of the Political Transition in Spain.
The difficulties in establishing a consensus in the Spanish Congress on memory policies have prevented a clear policy of repair and restoration of the memory of the victims of the Franco regime being carried out, while the symbols of the dictatorship (such as the Valley of the Fallen and the names of the streets referred to the leaders of the Franco regime) have remained in many places in Spain.

In the case of Catalonia, the creation of the Democratic Memorial in 2007 represents a turning point. This institution is born from the pressure of civil society. At the same time, it makes an exercise of return to this civil society through the dignification of the victims, organised in Catalonia in numerous associations. The Democratic Memorial also plays an educational role of the highest order, aimed at schools, with various activities and exhibition itineraries. The Memorial counts, in this sense, with the recourse of the Museum of Exile and other museums, such as the battle of the Ebro.

As explained by Ferrer-Fons, Rovira and Saurí (2012), in recent years, educational curricula have introduced the history of the Civil War and Francoism from a more solid perspective, but it is mainly through the activities promoted from the Democratic Memorial, with the students' work on the effects of war and the Franco regime in their immediate surroundings, that the school curriculum has been incorporating a critical look at the recent past.

On the knowledge that results, there are not many studies that evaluate the knowledge that students of the past have. And therefore, it serves as a reference to how memory policies affect cultural literacy. However, we can consult the study by Sáiz and López (2015), about the historical competences and narratives that we can find among students and future Spanish teachers of secondary education. The study is about the historical narratives of the students in the secondary education teacher training program. Most of the student reproduce in an uncritical way the narrative developed during the Political Transition, which represented the Franco regime and the same transition in a story based on the idea of exemplarity. The lack of criticism regarding the past may have an impact on the formation of students' knowledge.
On the other hand, as Rovira (2014) has pointed out in his thesis on the memory of the transition, the media have played a preeminent role in the creation of a mythified knowledge of the past, ignoring the knowledge from the socio-political context in which the events were developed, and places the leading role and the successful strategy of the political leaders at the centre of the narration.
Discussion

We begin from the fact that there is no literature in Spain and Catalonia explicitly devoted to cultural literacy. Our discussion is based on the three search parameters we have used to embrace the set of studies dedicated to cultural formation, identity and cultural practice. Once this frame of analysis of the academic literature has been obtained, we can adapt the existing literature in relation to the objectives and research questions of CHIEF.

Towards Intercultural Education?

The most interesting thing is that the concept of 'cultural literacy', despite being absent, allows us to understand very clearly the connections between formal education and informal cultural practices regarding the formation of the cultural background of young people. We can say that formal education and informal cultural practices are the poles of a continuum of possibilities. On the one hand, through studies on formal education we can see how the school curriculum is incorporating a series of ‘new’ subjects among traditional subjects. Through these cross-curricular subjects, the new referents of education have been incorporated, especially those referring to European values and the incorporation of new citizen rights, gender, respect for diversity, the environment, etc. The assumption of the European context as a multicultural and multilingual dimension has clearly affected education in Catalonia and Spain. However, this has not completely transformed the central trunk of the curriculum, which continues to be articulated around the traditional division by subjects (mathematics, language, history, technology, etc.).

On the other hand, we missed studies on how intercultural education is articulated in practice. From the Bonal and Rambla study (1999) on the recontextualisation process of education diversity, we know that schools tend to fit compartmentalise diversity in order to manage it, either by classifying students through levels in different classrooms, or by encapsulating the contents from a predefined structure. In their study, Bonal and Rambla demonstrated how teachers recontextualise new educational proposals in traditional schemes. The complexity of a school with increasingly diverse students and a multicultural context forces us to ask ourselves again if the school is assuming a change that leads to a cultural literacy that connects with young peoples’ social reality, or a recontextualization of new content is occurring from old schemes.
Is the role of history as part of the cultural background transmitted by the school changing enough to incorporate this multicultural dimension? Is it part of the migratory trajectories of young people in order to make them understand the cultural background they have acquired at home and what they can acquire at school?

Studies have focused a lot on historical literacy as part of cultural literacy, but it is only a part and there is an important gap in academic literature. In the context of historical literacy there is a preference for better training the future teachers in a much more complex and less factual vision of history. Causality, past-present-future relationship must be interrelated. To get historically more trained students, teachers need to learn how to build bridges between knowledge about the past and their implications in the social context of the present.

**Do new approaches of teaching based on competences increase cultural literacy?**

New approaches on how formal education is incorporating competences as a basis for the transmission and evaluation of knowledge in the school allows us to glimpse a new change that can have deeper consequences. It must be assumed that greater flexibility in content, guiding education based on competences, can help to build a more open cultural framework, more permeable to the diversity of society. In this sense, it would be interesting to be able to incorporate studies on how teachers are preparing themselves for this change. And it is received by students. Can the teaching and learning through competences increase cultural literacy? Studies on the identity and cultural practices of young people indicate that in Catalonia there is a new generation of young people living in a context of cultural diversity and hybrid identities. But what about the teachers who have to train these young people? Have they a multicultural background to teach in a multicultural context?

Various basic competences such as digital, communicative or social competences are closely related to cultural and intercultural learning. There is also a consensus that currently, when studying the processes of cultural learning of youth, formal, non-formal and informal education must be taken into account. Also, it is necessary to consider the processes of youth identity creation that are often in contradiction with the adult's eyes. New technologies appear as a relevant element to keep in mind. The CHIEF project should consider digital literacy as a dimension of cultural literacy.
Hybrid youth identities, but who?
The context in which many young Catalans build their identity is undoubtedly transnational. At the same time, autochthonous young people share a context of high cultural diversity in their learning and leisure environment. We have qualitative and theoretical studies that tell us about cultural hybridization as part of the new youth identities. This relational analysis of identity is an important contribution to the understanding of certain youth dynamics in specific social spaces. But we need to know how these dynamics are transforming the assumption of national frameworks.

Through research on youth and national identity in Catalonia, we can observe the two national frameworks in competition in Catalonia (Spanish and Catalan) and how the processes of institutionalization of these two national identities can affect young people indirectly. We do not have many studies focused specifically on the young population. In spite of this, there are some studies, such as Pujolar, González and Martínez (2010), about the linguistic behaviour of young Catalans, who point to a clear tendency towards the assumption of bilingualism and a dual culture, while reinforcing a Catalan identity with different intensities and combinations with other identities. But we still need other studies to tell us what cleavages occur in this context of diversity and what are the new forms of institutionalisation of cultural and social identity. What relationship is established between the social class, or the gender, and the new hybrid youth identities. And finally, what relationship exists between youth transnational identities and the accommodation of young people in a complex national context.

A new cultural generation?
If traditionally the youth culture has been studied as an age culture, it is necessary to consider to what extent new youth cultural practices include genuinely generational components. If the cultural literacy is transformed, it is necessary to count that the current Catalan youth is a transmitter of a new generational culture. As Ariño and Llopis (2017) say, new technologies are changing the way of generating culture. Therefore, it is not just about cultural participation of young people, but directly creating and producing cultural practices through networks and mobile applications.

Therefore, it is important that academic research allows us to point out the generational change that occurs in the way of interpreting and living the culture. For younger generations, the concept of culture extends and embraces other forms of culture apart from those that had been conceived so far, even when talking about high culture. Gastronomy, the cinema, the intangible heritage, the popular culture, the history of modern music and so forth.
Even so, it is observed that the cultural literacy acquired in the field of formal education has its weight when it comes to establishing what is the 'legitimate culture'. This is very interesting because it indicates that, although the cultural practices associated with the stage of youth are very influential in social relations, they do not completely change the notion of legitimate culture that has been internalised. In the same way, it is important to know that the cultural practices of the young Catalans are heavily influenced by their educational level and the social class of adscription. On the other hand, we also know that young people are more active (with more practices) culturally than adults.

ICTs as a new framework for 'cultural literacy'?
The contribution made by academic literature on the role of ICT as an indivisible component of the new political identities is interesting. The studies on the use of ICT by young people and the cultural, linguistic and informative practices that are derived from them, put on the table the fact that young people nowadays have spaces of cultural creation (which include a language and some own referents) that are very easy to manage and build as exclusive spaces thanks to ICT. On the other hand, the educational system is also analysed from the point of view of its ability to incorporate the use of ICT as a learning tool. The academic literature, from different contributions, indicates a space of convergence between institutionalised knowledge in formal education and spontaneous cultural practices of young people. But there is still a need for research in this area.

Some shortcomings
One of the fields in which interesting practices of non-formal or informal education in Catalonia are being developed are the projects that relate the school to cultural institutions. One of these projects is what is known as 'Tandem Schools' and is promoted by the La Pedrera Foundation. This program, which started in the 2011-2012 academic year, links each school that participates with a cultural institution, whether it be a museum, a music school, a language school, etc. The project is inspired by the model of the Magnet Schools, creating in each case a new educational project that revolves around a specialisation in a singular subject that vertebra the curriculum of the participating educational centres. To achieve this, a partnership is established for 3 years between these educational centres with reference institutions, with the advice, monitoring and financing of the Fundació Catalunya-La Pedrera, and the collaboration of the Department of Education, Teaching of the Catalan government.
There is a lack of studies that analyse how these new projects are focusing on 'cultural literacy' and their understanding in the context of formal and non-formal education. There are other projects that work in the same way. For example, In Residence, a program of Barcelona City Council that incorporates an artist into a high school during a year to develop a project with students. In general, we find missing gaps in the literature about the artistic practices of young people in Catalonia and Spain. In the reports published by the National Council of Culture and the Arts (CoNCA) in Catalonia not much attention is given to young people as creators.

On the other hand, there are studies that connect cultural literacy with leisure and education, which has a strong roots in Catalonia, with hundreds of organisations and thousands of young people involved. There are a lot of guides and good practices, but no enquiries about the implications of these practices, in terms of intercultural education and learning to participate in society.
Concluding Remarks

As we mentioned before, we have not been able to identify a research line that corresponds exactly to the perspective of CHIEF, although we have observed how the concept of 'cultural literacy' is already used in the field of media research. In fact, this research tells us how media and new technologies are forcing a new way of understanding education and cultural participation. The internet not only represents a new technological environment, but also a new learning environment. From this point of view, the research on education can no longer ignore the challenge of learning and acquiring knowledge about the cultural background by the new generations in a way that is radically different from what has been done up until this point.

With regards to the challenges posed by the CHIEF project, through the literature consulted in Spain and Catalonia it becomes clear that there is a gap between the culture transmitted through formal education and this new great cultural space that is the internet and new technologies. The capacity for access and cultural participation that they allow are giving young people the opportunity to be the protagonists of their own cultural training. As the surveys on cultural practices and studies on formal education prove, this has a very important role in defining the cultural framework in which young people are formed. But as Pierre Bourdieu explained many years ago, the culture transmitted through the educational system, school culture, is above all the culture of the middle classes with cultural and educational capital. Should we expect new technologies and the internet to break through this classical social inequality? This is what research still has to respond to us. At the moment, studies on the use of new technologies raise pedagogical and psychological issues around learning processes, such as the possibility of making more interdisciplinary and flexible teaching, or the ease of acquiring knowledge individually in the case of disadvantaged students, as shown in a study on the reception classrooms for immigrants from Rovira and Saurí (2009). But we would need more studies on how culture is being acquired in non-formal and informal settings, to know the extent to which it connects or disconnects the culture transmitted by the educational system, as we are thinking of in the CHIEF project.
We need to go further the dichotomy formal vs non-formal and informal educational spheres. If not, we lose part of the history and in this sense, the CHIEF research design is on the right path in exploring the different contexts.

On the other hand, the academic literature tells us that there is a process of cultural hybridization that is quite marked in the case of young Catalans. It should be taken into account that in 10 years, 2% of young people of foreign origin have gone from 2000 to 20.9% in 2017, in the context of the greatest exponential growth in a European territory of international migrations during the first decade of 2000. This demographic change is changing Catalan society in profound ways that the academic literature cannot yet fully grasp. There are partial approaches, some ethnographies, as well as some statistics on young people and their cultural practices. But we still need to go deeper into this field to understand how cultural diversity is building new frames for the socialisation of young people in a coexistence environment. This is one of the challenges that we hope to tackle with the CHIEF project.
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About CHIEF

CHIEF (The Cultural Heritage and Identities of Europe’s Future) aims to build an effective dialogue between different stakeholders in order to facilitate a future of Europe based on inclusive notions of cultural heritage and identity. The project focuses on the production and transition of cultural knowledge in both formal educational settings initiated from above, and a variety of informal human interactions. CHIEF will contribute to understanding and enhancing cultural literacy for young people, and the project will lead to more effective use of European cultural heritage as a site of production, translation and exchange of heterogeneous cultural knowledge. It will also help to recognise existing innovative practices and develop a new organisational model to enhance the cultural and inter-cultural competence of young Europeans.

CHIEF is funded by the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 Programme. It brings together ten partner institutions:

- Aston University, United Kingdom
- Daugavpils Universitate, Latvia
- Institut Drustvenih Znanosti Ivo Pilar, Croatia
- Caucasus Research Resource Centres, Georgia
- Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
- Universidad Pompeu Fabra, Spain
- Culture Coventry, United Kingdom
- Univerzita Komenskeho V Bratislave, Slovakia
- The Savitribai Phule Pune University, India
- Hochschule Fuer Angewandte Wissenschaften, Germany
Method

The key concepts used are, “cultural literary”, “cultural heritage”, “youth”, “education” and “culture” for this literature review. The search was conducted based on databases including DergiParkAkademik\(^{223}\), Google Scholar tr\(^{224}\), YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi\(^{225}\), Gençlik Birikimi\(^{226}\) which are used for searching national peer-reviewed journals, articles, books and thesis. It has not found any studies on “cultural literacy”. Although there are numerous publications on cultural heritage, it is linked with archaeology and tourism disciplines. We have limited our search using different syntaxes to correlate these concepts with our research topic as many results were conducted in terms of education, youth and culture: education in Turkey, education policies in Turkey, education and identity, education and multiculturalism, values education in Turkey, youth policies, youth studies, youth and its culture, youth and its profiles, youth and democracy, youth and daily life, youth and Europe (an-Union). We have included other texts in the literature review in the references of the studies considering that these texts are related to our research subject. Finally, our literature review is based on 49 sources.

\(^{223}\) http://dergipark.gov.tr/
\(^{224}\) https://scholar.google.com.tr/
\(^{225}\) https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/giris.jsp
\(^{226}\) http://genclikbirikimi.org/\(^{2}\), There are 24 sub-categories in this search engine. It is searched manually Youth and Culture/ Youth profile/ Youth studies/ Public Opinion on Youth/Subcultures” which are regarding our research topic from these sub-categories.
Introduction

A 33 session international conference titled, “Youth and Our Cultural Heritage”, was held on May 16-18, 2014 as a joint venture with Youth and Sports Ministry and 19 Mayıs University. It was one of the rare events where youth and cultural heritage issues were contextualized together. On the other hand, even the keynote speech of chairman of organizing committee reflects how the cultural heritage was handled from the very beginning in a narrow and protectionist manner.

The phenomena of globalization; it either eliminates many values from each culture or transforms the world into a global village which leads to uniformity by way of disrupting the basic qualities of culture, such as locality, nationality, local diversity and originality. In this process, many of our material and moral values and our cultural identity are certainly destroyed. Over the last fifty years of industrialization and mechanization of agriculture, the process of urbanization was the inevitable corollary. The importance of the issue will be better understood regarding the national and moral values we have lost and the corruption we encounter.

At this point, it has great importance for our nation’s vitality to discuss the problems of general culture and policies, to transfer cultural codes and values to next generations and in providing a road map for this, to create a reference source for the future government policies, and put forward an academic perspective on the issue (Şişman, 2014, p.13-14).

When we look at the existing literature on cultural literacy, cultural identities, and cultural interactions of young people in Turkey in relation to our research topic, it is possible to state that there has not been an established literature on the issue of ‘cultural literacy’ yet. The concept of Cultural Heritage is gradually being used. Nevertheless, as shown in the example above, the concept of cultural heritage is approached as dating back from, ‘our past’, which is partly threatened under current conditions, and a set of abstract and concrete values is to be preserved and transferred to the next generations.

Widespread perception and use of the concept restricts us to address the issue from the beginning. However, it is possible to indicate that discussions that are directly related to our research subject are conducted in literature under the different concepts and themes of education, youth, and culture. It could be observed that there has been an increasing interest toward youth studies and identities of young people especially after 2000s. Below, we have tried to examine the discussions that have come to the forefront in the context of these studies under the titles of education and youth.
Findings

Education in Turkey for Raising Young People

Education has been included as an instrument to transform society starting with the modernization efforts during the final periods of the Ottoman Empire and extending into the nation-building process. This influence of education manifested itself in various ways with the change of the policies that were adopted in a certain period. The emergence of ideological perspectives in the determination of the policies that guided the educational practices, the frequently and quickly realized radical changes in the area of education have made it impossible to examine the educational discussions as separate from the political and economic developments.

The thoughts of popularization and social utility that were given place in the educational policies starting with the establishment of the Republic till 1980s have undergone a huge transformation with the understanding of neoliberalism that was developed after 1980. With the attempt of directing the educational sphere, which was under the responsibility of the state in the previous periods to a certain extent, to commercialization and the rules of competitive market, the ‘solidarist’ relationship that was effective on the educational policies was replaced by a relationship that was based on ‘pricing’ (Apple, 2002; Dil, 2009; Çeken, 2006 cited in Asri 2015, p. 86). The neoliberal policies that were supported by IMF and World Bank have initiated the period of privatization and localization processes in education. The relationship of the educational policy of the Republican era, which was centralist and based on modern nation-state, and the discussions of privatization and localization (Asri 2015) after 1980 with the neoliberal policies, has directly affected the current educational discussion. And behind all these discussions, we could see the trace of different political approaches with regard to the type of youth that the government wanted to raise. Therefore, we could actually derive quite important results as to the meaning, role, and identity that are attributed to the youth in Turkey by examining the following areas of discussion that look like technical and administrative subjects in education at first sight.

The recent educational discussions in Turkey have, for the most part, revolved around the following issues:

- The duality of localism-centralism,
- The privatization of education and policy of encouraging private schools,
- Compulsory religious course, the headscarf ban in universities, and the problem of secular & religious education that is embodied in religious vocational high schools and values education,
The issues of multiculturalism-interculturality that have intensified after Turkey’s candidacy for the EU.

The Educational Discussions Revolving Around the Issues of Localism-Centralization
It has been observed that the educational system in Turkey does not work well which has been connected to the fact that the organizational structure of education in Turkey is extremely centralist and taxing. There are certain qualitative and quantitative studies indicating that one of the most emphasized problems of the educational system is its centralist structure upon analyzing the studies that have been conducted in terms of the problems of the educational system and the variables it involves (such as schools’ physical structure, curricula, and the sufficiency of the resources) (Kürşat and Altımkurt, 2011 cited in Şişman 2011).

With the introduction of the Law on Unity of Education on 3 March 1924, all the educational institutions in the country were linked to the Ministry of Education. Füsun Akarsu (2000) states that the rationale behind handing over the issue of education to the Ministry of Education was a statist, top-down, and coercive educational philosophy that attempted to make people accept the educational demands of the government. She highlights that this educational understanding is concretely manifested in the grey, monotonous, and ugly school buildings that are produced from a uniform(ibid.) project and which fail to suit the local climate conditions. According to Akarsu, uniform curricula and uniform educational practices constitute a type of education that is not embraced by the public. Even though Akarsu does not articulate an alternative to centralization, her contribution is significant since it directly criticizes the centralization in of the educational system and thereby fills-in a void regarding a systematic criticism of the educational system in Turkey.

Cengiz Akçay (2006) states that when the centralist and decentralist understandings of administration are examined, they both appear to entail advantages and disadvantages. In his book, Akçay provides a detailed comparative analysis of localism and centralism. He remarks that a local government understanding provides an opportunity for a more suitable educational programme for the local conditions; however, he also states that the most important aspect of central government is equality of opportunities in education with a constant and systematic educational policy (Akçay, 2006).
Critical approaches to neoliberal education policies have often pointed on issues of neo-conservatism and localization. Aydoğan claims that the localization discussions have been initiated so as to strengthen the infrastructure of the privatization practices in education. According to Aydoğan, on the one hand the problems that arise out of centralized administration are illustrated so as to introduce decentralized practices in education and on the other hand the importance of localization is emphasized. These are the indicators demonstrating that privatization policies need to be legitimized in education (Aydoğan 2008).

Privatization Discussions in Education
The privatization policies in Turkey recently went hand in hand with the conservative turn in education (İnal and Akkaymak, 2012). The quest of profit making in the field of education allowed room for the emergence of a number of private schools and other educational institutions with direct links religious groups and communities. Even though these private schools and institutions generally follow the state curriculum, they often bring together peers outside of school through various activities (such as praying together or having religious conversations). However, the conservative education of the state schools and schools of the religious sects directed the families who wanted to provide their children with secular education to private schools which claimed that they would meet this need.

As a result of the neoliberal policies after 1980, public expenditure in education dropped. Fatma Gök (2004, p.101) states that the decrease in the expenditure per student and the deterioration in education led to distrust toward state schools and the management of educational system by the state. The fact that the quality of education decreased due to the implemented educational policies caused the wealthy families to send their children to private schools for receiving a better education (Gök, 2004). The percentage of private schools in Turkey among the schools that provide formal education has exceeded 7%.

Fatma Gök’s study (2007) has shown how the state is engaging in a hands-off approach of the educational sphere. Private schools that promise students a better future include all sorts of activities to their programmes that could serve as an “indicator of a better education.” For example, foreign language education, being in touch with international educational institutions or developing joint programmes with those institutions, student mobility, national and international trips, different educational programmes such as the popular coding and robotic trainings, and organization of various social activities.
The financial sources that are transferred to the educational activities from state funds have dwindled. The decrease in public funds has forced the schools in poor neighborhoods to ask for money from the parents who cannot meet these demands. Gök (2007) describes the decrease of public expenditures in the educational areas as a great attack on poor people’s right to education.

The transformation of educational policies in Turkey during AKP rule has proceeded through two interrelated channels, namely neoliberal and conservative transformation (İnal and Akkaymak, 2012; Lüküslü, 2016). According to İnal and Akkaymak, the curricula and school textbooks that have started to be revised since 2002, the removal of the laws that restricted religious education, and the fact that there has been a increase in the amount of Quran and other religious courses have meant that AKP has been able to integrate its neo-conservative ideology to education. Since there has been no improvement in the quality of educational provision even though the number of high schools and universities has increased, especially after the accession to power of AKP, the students were forced to go to private teaching institutions so as to become successful in the central examination and enter into the highest rated high schools and universities. The students who were not able to acquire the success they desired in public schools, preferred to go to private schools by paying a lot of money (İnal and Akkaymak, 2012). İnal & Akkaymak (2012) have carried out the political and ideological analysis of the neoliberal transformation of education during AKP rule through the concept of conservatism.

Practices such as the revision of textbooks and curricula, and performance evaluation for instructors took effect; laws that restricted religious education were eliminated, and in the meanwhile the number of places that offered Qur’an courses showed a considerable increase. İnal and Akkaymak states that the party aims to change the modernist role of education, and thereby the emphasis put on religious education has increased. They also remark that AKP has been criticizing co-education, and it has been extolling single-sex schools and classes by defending the idea that single-sex schools are more useful for students’ physiological, mental, and social well-being. Apart from all these studies, they emphasize the fact that no investment has been made so as to improve the quality of education, and families and young people are directed to alternative education sources such as private lessons or courses.
The Discussions around the Problematic Secular Education
The religious education in Turkey has been introduced with the Law on Unity of Education in 1924 and it has raised numerous discussions. Even though it has been one of the most controversial subjects, the discussions on these issues were mostly guided by political preferences rather than pedagogical approaches and two opposing views were constantly defended. One of these views dictates that religion (Islam) is one of the historical, even national values; therefore, religious education should be definitely provided. According to this view, it is the lack of good religious and moral education that lies at the root of the unrest in the society (Okutan, 1980 cited in Güvendi, 2015 p.176). The second opposing view argues that Turkey is a secular country and compulsory religious education should not be included in the schools of a secular country (Koçer, 1967 cited in Güvendi, 2015). According to the people who support this view, having religious courses in schools presents a threat for Ataturk’s principles and modernization (Aydıın, 2007). There have been discussions in Turkey regarding the religious courses; religious courses have been questioned through different practices. At times the religious courses were completely eliminated from the curricula and at times there were included in the curricula as elective courses; they were compulsory on occasion. The discussions with regard to these courses are still relevant and the issue as to how these courses will be taught still continues. (Aydıın, 2007)

The presence of religious education as part of the school curriculum is key in understanding key trends in education policy in Turkey. This issue is important in terms of understanding educational policies in Turkey. Bahçekapılı (2015) provides a quite detailed account of the history of religious education in Turkey and discusses the Religious Vocational High Schools by placing the discussion in the context of 4+4+4 educational system. He states that religious education was banned by the “Kemalist regime” during the first years of the Republic; it was then included in the curricula under the control of the state starting with 1950s, and it acquired legitimacy in the eye of the society between 1980-1994. Bahçekapılı remarks that the intensification of religious education during AKP rule was realized for the purposes of democratization and demilitarization. With regard to the religious vocational high schools, Bahçekapılı proceeds in the discussion by contextualizing it within the 4+4+4 educational system.

On March 20 2012, controversial education reform in Turkey was passed into law. The bill lengthened mandatory education from eight to twelve years. Known as 4+4+4, the legislation now requires a compulsory four years of primary school, four years of middle school and four years of secondary school.
According to him, the new education system, which includes four years of primary school education, four years of secondary school education, and four years of high school education, has paved the way for the increase witnessed in the number of religious vocational high schools. Bahçekapılı (2015) states that this increase in the number of religious vocational high schools is significant in terms of creating a generation who receive religious education. Bahçekapılı’s study is significant in terms of understanding the religious education policies in Turkey from a conservative perspective. In addition, he assumes the given religious education representing the belief system of every individuals and social groups in Turkey. Therefore, he ignores the diversities within belief systems in society, and legitimizes the mainstream Islamic sect in the country.

Values Education
The concept of “values education” has been increasingly used in the aftermath of the EU Accession Negotiations in 2005. This concept has emerged as part of facilitating the process of Turkey’s integration to the EU (Kumbasar, 2011). The book titled Values Education compiled by Ayhan Kaya (2016) and which is an output of a project that has been carried out so as to enable Turkey and the EU to meet on shared values, could be regarded as the most important study in the literature of values education. The book contains both qualitative and quantitative fieldworks, and all the actors in the educational sphere, the students and instructors in particular, have been include in the study.

One of the sections in the book is analysed the results on Turkey comparing other European countries based on the results from the latest wave of the European Values Survey. Young people were asked some questions about "Europe", "family", "religion", "politics", "society". According to the responses, Turkey should be evaluated or considered together with countries such as Poland and Spain. Regarding European identity, people in these countries are belonging to their own countries and regions rather than European (Kaya, 2016, pp.4). In addition, alternative pedagogical application suggestions are also included in the book. It is stated that it is important to build a bridge between formal education and informal education. Non-governmental organizations prepare various modules for the development of educational methods for teachers.

---

229 A good example is the publications section of the Council of Europe and the European Union's cooperation in the youth field. [http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/publications](http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/publications)
It is important that the teachers use these modules to improve classroom activities. Schools are often empty extracurricular time in Turkey. According to Kurtaran, using extracurricular time at schools by NGO who work on youth field will enable the relationship between formal and informal education. This relationship will make both forms of education more efficient. Moreover, conducting European projects with students and teachers is important in the context of values education. Because, for now, formal education is inadequate to transfer values education to young people’s daily life practices (Kurtaran, 2016, pp. 196-197).

The values education concept, which has also been included in the educational system in Turkey, has led to many discussions. The “universal values” have been linked with religious values in time, and these values were, to a large extent, included in the curricula in the form of religious values (Ural, 2015). Ural who points out the change of meaning that the concept of values education has undergone, characterizes values education as a cover that is employed so as to hide the chaos created by the educational policies after 2002. He remarks that the neoliberal values extolled by global capital and the values system are linked with neo-conservatism. He also states the fact that universal, fundamental human characteristics are linked with religious teachings and serve as an instrument for rendering education religious (Ural, 2015).

The Multiculturalism-Interculturalism Discussions in Education
From the late Ottoman period up to the early Turkish Republic era, especially relations with the West, the question about how to make contact with different societies and cultures, has an important place in the educational and cultural debates. As a matter of fact, one of the methods used in the search for solutions to the problems that the Ottoman Empire had begun in the 19th century was the dissemination of the Western style schools. In particular, the schools opened by the minorities in Istanbul and the missionary groups that began to spread in the country were also influential (Akyüz, 1982). These debates continued in the nation-state formation process. For example, Ziya Gökalp, one of the prominent thinkers of nation-state building, defined the goal for Turkish youth who knows the scientific development of the West, who is educated in the West, or at least studied at the Western-style schools, but has not broken away from its own cultural roots and who also knows and can read their own cultural codes (Gökalp, 1923). When communicating with other cultures, this is often referred to as getting technical knowledge of the West, but preserving its own culture, which has been frequently brought up again by different groups in later periods of the republic.
After the 1990s, the controversial issues/debates of the nation-state-building process continued to be discussed in terms of what is culture, multiculturalism and the educational content provided by the state should be. Therefore, studies about the image of Atatürk, Westernization, secularization, religion, Islamism, veiling, feminism and gender, minorities, Armenians, Kurds, mother tongue education, in fact, created a fertile environment to discuss about how the intercultural relationship in education is defined and taught. In the academic literature, new studies have emerged that invite to rethink the state and its role in the whole process. As an example of this period, we can give: Tekeli (1998), Gürbilek (2001), Navaro (2002), Akın (2004), Altnay (2004), Selek (2004), Maksudyan (2005), Süvari (2006), Bora (2006), Özyürek (2006).

Nevertheless, it is observed that a lot of studies conducted in the area of educational sciences do not generally touch upon ‘sensitive’ political issues and identity issues. The educational scientists who write about cultural identity (Safran 2008; Şıvgın 2009 cited in Çayır 2016, p.81) indicate that globalization and the EU integration process have caused the erosion of the national identity. The boundaries of Turkishness have been sharply drawn; however, no solution has been proposed as to how this erosion in question could be prevented.

The multiculturalism discussions have entered into the educational literature in Turkey through the EU Accession Negotiations. Multiculturalism, which refers to the way different cultures exist together, gives reference to the social structure during the Ottoman period in the Turkish educational literature. In the book written by Günay, Aydın and Koç (2015), it is stated that intolerance toward differences in contemporary Turkey is an unusual situation. It is emphasized that even though the Ottoman Empire consisted of many different ethnicities, people used to live in peace and this was due to the state’s policy. The writers of the aforementioned study interprets the current situation in which one cannot even voice the fact that Kurdish education is a fundamental human right in present Turkey as a conflict with the multi-language education in English, Italian, Spanish, Greek, Persian, Kurdish, Zaza language provided in the Ottoman Empires’s madrasahs. It is interesting to note that while advocating certain policies, scholars frequently and strategically refer to the Ottoman era in order to legitimize their ideas and persuade the public.

The concept of Interculturality in education, which points to interaction during cultural encounters, is elaborated by Kemal Çayır. He criticizes the essentialist nature of multiculturalist educational understanding as well (Çayır, 2016).
Çayır states that when the school textbooks in Turkish curricula are examined, an educational understanding that aims to create a homogenous nation just like in the first years of the Republic is maintained. According to Çayır, these books are still written with an understanding of national culture that ignores the different ethnic cultures, languages, and religions in Turkey. (Çayır, 2016) The problems that different ethnic groups experience in Turkey are now openly debated in public. The fact that languages such as Kurdish, Zaza, Laz, and Abkhazian, which are spoken in Turkey, are included in the curricula of the schools only as elective courses mean that it is accepted that there are other languages and cultures in this geography other than Turkish. Nevertheless, the existing historical account and collective identity identified in school textbooks are still constructed via ‘Turkishness’ and Turkish. (Çayır, 2016) For Çayır, this is about the essentialist quality of the multiculturalism concept. In his article, Çayır emphasizes that culture is a product of communication and it should be understood as a collective lifestyle.

The Change of Perception Regarding Youth over Time
The studies that focus on youth as a social category do not have an extensive place in the field of social sciences in Turkey. This field has started to thrive only after the second half of 2000s.

Although most of the studies on the issue of youth are carried out by Educational Sciences, other disciplines such as Psychology, Sociology, Social Services, and Theology also carry out academic studies in the area of youth. These youth studies concentrate on certain issues, such as youth and adolescence problems, intergenerational conflict, the educational processes of young people, and the problems young people encounter (Yaman, 2010).

In the studies that are carried out, the image of youth changes depending on the different historical phases in Turkey (Yaman 2013; Neyzi, 2004; Lüküслü, 2009). The idealized image of youth that was given the mission of “protecting the state” during the early periods of the Republic (1923-1950) was replaced by a “politicized youth” between 1960 and 1980. And after 1980, the image of youth has been described as “apolitical.” In 1990s, the image of youth has come into prominence with the Islamic, Kurdish identities as a result of the fact that social movements have gained momentum and identity politics have become significant.
The studies that the academic literature in the field of youth depends on are studies that have been carried out with quantitative method rather than qualitative method. Especially after 1980, there were quantitative studies that were conducted with the support of the Ministry of Education (e.g. Gökçe, 1984). One of the quantitative studies most frequently referenced in academic literature is the study arguing that the fundamental problems that young people encounter in social life are unemployment, insufficient education, and terror (KAF, 1999). The study titled ‘The Youth of 1990s in Turkey’ represents one of the first studies that has been conducted by using both qualitative and quantitative research methods in the field of youth studies so as to look at the general structure of youth in 1990s; the political identities and tendencies of young people; their personal attachments and involvement in parties, groups, and communities; their cultural positions and the existence of traditional-modern structures that influence these; their educational backgrounds, and also their approaches to violence (Kentel, 1995). In parallel with the increase of young population, the amount of research fieldwork undertaken in the field of youth studies has increased after 2000s (Yaman, 2013).

Three thematic subject matters have been chosen below so as to reflect the academic literature in the field of youth, and to represent the issues that have been problematized in the historical context of Turkey. These subject matters are as follows: politics, identity, and participation. Through these subject matters, we will on the one hand try to show how the category of youth has been constructed since the nation-state building process in Turkey, and on the other hand follow the traces with regard to how contemporary young people tend to resist or negotiate dominant constructions of youth. Besides, we hope to demonstrate how the young people’s relationship with politics was transformed as a result of sharing their common experiences through globalization and new communication technologies, and how young people try to find themselves a space in the social sphere with their identities.

Youth and Politics
The issue of young people’s relationship with politics in Turkey where the young population is quite high is one of the primary issues that the academic research and debate has focused on. There is a general tendency in the academic literature stating that nowadays the youth in Turkey does not have a strong relationship with politics (e.g. Erdoğan, 2009). The studies in this field carry out their evaluation by looking at young people’s conventional political participation such as being a member of a political party or a political party’s youth section.
On the other hand, as indicated in the literature, the young people whose conventional political participation is low have been at the forefront during the process of Gezi Park Demonstrations (2013), a significant place in terms of Turkish political life (İnal, 2014). The youth has participated in the political decision-making process through unconventional political participation, with demonstrations and boycott so as to speak, and become the carriers of the action.

Prior to Gezi Park Demonstrations, two names stand out in the academic literature of youth studies who have indicated that young people’s relationship to politics was undergoing a transformation against the thesis that young people’s participation in politics was low (Neyzi 2004, 2013; Lüküslü 2005, 2009, 2011). The following section of this literature review will touch upon the research of Neyzi (2004) and Lüküslü (2009, 2011) so as to depict a picture of Turkish youth’s relationship with politics.

The Construction of the Concept of Youth in Social Discourse
Neyzi (2005) examines the issue of how the concept of youth was constructed in the social discourse by separating the recent history of Turkey into three periods. The first period (1923-1950) corresponds to the establishment and development of the nation-state. In this new period, young people are located at the center of the social discourse. The first comprehensive youth study of the early Republican era coincides with the expectation of the recently established nation-state that the young people work hard. In this book, young people are addressed as a social category that is readily attached to the newly established national state, who will become successful with the modern educational system and who is expected to work hard (Erişçi, 1938 cited in Bayhan, 2015).

During the first years of Republic, Nutuk is shown as an example so as to point to the basic source of the construction of the discourse in question (Neyzi, 2004, p.116). The first President of Turkish Republic Mustafa Kemal Ataturk gave a speech in the parliament in 1927, which was later named as Nutuk and published as a book. In this speech, there is a section that directly addresses young people:

“Turkish youth! Your first duty is to maintain and protect Turkish independence and Turkish Republic forever. This is the primary basis of your existence and of your future. This constitutes your most valuable treasure. The child of Turkey’s future! Your duty is to save Turkish independence and the Republic. You will find the strength that you need to achieve this in the noble blood that flows in your veins!” [Ataturk, 1989: 1197]
The second period of Neyzi’s social discourse analysis is the period between 1950-1980. The young people are again at the forefront of the political debate of this period. While the government of this period was discharged through a coup d’état, the student movements had an important role within this process. Another development in terms of youth during this period was that they were affected by the youth movements that began in Europe in 1968 and young people started to organize among themselves. In the beginning of 1970s, revolutionary youth movement was on the rise. Besides, these years also witnessed the political polarization of the young people in universities. There were “left” and “right” wing students. In this period, the youth was reconstructed in the social discourse. Mass communication tools also contributed to this construction process. The youth is now referred to as a ‘threat’ (Neyzi, 2004, p.120). Even though the discourse on youth was different on the surface, the young people from 1923 to 1980 all internalized the duty of building the new nation (Neyzi, 2004, p.134).

The period after 1980 is the period during which the modernist youth construction underwent a breakdown. The youth experienced disappointment toward the promises of the nation-state and they wanted to participate more in the public sphere (Neyzi, 2002, p.135).

The Youth Myth and Turkish Youth After 1980
According to Lüküslü, Starting from the final periods of the Ottoman Empire, youth has constituted one of the most important myths of Turkish political culture, the ‘youth myth’ ( 2009, p.15). Youth myth is the political mission given to the category of youth that was constructed as a part of Turkey’s modernization process. The political mission given to the youth in this scene was to protect and save the state, and the young people internalized this political mission. It is necessary to look at the birth, development, and breaking point of this youth myth so as to understand youth.

1980 signifies a date in which political, economic, and cultural transformations were experienced, and the new period was initiated in Turkey. The generation after 1980 is both labelled and criticized. The labelling in question concerns the fact that the new generation was ‘apolitical;’ and the criticism that was directed against them was about the fact that they did not resemble the political generations that came before them like the generation of 68 and 78. On the other hand, the young generations after 1980 were not able to internalize the youth myth like the previous generations. The study focuses on the experiences of young people in its fieldwork so as to understand why young people are distant to the conventional ways of participating in politics.
A total of 80 young people between the ages of 18-25 who studied in state and private universities and worked were interviewed in depth in Istanbul between the years 2000 and 2004. As a result of these interviews, the researcher concludes that the young people are not indifferent to the period they live in; on the contrary, they are anxious about the neoliberalism they find themselves in. Instead of criticizing the youth for being apolitical, one needs to rethink politics so as to better understand the underlying reason as to why the young people stay away from conventional political arena (Lüküslü, 2009, p. 196-197). While looking at the new ways of engaging with politics, one can also look at the internet as the tool for new youth movements for producing alternative politics, which include personal blogs, young civilians, ekşi sözlük [a sort of urban dictionary, which is very popular among young people in Turkey] and so on (Lüküslü, 2011, p.50).

After Lüküslü’s research, when heterogenic identity profiles and youth participated vigorously in a social movement against the gentrification of Gezi Park in 2013 (known as Gezi Occupation Movement or Gezi events), it can be seen that on the one hand, once again the youth myth becomes visible in public opinion by undertaking a different mission. In other words, it is verified that they can be protagonists and pioneers of a new political transformation; on the other hand, society has started to admit that this generation can have a different way of doing politics, making priorities and carrying out strategies than from ex-generations (Göle 2013; Kirişçi 2013).

Youth and Identities
According to Lüküslü and Yücel (2013), when the youth after 1980 is compared with the previous generations, it presents a heterogeneous structure rather than a homogeneous one. In other words, it could be said that the number of young people that is not ‘ideal’ increased and the youth that was attempted to be rendered uniform was replaced by various ‘youths’ (Lüküslü and Yücel, 2013, p.16). In this context, the youth after 1980 has begun to bring itself into existence in the social sphere through identities. As examples, we can talk about the young people who defined their identities through the subcultures that were nourished by music movements such as rock, metal, and punk in 1990s and young people who found their identities through emos and apache subcultures in 2000s. Another dimension of youth and identity is young people’s efforts to be in the social sphere with their ethnic, minority, and immigrant identities. The result of these efforts is their experience of being the ‘other’ of the society with its social psychological dimension due to their identities (Semerci, Erdoğan and Önal, 2017). In this regard, we can say that there are several studies that examine certain social identities in connection with young people.
Youth and Islamic Identity

Islamic movement has begun to be powerful after 1980, and 1990s were a turning point for the Islamic movement. Here, ‘the term Islamic does not only refer to one’s religious identity… The only reason why they are labelled as such is due to the fact that they are in search for an alternative Islamic life policy and a new social order rather than being more pious Muslims than the others’ (Saktanber, 2002, p. 262). The study in question looks at the different religious practices, clothing style, socialization spaces, and social behaviours of 60 university students in Istanbul between the ages of 18-25.

There are studies based on fieldwork in the literature regarding youth and Islamic identity, which indicate that youth’s relationship with religion has been transformed. On the other hand, there are still not many studies in the literature on this issue. The qualitative research that is carried out with religious young people that are seen more in the public sphere based on the thesis that Islamic movement is not homogeneous and it includes different stratifications within itself illustrates that these young people practice religion but also embrace certain aspects of the modern lifestyle (Avcı, 2012).

Youth Subculture

The scarcity of academic studies conducted on the subject of youth subculture in Turkey has been found out while the literature was reviewed. The limited amount of studies on the issue was produced after 1990 (Dogan, 1994; İnci, 2012). One of the studies that stands out in this regard is Yaman’s (2013) qualitative fieldwork on ‘apache youth.’ This study focuses on the social behavior and tendencies of poor young people in the city. The young people who live in Esenler, one of the districts of Istanbul with the lowest educational background, constitute the universe of this study. This poverty is closely related to lack of education –the low level of education, working in low-skilled jobs [especially garment ateliers and service sector]- unemployment, and being immigrants. Besides, this research also addresses the marginalization, social exclusion, and humiliation aspects of apache youth. The study in question presents the apache youth’s efforts for differentiating themselves from the society through their clothing style, hair, and music more as a matter of cultural style and preference rather than being against the system (Yaman, 2013, s.392).

Participation, European Union, and Youth

The first years of 2000s in particular are the years during which civil society has met with the youth studies through projects that were realized with the contributions of the European Union and European Council (Kurtaran and Yurttagül, 2014, p.10; Lüküslü and Osmanoğlu, 2018).
These studies examine the new concepts that aim to strengthen civil society, citizenship, and participation understandings, which have come to the fore with the EU harmonization process in the context of Turkey. Ayhan Kaya’s project titled ‘Values Education: Difference in Education and Right to Participate’ (2016) gives weight to basic education concepts based on citizenship and rights and it stands out in terms of examining how this approach could be implemented in Turkey’s formal educational setting. It investigates how a ‘European Union Citizenship’ image could be formed through the education of common values that are defined across Europe. In a similar vein, Kurtaran, Yurttagüler and Oy (2014) examine the way young people approach the concept of active citizenship. On the other hand, while Çayır (2014) analyzes the content of textbooks that are already in use in the formal educational system, he addresses the issue of how identity, citizenship, and rights are described in a critical manner. Therefore, the studies that are carried out in this field actually invite two-sided inquiry. Turkishness and people’s attachments along with the rights they have are questioned again as much as Europeanness. According to Kaya, “Just like citizenship, the concept of identity is also very much debated. The same debate is also made over European identity through the EU citizenship. When the agreement texts, youth and education programmes are examined, and also even when the creation of shared symbols and efforts for establishing a media is considered, it is understood that a “European identity” is tried to be formed within the EU’ (Kaya, 2017, p.3). Regarding all these discussions on belonging, intercultural interaction and redefinition, it is again the young people that are emphasized as the carrier and direct benefactor of these phenomena. As a matter of fact, these studies have been in conjunction with activities that aim to realize implementations including youth and civil society institutions through youth works. On the other hand, there are also studies that approach the issue of European Union and possible cultural interaction with more doubt and emphasize that local or national identity should be preserved.
Conclusion

Our literature review indicates that there is not an established literature on ‘cultural literacy’ in Turkey yet. The concept is very new for academic works. On the other hand, “the cultural heritage” has been mostly referred in archaeological and tourism studies. In fact, there is also a rising interest in using the concept with cultural, education, and youth studies too. However the way it is used mostly defines the cultural heritage in a very parochial sense as the culture to be inherited from “our” ancestors and transferred to the next generations.

Nevertheless, the academic debates related with our research subject are held with under different concepts and issues of education, youth and culture studies. Especially in the last two decades, there is a rising interest on youth studies and the identities of young people.

From the late Ottoman Empire Era to the Republic of Turkey period, the role of saving and prospering the country has been attributed to the youth in Turkey. In according to their political standings, each rival political group ranging from modernist-secular to Islamic-pious has tried to define a unanimous mission to the entire youth of Turkey. As the youth is considered to be the carriers of their mission, the education, especially the formal one, is objectified as the main instrument for raising suitable youth for such mission. Therefore, many issues of youth or education that might appear as technical or administrative matters at first sight, have subtle implications for the prevailing controversy in the public as well as in the literature. For instance, the privatization of the education can be easily evaluated under the discourse of neoliberalism, yet the some of the works in the literature highlight neoliberal policies have taken place with the implication of the conservative-Islamic policies in education. Similarly, the bill lengthened the mandatory education from eight to twelve years was one of the controversial issues, because it aimed to enable students to enrol in religious vocational school earlier (at the age of 10). While various discussions in education and youth taken place in the literature are summarized above, their possible implications for the culture and identities of youths in Turkey are highlighted.

After the 1990s, when the nation-state building process of Turkey is started to be questioned and reconsidered more openly, the controversial issues of education, youth and culture have intensified, yet more studies on these subjects such as mother tongue education, Westernization versus Islamism, and ethnic and cultural differences are conducted as well.
These studies provoke to rethink the mainstream cultural literacy and cultural heritage in Turkey which has been taken for granted for a long time. Meanwhile, as examined in the last section of the review, a new stream of research focusing more on the participation and identities of youth is evolving. These studies, some of which realized with the contribution of the European Council but not limited with them, question the prevailing habits of attributing a unanimous mission to the youth in Turkey. Instead, they pay more attention to understand the identities of heterogeneous youth groups and figure out ways to encourage youth to participate in public affairs without idealizing any culture. Yet, these studies also walk a thin line. Indeed, some of them can easily attribute youth to a new mission carrying the country on the 21st by acquiring the necessary quality needed in the global economy.
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Introduction

In the current political context of the UK negotiating an exit from the European Union, debate over issues of cultural identities, cultural diversity and cultural participation is on the rise. Public and academic discussion often sets young people at the forefront of such debates considering the potential effects of political change for future generations as well as highlighting an identifiable age diversification in beliefs regarding the UK’s participation in the EU (Dorling, 2016, Henn and Sharpe, 2016, Birch, 2016). Overall there are tangible dominant, yet contradictive trends, marking-up the UK context, within which ideas related to cultural literacy take shape. On the one hand, economic globalisation, the expansion of international institutions within and beyond the EU (such as for example the OECD) and the emergence of new forms of governance (Rhodes, 2017), along with the enhanced role of international networks as actors of policy (Ball and Junemann, 2012) create conditions for the erosion of nation-state boundaries, while also emphasising post-national forms of identification, citizenship and belonging. On the other hand, the deepening social inequalities (Dorling, 2014, Wilkinson and Pickett, 2010) and intensifying economic and political crisis across Europe, the implementation of austerity policies and the so-called ‘representation-gap’ (Rohrschneider and Whitefield, 2016) form a fruitful ground for the rise of euroscepticism, the questioning of integration processes and a refuge to nationalism.

Prior to this currently evolving landscape of socio-economic developments and competing political discourses, social scientists have emphasised the fragmentation and loosening of traditional institutions (Beck and Beck-Grenshem, 1996), which has led to increased unpredictability resulting to less linear and more diverse life pathways for young people (Dwyer and Wyn, 2001). Research has highlighted the loosening forms of young people’s participation and cultural and civic engagement, with references to ‘everyday makers’ (Bang, 2005) or ‘self-actualising citizens’ (Bennett et al, 2009) as opposed to dutiful citizens.
Others have examined how young people develop a ‘new biography of citizenship’ marked by ‘dynamic identities, open, weak–tie relationships and more fluid, short-lived commitments in informal permeable institutions and associations (Vinken, 2005, see also Harris, 2014).

Located within this complex context of increasing polarisation between various discourses and forms of post-nationalism alongside revived, yet re-contextualised nationalisms, academic research and ideas related to cultural literacy take shape. Additionally, transformations regarding the loosening of traditional, institutional boundaries occur in parallel with the continuing workings of traditional sources of inequality, thus creating new complexities in the making of youth cultural identities. The above trends indicate the need for further empirical investigation and pose conceptual and methodological challenges for academic research. That is, an entwined focus on documenting young people’s ‘emotional, expressive and aesthetic forms of engagements’ (Siurala, 2000: 4), allowing for loose commitments and individual processes of identification, along with capturing structural social forces active in these processes. To offer greater insights on the context and facilitate the development of appropriate conceptual and methodological tools for researching young people and cultural literacy, a review of academic literature is undertaken.
Method

The broader objective of the review of academic literature is to make sense of the bidirectional relationship between the practices of educational policies in each partner country and their underlying assumptions. Within this overarching agenda, the aim of the UK national review is, to identify and present key themes in academic debate and research regarding cultural literacy, cultural identities and interactions among young people in connection with education policy and practice.

To this end, an inductive approach to academic literature search was deployed and was carried-out in two successive phases. Initially an exploratory search was conducted to map-out existing research and key contributors. The search evolved around the key concepts of cultural literacy, cultural identities and cultural interactions in connection to young people and education. The main emerging themes were extracted out and were set into the following thematic groups: diversity (in its multiple and intersecting forms), participation (including issues of civic engagement and citizenship) and interactions (including the lived experiences of diversity and processes of self-identification). The second phase of the search was more focused around unpacking further these subthemes and identifying key approaches and contributions.

The literature presented below does not intend to be exhaustive but rather representative of the main trends and theoretical contributions in the academic research production. On this basis the key texts and contributors were selected.

Searches were carried-out throughout the period: September-November 2018. The databases surveyed included: Google Scholar, Oxford University Libraries Catalogues (OLIS), Web of Science and targeted searches of university websites.

The search did not involve any time limitations. It focused primarily on research and debate regarding the UK context. Although we were interested in mapping out key themes in recent debate and research, we were also interested in identifying shifts over time as well as capturing the evolution of approaches around our key themes.
The structure of the review was also inductively developed. It is based on the presentation of key trends and predominant theorizations along with a consideration of key policy developments and related debate. We start by presenting different models of teaching and learning about diversity, participation and belonging. We then refer to critical remarks on key conceptual constructs related with post-national citizenships and identities, which have dominated Western discourses. We then discuss a point of rupture in UK policy, marked by skepticism over multiculturalism and the quest for defining and promoting ‘Britishness’. Finally we present some empirical insights on young people’s lived experiences of diversity.
Findings

Models of Teaching and Learning About Cultural Diversity, Identity and Participation
The consideration of issues related to cultural identity, diversity and participation in the school classroom, became part of the National Curriculum in 2002, as part of the citizenship education. Following the recommendations of the Crick Report (QCA, 1998), the consideration of such issues became a statutory requirement for schools. This constitutes a landmark document in the UK education as it defined the scope of citizenship education and because of its enduring impact on policy and academic research. Following the report, the declared aim is defined as follows:

A main aim for the whole community should be to find or restore a sense of common citizenship, including a national identity that is secure enough to find a place for the plurality of nations, cultures, ethnic identities and religions long found in the United Kingdom. Citizenship education creates common ground between different ethnic and religious identities. (QCA 1998, p. 17)

Moreover the report provided well-specified directions in relation to the values that must be fostered through the curriculum and the teaching/learning practices in the classroom. These include:

Concern for the common good, for human rights and for the environment; commitment to equal opportunities including gender equality, active citizenship and voluntary service; belief in human dignity and equality; respect for the rule of law; and determination to act justly (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority 1998, p. 44).

The Crick Report has also been particularly impactful in academic research, as it’s been deployed as key background framework and point of reference for related debate and research.
For some, the report incorporated elements of progressive pedagogy and pointed towards less directive and more open and democratic forms of learning. Starkey (2018) argues that, by drawing on constructivist approaches to the development of knowledge, the report put forward pedagogic practices based on open dialogue, down-up co-construction of knowledge and therefore allowed space for negotiation regarding the definition of ethnic and cultural diversity in the classroom. Osler and Starkey (2005) also highlight that the report considerably downplayed national symbols and institutions, and through that, it opened up the possibility of decoupling citizenship and nationality in the learning process. Frazer (2007) also notes, how previous work by Crick on political literacy has informed the general standpoint of the report, highlighting that it incorporated ‘the specificity of political relations and political processes, their non-assimilability into the generality of morals and values, or social relations’ (p 30).

Arguably the Crick Report put forward a framework for citizenship education, which placed greater emphasis on the social and political elements of cultural diversity and identity compared to other alternatives such as ‘values education’ or ‘character education’ (Davies, Gorard and McGuinn, 2005). The latter approaches place their foci upon individual rather than public ethics, while being underpinned by an understanding of ‘character’ in terms of personal values and achievements. Additionally, they emphasize young people’s values and attitudes over knowledge and skills (Kisby 2016), therefore promoting an individualistic outlook to learning and dealing with issues that are ultimately social and political. As Frazer (2003) has argued, the emphasis on values ‘is an explicitly depoliticizing move in the debate about political education’ (p. 65).

Overall the introduction of citizenship education in school curricula –in the form inspired by the Crick Report- didn’t go uncontested. There have been several critical remarks in academic research in relation to its implementation in the form of citizenship education. Starkey (2018) critically notes that, although the Crick report recognises cultural, religious and ethnic diversity, it is somewhat ambiguous when it comes to its approach on individuals’ having/embODYING multiple identities. This point is elaborated and further explored in Olssen’s (2004) critical account of the Crick Report, which seek to locate it with respect to liberal and multi-cultural theorisations of diversity and participation.
Olssen (2004) discusses the Crick Report and its implications for citizenship education alongside a report produced by Parekh on the Future of Multicultural Britain (Runnymede Trust, 2000). He carries out a comparative analysis of the two reports, by identifying their philosophical underpinnings with a focus on conceptualisations of diversity and their operationalisation for the educational programs suggested. Throughout his analysis he draws on two distinctive theoretical frameworks: the liberal and the multi-cultural approach. He argues that the Crick report echoes certain elements of a liberal approach yet it does contain a communitarian conception of citizenship. In particular, as Olssen explains, in Crick’s report, citizenship is defined with reference to individuals’ rights and duties and is focused towards the common good. That is, it involves a social-democratic inspired rhetoric far from classical liberal understandings of citizenship as promoting ‘a self-regarding individual who promotes their own interests in their own way without infringing (i.e. harming) the rights or interests of others. (p. 179). At the same time, Olssen suggests, that the Crick Report as well as the educational suggestions stemming from it, embraces two key elements of liberalism related to ‘universalism’ on the one hand, and ‘the politics of concensus’ on the other. Drawing on the work of Marion Iris Young on universal citizenship and her model of ‘differentiated citizenship’, Olssen critically notes that ‘injustice arises as much from treating different peoples as the same as it does from treating the same peoples as different’ (p.181). In this respect, he argues that, by putting forward a single national identity as a reference for all the Crick Report fails to take on board the politics of difference. Additionally, Olssen claims, by making no references to racism or multiculturalism it promotes an, ‘overly consensualist model of society’ (p. 182) while also, at times, constructing certain ethnicities as ‘other’ when discussion issues of cultural diversity.

Kiwan (2008) argues that issues of diversity are increasingly more connected to citizenship. Apart from the intrinsic relatedness of the two, she highlights a number of social processes that enhance their links, such as migration and internationalization. Kiwan (2008) identified 4 models of citizenship education, which entail distinctive understandings of diversity and participation. These models were developed drawing on the findings of empirical research as well as analyzing key policy documents and reviewing existing philosophical, theoretical approaches to citizenship.
The empirical data were gathered via interviews with 30 individuals working on different levels and stages of policy-making regarding citizenship education—as part of a commissioned review. In each of these four models, diversity, participation, citizenship education or issues of citizenship more generally are interrelated and mutually constitutive.

1) Moral-conceptions-based model: These include approaches that draw heavily on political theories of liberalism. Liberalism is first of all criticized for providing a framework, which accommodates moral and political diversity, but it doesn’t do so in terms of religious and ethnic diversity (see also: Parekh, 2000). Moreover Kiwan, refers to debates on the extent to which morality should be coupled with citizenship, theoretical considerations on the necessity of establishing ‘shared values’ within contemporary societies and questions about their cultivation through education. The author argues that the existence of ‘shared values’ is not incompatible with respecting diversity at societal level, though the main concern should be on the processes in place for co-constructing and negotiating these sets of values. She demonstrates a critique towards moral conceptions of civic engagement for paying little attention to this critical element, that is, the process of co-constructing shared values. This is also a particularly important element of the education process, which should entail a constructively framed dialogue with a more general and a more particular, problem-solving outlook.

2) Legal-conceptions-based model: This is predominantly framed by Human Rights declarations and related policies and legal agreements. The emphasis and priority is on the recognition of minority rights. According to Kiwan, although this model entails a pluralistic understanding of identities and aims at achieving greater equality for minority groups, it nevertheless implicates a universalistic and static understanding of culture. Subsequently it involves a view of cultural diversity that is not couched upon identity and practice. Kiwan therefore questions the effectiveness of this model as failing to take into account that different groups have different degrees and forms of motivation towards active, cultural and social participation.
3) Participatory-conceptions-based models: A quest for promoting active participation through citizenship education has been identified as a key goal of the Crick report. Kiwan highlights that although the model of citizenship as active participation developed by Crick, affords the potential at a theoretical level, to accommodate ethnic and religious identity it doesn’t do so in practice, in the sense that it doesn’t explicitly address these issues. Additionally Kiwan argues that although throughout the citizenship curriculum there is an identifiable understanding of culture as non-static and constantly in flux, the learning outcomes are framed predominantly in passive terms (i.e. ability to describe, recognize, understand) rather than in an active, engaging and challenging mode. Finally, Kiwan criticizes this model for drawing heavily on cognitive engagement theory to make sense of participation, thus failing to address issues of diverse motivation. In other words, the willingness to participate is not understood as entangled with cultural socialization but instead depend on access to relevant information.

4) Identity based models: At the core of this approach is the question of the recognition and representation of diversity across the public and private sheres. According to Kiwan liberalism emphasizes the need to protect universally shared interests in the public sphere, maintaining neutrality over diversity – which is the price that citizens have to pay in order to ensure that they are treated as equals. In this respect, while there may be room for significant diversity at the level of private lives or at the level of local communities, there is ‘little scope for diversity in the public political sphere, where there is clearly a single political culture’ (p. 51). These views have been criticized by critical multiculturalism, on the basis that diversity in its multiple and non-static forms pervades all domains of social life, both private and public. In turn the recognition and representation of these forms of diversity should cut across the boundaries of private-public life and practice, while their incorporation is a constitutive element and prerequisite of inclusive societies.

Kiwan’s models of citizenship education indicate the multiple dimensions and layers of diversity alongside the multiplicity of identities and forms of citizenship.
Furthermore these four models provide a useful systematization of key approaches and implicated issues regarding citizenship and diversity in education and reveal how different approaches and their inherent understandings of citizenship lead to different teaching and learning practices.

A focus on embodiment and practice is also evident in Osler and Starkey’s (2005) understanding of citizenship and their suggested model of cosmopolitan education. They make sense of citizenship as involving three interrelated dimensions and particularly identify citizenship as status, citizenship as feeling and citizenship as practice. Citizenship as status relates to the legal standing of citizenship, its constitutional framing and the set of declared rights and responsibilities it involves. Citizenship as feeling invokes the affective aspects of it, linking it with individuals’ sense of belonging and stressing the significance of social bonds. Finally citizenship as practice, points towards relevant lived experiences of participation, community and collective action. These dimensions are discussed as interrelated and mutually reinforcing. They suggest that cosmopolitanism may feed into a form of citizenship that constructively encompasses all these three elements presented above. Moreover, they see cosmopolitanism as providing a framework for identifying with local, national and global levels in a progressive way that highlights what people have in common rather than what divides them. That is, they argue, that cosmopolitan citizenship allows a focus on the global issues through the legal dimension and the elements of feeling while simultaneously promoting the practice of citizenship at local and community level. Osler and Starkey (2018) have revisited these arguments in the light of most recent developments facing European countries and have stressed the increased need for enhancing learning around cosmopolitan citizenship in dealing with existing challenges and new realities.

From a different viewpoint, Parekh (2000) questions the concepts of multiculturalism, global citizenship and cosmopolitanism in terms of their limitations to comprehend and account for individuals’ social ties with political communities. He also explains how these conceptualizations fail to understand the dialectic relation of individuals’ embedded-ness into communities. To address these shortcomings he puts forward the concept of globally oriented citizenship.
He describes the globally oriented citizen as one that has a ‘political home’, as opposed to being in a state of ‘voluntary exile’ associated with cosmopolitan citizenship, while ‘reaching out and forming alliances with other having home of their own’. Global oriented citizenship is therefore invoking internationalism rather than cosmopolitanism as such.

Staeheli and Hammet (2010) identify the space between lived experiences and taught knowledge, bringing into question educational practices or programmes that do not rest upon -but instead seek to surpass- students’ lived experiences of social divisions. As they put it: ‘programmes to make a new kind of citizen cannot simply wipe away the memory of conflict and oppression in divided societies’ (p. 678). In this respect they are cautious of the effectiveness of programs that aim to foster a shared sense of cosmopolitan citizenship, although they are sympathetic of the principles of the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship itself. They argue that such programmes must be developed as a dynamic process with a focus on transformation and reconciliation of the lived experiences of those involved in the educational processes, otherwise they risk turning into a form of indoctrination (see also: Sears and Hughes, 2006).

While arguing that the gap between philosophical approaches and educational practices regarding citizenship and diversity, is filled-in with agonism and politics, they set to rethink the role of teachers and other professionals, who are positioned within the aforementioned space. They particularly focus on what they call ‘divided societies’ and consider how citizenship education is deployed by state policies as a devise for establishing a link between citizens and nations through ‘stories of peoplehood’ (Smith, 2003) and aim at ‘healing’ social divisions. Nevertheless, they argue these stories may be deeply problematic and highlight that the actors involved in educational processes - ranging from teachers and students, to policy-makers and community organisations- will ‘bring their own capacities, experiences and subjectivities to the education process and, in so doing, may contest or rework both the teaching of citizenship education and the ways in which it is received’ (p.686).
Neoliberalism, Post-national and EU Identities and Participation

Western discourses of cosmopolitan and/or global citizenship education and related programmes have been critically scrutinized both in terms of their theoretical underpinnings, and in terms of their implications in the formation of young people’s practices and subjectivities.

Hartung (2017) examines the emergence and spread of conceptions of ‘responsible global citizens’ in the context of neo-liberal network governance, whereby a number of different actors work beyond the boundaries and institutions of the state to influence educational practices regarding young people’s citizenship and participation. She examines how, the work undertaken by such networks, is brought together to develop and put forward certain conceptions of citizenship and influence learning practices. She is analyzing dominant discursive constructs, while also looking into the activity of a youth organizations that works alongside such cross-sector networks. She identifies individual responsibility as a key element of these educational discourses and argues that it is simultaneously directed towards oneself, towards the rights of others and towards wider social problems. In short, the conception of global citizenship that emerges within such networks emphasises a shift from state to individual responsibility and promotes ‘individual responsibility as a means of finding solutions to global problems’ (Hartung 2017). From a similar perspective, Hammett (2010) demonstrates a critical analysis of the concept of ‘active citizenship’ and related educational programmes that aim at fostering it at global level. He argues that in contemporary regimes of neoliberal governance, the promotion of such forms of citizenship involve the responsibilization of citizens and highlights that these are entangled with processes of a gradual depoliticization of society.

The promotion of active citizenship, as a strategy for tackling young people’s ‘apathy’ and ‘alienation’ through citizenship education, is further discussed by Watts (2006).
Starting from an account of citizenship education as encompassing the ‘ambiguous capability of fostering both independent-minded, socially effective citizens and conforming docile subjects’ (p. 87), Watts (2006) focuses on forms of participation and engagement and widely shared assumptions about democratic citizenship and identities that implicitly inform the school curricula. He argues that, in a context where young people’s social and political literacies have been repositioned and reinterpreted, the school curriculum still draws on traditional and narrow understandings of participation. As a result, young people’s own versions of engagement are at odds with those recognised and promoted by formal education, which in turn, results in education’s shortcomings regarding the fostering democratic participation.

Watts’ (2006) analysis draws on Blaug’s work on ‘engineering democracy’ and is structured around the distinction between ‘incumbent democracy’ and ‘critical democracy’. The former, while vested on government and represented in school curricula, is institutionalised and protective; institutionalised, as participation occurs through formally established channels and protective as it involves legal protection of rights. The overall aim of participation is to preserve institutions and achieve legitimacy, while the success of ‘incumbent democracy’ depends on its ‘effectiveness and ability to command resources’ (p. 91). Critical democracy stands at the other end of the spectrum, as its orientation is ‘responsive, deliberative, direct and personal’ (ibid.). It’s legitimacy depends upon the immediate representation of participants needs and views. Participation in this case occurs locally, face-to-face and involves empowerment of all social groups – including minority or marginalised groups. Moreover, participation also extends well beyond formalised procedures and is seen as an end in itself therefore, assigning democracy an experiential rather than institutionalised status. Watts argues that the curriculum is a site of struggle between different approaches to democracy, citizenship and identity and makes a case for embracing notions of critical democracy within the curriculum and throughout education, stressing that failing to do so may result in the reproduction of the so-called youth ‘apathy’.
The neoliberal orientation of the EU policy has been identified as a restrictive force towards the development of European citizenship and participation, as well as multiculturalism and social belonging. Mitchell (2006) discusses the policies and reforms of the European Commission, regarding education and training in the EU over a period of nearly a decade, from the late 90s to the mid 00s. Her research is set in the context of the expansion of the EU project and the emergence of new forms of governance, such as the ‘open method of co-ordination’ and other similar methods that predominantly deploy soft power. Mitchell argues that these trends constitute an extension of neoliberal governmentality over wider areas of social and civic life and practice. While examining how education and training policies have evolved, she finds a shift of priorities and discourses with a range of new programmes focusing on individual skills and mobility, aiming at developing competitiveness and individual professional success and generally being underpinned by pragmatic individualism. According to Mitchell, this constitutes a steady and ongoing retreat on behalf of the European Commission, from state-sponsored multiculturalism towards a market-driven logic featuring ‘an individualist discourse of responsibility for lifelong learning and the constant mobilization of work skills’ (p. 392). Thus, forms of social democracy and principles of redistribution, which dominated European politics in the previous decades, are loosing ground over a broader neoliberal project. The latter involves a complex amalgamation of elements of ‘third-way’ discourse, such as processes of greater decentralization and devolution of decision-making, alongside a focus on competitiveness, monetarism and market rationality.

Hansen (2000) discusses the efforts of the EU to articulate and foster a collective sense of European identity and culture across the various participant countries. He identifies a strong tendency in the official discourse of the EU to construct a common identity in ethno-cultural terms. He thus, discusses how the so-called European dimension in education promotes the formation of a collective EU identity that fits those who share common roots and a particular version of history, heritage and religion. In turn, he argues that the core underpinnings and structuring principles of such a view on EU collective identity resonate nationalist understandings, forms of identification and community belonging.
He points out the paradox that the ‘European cultural identity comprises cultural diversity exactly because the elements representing this diversity, that is the national and regional cultures, are described as sharing a common historical heritage, a common origin’ (p. 126). Along with deconstructing the principles interwoven with hegemonic approaches to EU collective identity, Hansen also questions the excluding implications stemming from the deployment of ethno-cultural elements in their formation of such identities. Moreover he suggests, that dominant rhetoric of ‘we are Europeans’ is universal and unifying and therefore, works on concealing the internal diversity across Europeans such as their class differences etc. Hansen and Hajer (2010) further demonstrate how EU is gradually shifting towards a neo-liberal socio-economic order whereby, a market citizenship is becoming a dominant form of identity. They argue that this hinders the possibilities of a social and political constitution of EU collective identities and forms citizenship. In terms of researching those issues, their critical remarks point towards going beyond a narrow focus on normative visions, prescriptive approaches and legal-institutional descriptions. Instead they stress the need to take into account and further explore ‘the enormous stakes, deep-seated contradictions and widening power asymmetries that shape the content, purpose and struggle of EU citizenship’ (ibid).

Questioning Multi-Culturalism, Assimilation Models and Fundamental British Values
Since the publication of the Crick report and the introduction of citizenship education in schools, much has changed in the UK in terms of the political and socio-economic conditions as well as in terms of the ideological developments, hegemonic discourses and key themes dominating public debate and academic research regarding cultural identities, diversity and participation. Tomlinson (2015) comments that schools are not only expected to solve wider societal problems but beyond that, they ‘are to be in the front line of the ideological and religious wars of the 21st century’ (p. 10). This is particularly the case in relation to young people’s learning about issues of civic engagement and participation, cultural identity and diversity.
Interestingly, a number of recent changes to curricula, shifts in pedagogical approaches and official guidelines for schools over the last decade occurred as a response to wider social challenges and triggered/were accompanied by fierce political debate. Below we will briefly refer to key moments of policy developments alongside a presentation of the key themes in academic debate and research.

In 2007 teaching and learning about diversity and cultural identities has been at the forefront of political contestation and wider public discussion, with the then-education secretary Alan Johnson stating that schools should play a key role in creation community cohesion (DCSF, 2007). The renewed concern with the role of education in relation to social cohesion and diversity occurred in the wake of the London bombings. While schools were seen as places to promote community cohesion and combat cultural and religious intolerance a review was commissioned (Ajegbo et al, 2007) to look into formal processes of teaching and learning regarding diversity in schools. The research-based report was published in the midst of intense political debate and was followed by a review of the citizenship education curriculum. The report argues for improving and deepening students’ knowledge of different ethnic and religious, local and national cultures and their interconnections. It highlights the need to ensure that pupils’ voice is being heard as well as indicating the need to support teachers in dealing with the challenges of teaching issues of diversity. Moreover it suggests that better links should be developed between schools and their local communities to enrich their learning processes through connections with the local lived conditions of diversity.

One of the novel elements of the revised curriculum was the requirement to educate students about ‘Britishness’ alongside enhancing learning about diversity. The concept of ‘Britishness’, which had already entered the public debate and, as Lindsley (2016) comments, became central ‘not only to debates of nationality and citizenship but to all manner of disparate socio-political areas such as crime, education and the media, and more and more it is being used in public debates as a form of cure-all for many of the current issues within twenty-first century Britain’. Nevertheless, as Phillips (2010) has highlighted, the definition of British values is set in opposition to ‘other’, minority ethnic cultures, this inexorably fosters a backlash against the ethnic and cultural ‘others’.
Banks (2015) also discusses this process of ‘othering’ ethnic, cultural and religious communities in education deploying the concept of ‘failed citizenship’. This refers to a state whereby minority groups, although having full citizenship rights, still feel excluded throughout the learning process and through the school curriculum they experience.

A turn to ‘Britishness’ in education was accompanied by fierce political dispute, including statements about the ‘end of multiculturalism’, debate on whether ‘multiculturalism failed Britain’ and a revived interest towards assimilation models for dealing with diversity. This turn was solidified with the introduction of statutory requirements for schools to actively promote the five Fundamental British Values in the wake of the Trojan Horse Affair (Arthur, 2015). These were defined as: democracy, the rule of law, freedom of speech, equal rights and freedom of religion. The active promotion of Fundamental British Values became part of the revised Teaching Standards (DfE, 2011), therefore constituting a key element in the preparation for teaching professions and was also introduced in the school assessment criteria by Ofsted. This rapid consolidation of Fundamental British Values as part of the discourse of education policy and practice, occurred in the context of dominant narratives of radicalisation, which emphasized issues of heightened security and constructed an urging need for counter radicalisation measures. Education was formally included in the wider strategy for fighting terrorism and tacking ‘radicalisation’ and ‘extremism’ through the Prevention Agenda.

The extension of the policing agenda into the field of education and its implications for wider understandings of diversity and cultural identities has attracted a lot of critical attention by academic debate and research. Raggazzi (2014) examines how the concept of radicalization serves as an effective discourse to ‘legitimize the extension of police action beyond its usual purview, by becoming involved in areas of diversity management such as education, religion, and social policy’. He illustrates this turn towards assimilation models of diversity management by putting forward the idea of ‘policed multi-culturalism’ and offering a comparative overview of policies of diversity management in the UK, France, Canada and the Netherlands in the 1990s-2000s.
He distinguishes between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ counter-radicalisation policies with the former involving legal action and bearing a proactive, anticipatory logic in tackling terrorism. The latter, involves the deployment of ‘soft’ power in the development of processes for dealing with ethnic, cultural and religious diversity, with examples of practice including community policing, police-community partnerships, awareness campaigns etc. This encapsulates what Raggazi (2014) refers to as ‘policed multiculturalism’ and entails a shift from models of multiculturalism practice in the UK, Canada and the Netherlands during the 90’s and early 00s. While previous models aimed at fostering community life and social cohesion and were founded on respect for ethnic and religious characteristics, policed multiculturalism implicates the ‘management of cultural groups and communities in the name of security imperatives’.

The elements of that make up the discourse of ‘securitization’ and the strategies for gaining legitimacy and achieving its hegemony are analysed by Kenrick and Fisch (2017) in terms of a ‘conflationary turn’. More specifically, the concept of ‘conflationary turn’ (p. 317) is deployed in order to capture the discursive devise deployed by neo-liberal governments whereby two very different, unique issues are linked together through the utilisation of ‘thin’ narratives, to produce similarities that entail oversimplifications and are devised to appeal to a public ‘common-sense’. They particularly discuss how the Troubled Families Programme, which involves the provision of support for disadvantaged families, is linked with terrorism and extremism with some councils, such as the Birmingham City Council, stating as a criterion for accessing support, situations where a ‘family member is believed to have been influenced by violent extremism’. The authors comment that implications involve a shift from considering vulnerability and diversity in terms of inequality and disadvantage, towards a ‘securitised lens’. For practitioners this represents a shift from working with families and communities towards an emphasis on ‘targeting’ certain populations.
The discourse of heightened threat and insecurity is provocingly questioned by Staeheli (2018), who argues that marginalised groups, such as those facing poverty and social disadvantage, as well as those marginalised on the basis of their sexual identities, religious beliefs or minority ethnic background, have almost always felt insecure in their daily lives. She therefore questions the universality of dominant constructions of insecurity inflicted on wider publics and highlights that the roots of insecurity for certain groups do not resonate with dominant constructions of ‘threat’ put forward by hegemonic policy discourses. Similar to Raggazi (2014) discussed above, she also argues that feelings of fear, threat and insecurity are instrumentalised by a ‘protectionist, masculinist states’, to achieve certain policy ends (p. 61). Staeheli (2018) refers to the use of emotions in attempts to ‘securitise governance and normalise fear’ (ibid). She insightfully comments that such strategies may take very different forms, including the deployment of emotions that may seem opposite to fear, such as hope for the future; this involves a leap and oversight of the present and a focus or deferral to the future.

Insights on Contemporary Lived Experiences of Identity, Diversity, Participation
Research (Davies, 2016) carried out with young people aged 14-18 years in Peterbrough – one of the most diverse UK cities featuring ‘superdiversity’, highlighted their confusion and critical remarks regarding the promotion of the Fundamental British Values. The study involved 250 young people in total and included a survey and focus groups with young people. The findings revealed that half of them were silenced, puzzled and generally did not comprehend what ‘fundamental British values’ may refer to. Some of the young participants who responded or engaged into the discussion of the issue, made sense of British Values in terms of popular (iconic) cultural practices such as eating fish and chips, drinking tea and celebrating the Queen’s birthday. On the other hand, the majority of the young participants were able to elaborate on ‘Christian values’, ‘Islamic values’, humanitarian values’ etc. According to the researchers, the focus group discussions, brought to the fore some critical remarks in relation to the Fundamental British Values.
For example, while unpacking and discussing democracy, as one of the five listed values, students highlighted their understanding of democracy in terms of a system of government, rather than a value, and some Muslim students pointed out that ‘the rule of law’ was also a principle of Islam.

Confusion over the content of Fundamental British Values and how it can be deployed to inform teaching process was evident in research on teachers’ and head-teachers’ perceptions and practices. Research by Keddie (2014) was conducted in the light of the publication of the revised Teachers Standards (DfE, 2012), which stressed the key role that teachers had to play in promoting the Fundamental British Values. The qualitative research was carried-out in six case study schools and involved interviews with teachers and head-teachers and focus groups with students in key stages 2-4 (8-16 years old). Findings highlighted the limited training and support that teachers received in dealing with sensitive issues of diversity. Their reluctance in addressing issues of diversity was coupled with confusion over governmental requirements for not ‘undermining the Fundamental British Values’.

Rhamie, Bhopal and Bhatti (2012) carried out research exploring pupils’ understanding of diversity, identity and Britishness as well as looking into how young people interact, co-exist and take-up news spaces where identities are negotiated and established. Their research was based on questionnaires and took place in two urban secondary schools with higher than average ethnic diversity of school population. The findings highlighted pupils’ positive responses to diversity, as they were in a position to discuss the positive impact of having different cultures in their classroom. The girls were able to articulate the benefits of diversity in a more elaborate manner compared to the boys. Yet, the research findings revealed that although young people were positively inclined to diversity in theory, in practice the majority tended to be friends with people of similar background. Thus, limited social mixing was paradoxically underscored by positive views on diversity, showing how the two trends may not be antithetical, while also pointing on the complexity of lived experiences of diversity.
In relation to negotiations of identities, Rhamie, Bhopal and Bhatti (2012) drawing of their findings, highlight the multiplicity of identities that young people occupy showing how they decided to draw on different identities depending on their interpretation of the context. In relation to pupils’ understandings of British values, their research reveals confusion and multiple types of responses including definitions with reference to, the place of birth, place of residence, passport and sets of rights and responsibilities, among others.

Keating (2015) explores young people’s cosmopolitan dispositions, inquiring on the sources contributing to their emergence and development. She particularly identifies key theories that aim to address issues around the emergence of cosmopolitan identities and practices, in the wider field of youth socialization literature. While operationalizing the concept of cosmopolitan dispositions, she focuses on the key sources suggested as decisive to the formation of cosmopolitan dispositions. She then carries-out a comparative empirical examination by testing their key assumptions drawing on data from the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS, 2009) and its survey of young people. Drawing on the literature Keating (2015) synthesizes the features that are attributed to cosmopolitan dispositions as follows:

“- a sense of belonging to/identification with an international community or community larger than the nation-state;
- trust and tolerance of immigrants, ethnic minorities, and cultural Others;
- support for equal rights for immigrants;
- respect for human rights;
- an interest in cross-cultural consumption of goods, culture, or media;
- support for international governance and/ or the globalisation of economies and societies (Keating, 2015, p. 3)."
The analysis showed that learning about international issues at school, learning foreign languages, young people’s contact with cultural Others and awareness of international issues through private and public discussions are all significant factors in the development of cosmopolitan dispositions. Considering the above, the author argues that the school has a key role to play in facilitating young people’s cosmopolitan dispositions.

Additionally, Janmaat and Keating (2017) explore how tolerant contemporary young people are in relation to previous generations. Drawing data from the British Social Attitudes Survey and the World Values Survey, the researchers carry out a trend analysis and examine age, period and cohort effects as determinants of tolerance. They also distinguish between optimistic and pessimistic predictive perspectives, which foresee raising and declining levels of tolerance respectively. Their findings suggest that young British are more tolerant towards racial diversity and homosexuality over time and compared to previous generations.

Nevertheless, they are found to be less accepting of immigrants and foreign workers (2017)
Discussion

Our review so far, presented key themes and approaches regarding young people and cultural diversity, cultural participation and identification both generally and more specifically in relation to education. It covered a range of issues, some of which are more UK-specific and others that have a more general standing/reach. We particularly referred to critical engagements with different models of teaching and learning about diversity and identity. These included unpacking and elaborating on different forms of post-national citizenship and belonging, as well as on their implications for learning programmes (for example theories of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism along with education for cosmopolitan citizenship and multicultural education respectively). Additionally, we made critical references to frameworks based on individualised understandings of identity and civic engagement and implicated teaching foci, (i.e. values, character) as opposed to explicitly political conceptualisations and societal emphases of education programmes (i.e. citizenship education, multicultural education).

Dominant models of educational provision were also discussed –drawing on academic research- with reference to the political theories they stem from. For example, discussion of, the seemingly fine lines between liberalism and critical multiculturalism, revealed their significantly diverse implications for educational practices. Elaboration on the key concepts and approaches to diversity, identity, participation also involved critical engagement with wider, dominant, Western discursive contexts. This for example involved a critical exploration of neo-liberal logics and regimes as well as interrogation of hegemonic conceptual constructs such as, ‘active citizenship’.

Alongside the discussion of key conceptual contributions, we also captured aspects of the evolution of the debate, by identifying key policy shifts and their reception in the academic field. The points presented throughout the literature review, highlight a shift in the discursive landscape of academic debate regarding education and cultural diversity, identity and participation throughout the last decade.
While related debate and research was previously, primarily concerned with various approaches to post-nationalism and their operationalization in education, the emergence of new policy priorities and duties for schools has been, if not disruptive, at least generative of a parallel stream of academic inquiries. The latter, include emphases on conceptual deconstruction of new dominant themes, which appeared in the educational field, such as, the idea of prevention, the promotion of Fundamental British Values, etc. They also include, problematisation over their implications of the new concepts, at the level of both discourse and practice; indicative is the academic works regarding the securitisation of education, and exploration of the challenges related to the enactment of new duties by the schools.

Therefore, the evolution of the academic debate could be described in terms of a turn towards defending a ground, which was previously considered as widely shared or common at least regarding its objectives, namely, the multicultural condition. In other words, a rather proactive type of inquiries, focused on extending and expanding notions of inclusion and their manifestation in education, seem to be inhibited by rather defensive emphases on ring-fencing multiculturalism as a fundamental cultural value at the core of social lives. Throughout these discussions Tomlinson’s argument that schools have been and still are at the forefront of the ideological wars of our times is confirmed and rather vividly illustrated –at least in the case of the UK. Schools are indeed viewed as premium sites for mending wider social problems and promoting the hegemonic agendas regarding cultural diversity and identity.
Conclusions

Overall, the presentation of key themes in the academic literature and the critical remarks discussed, offer useful insights and directions for conceptualising and researching cultural literacy. At the level of theory, and given the critical orientation and inductive, ethnographic approach of CHIEF, key insights include a concern with disrupting culturalism and essentialism. This consists of putting forward understandings of culture in terms of ‘systems of meanings’, which frame cultural interactions and mediate negotiations of cultural diversity and identity among young people. Culture is then to be understood as fluid, relative, relational and dynamic, while also related to groups of people with shared meaning rather than along national boundaries (Halbet, 2015). Making sense of culture as a process, rather than a marker of stable identity, suggests a dynamic framing of cultural literacy with a focus on responsiveness and informed tentativeness (ibid.). In this respect, cultural literacy involves a lot more than a set of skills and can rather be conceptualised in terms of a disposition. In methodological terms, such an approach allows a focus on bringing to the fore the various, “localised” or even marginalised versions of youth cultures and identifications, which may empirically inform, and in the last instance, enrich and expand our notions of cultural identity and belonging.
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