European University Institute | ROBERT SCHUMAN CENTRE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES

ACCEPT PLURALISM

APPLYING TOLERANCE INDICATORS:

ASSESSING TOLERANCE IN THE CURRICULUM

2013/15
5. New Knowledge.
Applying Tolerance Indicators

Jan Dobbernack,
University of Bristol

Disclaimer: The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the European Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information. A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet. It can be accessed through the Europa server (http://europa.eu).

Table of Contents

ASSESSING TOLERANCE IN THE CURRICULUM

INTRODUCTION

A new readiness to positively acknowledge cultural diversity and prioritize its tolerance is evident across Europe. Although the endorsement of diversity represents an important development, it coincides and sometimes clashes with stronger concerns about national identities and social divisions.

Uneasiness about social cohesion, declining social capital or uncertainty about the meaning of citizenship leads to a new concentration on 'what is shared'. This is reflected in significant anxiety that provides not just the mobilizing base for new types of populism but even in the mainstream raises questions about past 'excesses' of tolerance and about how much diversity the liberal state can accommodate. Such fears increase in times of social, economic and political crisis.

The challenge for education would, then, seem to be about how to balance the new focus on national identity, citizenship or 'muscularly' liberal values with a commitment to the cultural pluralism that is empirically present and often increasing all across Europe. The notion of 'multicultural citizenship' (Modood 2007) or conceptions of 'plural nationalism' (Triandafyllidou 2013) might offer some idea for how unity and diversity can be reconciled for different contexts and situations. The treatment of 'difference' in national curricula and in particular in history and citizenship education is an interesting case to examine the extent to which such attempts succeed or fail.

Debates about how the values of 'tolerance' and 'respect' should feature in state education and inform curricular objectives usually coincide with some contestation of the implications of immigration and of the presence of national minorities. While these debates usually are significant beyond school life, education is an important site for the negotiation of issues, such as the relationship between state institutions and minority religious groups or the official definition of national identity accounts.

As a result, the determination of what is to be taught represents a good test case for whether European states can claim to live up to standards of tolerance, respect and decency in how minority groups and individuals are treated.

This relevance of education is even more evident when we recognize that tolerance is an attitude that has to be learned and that requires competencies, which education needs to foster or inculcate. To a significant extent, the prospects of such efforts depend on the content of national and sub-national curricula.

In this report, we cover **Bulgaria, England, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain** and **Turkey**.

We thus include a wide range of countries: old and new immigration countries and countries where new immigration overlaps with a longer established concern with the diversity that national minorities represent.

By focusing on five key questions pertaining to the curricular acknowledgment of cultural diversity and the minority presence, the guiding question is how accepting these countries are of cultural diversity and our ambition is to provide an account of patterns of intolerance, tolerance and respect across these twelve cases.

PART 1. THE INDICATORS

The present report selects five issues that collectively provide for a snapshot, rather than a complete picture, of how accepting of diversity these countries are.

> We examine the way the **civic or citizenship curriculum acknowledges and engages with cultural, ethnic and religious diversity (Indicator 2.1.).**

> Regarding the national **history curriculum**, we ask country teams to evaluate the way **immigration-related diversity (2.2.) and the presence of national minorities (2.3.) are conceived**.

> In the case of **religious education (2.4.),** a curricular subject with high degrees of cross-country variation, we ask about exemptions and alternative arrangements for minority faith groups.

> Finally, each country team assesses **the provision of 'mother tongue' classes for native minorities and post-immigration groups (2.5).**

For each indicator, we rely on self-assessments. Country teams within the ACCEPT PLURALISM project not only have the contextual knowledge required for these evaluations, their evaluations occur (necessarily) on the basis of definitions of acceptance that are contextually appropriate and may not be completely shared. The comparative picture that emerges from evaluations provided by twelve teams of experts may thus highlight interesting trends, parallels or discontinuities.

Yet it should be seen and read with caution and readers are invited to critically follow the justifications provided by country teams for each score and to consult the extended assessments and evaluations provided in the Annex.

A note on scores

The individual evaluations that are offered here work in many cases across analytical levels and cover a number of phenomena that may be difficult to aggregate in a single score. The laws or provisions that might be in place to regulate citizenship or history education, and the normative ideals that these subjects are supposed to propagate on paper, for example, may well be ignored or even systematically circumvented in educational practice. Yet conversely, provisions that would be negatively evaluated may be exceeded, re-defined and improved upon in educational practice. The work done by local authorities, schools or even individual teachers is significant. Laws and policies often leave room for manoeuvre and thus for a positive engagement with diversity even where the curriculum does not envisage any such thing.

Both types of divergence – exceeding or circumventing curricular provisions – are evidently present in and complicate some of the evaluations that are offered below. This is especially the case as comprehensive data that would cover the variety of educational practices is unavailable for most countries. Hence, in the majority of evaluations offered below, a high level of certainty about legal or institutional provisions sits alongside accounts of the totality of educational practices that may be, at times, impressionistic and unreliable.

Yet the point of these indicators, and the judgments that they represent, is to provide arguments that work reasonably well in accounting for educational practice but that do not claim to mirror the diversity and variations that exists within each national context.

When regulations at the national level unfavourably align with negative practices at the local level, there are particularly good reasons to adopt negative evaluations. However, when progressive determinations from the centre are widely ignored or, conversely, when restrictive guidelines are more or less systematically exceeded in local educational practice – by individual schools, local authorities and so on – scores represent a judgment that each country team has to make.

What the indicators can and cannot show

Country scores on individual indicators should thus be interpreted as condensed statements on the situation in a particular country regarding one aspect for a given period of time. They represent contextual judgments by experts based on an interpretation of qualitative research and the available knowledge about the respective society and are backed by reference to relevant sources listed in the long versions of indicator assessment (in the Annex). The scores cannot be understood and should not be presented without the explanations provided by the researchers.

Scores may help to analyze the situation in countries in a comparative perspective, but from the fact that countries score higher or lower across a number of indicators we cannot infer that a particular country as a whole is 'more or less tolerant'. Scores cannot be aggregated.

Scores on individual indicators are not necessarily comparable; because different factors and reasons may have resulted in a particular score for a country (e.g. it may be that the score in one country only refers to a particular region). This means that scores can only be interpreted in a comparative way in relation to the explications and reasons provided.

For more information about each national case study please refer to the individual reports listed in the Annex. For the Toolkit of the ACCEPT PLURALISM Tolerance Indicators please see here: www.accept-pluralism.eu

INDICATOR 2.1 CIVIC EDUCATION - TEACHING ABOUT DIVERSITY

LOW – non tolerance	There is no civic education course in lower high school (around the 11-15 age bracket) and/or civic education only includes teaching on the country's political system and institutions with no reference to the cultural, ethnic or religious diversity of the country.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Civic education courses include specific references to cultural, ethnic or religious diversity, however, the courses are taught in an abstract or general way without presenting students with questions about particular examples pertaining to real situations that they may face in and out of school.
HIGH – acceptance	Civic education courses give significant priority to the value of cultural, ethnic and religious diversity and include experiential learning, including examples that are relevant to the contemporary reality and situations that children face in and out of school.

With this indicator we survey the provision of citizenship education in twelve countries. Our interest is primarily in the extent to which such educational programmes contain an acknowledgment of diversity and of the (legitimate) presence of post-immigration and national minority populations.

We also ask teams to assess the quality of the programmes that exist in their countries and in particular whether educational practices approximate the ideals that are enshrined, if at all, in the national curriculum. Significantly, this means covering a diverse field, which is already reflected in different terminologies: some courses may specifically address 'citizenship', others may follow the idea of 'social studies'. In some cases, such labels may change in line with different educational priorities. In the German case, almost each Land adopts its own label along with its own curriculum for the provision of Sozialkunde, Gemeinschaftskunde, Politische Bildung or just Politik.

Regardless of labels, over the last decade there has been an expansion of citizenship education across European school systems. The reasons for this are diverse, may be contextually different or perhaps are to be found in European policy convergence in the field of education. Evidently, however, there is an increasing concern with political apathy and the democratic commitment in particular of young people. More than any acknowledgment of diversity, it is worry about the long-term viability of democratic arrangements or about declining 'social capital' that underpins the introduction of citizenship education on national curricula.

Yet despite such priorities, new civic curricula often seem to take some steps towards the acknowledgment of cultural pluralism. The 'civic turn' or the 're-balancing' or 'thickening' of citizenship - however one

chooses to conceive of such phenomena (see Mouritsen 2008; Meer and Modood 2009) - contains ambiguities. While there is the risk of uniformity and difference-blindness in how the 'return' to key civic virtues is managed, such processes are not inconsistent with a civically thickened acknowledgment of cultural pluralism.

In the new curricula of civic or citizenship education, tolerance of 'diversity' is usually taught as part of a broader canon of liberal-democratic virtues, including freedom of speech and the value of democratic participation. With civic education, the virtue of tolerance may thus have moved more centre-stage, yet its proximity to other key virtues often seems to imply a conditionality: tolerance is a valuable objective but the extent of its reach is qualified and limited by other values and it may not be accorded to those that are hostile to such values (see Schiffauer 2013 for this logic). In situations where hostility to minority populations is expressed in the form of blanket denials of their commitment to the liberal achievements of 'the West', this makes for a difficult situation. It is thus necessary to pay close attention to how this difficulty is resolved and how 'liberal tolerance' is taught.

The value of 'national belonging' often provides a key anchoring point for civic education programmes. To be sure, this usually is said to imply belonging to the 'civic nation', not to a racially or ethno-culturally unified community. Yet, as the Turkish case of republican citizenship education illustrates, which is underpinned by an amalgamated 'Sunni-Muslim-Turkish' identity, in some cases the civic or ethnic nation may seem to be one and the same thing.

Even in Western Europe, the departure from racist or nationalist modes of exclusion – as Mouritsen and Olsen (2011) observe for the case of Denmark – is neither complete nor does 'liberal constitutionalism', as Christian Joppke (2007, 16) categorically suggests, 'rule out' the persistence of racist or nationalist motivations in how the 'liberal state' engages 'difference'. The way the nation is defined and historicized in education (see also indicators 2.2. and 2.3.) thus requires examination beyond a surface picture of top-level proclamations, which may not characterize the reality of how 'difference' is conceived and treated in school and beyond.

For these indicators, the question, then, would be how consequential the curricular emphasis on the tolerance of diversity turns out to be. The answer is that it depends.

The majority of country teams highlight high degrees of variation and often suggest, though usually on the basis of anecdotal observations (with the exception of Greece which has been able to obtain a clearer picture of school practices), that schools that serve diverse communities tend to be better at teaching the value of tolerance. It is of course regrettable that in many cases children living outside of these zones of diversity tend not to receive the same quality of diversity teaching than those within.

Minimal state regulation, however, may also allow for initiatives by teachers, schools and local authorities that can significantly develop such regulations in a positive direction (such as in Poland, England or Italy).

Any acknowledgment of diversity in the text of the curriculum may not count for much if it is promulgated by lacklustre or hostile teachers or circumvented by schools that fail to take the issue seriously.

Yet the factors accounting for how central regulations and teaching practices converge or work against one another often seem contingent and unpredictable. In some cases, for example in the Netherlands, there appears to be a professional inclination among educationalists towards tolerance and respect. Dutch teachers thus tend towards 'pragmatic' interpretations of Burgerschapskunde and thus complement the promulgation of 'Dutch values' with an emphasis on tolerance and anti-racism. In cases where civic education is meant to cover issues that are nationally contested or particularly sensitive, however, it may be too much to expect teachers – individually or collectively – to resolve issues that are subject to heated debates (such as in the case of Spain, Hungary and England).

Finally, the efficacy of citizenship education is perhaps particularly difficult to address. Intuitively, it appears misguided to assign positive or negative responsibility to any one educational module for attitudes among young or adolescent people. Levels of hostility towards minority populations provide a critical reality check for rhetorical, but perhaps ineffectual or dishonest, emphases on tolerance and diversity in citizenship curricula. Where key aspects of any socially prevalent hostility towards minority populations are not addressed in citizenship education, we may reasonably speak of a failure or neglect that justifies a negative evaluation of the according programmes.

This includes in particular hostility towards Islam or Roma populations, which in many cases – such as Germany or Hungary respectively – is not an issue that forms part of civic education.

Table 1. Applying Indicator 2.1 Civic education – teaching about diversity to twelve European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium	While the 'civic education' curriculum includes specific references to cultural, ethnic and religious diversity, the overall focus is clearly on the (civic) nation and the nation-state. The main goal is the formation and strengthening of the national identity. The place and role of minority communities in the Bulgarian society are insufficiently presented.
England	High/ Medium	Citizenship education became obligatory in 2002 (between ages 11 to 16) and contains an acknowledgment of diversity in the 'national story'. In practice, there are large variations between schools and local authorities. The current government (coalition between the Tories and the Liberal Democrats) intends to downgrade and 'depoliticize' citizenship education.
France	High	Civic education classes are taught as part of History and Geography from 6th grade to the end of High school. They address issues of diversity from a civic perspective.
Germany	Low/ Medium	In German citizenship education, cultural and especially religious diversity tends to be seen as a problem (rather than an opportunity). Muslim immigrants in particular are portrayed as poor, different from the majority and even culturally backward.
Greece	Medium	There is a civics and social studies component in elementary education and lower high school. It includes a concern with the 'European conscience' and 'national identity and cultural 'self-knowledge'. Cultural and ethnic diversity is scarcely covered.
Hungary	Medium	Until now students were expected to know about minority rights and ethnic and national diversity. A new centralised school system with a new national curriculum will be implemented in January 2013. This curriculum has already been criticised for emphasising Hungarian nationalism at the expense of cultural diversity.
Ireland	Low/ Medium	'Civic, Social and Political Education' is required for lower secondary students. The curriculum does not focus on issues of immigration or diversity. The required 'action' component tends to be implemented formalistically. The subject is given too little time to cover the curriculum, considered a low priority in many schools, and the active component is marginalised by teachers.
Italy	Low/	Civic education courses have never been considered central in Italy. In 2010, the Education Minister Gelmini introduced new civic education courses. Nonetheless, the actual school-hours dedicated to these courses are very few

	Medium	and references to the country's diversities are limited. Every school can decide on its own how to implement them, how/if to introduce references to diversity.
Netherlands	**High**	Since 2006, citizenship education is compulsory. Respect for freedom of education means that the precise interpretation of the content is left to schools. Teachers and schools tend to emphasize the teaching of tolerance, anti-racism and respect for diversity. Multiculturalism, discrimination, respect, and issues related to religious and ethnic diversity and inequality are important topics in these classes. Yet, many schools have developed patch-work curricula and/or continue to teach existing programmes under the label 'citizenship education'. Inevitably, there is great variation between schools.
Poland	**Medium**	Two school subjects in lower high school ('Knowledge and society', and History) contain an element of teaching about minorities (especially in historical terms), but this knowledge does not make much reference to the current situation in Poland.
Spain	**High/** **Medium**	The current curricular changes regarding Education for Citizenship (EfC) make it difficult to assess this indicator. The extensive integration of tolerance, multicultural societies, respect for diversity makes us rank EfC HIGH as it had been applied since 2006. The elimination of reference to racist prejudices and uncertainties on the future of EfC might point toward a MEDIUM or even a LOW score if citizenship education disappears.
Turkey	**Low**	National curriculum in Turkey still bears a nationalist form advocating homogenization and Sunni-Muslim-Turkish citizenry. Despite the fact that the new curriculum reform reflects some signs of Europeanization, homogeneity is still explicitly celebrated by the curriculum.

INDICATOR 2.2 INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRATION HISTORY IN NATIONAL HISTORY CURRICULA

LOW – non tolerance	The national history narrative reflects only the majority view point. There is no consideration of the contribution of immigrants in the making (past or present) of the nation or the state
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	There is an acknowledgement of the multi-ethnic or multi-cultural or multi-religious composition of the nation. There is no appreciation, however, of multiple perspectives in the national narrative and in particular of migrants' experiences of inequality, discrimination or exploitation.
HIGH – acceptance	The national history curriculum has been or is being revised to accommodate for the experiences of immigrant groups. Tensions and alternative viewpoints are given due consideration and the critical role of history as making sense of our past, present and future is emphasised.

Claims for the revision or extension of national curricula to cover immigration history are usually made in order to increase the symbolic weight that is given to the presence of settled minority groups. Education is an important site for the negotiation of national narratives and whether these acknowledge social pluralism. How such narratives are conceived and presented in the curriculum may not just be of symbolic but also of practical significance.

The systematic disavowal of immigration history makes it more difficult for post-immigration communities to develop a sense of belonging and self-worth, and cements a situation where such communities continue to be perceived as outsiders.

Yet European countries have experienced different forms and degrees of immigration and accordingly any engagement with aspects of 'immigration history' in education is likely to entail an emphasis on particular features or narratives. For receiving countries of post-war labour migration, such acknowledgments will likely be different from those in South, South-East and Eastern European countries, which only recently, if at all, have become a new destination for labour migrants or refugees. Yet even within this schematic division, there are notable distinctions: in contrast to Germany, French and British immigration is entangled with colonial history and the two may thus be treated alongside ('we are here because you were there'). Nations that emerged out of the collapse of multi-national empires, in particular the Hapsburg and the Ottoman Empires, may adopt different narrative of their histories and of how past and recent episodes of immigration feature in it.

Among the historical episodes that nation states may choose to recognize or consider within the domain of history education, there are perhaps three broad areas that can be distinguished:

i. Population movements in the 19th or early to mid-20th century, including between colonies and colonial centre, 'population exchanges' during/after World War I, and the displacement, expulsion and arrival of populations in the aftermath of World War II. These are often sensitive historical issues and their relevance for more recent formations of diversity and contemporary immigration is sometimes difficult to determine. Yet it seems that such episodes continue to carry symbolic weight and thus remain an important benchmark for the acknowledgment of pluralism and contemporary diversity (Triandafyllidou 2013).

ii. Post-war arrival of labour migrants and long-term settlement with family reunification between 'high' and 'low-wage' countries in Southern and South East Europe, North African and Turkey or former colonies in South Asia or the Asia-Pacific region. The most notorious case here is perhaps the German disavowal of the label Einwanderungsland, a country where the settlement of post-immigrant minority populations had become an irrevocable fact, not a temporary aberration, in the aftermath of this immigration. More recently, many of these countries have made some steps to acknowledge the permanent settlement of (previous) labour migrants and their descendents.

iii. Recent migratory phenomena, including the arrival of refugees and labour migrants or immigration from new European Union accession countries or countries hit by the ongoing economic depression. It may be difficult to consider such recent episodes as part of history lessons, also because long- or only medium-term demographic outcomes of current trends are difficult to predict (such as in the case of the settlement of labour migrants from new accession states to the European Union). Yet it is particularly new types of immigration that challenge established self-conceptions of countries – such as Italy and Spain but also Turkey, for example – that have recently become net recipients.

Issues in the area of 'immigration history', accordingly, vary inasmuch as countries choose to highlight different episodes. But across a number of cases, one of the most significant challenges appears to be the treatment of migration-related diversity when it in some way contradicts, and so necessitates a revision of, national origin-stories.

There is a problem if the treatment of population movements focuses exclusively on preferred episodes of migration or expulsion, often to do with people who are seen as ethno-nationally close, at the expense of other populations whose arrival or expulsion is conveniently ignored. Countries do particularly well if they manage to acknowledge many episodes and multiple perspectives, such as in the case of the Dutch canon of history education (http://entoen.nu/veelkleurignederland/).

Table 2. Applying Indicator 2.2 Integration of immigration history in national history curricula to twelve European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	N/A	Bulgaria is (still) not an attractive destination country for immigration. Immigrants are a fairly recent phenomenon and represent below 1.5% of population.
England	Medium	History includes an acknowledgment of immigration and at Key Stage 3 (between 11 and 14) the emphasis is on 'cultural, ethnic and religious diversity'. The national history curriculum is due to be revised and there is significant variation between schools and local authorities.
France	High	The national history curriculum was recently revised to reflect the contribution of immigration history to national French history. However, issues remain on how this dimension of history should be taught and tensions over the teaching of colonial history have not yet been resolved.
Germany	Medium	Although since 2000 there has been an acknowledgment of its status as an 'immigration country', German curricula have not been drastically changed in this regard. Immigration is mostly presented as a problem rather than as having contributed to the reconstruction of the country after WWII and still contributing to Germany as a pluralist society.
Greece	Low	There is no attempt to integrate the country's immigration experience into the national history curriculum.
Hungary	N/A	
Ireland	Medium	The primary history curriculum stresses diversity and promotes 'open, questioning attitudes to…beliefs, values and motivations…, tolerance towards… ethnic, cultural, religious and social groups'. The secondary syllabus focuses more closely on Irish history, linked to European and world history. Immigration is, however, relatively recent in Ireland and the curriculum has not been substantially revised since the late 1990s.
Italy	Low	The national history narrative reflects only the majority's view point. Curricula and textbooks that are used in classrooms have a European or Italian view, with a few references to other perspectives. Some teachers/schools include some references to the countries of foreign students in the curricula, but this is done informally and in an unstructured way.
Netherlands	High	A major reorientation in the teaching of Dutch history has been the development of a 'canon' that should form the basis for teaching at all

		educational levels (primary and secondary, vocational and pre-university). The canon includes important elements of immigration and multiculturalism, colonial history and the history of slavery. These issues are now an important part of the curriculum that is being taught in Dutch schools. The canon was developed between 2006 and 2008, and since 2010 it has been translated into teaching objectives and examination requirements.
Poland	**Low** / **Medium**	The curriculum of history and 'knowledge of society' contains very few elements of multicultural education (especially in historical perspective), and these do not refer to the contemporary situation.
Spain	**Low**	There is no history of immigration in the national curriculum (which can be understood as a result of the fact that Spain is a recent immigration country). Spanish emigration is part of the curriculum but occupies a marginal place.
Turkey	**Low**	Although Turkey has always been a country of emigration since the late 19th century, and also recently a country of forced domestic migration (Kurds), of transit migration, and of immigration, phenomena related to migration have not been included in the curricula.

INDICATOR 2.3 INTEGRATION OF HISTORICAL MINORITIES IN NATIONAL HISTORY CURRICULA

LOW – non tolerance	The national history narrative reflects only the majority viewpoint. There is no consideration of the contribution of native minorities in the making (past or present) of the nation or the state.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	There is an acknowledgement of the multi-ethnic or multi-cultural or multi-religious composition of the nation. There is no appreciation, however, of multiple perspectives in the national narrative and in particular of native minority historical experiences of domination and inequality or discrimination. Accounts of past events, heroes and national myths adopt only the dominant majority perspective.
HIGH – acceptance	The national history curriculum has been or is being revised to accommodate for the experiences of minority groups. Tensions and alternative viewpoints are given due consideration and the critical role of history as making sense of our past, present and future is emphasised.

This indicator deals with the curricular treatment of 'national', 'ethnic', or 'historical minorities', a somewhat loose collection of categories that refer to varied populations within states with significant national majority populations. We use the label of 'historical minorities' here in order to distinguish these populations from the post-immigration minorities of post-WW2 Europe.

Kymlicka raises a point that is significant for our purposes: in a 'multi-nation state' the minoritarian status of any population often appears to be a matter of perspective. Minorities that are numerically insignificant at the state level may be regionally significant or even local majorities. The issue, then, is about which minority groups find consideration at what level and has the "ability to use which state powers to sustain its culture" (Kymlicka 1995, 112).

To be sure, with this indicator we are not - at least not exclusively - following Kymlicka's lead in enumerating rights that are due to minorities to ensure 'the viability of their societal culture' (Kymlicka 1995, 109). It is conceivable that such cultures are well protected without being assigned a role in the national curriculum. Their protection could be achieved through a system of educational-territorial autonomy that either grants exemptions or provides for educational federalism of the type that exists, for example, in Spain. In Italy, the German-speaking population in the Alto Adige region enjoys significant degrees of cultural self-determination without being acknowledged in the national curriculum.

Rather, with this indicator, we aim at the extent to which multi-nation states or states with historical minorities recognize and act upon the recognition of their multi-nationality or of the historically established minority presence. It is clear that the most significant obstacle for this objective is the

hegemony of particular majority nationalisms that have underpinned nation-building projects across Europe, which were usually not hospitable to diversity within.

Although we do not provide an evaluation of the United Kingdom for this indicator (the reason being that education is a 'devolved' policy field), the multi-national composition of the UK has yielded debates that may of be some interest. The four nations-story that is currently highlighted in definitions of British identity is built on the constitutive entanglement of English, Scottish, Irish and Welsh components. Yet it is not as if this notion existed all along. It emerged in struggles against the preponderance of English identity on the British Isles and, as for examples in the case of Wales, through a cultural re-awakening that only took place and became politically relevant in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

It is not our intention to suggest that the particular case of the United Kingdom offers straightforward lessons for the rest of Europe. Indeed, challenges are significantly different in places such as Turkey or Hungary, where the acknowledgment of constitutive diversity would seem to put into question core features of a national identity that is parochially conceived. In such cases, the extension of curricular provisions may become a political football and is open to be used to incite populist outrage (as for example in the case of Greece).

Table 3. Applying Indicator 2.3 Integration of Historical Minorities in National History Curricula to twelve European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	**Medium**	After 1989, history textbooks and curriculum were substantially revised to present a balanced and more modern narrative about the historical facts, and acknowledge the multi-ethnic and multi-religious composition of the Bulgarian nation. However, still only little attention is paid to the contribution of minorities to the historical and cultural development of the state and the historical narrative remains clearly ethnocentric.
England	*N/A*	
France	**Low**	In an effort to teach a history that 'everyone can relate to', the national history curriculum tends to overlook the experience of minorities, should they be based on regional, religious or immigrant affiliation.
Germany	*N/A*	National minorities of Frisians, Sorbes and Danes are very small and their representation in history curricula has never really been an issue. This is similar for Sinti and Roma, who have been acknowledged as national minorities in 1998.
Greece	**Low**	There are no provisions for integrating the point of view of any historical minority into the mainstream history curriculum taught in Greek schools.

Hungary	Low	Minorities are hardly present in history teaching. When they are, they appear in conflict with the majority. History teaching does not emphasise mutual co-existence, nor does it account for the contributions of minorities to Hungarian society.
Ireland	Medium	The primary history curriculum stresses diversity and promotes 'open, questioning attitudes to…beliefs, values and motivations…, tolerance towards… ethnic, cultural, religious and social groups'. The secondary syllabus focuses more closely on Irish history, linked to European and world history.
Italy	Low	In the territories where the linguistic minorities live, the history and languages of minorities were integrated in the curricula, but with differences. In some regions, the minorities' views and languages are represented and taught in a systematic way at school, in other regions they are taught more informally.
Netherlands	High	The 'canon' includes important elements of immigration and multiculturalism, and of colonial history and the history of slavery. These issues are now an important part of the curriculum that is being taught in Dutch schools. 'Historical minorities' are an important part of the national narrative, as the Netherlands is commonly considered to be a country of minorities.
Poland	Low/ Medium	National and ethnic minorities appear in the curriculum only as a statistic (indicating the ethnic homogeneity of the population).
Spain	Medium	We rank Spain in a medium position regarding this indicator due to the possibility for the Autonomous communities (AC) to integrate minority nations' history in the curriculum but without this history being part of the national curriculum (and consequently, no student from outside the AC being taught about this history).
Turkey	Low	Officially recognized minorities – Greeks, Jews and Armenians- are recognized in the history curriculum. But the term minority still bears negative connotations as if they constitute a challenge against the indivisible unity of the nation.

INDICATOR 2.4 ORGANISATION OF RELIGION CLASSES

LOW – non tolerance	Religion courses include the teaching of the majority religion and not just history of religions. The majority view point is dominant (the majority religion is the only true religion, other religious traditions if taught, are clearly signaled as misguided and 'wrong'). Religion classes are compulsory and no alternative courses are offered.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Pupils can be exempted from religion classes upon request by their parents. No alternative arrangements are made to accommodate their special requests or needs.
HIGH – acceptance	When a sufficient number of pupils requests alternative arrangements, instruction in other religions is offered including also philosophy classes for children whose parents are atheists. There is also a possibility to opt for a completely different course (e.g. study or free time).

For this indicator we need to acknowledge considerable diversity in how primary and secondary education is structured across Europe. 'Religious instruction', 'religious education', 'history of religion' may mean very different things, ranging from the inculcation of religious doctrine to a more or less detached, social-scientific engagement with religion as a human phenomenon.

We are also dealing with different types of 'establishment', or indeed with countries without established' church-state relations. In the majority of countries surveyed here, the Catholic Church, Protestant and Orthodox churches have historically enjoyed a privileged relationship with the state. Many features of this special relationship remain in place and only slowly are some countries beginning to 'pluralize' their arrangements and to consider the legitimate requests of minority faiths for inclusion.

This pluralization can take different shapes in response to different challenges. In some contexts, historical models for the inclusion of different Christian denominations provide models that can be extended towards non-Christian faiths. In such situations, the treatment of pupils of minority faiths will be one issue together with the establishment of minority faith schools ('levelling up') or the phasing out of faith schools altogether ('levelling down').

In other places, the availability of teachers that are qualified to offer instruction in minority faiths is a key issue (such as of Islam teachers in Bulgaria and in some of the German Länder). The recognition of their educational credentials as well as considerable suspicion by authorities are key concerns. Moreover, it is a recurrent pattern among countries surveyed in this report that principled commitment to deliver instruction in minority faiths, which exists for reasons such as the desire to exert some oversight over the teaching of minority faith, often fails due to a variety of practical reasons, including the absence of funds, unwillingness by local actors, or the lack of qualified teaching staff. Spain offers a particularly good

example of how an education system can adequately respond to religious diversity by maximizing the number of choices available to pupils but may not always be practically capable of redeeming its promise and offering the different streams of religious education that would be required.

There are two key criteria explored with this indicator: the presence of meaningful exemptions and of alternative provisions. The two, however, are obviously related in the sense that exemptions that are offered to pupils that do not share majority faiths often fail because high-quality alternatives are unavailable, or because there is a remaining stigma attached to the 'opting out' of conventional lessons in religion.

Table 4. Applying Indicator 2.4 Organisation of Religion Class to twelve European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	Medium/ High	'Religion' has been introduced in the curriculum as an elective subject, which is offered if a sufficient number of children request it. Although in theory instruction in all traditional religions in Bulgaria (Orthodox Christianity, Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism, Armenian church) should be available, in practice only two subjects were introduced to date: Religion – Orthodoxy and Religion – Islam (the two largest religions communities).
England	Medium/ High	The 'in the main Christian' character of the nation is highlighted. For religious education, individual syllabuses are agreed by local authority committees (SACREs) and can be changed from a default focus on Christianity to include an emphasis on other religious. This usually means that adaptations are made to reflect the faith composition of local areas.
France	N/A	
Germany	High/ Medium	In most federal states, the situation still has to be scored as medium as non-Christian pupils can opt out of religious classes but religious education in Islam or other minority religions is still rare. However, the issue has received considerable public attention and many federal states have recently started initiatives to introduce Muslim religious classes at public schools, which could then be regarded as 'high' level of tolerance.
Greece	Low	The majority religion forms integral part of the curriculum and school daily routine. Pupils can be exempted upon request of their parents but no alternative arrangements are made. Hence sometimes they just have to sit in the class without however properly 'attending' it.
Hungary	N/A	

Ireland	Medium	Pupils can be exempted from religious classes. The 'integrated' religious curriculum implemented in 98% of Irish primary schools has, however, been identified as problematic. A state-examined, but not compulsory, subject, Religious Education, has been introduced at secondary level, emphasising the value of religious diversity and mutual respect for people of all beliefs. This exists in addition to denominational religious education.
Italy	Medium	Religious courses include only the teaching of the majority religion and the majority point of view. Actually, pupils can be exempted from religious classes but there are not structured alternative courses and pupils' request of attending other religious courses cannot be accommodated.
Netherlands	Medium	In public schools there is a constitutional right of parents to have religious classes in the school building if they demand so. However, in reality it is quite uncommon for this type of special religious classes to be organised in public schools. These schools will normally provide more general classes on the 'history of religions' and/or classes on societal and ethical issues. Religious parents can choose to send their children to a religious non-state school.
Poland	Medium	During the course of religion or ethics classes, the school has the duty to provide care and educational activities for students who do not attend any of the courses, which is becoming an increasingly popular alternative.
Spain	High	The legal framework and openness to accommodate minority religions makes us rank Spain high on this indicator (according the description of the indicators) but problems in the implementation might point to a position in-between medium and high.
Turkey	Low	Religious education is provided by the state schools with a strong bias on Sunni-Islam, discriminating against the Alevi minority. Those students belonging to religions other than Islam are exempted from compulsory religion courses at school.

INDICATOR 2.5 ORGANISATION OF MOTHER TONGUE CLASSES FOR NATIVE MINORITIES

LOW – non tolerance	No teaching of their mother tongue for children from large minority groups.
MEDIUM – minimal tolerance	Teaching of mother tongue for native minority children can be arranged within school premises and hours but is not paid for/subsidised by the state. Parents have to contribute for the payment of teachers and/or education materials (books etc).
HIGH – acceptance	Minority language teaching and specific courses taught in mother tongue of migrants/minorities. In other words not only minority/migrant mother tongue is taught but it is also used as a medium for instruction in other courses.

For the request to be taught in one's mother tongue the type of minority status that one enjoys is evidently of considerable importance. In no other area does the right to cultural self-preservation that is (often) readily granted to 'national minorities' depart that starkly from the response to requests that are put forward by post-immigration groups. Language acquisition has become a hot button issue in European 'debates' about the integration of the latter populations.

The normative considerations that underpin this distinction are not our concern here (see, again, Kymlicka 1995 for one point of view). Practically, it is perhaps the case that the language rights granted to many national minority groups are different in that these groups are in many cases fluent in the majority tongue. In some cases (e.g., Hungary), linguistic self-preservation does not feature highly among the claims that national minority populations (e.g., Roma) put forward; the focus on language may, in fact, be a distraction where such populations speak the majority tongue as their language of choice and can be criticized where it represents an unhelpful focus on culture at the expense of socio-economic requests. However, this should not be seen to dispute the significance that language preservation has for many minority populations, including in many national contexts for a sizeable proportion of Roma.

In the case of post-immigration groups, it is worth pointing out that the normative legitimacy of their claim is not usually considered in connection to the idea of cultural self-preservation. Language retention, or the transmission of ethno-cultural practices across generations, is an objective that is often, if it is welcomed at all, accorded to the 'private sphere' or the family. Yet in the first episodes of labour migration after WWII, such considerations were evidently different.

France and Spain still retain language programmes, such as for the descendents of Portuguese labour migrants. Inadequate language competencies were generally not regarded as problematic for as long as the settlement of labour migrants was seen to be temporary and as long as the provision of low-skilled

labour in the industrial economy did not seem to depend on linguistic proficiency. The current concern with language acquisition, in turn, seems to be fuelled by a combination of issues, including arguments drawn from 'welfare dependency', where the idea of economic self-sufficiency is connected to command of the language of the receiving country, but also from a civically thickened notion of citizenship in which language is considered the prerequisite for democratic participation and civic belonging.

It is worth pointing out that the value of bi-linguality, although it is registered in some debates about minority language acquisition, does not appear to feature very highly in the majority of cases. Where language has come to be seen as a critical issue of integration, majority language acquisition has been prioritized over minority language retention. The current anxiety about the lack of 'integration' among many post-immigration minority populations appears to make any positive acknowledgment of multi-lingual competencies very difficult.

One question for this indicator would be whether the focus on language acquisition in the case of post-immigration groups should be considered as a sign of intolerance, whereas the language rights granted to native minority populations amount to tolerance. This seems all but clear. In many cases, such as for the cultural rights granted to Muslims in Western Thrace (Greece), it is a historically specific arrangement that accounts for the acknowledgment of multi-linguality; this arrangement is not replicated for other minority groups.

In the case of this indicator, it is then important to highlight the specificity of each score, which defies any ranking as the evidently different cases around national minority and post-immigration groups are not distinguished. It is, however, possible to point out best- and bad-practice cases. For post-immigrant populations, language is often a condition for the enjoyment of various social and political rights while no adequate measures are put in place to support its learning. In some of these cases, it appears that the retention of the mother tongue is not supported and in fact, active measures by parents or cultural communities (through supplemental classes) are perceived as signs of their unwillingness to 'integrate'.

For national minority groups, as we have pointed out in Indicator 2.3., it is in particular some anxiety about national fragmentation that precludes positive measures towards the recognition of cultural rights.

Table 5.   Applying Indicator 2.5 Organisation of mother tongue classes (national minorities/immigrants) to twelve European countries

Country	Score	Notes
Bulgaria	**Medium**	Minority children can study their mother tongue in the municipal schools under the protection and control of the State along with the mandatory studying of Bulgarian. The legislation guarantees only the right to study one's mother tongue, but not also the right to have instruction in other courses in mother tongue. Courses in four mother tongues are offered: Turkish, Romani, Armenian and Hebrew. However, the practical implementation of mother tongue education is highly unsatisfactory.

England	Low	The main focus is thus on 'English as an additional language' (EAL), and so on support for recently arrived children to quickly acquire proficiency in English, rather than on 'mother tongue' education. It is government policy to integrate children into the classroom even if they are not fully proficient in English.
France	Medium	Teaching of mother tongue for immigrant minority children can be arranged within school premises but is not paid by the state. It is arranged within the old labour agreements of the 1970s The number of schools that provide this kind of classes is limited (86,312 students in primary and secondary schools in 2011 out of 10 million pupils).
Germany	Medium (LOCAL: Low/ High) *VARIED*	Practices of teaching mother tongue classes highly vary between federal states and schools. While Bavaria has abolished the Turkish mother tongue classes from its public schools in order to only support the learning of the German language, North Rhine Westphalia has recently introduced a new concept of enabling pupils with migration history to learn their 'language of origin' at public schools at the place of second foreign language even until *Abitur*.
Greece	High	Bilingual and religious (Muslim) education provided for the officially recognised minority of Muslims in western Thrace.
Hungary	High	As most ethnic and national minorities in Hungary have more or less become Hungarian over the generations, these language classes typically feature as second language classes. This allows us to assign a high score on this indicator, but it should be recognised that this is not a pressing issue in Hungary today.
Ireland	Low	There are no native minority languages in Ireland. There is no recognition of the Travellers' language/dialect; however, there has been no demand for education in this dialect. There is no provision of mother tongue classes in immigrant languages. However, the State Examinations Commission provides examinations in some languages that are not part of the normal school curriculum.
Italy	Low	In spite of a general support for interculturalism and for the protection of Europe's linguistic diversity, Italian schools do not offer mother tongue teaching. Some schools organize mother tongue courses but they are not within the school hours and they are leisure time activities. They are few and far between.
Netherlands	Low	We think the Netherlands should score 'low' on this indicator, also to illustrate that the trend is towards providing less opportunities for (state financed) teaching of mother tongue languages to immigrant children in governmental schools. In the period of Ethnic Minorities Policies (1983-1989) education in the

		own language and culture existed (until 1995). Later on, this was continued in a different form (Onderwijs is allochtone levende talen, OALT), between 1998 and 2004).
Poland	**Medium**	Polish schools give the opportunity to organize native language lessons for children from ethnic and national minorities, but do not encourage it and do not promote this type of activity.
Spain	**Medium**	Apart from two ancient programmes for Portuguese and Arabic languages there is no national initiative to teach mother tongue language. Many schools have been active in implementing such classes but there is a general lack of resources and language classes are often only attended by immigrant student and not by natives.
Turkey	**Medium**	Minority languages are conventionally seen to challenge national unity. However, reforms have recently been initiated to allow for 'private' mother-tongue instruction. There is considerable contention around Kurdish minority rights and some steps are being made to improve the linguistic rights of this group.

Table 6. Curriculum indicators: Overview of scores by country

COUNTRY	INDICATOR 2.1 CIVIC EDUCATION	INDICATOR 2.2 IMMIGRATION HISTORY	INDICATOR 2.3 HISTORICAL MINORITIES	INDICATOR 2.4 RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	INDICATOR 2.5 *MOTHER TONGUE*
BULGARIA	MEDIUM	N/A	MEDIUM	MEDIUM / HIGH	MEDIUM
ENGLAND	MEDIUM /HIGH	MEDIUM	N/A	MEDIUM / HIGH	LOW
FRANCE	HIGH	HIGH	LOW	N/A	MEDIUM
GERMANY	LOW/ MEDIUM	MEDIUM	N/A	HIGH / MEDIUM	VARIED
GREECE	MEDIUM	LOW	LOW	LOW	HIGH
HUNGARY	MEDIUM	N/A	LOW	N/A	HIGH
IRELAND	LOW / MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	LOW
ITALY	LOW / MEDIUM	LOW	LOW	MEDIUM	LOW
NETHERLANDS	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
POLAND	MEDIUM	LOW / MEDIUM	LOW / MEDIUM	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
SPAIN	HIGH / MEDIUM	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	MEDIUM
TURKEY	LOW	LOW	LOW	LOW	MEDIUM

PART 2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

For social scientists wishing to establish the empirical scope of normative concepts, it is arguably difficult to determine how much, or how little, of tolerance or respect is empirically present in any one situation or context. Such problems are heightened in the case of cross-nationally comparative evaluations.

Tolerance is not a condition that can be established without reference to values and interpretations that may not be completely shared. Differences between normative perspectives and terminologies may lead to misunderstandings. For example, in a recent book on tolerance, Brian Leiter addresses France and argues that recent political interpretations of laïcité represent 'a case of impermissible intolerance of religion' (Leiter 2012, 114). Yet many commentators, not just from France, will disagree and argue that republican difference-blindness provides for high degrees of egalitarian acceptance. While pluralist conceptions of tolerance require the visibility of difference in the public sphere, in the republican case tolerance may be seen to require the opposite: not 'passive acceptance of the practice of the Other, but an active principle that keeps all religious expressions in the private sphere' (Kastoryano and Escafré-Dublet 2010, 18).

Such disagreement applies in the case of significant cultural differences in Western European post-immigration societies. Egregious cases of discrimination and disadvantage in East or South East Europe – most starkly for Roma populations – indicate a different dilemma for comparative evaluations of tolerance. Even if a strategy of maximum tolerance or respect was more widely adopted, its possible impact in these cases would be questionable. It is unclear how tolerance could address or improve the protracted conditions of Roma exclusion. Rather than the 'toleration' of difference, it is the integration of these populations that is the key issue and that should be a governmental objective. The fact that it isn't is not the result of a lack of tolerance but of racism that pervades the mainstream (see Fox and Vidra 2011).

Accordingly, the multiple justifications or rationalities of tolerance seem to make comparisons problematic. It is difficult to agree on political remedies, which may be considered 'tolerant' in one context but miss the point or may even be harmful in another. Although it may be possible to 'control' for such differences – as we have done in the case of religion and laïcité – and to acknowledge different types of problems that minority populations face, there remains a moment of uncertainty in how and for what reasons a particular situation is deemed tolerant or not and whether 'tolerance' provides the best response to the marginalization of minority populations across Europe.

Yet this uncertainty should not lead us to ignore the very real issues that are covered in this report. In the policy field of education the determination of what is to be taught represents a test case for European states that claim to be tolerant or respectful in their treatment of minority groups and individuals. This significance of the curriculum is reinforced when we consider tolerance as an attitude that has to be learned and that requires competencies, which need to be fostered. The 'attitudinal learning of tolerance' (see Heyd 2003; Bader 2013) may not solely depend on the content of national or sub-national curricula (and more on the 'lived' experience of diversity, conflict and conflict-resolution). Yet without adequate

subjects, modules and learning resources it will be difficult for educators to work towards tolerance, not to mention the symbolic disapproval that the failure to acknowledge diversity in the national curriculum entails. By this we do not mean to suggest that the inculcation of positive attitudes towards (a variety of) differences, respect or 'recognition' for them as well as their de-stigmatization, should be the only objective in curricular design. In many cases, post-immigration and national minority populations are severely disadvantaged and suffer socio-economic penalties that a mere remedy of 'respect' and 'recognition' will fail to address. School curricula should also target socio-structural conditions of minority disadvantage. Yet without disputing the relevance of such responses, the evaluations provided by country teams in this report were focused on the role of education in workings towards tolerance of and respect for 'difference'.

Our evaluation of the curricular field begins by taking notice of important developments and disjunctures that are more or less ubiquitous in the country cases summarized here. Put briefly, there is a convergence around a rhetoric of liberal cosmopolitanism, of which the tolerance of and respect for 'difference' is an important part. Ethno-nationalist ideas remain on the agenda in some instances, such as in the content of 'civic education' in Hungary or Turkey (see Indicator 2.1.), but are often subject to critique and appear as an exception. The 'decline of nationalistic history-writing in the Western world' (Kennedy 1973) is perhaps less complete in education, which is often seen to require positive reinforcement through tangible narratives, symbols and heroes. Yet this civic nationalism seems not incompatible with liberal ideas of tolerance and diversity. Indeed, as it has been variously remarked, contemporary civic nationalism seems to articulate itself in this language of liberal universalism. Paradoxically or not, it speaks with the 'dual pathos [that is] invested in ways of life, which are claimed to be both universal and intrinsically ours' (Mouritsen 2008, 23).

This observation about political rhetoric and public commitments applies in the majority of cases considered in this report. Civic education programmes speak of respect for 'diversity'; the 'national story' is presented not as a narrative of supremacy but of enlightenment and steadily growing tolerance; different types of 'belonging' to the nation are considered possible. Even though such emphases often reflect aspirations, rather than existing educational practice, they should still be welcomed. Yet there are also reasons for caution. The new language of civic universalism has the potential to make European countries more hospitable for immigrant and minority populations but it also reflects a worrying tendency to exclude others whose ability to comply with narrow understandings of liberal commitments is questioned. Moreover, any celebration of the decline of ethno-nationalist parochialism on the basis of the new universalist rhetoric may be premature. In concrete cases – when challenging instances of cultural diversity are debated and political responses decided – *civic* nationalism and *nationalist* nationalism may not be as diametrically opposed as some seem to suggest (for example, Joppke 2004, 250). Rather than a complete convergence around liberal-universalist ideals, a national – sometimes distinctly nationalistic – flavour remains palpable in the way difficult instances of diversity are politically addressed.

Regarding the curriculum, two common ways for liberal-universalist principles and other inclusive ideals to fail is the absence of a corresponding educational practice and the lack of resources that would be required to deliver upon curricular commitments.

In a report on the failure of policies that purportedly contribute to the integration of Roma populations across East and South East Europe, Jon Fox and Zsuzsa Vidra (2011) list a variety of ways in which integrationist objectives can be undercut, evaded or mis-interpreted. Regarding the curriculum, there are obviously many opportunities for local authorities, schools and individual teachers – in all parts of Europe – to circumvent its intended meaning, beginning with indifference or obstructionism in the classroom. Yet conversely, exclusionary policies may also be improved and overly narrow curricula can be expanded by local authorities, heads of school or individual teachers. There is some evidence for how civic education teachers expand on a narrow civic curriculum in the Netherlands, or for inclusive and accommodating practices by many English schools and local authorities that cater for diverse student bodies. Altogether, however, this does not provide a coherent picture of whether autonomy and decentralization are better or worse in serving the cause of tolerance in education.

Under-funding is another common feature of the educational programmes that we have surveyed here and at times of wide-spread public-sector cuts the situation is unlikely to improve. All country teams in their evaluations had to take account of good intentions that weren't acted upon. In particular the area covered by Indicator 2.4., the availability of instruction in minority faiths, suffers from a lack of resources. Even at the most positive end, such as in the Spanish case, the objective to maximize choice between different programmes of religious instruction is not fully resourced and provisions for minority faiths are not available throughout all of Spain's autonomous regions. In cases where the state chooses not to support or incorporate education in minority faiths, it is important that education is opened to religious groups or civil society actors who - subject to appropriate oversight, but not to intrusive and hostile interference - may play a role in delivering programmes that benefit pupils of minority faiths. We are aware that this raises difficult questions about the social place of religion or the types of religious actors that are granted access, which won't be answered uniformly across Europe.

In the area covered by Indicators 2.2. and 2.3. - the symbolic acknowledgment of immigration and of the minority presence in history - we are dealing with questions that may be contested in line with foundational narratives of the nation. Where issues that the citizenship or history curriculum are meant to reflect are contested, perhaps mirroring significant cultural cleavages, it will be necessary to provide for an environment to debate diverse perspectives in a way that avoids misrepresentations and name-calling. Reflecting on his annoyance about the teaching of 'creation science' in the United States, T.M. Scanlon (2003, 196) points to his own 'feeling of partisan zeal in such cases, a sense of superiority over the people who propose such things and a desire not to let them win a point even if it did not cost anyone very much'. Representations of the nation or national values are likely to be accompanied by similar sentiments. Rather than delivering uncontested truths about history and culture, policy makers will be better advised to design the curriculum so that it can provide a forum for discussion with the participation of all.

We take it for granted that tolerance and equal respect require not just the removal of stigmas and disrespect, but some form of minority involvement in decisions about the content of state curricula. In order for new perspectives or subjects to be perceived as legitimate, a strong element of democratic participation needs to be ensured. Significantly, minority concerns may be internally contested and the different minority groupings should not be treated as a homogeneous block. Not just in the classroom, but

also in a wider political setting, education represents an important forum for official encounters between minority groups and state institutions. It is important that such encounters are not mismanaged due to simplistic accounts of homogeneous 'minority needs'.

The indicators and evaluations that we have presented in this report allow for snapshots of a number of moving targets. How we decide to comprehend particular situations reflects, it is worth repeating, our understanding of the tolerance and respect that is due to minority groups in European societies. Yet such understandings are obviously contested and tolerance is not a condition that can be established without reference to values and interpretations that are unlikely to be completely shared. Differences between normative perspectives and terminologies might make comparison difficult or lead to misunderstandings that we would hope to avoid.

What this report into tolerance in the curriculum hopes to have provided, then, is a collection of evaluations that allow for some insights into the diversity of challenges European countries face. In some cases, it will be possible to highlight policies that have been adopted in a particular country as 'best practice' examples that should be replicated elsewhere. In more cases, the evaluations provided here allow for a glimpse into the complex dynamics of policy failure, namely into situations where commitments that exist on paper fail to be acted upon and promises of decency, tolerance and respect remain unfulfilled.

FURTHER READINGS AND COUNTRY REPORTS:

ACCEPT PLURALISM Tolerance Indicators Toolkit
By Anna Triandafyllidou, European University Institute (2013)
Download your copy from: http://www.accept-pluralism.eu/Research/ProjectReports/ToleranceIndicatorsToolkit/ToleranceIndicators.aspx

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses in Bulgaria
By Marko Hajdinjak and Maya Kosseva with Antonina Zhelyazkova, IMIR (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23257

Concepts and Practices of Tolerance in France
By Riva Kastoryano and Angéline Escafré-Dublet, CERI Sciences Po', Paris (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23254

Tolerance Discourses in Germany: How Muslims are Constructed as National Others
By Nina Mühe, Europe – University Viadrina (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23404

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses and Practices in Greece
By Anna Triandafyllidou and Hara Kouki, European University Institute (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23261

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Hungary
By Zsuzsanna Vidra, Jon Fox, Anikó Horváth, Central European University and University of Bristol (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23402

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity in Ireland. Concepts and Practices
By Iseult Honohan and Nathalie Rougier, University College Dublin (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23258

Overview Report on Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Italy
By Maurizio Ambrosini and Elena Caneva, University of Milan (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23259

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Discourses in the Netherlands
By Marcel Maussen with Thijs Bogers and Inge Versteegt, University of Amsterdam (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23514

Tolerance of Cultural Diversity in Poland and Its Limitations
By Michał Buchowski and Katarzyna Chlewińska, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/24381

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity Concepts and Practices in Spain
By Ricard Zapata-Barrero, Flora Burchianti, Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas, GRITIM – Universitat Pompeu Fabra (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/24378

Comprehensive Report on Turkey: The Myth of Tolerance
By Ayhan Kaya, Istanbul Bilgi University (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23260

Tolerance and Cultural Diversity in the UK
By Jan Dobbernack, Tariq Modood and Nasar Meer, University of Bristol (2012)
Download your copy from: http://cadmus.eui.eu/handle/1814/23256

Bibliography

Bader, V. (2013). Concepts of tolerance and toleration. Moral minimalism and more demanding moralities. Hard to Accept. Perspectives on Intolerance, Toleration and Respect. J. Dobbernack and T. Modood. Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Fox, J. and Z. Vidra (2011). Roma segregation in education institutions. Tolerance and cultrual diversity in schools: comparative report. M. Maussen and V. Bader. Florence, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies: 73-85.

Fox, J. and Z. Vidra (2011). Roma segregation in educational institutions. Tolerance and cultural diversity in schools. Comparative Report. M. Maussen and V. Bader. Florence, European University Institute 73-85.

Heyd, D. (2003). Education to toleration: some philosophical obstacles resolved. The culture of toleration in diverse societies. Reasonable tolerance. C. McKinnon and D. Castiglione. Manchester, Manchester University Press: 196-207.

Joppke, C. (2004). "The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: theory and policy." The British Journal of Sociology **55**(2): 237-257.

Joppke, C. (2007). "Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe." West European Politics **30**(1): 1-22.

Kastoryano, R. and A. Escafré-Dublet (2010). Tolerance and cultural diversity discourses in France. San Domenico di Fiesole, European University Institute.

Kennedy, P. M. (1973). "The decline of nationalistic history in the West, 1900-1970." Journal of Contemporary History **8**(1): 77-100.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). Multicultural citizenship: a liberal theory of minority rights. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Leiter, B. (2012). Why tolerate religion? Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Meer, N. and T. Modood (2009). "The Multicultural State We're In: Muslims, 'Multiculture' and the 'Civic Re-balancing' of British Multiculturalism." Political Studies **57**(3): 473-497.

Modood, T. (2007). Multiculturalism. A Civic Idea. Cambridge, Polity.

Mouritsen, P. (2008). Political Responses to Cultural Conflict: Reflections on the Ambiguities of the Civic Turn. Constituting Communities. Political Solutions to Cultural Conflict. P. Mouritsen and K. E. Jørgensen. London, Palgrave: 1-30.

Mouritsen, P. and T. V. Olsen (2011). "Denmark between liberalism and nationalism." Ethnic and Racial Studies iFirst: pp. 1-20.

Scanlon, T. (2003). The difficulty of tolerance: essays in political philosophy. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Schiffauer, W. (2013). The logics of toleration: Outline for a comparative approach to the study of tolerance. Hard to Accept. Perspectives on Intolerance, Toleration and Respect. J. Dobbernack and T. Modood. Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Triandafyllidou, A. (2013). National identity and diversity: Towards plural nationalism. Hard to Accept. Perspectives on Intolerance, Toleration and Respect. J. Dobbernack and T. Modood. Basingstoke, Palgrave.

About ACCEPT PLURALISM – project identity

Acronym	**ACCEPT PLURALISM**
Title	**Tolerance, Pluralism and Social Cohesion: Responding to the Challenges of the 21st Century in Europe**

Short Description

ACCEPT PLURALISM questions how much cultural diversity can be accommodated within liberal and secular democracies in Europe. The notions of tolerance, acceptance, respect and recognition are central to the project. ACCEPT PLURALISM looks at both native and immigrant minority groups.

Through comparative, theoretical and empirical analysis the project studies individuals, groups or practices for whom tolerance is sought but which we should not tolerate; of which we disapprove but which should be tolerated; and for which we ask to go beyond tolerance and achieve respect and recognition.

In particular, we investigate when, what and who is being not tolerated / tolerated / respected in 15 European countries; why this is happening in each case; the reasons that different social actors put forward for not tolerating / tolerating / respecting specific minority groups/individuals and specific practices. The project analyses practices, policies and institutions, and produces key messages for policy makers with a view to making European societies more respectful towards diversity.

Website www.accept-pluralism.eu

Duration	March 2010-May 2013 (39 months)
Funding Scheme	Small and medium-scale collaborative project
EU contribution	2,600,230 Euro
Consortium	17 partners (15 countries)
Coordinator	European University Institute
	Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Person Responsible	Prof. Anna Triandafyllidou
EC officer	Ms. Louisa Anastopoulou, Project Officer,
	Directorate General for Research and Innovation, European Commission