Intercultural education in Europe: epistemological and semantic aspects

Agostino Portera

Intercultural education in Europe: epistemological and semantic aspects

Agostino Portera*

Centro Studi Interculturali, Università degli Studi di Verona, Verona, Italy

This article analyses the role of educational opportunity in a time of globalisation, a new economy and life in a multicultural society, and gives an epistemological and semantic account of the concept 'intercultural education', distinguishing it from multicultural and transcultural education. Starting with a historic overview of various conceptualisations of meetings/clashes among people with different linguistic, religious, cultural or ethnic features, distinctive theoretical elaborations are reviewed, above all in a European context and in the educational field. After outlining the development of intercultural education (main contents, methods and objectives, as well as limits), this article supports the thesis that education, in an intercultural sense, is currently the most appropriate answer to globalisation and interdependence.

Keywords: Italy; intercultural education; multicultural education; trans-cultural education; epistemological clarification; development of intercultural education

Introduction

The new millennium has begun with dramatic and at times violent changes that affect humanity in profound ways. Globalisation, the rise of new economies, and life in a multi-cultural society, challenges the very nature of educational institutions around the world. Many schools and families seem to lack the ability to cope with the risks and opportunities that accompany such revolutionary changes.

The spread of the mass media in our daily lives, the growth of information technology, profound geo-political changes, and the establishment of new markets, variously described as 'globalisation', 'new economy' or 'computer-information revolution', imply a reduction in distance, stronger ties between different geographical areas, greater mobility, as well as new and diversified migration flows. Emigration is no longer a prerequisite for interaction across ethnic groups characterised by different languages and religions. In a scenario of globalisation, a person's life is directly or indirectly influenced by other cultures and by contemporaneous events in the rest of the world. We can assume that the present increase in migration flows will not diminish in the near future. As a consequence of globalisation, the development of relations between nation states and people with different cultural back-grounds seems to give a new connotation to the phenomenon of migration, inasmuch as its transient, marginal or even 'disease-inducing' overtone gives way to its proper structural and systemic features.

On the other hand, in Western and most industrialised societies, post-modernist culture is prone to promote an inward-looking human being, a person imbued with an individualistic

*Email: agostino.portera@univr.it or csi.intercultura@univr.it

and narcissistic attitude, self-centred, consumer-oriented, quantity-oriented (to the detriment of quality) with a volatile and erratic nature (Baumann 1977; Giddens 1998). Fickle tastes, immediate gratification, exaltation of the domestic sphere and personal interests, self-fulfilment and physical fitness have become the essential elements of our present time. The individual considers herself or himself self-sufficient, driven by a constant and unilateral pursuit of pleasure and happiness.

With respect to education, Baumann (1977), Giddens (1998), Portera (2005) and others have shown that many teachers and parents, even though they are adults, find it difficult to cope with their own adolescent crises, and are often not able to exercise proper choices. Some educators still follow their ideals of absolute freedom, but can hardly control their own lives in a civil and democratic society, or marry personal freedom with principles of common good, commitment and responsibility. Very often, young people choose to live only in the present ('life is now'), fearing any kind of long-term commitment (work, marriage, children), unable to stand by their principles and be faithful to partners or supportive of a family.

Education, especially formal education, has been deeply affected by these developments. Fears and insecurities slowly surface; educational strategies, curricula and teaching methods are hastily revised. As a result, solutions are often technical, devoid of clear aims and stable moral principles: instead of being solved, problems escalate. The situation spirals downwards into a regressive 'treatment' in which solutions are often worse than the 'illness' itself.

What can pedagogy do in this kind of situation? What strategies are helpful or appropriate for educational praxis? Does intercultural education offer a way out? We will address this issue in the remainder of this paper.

Development of intercultural education in Europe

In the USA, 'multicultural' education became a topical issue in the early 1970s, when the first scientific articles and contributions were published, and is still the most widely used term. Likewise, curricula on multicultural education were introduced in Canada in the 1970s, mainly in response to Franco-Canadian movements and other anti-anglicising minorities. Even in Australia, the first educational answers on a multicultural level arrived in the 1970s. The concept of intercultural education has only begun to take root in English-speaking countries during the past few years (Gundara 2000, Sleeter and Grant 2007).

In Europe, most countries with relatively high immigration flows (such as France, Germany, Belgium and The Netherlands) show a similar line of development with respect to intercultural education. In the period after the economic miracle of the 1950s, teachers and politicians focused their attention on overcoming linguistic problems in schools. On the one hand, developmental measures for learning the host countries' languages were put in place; on the other hand a great deal of emphasis was placed on giving children the opportunity to 'preserve' their languages and cultures of origin, so that a return to their native country could become possible at any time. Also during this time, numerous projects were created which could be termed 'multicultural': the main aim was getting to know about commonalities and differences on a linguistic, religious and cultural level. In the 1970s, some countries even saw the creation of new subjects due to the growing numbers of foreign children in schools, such as *Ausländerpädagogik* (pedagogy for foreigners) or *pédagogie d'accueil* (pedagogy of reception) in France, whose goal was the realisation of specific, 'separate' measures of intervention for foreign children. Over time, however, this concept has been increasingly criticised, as the risks of a 'compensatory' and 'assimilatory' pedagogy became

increasingly visible. It was only in the 1980s that theoretical considerations and practical intervention strategies with respect to intercultural pedagogy slowly began to form (Portera 2003a, 6–26; 2006a, 89–100).

The Council of Europe adopted the strategy of multiculturalism and multicultural pedagogy in the 1970s. I would like to quickly summarise these developments and those that followed. In 1970, the Conference of Ministers passed its first resolution (no. 35), focusing on the entry age of migrant worker children into schools of the member states. A so-called 'double track strategy' was established to promote both the integration of these children within host country schools and also maintain cultural and linguistic links to the country of origin, so as to facilitate possible school reintegration. Further conferences (1973 in Bern, 1974 in Strasbourg, 1975 in Stockholm, 1976 in Oslo), also addressed 'problems' relating to the education of migrant workers, as well as the possibility of maintaining one's links with languages and countries of origin. Stimulated by the Council of Cultural Coop- eration (CDCC), a working group was set up between 1977 and 1983 under the direction of L. Porcher and Micheline Rey. Its aim was to examine teacher education in Europe with respect to methods and strategies. This framework was underpinned by the recognition of the necessity to implement 'intercultural education'. Then, in 1983, at a conference in Dublin, the European ministers for education unanimously passed a resolution on the schooling of migrant children, in which the importance of the 'intercultural dimension' of education was highlighted. The following year, a recommendation for teacher education was issued based on intercultural communication. Since the mid-1980s the Council of Europe has begun to promote numerous projects for education, which is no longer seen as multi- or trans-cultural, but instead as 'intercultural' (see Rey 1986).

Since the 1990s, the Council of Europe has defined intercultural education in terms of 'reciprocity' (Rey 2006, 101–6). An intercultural perspective has an educational and a polit- ical dimension: interactions contribute to the development of co-operation and solidarity rather than to relations of domination, conflict, rejection, and exclusion. After 1989, the Council of Europe intensified its co-operation with Central and Eastern Europe and helped it to develop, taking into account human rights and the rights of minorities (Foucher 1994). A key project was: 'Democracy, human rights, minorities: education and cultural aspects' (1993–1997) and the 'Working groups on cultural rights', with attention devoted to minor- ities. Of particular significance were studies concerning 'identity': individuals have a complex (plural) identity, referring to elements (values, symbols, any kind of cultural feature) of various cultures. Moving on from the assumption that globalisation should not bring homogenisation. It is important to promote dialogue and intercultural understanding. Therefore the Council of Europe established the project 'Education for democratic citizen- ship' – in co-operation with the EU, UNESCO, World Bank, OSCE, UNICEF, Soros Foun- dation, etc. (1997–2000; 2001–2004) – with the aim of raising citizens' awareness of their rights and responsibilities in a democratic society, of activating existing networks and encouraging and facilitating the participation of young people in civil society (Birzea 2000, 38). After the events of 11 September, in the Athens Declaration, the Ministers of Education decided to promote widespread 'intercultural and inter-religious dialogue'. The most recent Council of Europe projects carry the following titles: 'Intercultural dialogue and conflict prevention' (2002-2004); 'Youth building peace and intercultural dialogue'; 'Heritage classes' international exchanges'; 'The new challenge of intercultural education, religious diversity and dialogue in Europe' in co-operation with UNESCO and ALECSO (since 2003).

Today, 'intercultural education' and 'intercultural pedagogy' are regarded as a more appropriate response to the new context of globalisation and the increasing convergence of

different languages, religions, cultural behaviour and ways of thinking. In my judgement, the change in the pedagogical paradigm can be seen as revolutionary in that it has allowed educational strategies to replace previous approaches which had compensatory characteristics, such as *Ausländerpädagogik* (foreigner pedagogy), in which migration and growing up in a multicultural space were seen from only one perspective: as risk factors. The repercussions of these risk factors could, without competent pedagogic interventions, lead to physical, psychological or psychosomatic disturbances. For the first time, within the member states of the European Union, the education of children of foreign origin could be undertaken with some consideration of the 'dynamic' character of individual cultures and their respective identities. For the first time in the history of pedagogy, children of immigrants were no longer regarded as a 'problem' or 'risk', but as 'resources'. Officially, the possibility of enrichment and of personal and social growth was recognised, which stems from the congregation of people from different ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds.

With respect to the situation in Italy, it has historically been a country of emigration rather than immigration. Therefore the 'problem' of immigration only gained importance at the end of the 1970s. Teachers may benefit from the experiences of other European countries in which strategies relating to intercultural pedagogy have been used. Today, the spread and the legal establishment of intercultural pedagogy (also in school laws and decrees) can thus be seen as one of the strongest in Europe (Portera 1998; 2003b; 2007).

Conceptual and semantic clarification

In Europe, the concepts of intercultural education and pedagogy have been used frequently and can be found in many European documents, numerous books and school laws. Yet, it has emerged from numerous studies (Perotti 1996; Portera 2000) that there is an on-going failure to provide a clear semantic definition or distinct epistemological foundation for the concept. Among teachers and those responsible for school politics, very often the basic principles of intercultural education are misunderstood or are scarcely known or heeded. In view of this situation, it seems both appropriate and necessary (based on research and literature) to provide a short semantic clarification of the concept of 'intercultural education' as well as a more specific definition of 'trans- and multicultural education' (see Gundara 2000; Portera 2003a, 2004, 2006b).

The concept of 'trans-cultural education' refers to something that pervades culture (as in the fields of cross-cultural psychology or trans-cultural psychiatry). This approach is supported by the theory of cultural universalism, which is rooted in Emanuel Kant's cosmopolitan education of a man free from barbarities, in the universal principles of the French revolution affirming the dignity of all human beings, in Norberto Bobbio's studies on education aimed at 'universal values' (Lukes 2003). The French Enlightenment, above all Voltaire and Condorcet, spurned the idea that the fundamental purposes of humanity are identical at all times and in all places, and that there is only one truth. Educational strategies would aim to develop common universal elements: respect, peace, justice, environmental protection, human dignity, autonomy, etc. Although this principle has many merits, on closer inspection some limitations are visible as well. A view of the world is depicted here which is unrealistically supposed to be unitary, while in reality the world is very heterogeneous and fragmentary (the danger here being to overlook the particular social and cultural memberships of each person). Furthermore, this movement (of trans-cultural education), which is very strongly rooted in Europe, could turn out to be a new and further form of cultural imperialism, by means of which Europe or the Western world could try (covertly) to force their own value systems via economical or cultural power onto the rest of the world.

Even though such a structuralist framework is favoured by many educationalists and foregrounds many basic values common to all cultures, another possible danger is that of stasis. Those movements and processes of change which take place in single societies would not be taken into consideration, thus fostering the risk of labelling and generalising everything uncritically as 'human' without appropriately respecting actual cultural differences. One consequence could be a promotion of an 'a-cultural' pedagogy or even pedagogy focused on the assimilation of minorities.

Multi- or pluricultural education aims to respect diversities. Educational intervention, defined as multiculturalism, multicultural education or multicultural pedagogy, works from the *de facto* situation of the presence of two or more cultures, and aims at the recognition of commonalities and differences. The main educational aims are acknowledgment and respect of cultural diversity. General multicultural epistemology took root between the two world wars as a result of criticism of the positivist approach; Cartesian dualism and a rationalist paradigm were at its core, inspired by distinguished scholars (E. Husserl in philosophy, C. Saussure in linguistics, F. Boas in anthropology). The first studies where the notion of cultural pluralism emerged, hinting at diversity and acknowledgment of otherness, were already written however in 1580 by M. E. Montaigne, in his essays *Dei cannibali* e *delle carrozze (Of cannibals and coaches)*. But the real foundations were laid between 1720 and 1740, above all by G. B. Vico, whose book *Principi di scienza nuova* is quite rightly regarded as one of the first texts of multicultural epistemology. Berlin (1994, 96–103) describes Vico as 'the real father' of the idea of culture and cultural pluralism. In his vision, each culture has its own peculiar structure and set of values 'secondo il quale ogni cultura autentica ha la propria peculiare visione, la propria scala di valori'. After Vico, other authors in the field of differences and cultural pluralism need to be mentioned, among them Herder, Fiche, John Stuart Mill, Schopenhauer, Marx, Freud, and, in recent times, Barthes, Lévi-Strauss, Focault, Feyerabend, and Rorty.

In the field of European pedagogy, there was a positive recognition that developed from this principle that being different or being 'other' should be respected and that someone from another country should be given the same rights as the local person. The educational aim is both to know and to 'tolerate'[1] people with different cultural backgrounds and live in peaceful co-existence. By practical application, the main risks are then the tendency to see other cultures as static and rigid, as well as the danger of stratification; that is, the placing of single persons or ethnic groups in a hierarchy. Perhaps, because of the impossibility of respecting all diversities, in many European schools multicultural pedagogy has become a sort of pedagogy of assimilation of the minority (Nieke 1995, 12–17). As far as educational interventions are concerned, there is a danger of limiting oneself in practice to exotic or folkloristic presentations, and of increasingly forcing people into assumed cultures of origin. Thinking and behavioural patterns could be attributed to migrant children who even in their own villages or cities of origin no longer exist.

On the basis of this development, the principle of intercultural pedagogy represents a truly Copernican revolution. Concepts such as identity and culture are not interpreted any more as static, but as dynamic. Otherness or strangeness is not seen just as a danger or risk in terms of conspicuous behaviour or illness, but instead as a possibility for enrichment and for personal and social growth. The meeting with the 'other', with an individual of different cultural origin, is seen as a challenge and as a possibility of confrontation and reflection in the realms of values, rules and behavioural standards. Epistemologically, the intercultural principle can find its place between universalism and relativism. At the same time, however, it can subsume both in a new synthesis. In other words, the intercultural principle can incorporate all the positive aspects of trans-cultural and multicultural pedagogy, but at the

same time include all the above-named dangers, to bring about awareness of them. While pluri- or multiculture refers to phenomena of a descriptive nature, and pedagogic strategies refer to living together in a peaceful manner, one beside the other, the prefix 'inter' describes the relationship, the interaction, the exchange between two or more persons (Abdallah-Pretceille 1990). Societies became all pluricultural and can be defined as *multi*cultural; in the sense of the presence of people with different norms, values, religions and ways of thinking. Educational interventions, however, should be intended as *inter*cultural: differences and similarities are taken in consideration, brought into contact and bring about interaction (Camilleri 1985).

Limitations and 'traps'

Some limitations and 'traps' inherent in the use of the concept of intercultural education in theory and in praxis can be postulated on the basis of experiences across Europe, in schools and even within the Centre for Intercultural Studies[2]:

(1) A lack of clarity of concepts may pose a risk to teachers and educators, to the extent that they are tempted to define any initiative pertaining to immigrant children as 'intercultural', thus acquiring 'fashionable' overtones (Portera 2000; 2006a). The result is often that teachers only celebrate exotic cultures in their classroom and plan 'cultural' projects without any critical analysis of the educational value of their efforts. Many teachers and educators show respect for different cultures but they remain so committed to their traditional approach to this topic that they are no longer able to criticise, evaluate or distance themselves from their own approach.

(2) *Epistemological and theoretical weakness.* Some authors argue that intercultural education needs 'more complex conceptualisation, more history, more politics and fewer norms' (Coulby 2006, 254). While comparative education and multicultural pedagogy have a long tradition and have generated broad empirical evidence for their functioning, intercultural pedagogy has a relatively short history (since 1980) and much praxis is considered to be unrealistic or utopian (Bash 2007).

(3) *Terminology.* Often, certain terms are used in an unclear or improper manner, and this can lead to a reinforcement of stereotypes and prejudices. For example, the word 'race', which can found in legal codes around the world and in the scientific literature (especially in the English language), does not have any scientific foundation whatsoever. For this reason it was banned from European Parliament language (*Gazzetta ufficiale della Comunità Europea* 1997, 20). Its use can nourish the wrong conception of the existence of pre-established and hierarchically ordered 'races', as well as discrimination based on exterior characteristics such as a dark skin. Human history is a history of migration. Research in palaeontology, genetics, archaeology and historical linguistics shows that the common origin of all human beings can be found in southern and eastern Africa and in the East; that means: the only existing 'race' in this world is the human one (Lewontin 1984).

(4) Sometimes teachers tend to emphasise only differences and thus they stereotype and marginalise. For example, in the French context, a sort of *pédagogie couscous* (Dasen 1994) emerges with a focus on different food customs, dress, habits, etc.

(5) There is the risk of appointing immigrant pupils as ambassadors of their countries of origin, thus forcing them to represent a culture of which they have no detailed knowledge. Some immigrant children attempt – not without difficulty – to free themselves

from the culture of their countries of origin and to develop a sense of their own iden-
tities, as a synthesis of preferred cultural standards.

(6) The results of a previous study (Portera 1995, 2007) pointed to the existence of
another phenomenon in schools; I called it 'xenophilia'. This refers to a teacher's
'hyper-identification' with an immigrant child. Xenophilia can serve to place some
immigrant children on a pedestal or make them the 'teacher's pet'. This can have
negative consequences for all involved. For the children themselves, the price they
might have to pay is a repression or denial of some parts of the own self (identity),
or the development of family conflicts.

In addition to these risks, there are the dangers posed by an increase of extreme nation-
alism in recent years. Throughout Europe, newspapers contain reports of deviant behaviour
or crimes committed by (mostly undocumented) immigrants. Although it is important to
correct the endless stream of inaccurate or distorted pictures presented by the tabloid press[3],
we cannot only label them as ethnocentric or racist: we must take these reported events seri-
ously, give them careful attention and try to open a dialogue. The ideas of nation and citizen
have to be revisited in order to clarify not only rights, but also duties, and to develop social
democratic norms for all citizens in a country (Benhabib 2004). In other words, intercultural
education will only work in conjunction with education about lawfulness and respect for
limits (Portera 1998, 214). No kind of education will work without precise, clear and
accepted rules and regulations. The need for young generations to discover, develop and
then express their (cultural) diversity does not imply, and cannot lead to educational spon-
taneity, nor normative relativism or educational permissiveness, where anything goes and
everything is accorded the same value (cultural relativism).

Difficulties of another order derive from a new line of research which is taking root in
France, in German-speaking and Anglophone countries, in which critics dispute the use of
the concepts used to refer to ethnic groups and culture. Some European experts, like Perotti
(1996), argue that these concepts, introduced in the United States in the 1960s during the
struggle for minority rights, are currently used to disguise the real problems of immigrants
in Europe, as their difficulties are not cultural, but rather social, economic and political. In
Germany, some educators argue that an intercultural approach is often considered only
when there are immigrant pupils in a classroom or when problems arise, as if this discipline
were a *Sonderpädagogik* (special pedagogy) education for children with special needs.
Critics also note that an intercultural approach includes some anti-emancipatory elements,
which could favour deeply entrenched attitudes and mould political-structural problems into
cultural aspects (Allemann-Ghionda 1999).

The above analysis, relating to the development of an intercultural approach in European
countries (mainly in Northern Europe) suggests that several benefits can be derived from
intercultural education: revolutionary ideas, innovative educational strategies, interesting
projects, noticeable and significant changes in textbooks, programmes, curricula and in
school legislation. Reich (2000) noted that there is also a movement that currently opposes
these ideas. He observes an increase in both teacher neo-conservatism (for the fear of devel-
oping a relativism of values) and in teacher universalistic approaches (for fear of differen-
tiating too much among students). Therefore, in his words, there is a danger that
'intercultural education might lose its practical importance, as well as its theoretical and
political credibility' (Reich 2000, 72).

Considering the present situation in the world's industrialised countries, there is an urgent
and immediate need for a semantic and conceptual discussion about education, with a view
to removing linguistic misunderstandings and finding common and shared terminology.

There is a need for dialogue and international understanding. If educators achieve this basic framework for agreement, and all concepts have the same meaning in any country and any language, then we can open a clear and open-minded dialogue to meet the educational challenges of globalisation, pluralism and complexity. We have to 'gamble' on proposals, models and programmes which have been planned or launched in different countries. A dialogue between IAIE members and other authors aiming to acquire and reach shared meaning and understanding, not only for research, but also for teachers and educators in practice, has been started in the Verona congress (Portera 2005, 309–14), continued in the present special issue of the journal and will follow in a book (Portera and Grant, forthcoming).

Finally, it is useful to note that there are several centres for intercultural studies, established at European Universities, that promote intercultural education, both in theory and praxis, and engage in high quality work[4].

Conclusion

The intercultural educational approach represents the most appropriate response to the challenges of globalisation and complexity. It offers a means to gain a complete and thorough understanding of the concepts of democracy and pluralism, as well as different customs, traditions, faiths and values. Intercultural education helps to identify the risks of globalisation and multicultural communities; of economically motivated rules and regulations, without any intervention by governments and/or politics. Moreover, the intercultural approach can help to identify new opportunities (e.g. fruitful exchanges between different people; new interactive/paritetic forms of communication and relationship). Since intercultural education takes into consideration both the common objectives of all human beings and specific peculiarities, it transcends the mere acknowledgment of equal dignity of all people of the world, regardless of skin colour, language and religion (basic principles of trans-cultural education), respect for differences (right to have the same opportunities though being different), or peaceful coexistence (basic principles of multi-cultural education, which is a desirable goal when we consider wars and injustices in many parts of the world). Intercultural education offers the opportunity to 'show' real cultural differences, to compare and exchange them, in a word, to *interact*: action in the activity; a compulsory principle in every educational relationship. It provides the immigrant with skills and abilities to manage activities with common norms and regulations. There is a game, an 'interaction', between people with different ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds in which the aim is not assimilation or fusion, but encounter, communication, dialogue, contact, in which roles and limits are clear, but the end is open.

As has been shown, it is not just a matter of new terminology, nor to substitute 'multi-cultural' with 'intercultural'. The social sciences, teachers and educators need a common language. If we are aware that we need to get rid of strategies that are full of verbal, physical or psychological violence (which only increases problems or ignores them), of assimilation (which is bound to fail, since the process of identity acquisition always implies liberty), of universalism (which might level out anything and anyone; it does not consider differences in cultural features), then deep, competent and careful reflections on the educational paradigm for the new millennium should ensue. Moreover, if we take into consideration various past and present theories, in particular those regarding the human sciences, scientific research ought to be considerably increased in order to study positive, negative and also socio-economic factors and mechanisms affecting the peaceful coexistence of heterogeneous groups. The real causes of progress or failure at school and of inclusion or exclusion of minorities need specific attention as well.

One possibility is offered by the Centre for Intercultural Studies in Verona, where it is attempting to develop research and intervention projects relating to intercultural communication (the year 2008 was designated by the European Council as the Year of Intercultural Dialogue), education for democratic citizenship (equal opportunities within linguistic, religious or cultural differences, along with education to promote critical thinking, autonomy, and the rights and responsibilities associated with a peaceful life), and intercultural management and competence (for developing strategies for problem solving in multicultural contexts).

Notes

1. The term 'tolerance', used until today in connection with multicultural (and sometimes intercultural) education, in fact transmits a hierarchic idea: one person is up and has to tolerate other persons (down). Therefore, I prefer to use the expression 'respect', which is more equitable; the contact can happen on the same level.
2. The Centre for Intercultural Studies was established at the Department of Educational Science, University of Verona, 1998 and its director is Prof. Agostino Portera. The main aim is to promote and provide scientific and cultural services, as well as methodological and educational tools in the field of teaching and education in a pluralist and multicultural society. The Centre's purposes are to study and conduct research, improve school and educational curricula, support and consult in the psycho-pedagogic field, as well as training and specialisation in the multicultural sector. For these purposes, it provides advice and services to researchers and experts in intercultural pedagogy, to educators and social workers, to teachers, to university students and to graduates. The most recent research relates to: self-image and the others' image, and intercultural content, in textbooks used in primary schools; the methodology and didactics of teaching intercultural pedagogy; adolescent and young migrant identities; teaching projects on learning a foreign language; mixed families and international adoptions; self-image and the others' image, and intercultural content, in textbooks used in secondary schools; cooperative learning; intercultural communication and mediation for conflict resolution in schools; and intercultural communication in industry. For further information, publications and material: http://fermi.univr.it/csint/
3. In order to avoid misunderstanding, it is important to add that frequently the mass media do not report hate crimes directed against immigrants. Those holding foreign passports seem to be noticed by the media more often when there is talk of crime or deviant behaviour (Corte 2006).
4. In addition to the Centre for Intercultural Studies in Verona, other important centres established in European include:

   (a) The International Centre for Intercultural Studies, Institute of Education, University of London (Head Prof. Jagdish Gundara, UNESCO Chair in Intercultural Education). The Centre, one of the oldest in the area of intercultural education, has been involved in a wide range of funded projects, including an EU project that examines minority languages, funded under the EU Framework 5 programme, and a cross-national ITC development programme on intercultural education, also EU funded. The Centre has worked with a wide range of national and international agencies, including the Commonwealth Secretariat, Council of Europe, ESRC, EU, MRG, the Swedish National Board of Universities, UNICEF, UNESCO and UNRISD. Research and development work includes: the Commonwealth Values in Education Project; Educational Needs of Gypsy/Traveller Children; Educational Needs of Turkish Cypriot Children; Educational Needs of Refugee Students; and the EU Feasibility Study on the South Eastern Europe Educational Co-operation Centre. For more information, publications and other material see: http://ioewebserver.ioe.ac.uk/ioe/cms/get.asp?cid=6327
   (b) The Centre for Intercultural Studies, Free University of Berlin, directed by Prof. Gerd R. Hoff, is also one of the oldest institutes doing research and teaching in intercultural education. Early on, the *Studiengruppen zu Migration und Integration* which still exists, was created. It does work in the field of immigration and inclusion. Other focal areas relate to the field of intercultural dialogue, and actions against racism. Recent research has been carried out in the field of cultural capital in emigration; intercultural competence; and the formation of an international academy for innovative pedagogy and cultural awareness in Europe.

There is also a workgroup for *Interkulturelle Erziehungswissenschaft* (intercultural educational sciences) and a European Master's Degree Programme. More information, publications and other material can be found at: http://www.ewi-psy.fu-berlin.de/einrichtungen/arbeitsbereiche/interkulturell/index.html

(c) The Centre for Intercultural Communication and Interaction in Ghent (Belgium), was founded in 2000 as a research unit that pays attention to fundamental research as well as to the implementation of such research in the cultural field. The latter involves the execution of commissioned policy research projects, as well as regular interventions in, and/or contributions to, social discussions and to social/cultural projects in development. It brings together researchers from diverse fields and specialties. The main study areas are: interdisciplinary anthropology; comparative study of religion; gender studies; post-colonial studies; performative anthropology; and applied research on interculturality. Research results are published in books and articles. Films, essays, educational materials and information reports for policy makers and others in society are also available. For more information, see: http://cici.ugent.be/en

Notes on contributor

Agostino Portera is Full Professor of Intercultural Education, Director of the Department of Educational Science and Head of the Centre for Intercultural Studies of the University of Verona, Italy. He is currently editing a book with C.A. Grant, to be published by Routledge, called *Multicultural and intercultural education for the global world*.

References

Abdallah-Pretceille, M. 1990. *Vers une pédagogie interculturelle.* Paris: INRP Sorbonne.
Bash, L. 2007. Globalism and culturalism in intercultural education. Speech, Convegno Internazionale. La SICESE (Maggio). *Gazzetta ufficiale della Comunità Europea*. 1997. Documenti e leggi della comunità. January 30.
Bauman, Z. 1977. *Postmodernity and its discontents.* New York: New York University Press.
Berlin, I. 1994. *Il legno storto dell'umanità. Capitoli della storia delle idee.* Milano: Adelphi.
Benhabib, S. 2004. *The rights of others.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Birzea, C. 2000. L'éducation à la citoyenneté démocratique: un apprentissage tout au long de la vie. In *Projet Education à la citoyenneté démocratique.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
Camilleri, C. 1985. *Anthropologie culturelle et éducative.* Lausanne: Delachaux & Niestlé.
Corte, M. 2006. *Comunicazione e giornalismo interculturale.* Padova: Cedam.
Coulby, D. 2006. Intercultural education: theory and practice. *Intercultural Education* 17, no. 3: 245–57.
Dasen, P. 1994. Fondements scientifiques d'une pédagogie interculturelle. In *Multikultur und Bildung in Europa,* ed. C. Alleman-Ghionda. Bern: Lang.
Foucher, M. 1994. *Minorities in central and eastern Europe.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
Giddens, A. 1998. *The third way: The renewal of social democracy.* Cambridge: Polity.
Gundara, J.S. 2000. *Interculturalism, education and inclusion.* London: Paul Chapman.
Lewontin, R. 1984. *La diversité génétique humaine.* Berlin: Puf.
Lukes, S. 2003. *Liberals and cannibals.* London: Verso.
Nieke, W. 1995. *Interkulturelle Erziehung und Bildun.* Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
Perotti, A. 1996. *Migrations et société pluriculturelle en Europe.* Paris: L'Harmattan.
Portera, A. 1995. *Interkulturelle Identitäten. Risiko- und Schutzfaktoren der Identitätsbildung italienischer Jugendlichen in Südbaden und in Süditalien.* Cologne: Böhlau Verlag.
———. 1998. Multiculture, identity, educational need and possibilities of (intercultural) intervention. *European Journal of intercultural Studies* 9, no. 2: 209–18.
———. 2000. *L'educazione interculturale nella teoria e nella pratica. Stereotipi pregiudizi e pedagogia interculturale neilibri di testo della scuola elementare.* Padua: CEDAM.
———. 2003a. Educazione e pedagogia interculturale in Italia e in Europa. In *Pedagogia interculturale in Italia e in Europa. Aspetti epistemologici e didattici,* ed. A. Portera. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.
———. 2003b. L'educazione interculturale nella teoria e nella pratica in Italia. In *Pedagogia interculturale in Italia e in Europa. Aspetti epistemologici e didattici,* ed. A. Portera. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.

———. 2004. Stereotypes, prejudices and intercultural education in Italy: research on textbooks in primary schools. *Intercultural Education* 15, no. 3: 283–94.

———. 2005. Main results of the conference: Diversity in education in an international context. *Intercultural Education,* 16, no. 3: 309–14.

———. 2006a. Educazione interculturale in Europa. In *Educazione interculturale nel contesto internazionale,* ed. A. Portera. Milan: Guerini.

———. 2006b. *Globalizzazione e pedagogia interculturale.* Trento: Erikson.

———. 2007. *Tesori sommersi. Emigrazione, identità, bisogni educativi interculturali,* 3rd edn. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Portera, A., and C.A. Grant. Forthcoming. *Needs of education for the global world. Multicultural and intercultural education in different countries.* New York: Routledge.

Rey, M. 1986. *Former les enseignants à l'éducation interculturelle?* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

———. 2006. The Council of Europe and the field of intercultural education. In *Educazione interculturale nel contesto internazionale,* ed. A. Portera. Milan: Guerini.

Reich, H.H. u.a. 2000. *Fachdidaktik interkulturell. Ein Handbuch.* Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Sleeter, E., and C.A. Grant. 2007. *Making choices for multicultural education,* 5th edn. New York: Wiley.