Divergences and convergences between education and cultural policies in Catalonia 1980-2010

GEMMA CARBÓ RIBUGENT*

Director UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policies and Cooperation. University of Girona

Abstract

Significant international political discourse in the field of education and culture (UNESCO, EU, IFACCA) calls for advances to be made towards more coordinated and complementary public policies. Innovative international projects have pointed the way forward. (Creative Partnership: <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/creative-partnerships>)

Unfortunately, while they may have succeeded in producing examples of good practice, they have not gone on to become standard practice in Catalonia. The aim of our investigation is to identify the factors responsible for divergence – and the difficulties involved in promoting convergence – between education and culture by studying the preambles of laws between 1980 and 2010 and the opinions of qualified professionals and experts. Our investigation confirms that there is a lack of fluidity in the dialog between cultural and educational policies in Catalonia. However, our research has provided evidence that cultural education can be systematized in order to improve synergy in future policies. The principle strategies involve (i) the reinforcement of educational local issues and the challenge of cultural citizenship; (ii) coordinated action aimed at developing cultural competencies while taking into consideration the appreciation of diversity, media education and intercultural dialog and, (iii) the promotion of creativity and the exploration of training in expressive potential in all kinds of artistic languages.

Keywords

cultural policies, education, cultural diversity, citizenship

1. Education and culture

Contemporary political discourse makes frequent reference to cultural diversity, innovation and creativity. The intrinsic value of these paradigms is widely recognized and their promotion among the citizenry is thought to be particularly important, especially in terms of the education of new generations. Concepts such as *educational revolution* are the order of the day.[1] As UNESCO pointed out as far back as 1992:

---

* E-mail: gemma.carbo@udg.edu

1 See, for example, the latest proposal by Sergi Jordà at the *Center for Contemporary Culture Barcelona*: <http://www.cccb.org/ca/curs_o_conferencia-i_c_i_una_revolucio_educativa-40316> [10.10.2015].

> when knowledge becomes the core of the new productive paradigm, educational transformation becomes a key factor in developing the capacity for innovation and creativity. (ECLAC-UNESCO 1992: 119)

In our professional experience in cultural management, we have seen the many meeting points between the world of arts, communication and culture and the world of formal and informal education. Museums and art galleries, cultural centres, heritage sites and creative spaces, festivals of the performing arts and cinema are providing experiences based on a contemporary vision of education understood as cultural communication.

In the meanwhile, education professionals now take into consideration the need to integrate a cultural perspective with cultural skills in order to form creative, free and politically responsible citizens and workers. Schools are providing inspiring projects and proposals and undoubtedly continue to be the basic institution for socialization; they continue to guarantee participation in cultural life and universal access to culture in general; they remain, unquestionably, one of our most important cultural and educational institutions, but they are no longer the only one to consider, as there is more and more emphasis and demand for informal, social, adult and lifelong education from groups with very diverse cultural characteristics.

In our society, there is a growing awareness of the role played by citizens –particularly young people through ICT – as cultural producers and consumers and of how their critical capacity in relation to knowledge and diversity is vital in ensuring the foundations of public and democratic systems of government. This awareness increases, while, at the same time, an evident crisis is confirmed in the cultural and educational models that have prevailed until now, as noted by various contemporary researchers (CAMPS 2011; GARCÉS 2013; MARINA 2004; BURKE 2010; GARDNER 1998; MARINA 2004). Coherence with these new contexts requires the design of educational and cultural policies that are innovative, holistic, crosscutting and have a greater degree of complementarity. This is already an explicit goal of international as well as local cultural policies (UCLG 2015; EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2010).

Our basic assumption is that there does exist a certain consensus in terms of philosophy and sociology and in the international democratic political and cultural discourse on the importance of a culture-education dialogue. However, in many European countries, and especially in the region of Catalonia (Spain), the historical precedents of public policies and the departmental structuring of administrative bodies based on theories

of modern nation-states currently exert so much influence and pressure that it is impossible to draw up a legislative framework which defines education and culture as complementary areas with cross-departmental, i. e., transversal, powers.

Our hypothesis is: if the Catalan and/or Spanish laws relating to education[2] do not incorporate this vision [of a convergence of culture and education] and, on the contrary, generate divergence or separation, we will understand the difficulties and obstacles to ensure such areas of convergence.[3] The aim of the investigation is to enable us, on the one hand, to confirm or refute the hypothesis and, on the other, to categorize (i. e., to describe and define the limits of) the obstacles and/or opportunities that have arisen in the efforts to improve the complementarity of the cultural and educational sectors.

2. Theoretical basis of this research

Contributions from various disciplines such philosophy (Ethics and Aesthetics), history (Cultural History), education (Policies, Pedagogy, Didactic), law (Human Rights) political science (Cultural Policies, International and Local governments) have helped to define a specific theoretical and conceptual framework for the research that forms the basis of this manuscript. One of these involves the question of politics – specifically cultural politics and cultural life. In this sense, in contemporary philosophy, studying the relationship between moral and political ethics is thought to be fundamental. This issue is highly relevant here because our work stems from the belief that culture and education are areas of public politics directly related to an ethical concept of politics in general as an area in the public social sphere. Understanding politics and ethics as being bound together is, to some extent, a response or reaction to a certain relativism in moral issues which is characteristic of societies in contexts of crisis and which is of concern to contemporary authors (CAMPS 2011; GARCÉS 2013). We share this concern and we have made it the basis of this work. Relativism is a cultural fact that has been promoted first by religious conviction and then by absolute belief in science (reason) or in passion (psychology) (RORTY 2010). Cultural 'relativism' has led, in the long run, to a situation in which there is misgovernment

---

2   Statutory laws (leyes orgánicas) that govern fundamental rights.

3   A summary of these laws can be found on: <http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/ 10803/119604/tgcr.pdf?sequence=5> p. 441.

and a weakening of the role of public politics as a pedagogical area and of authorities as agents in the education of their citizens. As Symonides explains:

> The acceptance of the very idea that persons belonging to one culture should not judge the policies and values of other cultures, that any system of common values cannot and does not exist, indeed undermines the very basis of the international community and the 'human family'. (SYMONIDES 1998)

The loss of importance of the notion of 'Citizenship', which was instrumental in the shaping of modern states, has led, in the end, to the loss of what we had built to ensure social harmony and the resolution of everyday situations of intercultural relations. The starring role of the market as the regulating agent of social relations and of neoliberalism as a dominant philosophy in the international, national and regional context in the recent years has led to the emergence of new conflicts of coexistence and makes it necessary to rethink the role of politics and the characteristics of policies in the public arena in the future. As different authors defend (RORTY 2010; CAMPS 2011; MARINA 2013), it is essential to reclaim the discourse, in political philosophy, the public ethic that is directly related to the educational and pedagogical function of the exercise of government and is founded on the recognition and respect for the aesthetic and cultural diversity that characterises the democratic context of citizens today. For Richard Rorty, particularly, "philosophy today is an exercise in political reflection, and politics is understood, above all, as cultural politics" (RORTY 2010: 11).

In general, however, cultural politics has been defined historically as public politics in a sectorial sense only (FERNANDEZ 1991). More contemporary research is expanding the perspective and indicates a significant change in the definition and scope of cultural politics. Authors such as E. Delgado point out that cultural politics is directly related to local territorial development in the fullest sense (DELGADO 1999) and reflections by authors such as Martinell, on the contribution that culture and cultural politics bring to development and to the politics of cooperation and international relationships, are geared towards a perspective that is both sectorial and transversal (MARTINELL 2010). From this more holistic viewpoint, the discussion has advanced sharply and has raised the need to focus not so much on the traditional aspects, such as cultural facilities, cultural industries and cultural agents, but rather, on the whole 'cultural system', understood as a much wider field that includes communication and education.

The second major concept in this research concerns human rights and cultural rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted on the 10th of December 1948, is the international legal definition of the political philosophy we discussed in our first point. There are numerous legal studies on the subject, but of specific interest to us here are those that refer to cultural and educational issues. Article 27 of the Declaration recognizes the right to freely participate in the cultural life of the community and the right to the protection of the moral and material interests involved in its creation. Article 22 states that cultural rights are indispensable to the dignity of the person and the free development of their personality. The right to education is recognized in article 26, which specifies that it must be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages, and shall be directed to the full development of the human person, in accordance with the decision of the parents.

From the perspective of cultural politics, the freedoms that are understood as cultural ones are the freedom of opinion and expression, the freedom of education and of scientific research and the freedom to participate in cultural life. These rights and freedoms are designed to prevent totalitarianism. By ratifying the pact, states agree – in cultural matters – to take measures in support of the preservation, development and promotion of the arts, science and technology, and to respect the freedom that is indispensable for research and creative activity. Furthermore, the states recognize the benefits of promoting international cooperation on scientific and cultural issues.

As for the right to education, positive state intervention is particularly important in guaranteeing the definition of the educational model and free primary education as well as general access to secondary education. But it is important to point out that educational content is directly related, on the one hand, to fundamental cultural freedoms, while on the other hand, in contemporary multicultural contexts, such content must also be a guarantee, from the standpoint of diversity, of the right of citizens to participate in cultural life.

The concept of cultural rights, according to a scholarly opinion on the subject (SYMONIDES 1998), would mean the concept that encompasses both aspects by making education the instrument of participation in cultural life. It is a concept without precedents and with no specific legal expression; its interdependence and association with other rights – economic, social, civil and political – means it is a difficult concept to define (GONZÁLEZ 2003: 84). The Human Rights Council, through the resolution numbered 10/23 of 26 March 2009, established a new special

procedure entitled «independent expert in the field of cultural rights», with the mandate inter alia to identify the best practices and possible obstacles to the promotion and protection of cultural rights and to study the relationship between cultural rights and cultural diversity. The legal debate seems to be mired in theoretical conflict but in short:

> All education worthy of the name should have as its goal and as its ideal, the traversing of borders and cultures, i. e., transculturalism, as opposed to confinement to one single tradition; it is within each individual where the notion of diversity becomes meaningful. (AUGÉ 2010: 45)

A third conceptual approach involves the question of cultural management and its link with education. Despite now having to share the stage with international politics, regional politics – above all, local politics – still remain the most accessible arenas for thought and action in the fields of culture and education. In this context, discussion centres on cultural management and educational administration, and the immediate relationship between agencies, institutions and administrative departments. Legislation, municipal charters or the Agenda 21 for Culture (<http://www.agenda21culture.net/>) promoted by the UCLG cultural section (United Cities and Local Governments) are the reference documents for studying cultural politics and management since they translate contemporary philosophical, political and legal discourse at the international level in terms of governance at the community, local or regional level. All these documents, in general, insist that the citizens themselves play the leading role and demand their participation in defining and agreeing on the frameworks of peaceful coexistence for which the alliance of culture and education – from the intercultural perspective of protecting and promoting cultural diversity – is of strategic importance. Consideration of these issues based on ʻ best practices’, in the field of public policy, especially in local politics has already begun (FUNDACIÓN KALEIDOS 2010; LAAKSONEN 2012).

The departments and centres of administration at the national, regional and local levels have also tested various ways of organizing and allocating educational and cultural functions but this has not led, in the long term, to many changes or advances in terms of cross-cutting solutions. In this research, we are specifically interested in the autonomous government of Catalonia (within the state of Spain), as we have found that, in this region, the cultural political discourse, both at the international and local levels, is now clearly focused on the search for areas of complementarity between education and culture but, the theories on bureaucracy indicate that national and regional administrative and or-

ganizational bodies – above all, public ones – are systemically, and by definition, reactionary to change and collaboration.

Public administration in Catalonia, especially at the national and regional levels, works in accordance with the bureaucracy, (which is supposed to guarantee efficiency and transparency), and the goal of 'incrementalism', i. e., the continuous and progressive increase in departmental resources as a political strategy – which was the general rule, at least until the beginning of the current crisis. The competence between departments and agencies is the most common situation that makes the coordination difficult. The crisis and the budget cuts do not seem to affect that tendency.

The new paradigms – cultural diversity and creativity – now make the changes we have been discussing more urgent. The paradigm of cultural diversity is a relatively new concept in the world of national cultural politics (UNESCO 2005), despite the fact that it has always been present – in other guises – in the history of diplomacy and international relations. Diversity, from the European perspective, has always been closely linked to minority ethnic identities associated with other continents. 'Difference' was not a notion worth considering within the territory of Western nation states, which were centralist in character and apparently monocultural. Towards the end of the twentieth century, the situation began to change:

> Gradually, the scenarios of diversity, which were linked at their inception to ethnic issues and the struggle for civil rights, began to widen to include new players, viewpoints and themes. A multiple polyphony of diversities erupted: issues relating to gender, youth and urban life; the re-emergence of what is *local*; the environment, biodiversity, new aesthetics, etc., all of which resulted in a shift in the political, intellectual and ethical notion of cultural diversity. (RIVAS 2011)[4]

Cultural diversity began to be a central element in international relations – as well as in the cultural politics of nations – from 1996 onwards with the publication of the report for the World Commission for Culture and Development, *Our Creative Diversity*, and more especially from 2005 onwards, when UNESCO approved the *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*. According to this convention, cultural diversity is now a common heritage of all humankind. For the human race, it is as necessary as biological diversity is for all living organisms. Cultural diversity is a factor in development, not simply in economic terms, but as a means of access to a satisfying

---

4 Wale'keru [Culture & Development research magazine], 1. <http://www.walekeru.net> [February 2013].

existence. The catalyst for the international political reaction was, as the scholarship (YÚDICE 2002) pointed out, the understanding that these [cultural] *expressions* are now a major economic resource and that they articulate a strategic sector which shapes the cultural and creative industries.

Cultural diversity is linked also to creativity. Diversity is a precursor of creativity and innovation; it stimulates the lateral and interdisciplinary thinking that is indispensable in the new economic and social contexts (ALONSO 2014: 28). Cultural diversity also ensures the supply of content to the information and communication industries and adds value to work groups and research teams. Only a few years passed between the initial 'cultural exception' proposed by Canada and France in the 1990s to the swift ratification of the 2005 Convention by UNESCO. The international political response has been the most significant one in the history of UNESCO's cultural conventions.[5] This new cultural politics is now, as we saw in the previous section, also tied to international cooperation and individual and collective development. However, as Yúdice also points out, the cultural industries of many countries remain isolated from the ministries of culture and public policy, and there are many voices of doom that still denounce them as the purveyors of cultural expression that serves only to homogenize and is generally undesirable from a specific view of culture and education (YÚDICE 2002). Intercultural or multicultural education is another field of knowledge that has been essential for this research. The concept of multiculturalism arises from, and is directly related to, education, pedagogical thinking and cultural studies. For authors such as Giroux (1990; 1997; 2001; 2005), the link between critical education and cultural politics was always evident:

> Without falling victim to generalisation, scholarship of cultural studies and critical educators are both dedicated to a cultural work that puts policy in the context of relations that articulate symbolic representations, day to day life and power technologies; both take care of cultural policy as a social and learning experience. *(GIROUX 1997: 10).*

Historically, critical education and cultural studies arose in the context of the initial cry for multicultural realities – a paradigm linked to cultural minorities and their civil, economic, political and social rights, which

5   "This youngest and fastest growing UNESCO cultural convention has ushered in a new international framework for the governance and management of culture and has been ratified by 138 States and the European Union to date." <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/media-services/single-view/news/countries_mark_10th_anniversary_of_unesco_convention_on_diversity_of_cultural_expressions/#.VhjGGevnsw8> [10.10.2015].

had been denied for them for so long by the ruling powers. In this context, intellectuals and educators, in response to the educational models (that had aimed to reproduce social, cultural and economic structures that no longer reflected reality and also as a political position in relation to the demands of cultural minorities) developed critical education (FREIRE/SOLER-GALLART 1970; BARBOSA 2008; GIROUX 1997). According to scholarship, critical cultural education has been tackled using different pedagogical approaches:

> If race and difference are prioritised, we are talking about racist education, which segregates and separates depending on diversity. Another approach is assimilation, typical, for example, of the French State, in which case differences are simply ignored. Education that has sought integration is one that prioritizes the individual abilities of each student and achieves equal opportunities for all of them, no matter what the collective identity is. (BESALÚ 2005: 58)

Education from a classical multicultural perspective takes differences on board and is set up in a way that discourages dialogue and maintains separate areas defined by cultural differences. Intercultural education is based on the idea that diversity is a positive value; it does not focus on differences or on the static nature of cultural identity, but rather on the ongoing process of permanent dialogue between individuals and groups.

> The term multicultural describes the culturally diverse nature of human society. It not only refers to the elements of ethnic or national culture, but also includes linguistic, religious and socio-economic diversity. Interculturality is a dynamic concept and refers to evolving relations between cultural groups. [...] Interculturality presupposes multiculturalism and results from «intercultural» exchange and dialogue on the local, regional, national or international level. (UNESCO 2009: 17)

In the last decade, critical multiculturalism has emerged in the US with a new perspective very similar to intercultural education paradigms. Authors like Banks explain that:

> Multicultural education is an idea, and educational reform movement is a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions. (BANKS 2010: 19)

Cultural identities remain, for young people today, as a central question. But as noted by different authors, the young people of the 21st century do not need roots; they need anchors that enable them to navigate a global world (BARICCO 2006). Intercultural relations are a condition of life and multicultural situations and cultural diversity forms part of their own individual and collective DNA.

Interculturalism or critical multiculturalism as an up-to-date pedagogical approach, requires significant changes in schools not only in

content and form but in the educational structure itself, which will need to be based on diverse cultural expressions understood as on going, individual and collective processes linked to formal, informal and lifelong education.

Finally, in the context of this study, the pedagogy and the field of cultural and communicative competence is also important. This requirement that the educational and social structure should adapt to the new demands arising from the technological revolution of the Internet and the Network Society, and the acceptance of cultural diversity as a core value of individual and collective development are opening up interesting fields of thought in the field of teaching and the organization of school curricula.

From the conventional organization of the curriculum which derives from the subjects and disciplines, the tendency is now moving towards structuring the curriculum based on the skills and abilities that need to be galvanized in children and young people, and among the public in general. In EU countries (EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT 2006), the skills defined as transversal are those directly related to cultural diversity. They include, among others, artistic and cultural competence and communicative competence. Some countries, such as Germany (BKJ 2010), are developing interesting proposals for their citizens by recognizing these cultural competences through systems of cultural assessment of their practices and non-school training.[6] Cultural education is not yet understood in such a transversal sense in Spain and Catalonia where, strictly speaking, it often remains associated with artistic competence (ALSINA et al. 2012).

Advances in the field of psychology and neurology lend support to a change in approach, with proposals that allow us to take into account multiple forms of intelligence and learning. Studies on learning processes demonstrate the links between the two hemispheres of the human brain, left and right and the need that they work together (KOSSLYN 2001). Relationships have also been considered between the two traditionally divided approaches to reality, i. e., between scientific, logical/mathematical thinking and the subjective, emotional approach to reality that determines the arts. Emotional intelligence as Goleman (1996) explains is at the base of both scientific and creative processes. The traditional school curricular separations between the sciences and the humanities, as well as between memory (usually linked to historical and

---

6   See German Federation of Associations for Cultural Youth Education (BKJ).

cultural heritage) and creativity (usually linked to contemporary crea-
tion), between reason (as the logical thinking paradigm) and subjectivity
(as the artistic thinking approach) and even between nature and culture,
as described by Anna Mae Barbosa (1998), no longer help us to under-
stand our current reality defined by Morin as a complex entity:

> Pertinent, knowledge must confront complexity. Complexus means that which is
> woven together. In fact there is complexity whenever the various elements (eco-
> nomic, political, sociological, psychological, mythological…) that compose a whole
> are an inseparable, and inter-retroactive, interactive, interdependent tissue be-
> tween the subject of knowledge and its context, the parts and the whole, the whole
> and the parts, the parts amongst themselves. Complexity is therefore the bond be-
> tween unity and multiplicity. (MORIN 1999: 15)

One of the key, pivotal elements of the cultural competence linked to
reality in which we live today (and one which comprises a second, dif-
ferent, transversal competence, in terms of teaching and curriculum or-
ganisation) is communication. The digital revolution and the Internet
– described as a planet-wide, artificial 'neurocerebral' system by Morin
(2009b) – have exponentially multiplied and accelerated the cultural
and communicative possibilities of the present day, reviving the histori-
cal debate regarding the media and communication and its relationship
to culture and education which may be seen as incestuous or, on the
contrary, essential.

In the field of cultural politics and administration, as well as in the
field of education, the culture-communication-education triad still en-
flames debate between radical supporters and equally radical oppo-
nents; between those who champion the endless integrative possibilities
of the culture-communication alliance (FERRES 2008) and those who
decry it as leading to an apocalypse of homogenised culture that ought to
be kept well away from education (FUMAROLI 2007).

The replications and derivations of this debate – already analysed by
the Frankfurt School and to which little else has been added – could go
on forever but we are starting to see a generalized demand that certain
responsibilities and decision making policies be adopted in relation to
this new reality (UNESCO 2011). The leading scholars (BARBERO 2003;
ROBINSON 2001; NUSSBAUM/UDINA 2011) in this line of research
and reflection insist that, if we do not take this triad of culture-commu-
nication-education seriously and facilitate coordinated policies in this
sense, we shall find that culture and education will remain in the pub-
lic domain as a secondary item on the political agenda in terms of how
much time and money is spent on them, while communication will re-

main permanently at the mercy of the market and the economic circles of power.

> The consequences are already in sight but the political clans still all maintain separate policies on culture, on communication and on education, and what our countries are risking by this absence of connections is their own viability: their social and productive viability and their political and cultural viability. (BARBE-RO 2003: 56)

3. Methodology

For our research, we have chosen the region of Catalonia and, as our primary source of information, the laws concerning culture and education approved by the parliaments of the region and the nation of Spain[7] between 1980 and 2010, that is to say, from the return of *la Generalitat* (the democratic, autonomous regional government of Catalonia) until the recent legislature.[8] We want to ascertain whether these laws articulate specific policies and plans of action that could be in line with this vision of complementarity between culture and education. We have opted for a time period that should be long enough for the unfavourable conditions at the end of the Franco dictatorship and the period of democratic transition to be overcome. It includes a series of eight democratic legislatures during which time, in theory, it is feasible that the Catalan Governments of Catalonia, of various ideological tendencies, will have been able to consolidate cultural politics in this regard.

For a second analysis, we carried out 20 in-depth qualitative interviews (Barbosa A.M), (Celso S.), (Barbieri S). (Teixeira C.), (Barbero J.M), (Jiménez L.), (Martí,J.), (Vintró E.), (Camps V.), (Subirats M.), (Mascarell F.), (Del Pozo J.M.), (Bosch E.), (Pardo J.), (Font J.), (Font M.), (Bosch L.), (Figueras P.), (Panadés P.), (Rodà F.)[9] with a selected sample of qualified international experts on cultural politics and educa-

---

7   In the case of Spain, these refer to statutory laws (i. e., leyes orgánicas, requiring approval by an absolute majority of the Spanish Parliament) that affect Catalonia.

8   At the time of writing the research, the elections to the Catalan Parliament of the 25th of November 2012, which formally end the 9th legislative period of government, had not yet been called; that's why we talk about the most recent legislature. The paper we present here has been adapted to the state of the art in publications from 2012, when the research was finished, up to the present day. The legislation in culture and education hasn't changed significantly since 2010.

9   The interviews models can be found on: <http://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/119604/tgcr.pdf?sequence=5>, p. 441.

tion as well as political specialists and cultural and educational managers in Catalonia. The selection criteria are of the polar types:

- Opposition education-culture / Opposite international-local
- Opposite man-women / Opposite experts-professionals, technical
- Opposite junior-senior / Opposite academic-political

With these interviews, we used the grounded theory method (ABELA 2007) to construct a more accurate interpretation of the problem. All the investigative work is based on two epistemological framework or paradigms: critical theory (MAURA 2013) and constructivism (BERGER/ LUCKMANN 1966). The goal of the research is criticism and transformation, defining new knowledge that can be useful to improve synergies between cultural and educational policies in Catalonia. However, we work in a constructive way, taking into account the opinion of professionals and experts.

4. Results

The general underlying hypothesis of this research was that if we succeeded in identifying the points of divergence (or the factors involved in separation) and the points of convergence (or the areas of complementarity) between the systems of education and culture, this would enable us to articulate a theoretical discourse and define a conceptual framework for a proposed type of cultural education.

Among the specific hypotheses, the most important one was that if political discourse expressed in the preambles to these laws did not make provision for the convergence of the systems of culture and education, or generated separation or expressed divergences, this would demonstrate the need for new public policies or political and regulatory readjustments for the implementation of a cultural education proposal that responded to contemporary needs. Conversely, if the political discourse expressed in the preambles to these laws did, in fact, define the areas of convergence and complementarity, this would be deemed as enabling advances to be made in drawing up laws governing culture and cultural education.

In accordance with the assumptions we have set out, the method we employed led to the conclusion that there are more factors of divergence and obstruction than factors of convergence and coordination between cultural politics and educational politics in Catalonia. The final figures

showed that the points of divergence comprised 59% while the points of convergence comprised 41% of the preambles.

a) Laws that express in the preamble divergences or a divide with education / cultural systems:[10]

Framework legislation 1, 2, 58, 79
Public administration laws 36
Cultural laws 9, 11, 39, 84, 45, 26, 41, 40, 48, 71, 82
            Spectacle regulation
            Popular culture: anthem and National Day
            Linguistic politics
            Museums and Heritage
            TV, cinema and media
Landscape 38, 14
Education laws 5, 17, 30, 42
University laws 8, 35, 51, 52, 53, 65, 66

b) Laws that express complementarity or synergy with culture / education:

Cultural administration 49, 83
Cultural laws 10, 12, 13, 24, 46, 47, 55, 56, 57, 69, 70, 77, 78, 85
            Libraries
            Linguistic politics
            Cultural actors' organisation
            Archives
            Popular culture law
            TV, cinema and media
            Landscape
Laws of new professional bodies 25, 59, 67, 68
Educational laws 4, 6, 7, 18, 19, 27, 29, 50, 62, 64, 73, 81
University laws 31, 32, 33, 34, 44, 61, 74, 80

Secondly, an analysis of the interviews allowed us to classify these points of convergence and divergence as conceptual categories. 9 categories were detected for divergence reasons and 6 for convergence items.

	CATEGORY*	CODES	CITATIONS	%
Divergence or Divide	9 categories	18 codes[12]	294 citations	59%
Complementarity & Synergy	6 categories	12 codes	204 citations	41%
TOTAL	14 categories	30 codes	498 citations	100%

[11]c) Divergence categories and codes

10   See relation of laws and detailed analysis on: <http://dugi-doc.udg.edu/bitstream/handle/10256/8065/tgcr.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 435.
11   A code is a concept, idea or message that summarises different coinciding citations.

Code Super Families   HU: Cultural Education
Code Family: Bureaucracy and public administration Created: 2011-12-29 15:40:33 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Administrative division] [Competencies distribution] Quotation(s): 51
Code Family: Disconnected schools – cultural and natural environment Created: 2011-12-29 15:38:56 (Super 1) Codes (2): [School as a protected area] [Culture as a consumption area] Quotation(s): 27
Code Family: Syndicalism and professional questions Created: 2011-12-29 15:38:38 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Managers without culture] [Teachers without vocational attitudes] Quotation(s): 41
Code Family: ICT – Digital Revolution Created: 2012-03-19 18:35:13 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Generational changes (ICT)] [New cultural forms (ICT)] Quotation(s): 26
Code Family: University Created: 2012-03-19 18:38:53 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Teachers training far from culture] [Universities far from cultural life] Quotation(s): 40
Code Family: Media, education and culture Created: 2012-03-19 18:43:03 (Super 1) Codes (2): [criminalisation against school] [Elitist culture] Quotation(s): 32
Code Family: Systemic divorce between cultural and educational politics Created: 2011-12-29 15:38:26 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Liberating function of cultural system] [Conservative function of educational system] Quotation(s): 42
Code Family: Cultural diversity and identities Created: 2011-12-29 17:19:05 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Cultural identity as an educational resource] [Multicultural realities as a problem] Quotation(s): 13
Code Family: The training of professionals Created: 2011-12-29 16:25:11 (Super 1) Codes (2): [Education doesn't mean culture] [Culture is not education] Quotation(s): 48

d) Convergence Categories and Codes

Code Family: Arts education Created: 2012-03-21 18:32:38 (Super) Codes (2): [Arts and culture as an extra-curriculum subject] [Arts education in cultural institutions] Quotation(s): 36

Code Family: To read, to write, literature Created: 2012-03-21 18:41:38 (Super) Codes (2): [Literacy] [Reading politics] Quotation(s): 23
Code Family: Heritage Created: 2012-03-21 18:31:56 (Super) Codes (2): [Heritage education] [Heritage education and sustainability] Quotation(s): 18
Code Family: Body pedagogy Created: 2012-03-21 18:33:21 (Super) Codes (2): [Performing Arts as a pedagogy] [Physical education] Quotation(s): 16
Code Family: Cultural citizenship, educating cities Created: 2012-03-21 18:34:04 (Super) Codes (2): [Educating cities and schools] [Cultural and educational resources of the cities] Quotation(s): 50
Code Family: Creativity as a value Created: 2012-03-21 18:30:22 (Super) Codes (2): [Creativity and education] [Creativity and culture] Quotation(s): 27

5. The categories of divergence

According to our interviewees, the root causes —and the most important point in numerical terms— of the disconnection between cultural life and the educational system are administrative division, the bureaucracy and the power distribution inherent in the public sector. It would appear that the creation of a number of independent cultural bodies did, at the time, facilitate convergence to a significant degree, or at least it was considered so in the preambles or articles of law that created them. It remains to be seen whether the increased autonomy for schools that shall be regulated by the imminent new education law will also facilitate these projects of cooperation. In this regard, it is our understanding that legal foresight of this possibility of interrelationship is essential.

The second issue to consider is to overcome the perception held by professionals from both sides of the culture/education divide that collaboration between them implies some kind of intrusion into their professional work and an improper allocation of functions. Culture specialists accuse schools of being curriculum-obsessed and too technical; schools accuse culture of being too commercial. The preambles to the education laws refer exclusively to the regulation of educational stages and durations within the system; a defence of guaranteed basic rights – with different interpretations depending on the government of the time

(academic freedom, equal access, etc.)– and a focus in the systematization of learning. Only in the case of the LOGSE (a state-wide education law passed in 1990) is there any mention of art and culture. Meanwhile, the most important laws (see pag. 19) regulating cultural matters refer solely to issues such as intellectual property, foundations, heritage or cultural industries with little mention of education or training. The main exceptions, in the case of Catalonia, are the laws governing popular culture and associations and, more generally, the legislation on Catalan and Spanish language rights which, although aimed at the general public, do provide for greater ties to the world of education.

The divergences therefore, are systemic (MARTINELL 2001), they are firmly established and exacerbated by the division of powers, by the kinds of laws that cover one sector or the other but never both and by the constraints of budgets, regulatory control and so on which are of primary importance in education, but secondary in the case of culture. We have found that, throughout the period we have studied, when those drawing up the laws on culture have chosen to consider the function of education in the preamble, it is because they understood that what they were legislating about was a fundamental part of the collective culture – language, heritage, popular culture and film laws – depending on the period or government.

The consolidation of various professional and corporate identities is evident in the preambles to the laws when they refer to newly emerging professions in culture and/or education, confirming the tendency for each sector to work from very different standpoints. In general, the cultural sector is more market-orientated (with professions involving audio-visuals, graphic design, publicists, etc.) while in education the focus is on social services and basic rights (social education, pedagogy, etc.). Exceptions would include librarians and facilitators or cultural managers —although this profession does not yet have a professional association regulated by law.

A major obstacle to the education and culture dialogue has been found in the evolution of university laws. The preambles to the laws that regulate universities confirm the trend of a dangerous divorce between practical, scientific and technical knowledge on the one hand and culture, the humanities, the arts and creativity on the other. Some universities were, in fact, set up in Catalonia as instruments of territorial politics and were more closely associated with a cultural function, but legislation regulating governing councils and participation has not succeeded in consolidating this option.

6. The complementarity areas: cultural education

We can say however, that despite all the evidence of divergence, there are some areas of complementarity or convergence between education and culture: literature, media literacy, heritage, arts education, pedagogy of dance and movement, education in the values of diversity are more and more in the heart of new educational approaches in Catalonia, not only led by schools. The systematization has allowed us to establish the parameters of cultural education. [12]

First, there are concepts such as cultural citizenship, educating cities, city educational projects or similar projects in many countries that focus the action at the political local level, which create areas for dialogue between education and culture, surmounting the obstacles arising from the distribution of power, bureaucracy and administrative divisions, from a grassroots perspective of local management. This is especially achieved through proposals of working projects promulgated via social demand and via public participation.

Secondly, there are numerous projects connected with arts education for cultural and intercultural skills. In some cases, these involve the projects improved by cultural legislation approved in the last legislative period in Catalonia and which are designed to promote the participation of artists and cultural agents in formal education following the international referents as: Creative Partnerships in England (<http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/creative-partnerships>), *En residència* (<http://www.enresidencia.org>), *cinema en curs* (<http://www.cinemaencurs.org>), *ConArte Internacional* (<http://conarte internacional.net>) as well as in informal education (*Integrasons:* <http://www.integrasons.com>), social community development. These projects tend to initiate dialogue between agents from the two sectors, clearly overcoming the technical division of functions and management and achieving constructive dialogue between the two sides as UNESCO argues in the Arts education road map (UNESCO 2006) and Arts Education Agenda (UNESCO 2010). Finally, the third parameter is the social recognition of the value of creativity. This is creating a clear demand from private and business sectors aimed at the cultural sector; a kind of demand, which may help to significantly reduce the systemic differences between education and culture. Such creativity is valued due

---

12 See the quotations and detailed analysis on: <http://dugi-doc.udg.edu/bitstream/handle/10256/8065/tgcr.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 267-347.

to its clear relationship with expression and communication, i. e., connectivity, not only as a question of technology but also in the sense of the skills developed in literacy, the theatre, the visual arts, the performing arts, movement, dance and festival, in short: body language.

7. Conclusions

The contribution presented by this manuscript allows the cultural management professionals and the policy makers in Catalonia to advance in line with the goal of cultural education. The results of the investigation have contributed some important and significant information regarding the problems for better cross-cutting policies and, the existence of areas in which education and culture are, nonetheless, working together in Catalonia following other international projects.

In line with the results, we propose that cultural education would be materialised in this way in areas of intervention that respond mainly to cultural hybridization: literature that considers new literacies, knowledge of heritage that sets the foundations for discovering cultural diversity, arts education for everybody and a pedagogy of body and movement that allows creative and expressive competences to develop.

This cultural education would include arts education as a basic condition in education for the development of children and young capacities, but also education in the communications media and in new literacies to produce critical and creative citizens. The ability to read media critically and communication skills in general —allied with aesthetic enjoyment and the possibility of participation— can counteract the power of the media in the field of contraindicative educational values. Critical and cultural media and digital literacy not only for students but also for teachers can contribute also to counteract the fear of a cultural paradigm shift that still seems to be discussed in schools.

Cultural education also includes heritage education. Heritage is understood by our experts (PARDO/BOSCH 2009) as the memory of scientific knowledge, artistic and cultural traditions. Heritage can be tangible and intangible, cultural and natural. The educational activities in museums and heritage sites are an opportunity to break down the isolation of the school from its natural and cultural environment. When heritage education is based on the paradigm of cultural diversity, it also serves as an important educational resource against exclusive identities.

Finally, theatre and dance pedagogy, when based on human rights values, clearly improve the construction of cultural and creative citizenship in all the areas. This pedagogy advocates for cooperative team work that has its major potential in the diversity. The consideration of physical and performing education is crucial for the development of free expression and critical future publics of culture.

All that means the need for an international effort to create synergies between policies and programs usually working in separate times and areas (citizenship, youth, culture, education, communication, immigration etc.). The cultural managers of the future must be prepared to design and implement projects from the perspective of cultural education. That's why, according to the data and opinions drawn from this research, one of the major strategic commitments, or future challenges, for cultural education is the need to place universities at the heart of cultural and educational policies.

University models of education and research, as well as knowledge transference must respond clearly to the new paradigms of the 21st Century. Following the laws and the opinion of our experts, Catalan universities appear to have lost their role as a key player in cultural concerns and the trend is now towards a model based on meeting the demands of the professional market —which is in decline and in crisis— for trained, specialised and technical human power. This is bringing into question the future of universities in the general and in our local context. The excessive specialisation and compartmentalisation of knowledge and of areas of activity, which is characteristic of universities in most of the countries (NUSSBAUM 2011; MORIN 1999), is one of the reasons that explains the separation caused by 'guildism' and the excessive unionisation of people working in the field of culture and education. The creation of professional associations in recent years is clear evidence of this growing trend to determine the boundaries and distinctions between professions. Lifelong training of professionals, as proposed for universities, consolidates and reinforces the divide between the two systems. We urgently need to articulate training programs where there is real dialogue between specialists in pedagogy and teaching and those with knowledge in the fields of general culture and science, mainly when we talk about cultural managers.

The manuscript allows rethinking the way to work in international higher education networks for academics, students and professionals in the fields of (applied) cultural studies, sociology of the arts and culture,

arts management, arts education, cultural economics and cultural politics as this journal also intends to do.

Education is, by definition, a political responsibility and the guarantee of the fundamental right to participate in cultural life. That is why it cannot be disconnected from artistic practice, cultural consumption and social and cultural participation of all citizens without discrimination of any kind, including discrimination based on aesthetics or age. The commitment of state schools to quality and to an art education and culture that is not exclusively aimed at excellence and commercial is, definitively, a political and ethical option, as we have seen by the analysis of cultural and educational laws and the opinions of our interviewed experts.

In order to close with the first topic, and as the philosopher Victoria Camps (2011) established, the ethics and the aesthetics share the question of feelings and emotions.

> The pursuit of emotions is the condition for public ethics (CAMPS 2011: 273). Argumentation in pro of the emotion in ethics brings me inevitably to link ethics with aesthetics (CAMPS 2011: 323).

Arts and cultural education mean aesthetic and emotional education as well as democratic citizenship education. Cultural managers have, as an ethical imperative of their work, the defence of the right to participate in cultural life and that is only guaranteed, in our view, through cultural action as an aesthetic, ethical and political commitment linked to education as a universal public service.

Notes on Contributor

Gemma Carbó Ribugent is Director of the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policies and Cooperation at University of Girona.

Bibliography

ALONSO, C. (2014): *El saber interdisciplinar*. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Comillas.

ALSINA, P./GIRÁLDEZ HAYES, A./ABAD, J. (2012): *La competencia cultural y artística: 7 ideas claves*. Barcelona: Graó.

ANDRÉU ABELA, Jaime/GARCÍA-NIETO, Antonio./PÉREZ CORBACHO, Ana Maria/ CSIC (2007) *Evolución de la teoría fundamentada como técnica de análisis cualitativo*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

AUGÉ, Marc (2010): *La comunidad Ilusioria*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

BANKS, James A. (⁷2010): *Multicultural education Issues and Perspectives*. U.S.A.: Wiley.

BARBERO, Jesús Martín (2003): *La educación desde la comunicación*. Bogotà: Grupo Editorial Norma.

BARBOSA, Anna Mae (2008): *John Dewey e o ensino da arte no Brasil*. Sao Paulo: Cortez.

BARBOSA, Anna Mae (1998): *Tópicos utópicos*. Sao Paulo: Editorial Belo Horizonte.

BARICCO, Alessandro (2006): *Los bárbaros: Ensayo sobre la mutación* [*I barbari*] (Translated into Spanish by X. González Rovira). Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama.

BAUMAN, Zykmund (2008): *Múltiples culturas, una sola humanidad*. Buenos Aires: Katz Editores.

BAUMAN, Zykmund (2007): *Los retos de la educación en la modernidad líquida*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

BESALÚ, Xavier (2005) *Diversitat cultural i educació. Per una educació intercultural a les escoles de primària de Girona. Girona:* Universitat de Girona. <http://www.tdx.cat/TDX-0831106-132627/index.html> [06/12/2015].

BERGER, Peter/LUCKMANN, Thomas (1966): *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.

BONET, Lluis (1995): *Diversitat cultural i polítiques culturals a Europa*. Barcelona: Fundació Jaume Bofill.

BKJ (2010): *Cultural Competency Record*. Hrsg. von der Bundesvereinigung Kulturelle Kinder-und Jugendbildung e. V. Remscheid: BKJ.

BURKE, Peter (2010): *Hibridismo cultural*. Madrid: Akal.

CALAF MASACHS, Roser/FONTAL MERILLAS, Olaia/VALLE, Rosa Eva (2007): *Museos de arte y educación: Construir patrimonios desde la diversidad*. Gijón: Trea.

CAMPS, Victoria (2011): *El gobierno de las emociones*. Barcelona: Herder.

CEPAL-UNESCO (1992): *Educación y conocimiento. Eje de la transformación productiva con equidad*. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL-OREALC.

COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (CESCR) (2009): *Observación general Nº 21. Derecho de toda persona a participar en la vida cultural (artículo 15, párrafo 1 a), del pacto internacional de derechos económicos, sociales y culturas)*. CESCR: Unpublished.

DELGADO, Eduard (1997): In from the Margins. A Contribution to the Debate on Culture and Development in Europe. Council of Europe by the European Task Force on Culture and Development <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/Resources/Publications/InFromTheMargins_Short_EN.pdf> [06/12/2015]

EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2010): Green Paper. Unlocking the Potential of Cultural and Creative Industries. <http://ec.europa.eu/culture/documents/greenpaper_creative_industries_en.pdf> [10.10.2015].

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (2006): *Recommendation 2006/962/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning* [Official Journal L 394 of 30.12.2006].

FERNÁNDEZ PRADO, Emiliano (1991): *La política cultural: ¿Qué es y para qué sirve?*. Gijón: Trea.

FERRÉS I PRAT, Joan (2008): *La educación como industria del deseo: Un nuevo estilo comunicativo*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

FREIRE, Paulo/ SOLER-GALLART Marta (1970): Cultural action for freedom. Her Reprint Series. 2000 ed. Cambridge: Edition Harvard Educational Review

FUMAROLI, Marc (2007): *El estado cultural: Ensayo sobre una religión moderna*. Barcelona: Acantilado.

FUNDACIÓN KALEIDOS (2010): *Transversalidad en los proyectos locales: De la teoría a la práctica*. Gijón: Trea.

GARCÉS, Marina (2013): *Un mundo común*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.

GARDNER, Howard (1998): *Inteligencias múltiples. La teoría en la práctica*. Barcelona: Paidós.

GIROUX, Henry Armand (1990): Los profesores como intelectuales: Hacia una pedagogia crítica del aprendizaje. Barcelona: Paidós.

GIROUX, Henry Armand (1997): *Cruzando límites*. Barcelona: Paidós.

GIROUX, Henry Armand (2001): *Cultura, política y práctica educativa*. Barcelona: Graó.

GIROUX, Henry Armand (2005): *Estudios culturales, pedagogía crítica y democracia radical*. Madrid: Ed. Popular.

GOLEMAN, David (1996): *Inteligencia emocional*. Barcelona: Kairos.

GONZÁLEZ MORENO, Beatriz. (2003): *Estado de cultura, derechos culturales y libertad religiosa*. Madrid: Civitas.

KOSSLYN, Stephen (2001): *Psycology. The Brain, the Person, the World*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

LAAKSONEN, Annamari (2012): *Creative intersections*. Melbourne: IFACCA D'ART REPORT 41.

LLUCH, Gemma. (2012): *La lectura al centre: Llegir (i escriure) llibres, pantalles i documents en el pla de lectura de centre*. Alzira: Bromera.

MARINA, José Antonio (2010): *La educación del talento*. Barcelona: Planeta.

MARINA, José Antonio (2004): Una cultura para la educación. *La Vanguardia*. – In: Martinez Salanova, Enrique., *Cine y Educación. El país de las aules*. Educomunicación online magazine (February 18). <http://www.uhu.es/cine.educacion/cineyeducacion/temasserytener.htm#Una_cultura_para_la_educaci%C3%B3n_(Sobre_Ser_y_tener)_> [10.10.2015].

MARTINELL, Alfons (2001): *Las relaciones entre las políticas culturales y las políticas educativas*. Unpublished document. *Jornades sobre Polítiques Culturals i Educació* [Cultural and Educational Politics Workshops]. Unesco Chair, University of Girona.

MAURA Eduardo (2013): *Las teorías críticas de Walter Benjamin*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.

MORIN, Edgar (2009): On va el món? cap a l'abisme? – In: l'Arquer (ed.), Barcelona: L'Arquer editorialMORIN, Edgar (2009): *Para una política de la civilización*. Barcelona: Paidós.

MORIN, Edgard (1999): *Seven Complex Lessons in Education for the Future*. Paris: UNESCO.

NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION (1995): *Aesthetics for Young People*. U.S.A: University of Illinois Press.

NUSSBAUM, Martha Craven /UDINA, Dolors (2011) *Sense ànim de lucre: Per què la democràcia necessita les humanitats*. Barcelona: Arcàdia.

PRIETO DE PEDRO, Jesús (1993): *Cultura, culturas y constitución*. Madrid: Congreso de los Diputados.

RIVAS, Patricio (2011): Genealogía de la diversidad. La diversidad cultural como poder constituyente in *Wale'keru* (Culture and Development Research Journal), n. 1 Universitat de Girona, Universidad Tecnológica de Bolívar & Laboratorio Iberoamericano de Investigación e Innovación en Cultura y Desarrollo. *Wale'keru*. <http://edu-library.com/es/show?id=476>; <http:// www.walekeru.net>.

ROBINSON, Kean (2001): *Out of Our Minds: Learning to be Creative*. Oxford: Capstone.

RORTY, Richard (2010): *Filosofía como política cultural*. Madrid: Paidós Básica.

SYMONIDES, Janusz (1998): Cultural Rights: A Neglected Category of Human Rights. – In: *International Social Science Journal* (December) <http://www.iupui.edu/~anthkb/a104/humanrights/cultrights.htm> [06.12.2015].

UCLG. COMMITTEE ON CULTURE (2004): *Agenda 21 for Culture. Barcelona*. <http://www.agenda21culture.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=44&Itemid=58&lang=en> [06.10.2015].

UNESCO/UNITED NATIONS (1992): *Educación y conocimiento: Eje de la transformación productiva con equidad*. Santiago de Chile: UN, UNESCO.

UNESCO (2005): Convention for the Protection and the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2006): *Roadmap for Arts Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2009): *Guidelines for Intercultural Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2010): *Art Education Seoul Agenda*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2011): Alfabetización mediática e informacional. Paris: UNESCO.

UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG, UNESCO CENTER OF CATALONIA/COUNCIL OF EUROPE (1998): *Projecte de declaració sobre els drets culturals*. Barcelona: Unesco Center of Catalonia.

YÚDICE, George (2002): *El recurso de la cultura: Usos de la cultura en la era global*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

WILSON, Carolyn/ GRIZZLE, Alton/ TUAZON, Ramón/ AKYEMPONG, Kwame/ CHEUNG, Chi-Kim (eds.) (2011): *Media and Information Literacy Curriculum for Teachers*. Paris: UNESCO.