Europe and the World

Luigi Cajani, Ian Davies, Marta Fulop,
Elisabet Nasman and Alejandra Navarro Sada

CiCe guides for research students and supervisors

3

Children's Identity & Citizenship in Europe
Thematic Network
Socrates

London, UK: 2008

This Guide has been written and prepared by the CiCe Network's Working Group on Research Degrees:

Luigi Cajani, Department of Modern and Contemporary History, Università "La Sapienza", Rome, Italy

Ian Davies, Department of Educational Studies, University of York, UK

Marta Fülöp, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

Elisabet Näsman, Department of Sociology, Uppsala University, Sweden

Alejandra Navarro Sada, Department of Developmental and Educational Psychology, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

Series editor: **Alistair Ross**, International Coordinator, CiCe

Education and Culture
Socrates

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.

CiCe Guides for Research Students and Supervisors

Europe and the World

ISBN: 978-0-9560454-2-3

CiCe Guidelines: ISSN 1741-6353

September 2008

CiCe Central Coordination Unit
Institute for Policy Studies in Education
London Metropolitan University
166 – 220 Holloway Road
London N7 8DB
UK

This publication is also available in electronic format at http://cice.londonmet.ac.uk

Europe and the World

Luigi Cajani, Ian Davies, Marta Fülöp, Elisabet Näsman and Alejandra Navarro Sada

Contents

Introduction 1
Luigi Cajani

Global Citizenship Education: issues for researchers 2
Ian Davies

Intersectionality in intercultural citizenship research 6
Elisabet Näsman

Globalization processes, competition, identity and citizenship 8
Márta Fülöp

From the home town to the world: spaces and identity 12
Luigi Cajani

Researching economic issues from a crosscultural perspective 16
Alejandra Navarro Sada

List of references 19

Introduction

Luigi Cajani

During the last two or three decades the dramatic acceleration of cultural exchanges has impacted upon all societies of the world at varying levels of intensity. The diffusion of mass media, internet, low-cost flights and mass-migrations is changing the collective representations of one's belonging to a group. Cultural and value-based inputs no longer come primarily from the context of one's nation, which is losing its importance as point of reference, torn by localisms on one side and cosmopolitism on the other, but from all over the world, through communication networks which tend to be more and more individualized. The layers which form individual identities become more and more complex and their mutual relation more and more movable. This new interplay of identities obviously challenges traditional allegiances related to nation states and therefore requires new visions of citizenship education in a global context. In this booklet we sketch some research issues, in some cases more theoretically, in others more empirically, related to this context, focusing above all – on the one hand - on Europe, which can, in many ways, be considered a supranational political structure, which is taking over the role of national polities, and – on the other hand – on the World, which is the horizon of globalization. In the following vignettes, Ian Davis explores the differences between global education and citizenship education and suggests some possible research projects for investigating them; Elisabet Näsman gives a brief theoretical synthesis of *intersectionality* and its meaning for identity research; Márta Fülöp gives a theoretical framework to how global competition might effect the individual and especially the group identity and the relevance of this process in terms of citizenship; Luigi Cajani shows what kind of opportunities empirical research provides for history teaching to analyze the interplay of space dimensions in the development of individual identities; and finally Alejandra Navarro Sada shows some results of empirical research between Spain and Mexico on young people's understanding of economic processes and how they reflect on the notions of prosperity and social justice.

The work contained in this booklet has emerged from a small group of scholars who have expertise within specific academic and professional areas and who are committed to developing cross disciplinary understanding in - and for - a Europe that is not narrowly or exclusively defined but that is committed to democratic citizenship. We hope, through research, to be able to contribute to the development of an informed, open-minded and pluralistic Europe. The perspectives in this booklet - from history, psychology, sociology and education - raise the possibility of and suggest the need for exploring identity and taking action.

As European researchers we seek local, national and cross national understanding for a global future and we hope that the ideas in this booklet will help others to investigate the nature of this challenge.

Global Citizenship Education: issues for researchers

Ian Davies

Many academics conduct educational research entirely within one nation state or continent in ways that are valuable. Such work may actually be 'global' in terms of its quality that might influence people in other countries and because of its concern with matters that are of enduring human concern. Indeed, it is possible when people act internationally (i.e. *between* the nations, 'inter-nationally') they may be involved in furthering the interests of their own nation state or perhaps even their own personal agenda.

However, my personal and simple preference is to undertake research in collaboration with people in many other countries. This allows me explicitly to recognise current realities that are influenced by the forces of globalisation and think expansively about the meaning of normative educational policies in order to search for better forms of education. This may well be a rather old fashioned approach. Heater (1999) argues that prior to the 18th century four ideas (cosmopolitanism, citizenship, patriotism and nation) co-existed in European political thought but that by 1800 citizenship and nationality were virtually synonymous terms. We may now be witnessing, in the face of new forms of globalisation, the resurgence of less nationally bounded contexts for citizenship education. There is, therefore, an imperative for researchers to respond to these new challenges and to explore what may be called 'global citizenship education'. In so doing it is necessary to regard globalisation as something that is not the same as westernisation but rather that which is characterised by a network of flows within and across different spheres (Isin and Wood 1999). We should also be aware that understandings of global citizenship vary from a rather vague recognition of everyone belonging to the human race, to a much more precise and concrete advocacy of world government (Heater 1997).

Heater goes on to explain (1997, pp.36-38) that there is a range of meanings that can be applied to global citizenship. He has outlined four main meanings that can be placed on a spectrum of which the opposite ends are 'vague' and 'precise'.

Research focus: exploring global citizenship through international exchanges

It is commonly asserted that international exchanges provide opportunities for developing international or global citizenship. We established a project that allowed us to help develop and explore global citizenship among student teachers.

At the outset of the project we recognised the very many challenges of our work. For example, a review of European action programmes (e.g. Socrates) by the European Commission in 1998 concluded that:

- the most significant contributions made by the programmes is their promotion of trans-national and intercultural cooperation and exchange
- the most common participants are those in mainstream high status contexts
- "in practice it could not be said that the majority of the projects they looked at had a primary, explicit and concrete orientation towards learning for active citizenship" (European Commission 1998, p. 24)

These findings have been supported by others, e.g. Teichler and Maiworm (1997), Osler and Starkey (1999) and Grainger (2003) with the latter suggesting:

> there was a consensus that students appeared to be motivated to participate in the ERASMUS/SOCRATES exchange programmes by such goals as the desire to travel and live abroad, experience other cultures, enhance their foreign language skills and in particular, improve their job prospects.

We established a three year European-Canadian project in which three interconnected activities provided the means by which data could be analysed:

i. organising conferences in citizenship education in Europe and in Canada (year 1)
ii. school-based involvement in a country other than their own (years 2 & 3) moving 75 student teachers and 8 members of staff;
iii. a programme of activities designed to increase awareness of citizenship issues in a variety of settings (political, cultural and social) and to encourage the practice of education for citizenship in their future careers (years 2 & 3).

Those who became involved in the project showed in a variety of ways that they had learned a great deal about issues beyond their own countries and were keen to assert that they felt more 'global' than hitherto. Our observation and interview data showed largely positive indications of knowledge and understanding of key issues and an enhanced sense of personal efficacy. Forms of understanding developed that took participants beyond simple dichotomies of monocultural or multicultural education. For example, two New Brunswick students were placed in a school in London. For them this was a real experience with diversity as they come from a relatively mono-cultural part of Canada and this school's population is 100%

Bangladeshi Muslims. Both students, however, commented on the cultural isolation of the school and the lack of interest of students to learn about other cultures. One wrote, "The students at that school are almost 100% Muslim-Bangladeshi, with many students interacting only in this culture both within and outside of school." As the organizers of the project we were helped to reflect on the meaning of diversity.

Questions and issues that could be pursued by other researchers

The above work and other projects that have focused on textbook analysis and curriculum evaluation have led me to some rather tentative conclusions about the nature of citizenship education and global education. These tentative conclusions could be explored by other researchers. There are a cluster of questions that are associated with our current rather loose characterizations about the nature of global citizenship. I suggest that there are in fact two rather distinct traditions that exist between citizenship education and global education. I highlight below six of the differences that emerge from those traditions. For each difference between global education and citizenship education I suggest a possible future research project.

Although national citizenship itself is so old to be regarded by some as almost outdated, citizenship education is a new area. As such it does not yet have a tradition or pedagogy of its own. Global education, on the other hand, has a very well developed style and there are very many practical guides available. This assertion could be explored by means of analysing educational policy documents and professional resources from the last 50 years. Is it really true that citizenship education is so new and that global education has a longer history?

Citizenship education seems to emphasise either community based involvement or classroom based cognitive reflection. Global education tends (not exclusively) towards the affective. This area could be explored by analysing perceptions of teachers. How do they understand global education and citizenship education? There could also be a series of school-based studies in which student activities were observed.

Citizenship seems to have emerged from a social science context in which communitarianism has recently become significant. In England this has, in part, emerged through the preferences of key politicians and policy advisers. Global education emphasises rather more noticeably political activity as opposed to political science or community involvement. Global education searches more obviously for issues that require immediate and perhaps radical attention. The validity of this characterisation could be researched by interviewing key policy makers and members of influential non-governmental organisations.

It is possible that due to the, more academic, background to citizenship education that it has a narrower but more coherent base than global education. The combination of the affective orientation and a political outlook may mean that global educators will be accused at times of more fragmentation than other forms of education. Academics and members of non-governmental education could be interviewed to understand their perceptions of the nature of global education and citizenship education.

The context for citizenship education is often the nation state. This does not mean that international or global matters are always avoided. Often, however, citizenship education is in contrast to the more obviously post-national perspective of those associated with global educators. The latter will at the very least search more determinedly for ways in which the nation can become involved globally or, more likely, will see issues in terms of global interconnectedness in which the nation state is no longer the prime focus of analysis. It would be possible to explore this issue by setting up classroom-based research to identify what teachers and students actually focus on.

The level of legitimation for citizenship education is far higher than that for global education. However, teachers have in the past reacted very positively to global education by attending courses, buying materials and developing relevant classroom work. It is very possible that in the near future the citizenship education agenda will in practice become more close to that of global education. It is possible that teachers searching for ways to implement citizenship education will not draw from the official perspectives on citizenship education, but instead, turn to the ideas and teaching materials of the global educators. The declining power of the welfare state and the rise of globalisation mean that there is a need for greater integration between the two areas. Politicians and policy makers could be interviewed and key national curricula analysed to explore the extent to which global education and citizenship education are perceived to hold different status.

It will be important to monitor the continuing debates about the nature of citizenship education and global education in order to determine what sort of goals are being targeted and what potential there will be for widespread implementation of effective and appropriate education for improved knowledge, understanding and participation in contemporary society. New researchers in Europe together with their colleagues in other parts of the world are in a very good position to carry this work forward.

Intersectionality in intercultural citizenship research

Elisabet Näsman

Intercultural research on citizenship education

In studying citizenship issues from an international or even global perspective, issues of nationality and ethnic relations come to the fore. In the CiCe network citizenship research is linked to education with a focus on children and young people. This brings the age dimension and the life course structure into the discussion as important to consider along side the intercultural aspects. The age order of society is a powerful structure distributing opportunities and resources according to ideas of normality and deviance in the various life phases defining different age categories. Children and youth are in the age order of societies, in general, a subordinated category but their citizenship status and the age limits defining their life phases may vary between nations and cultures as well as the aims and forms of citizenship education. Ageism varies depending on culture, context and situation. Intercultural research on citizenship education may thus illuminate the extent to which children and young people as age categories are excluded and included in different societies. When these issues are considered alongside the reality of ethnic diversity within nations it means that the differentiation among children and young people becomes visible and the idea of homogenous status of the age categories may be contested. How do ethnicity and age interplay in processes of exclusion and inclusion?

Intersectionality

The relationships and interplay between different categorizations of people have been discussed in terms of *intersectionality*, primarily within queer theory, critical feminism and post-colonial theorizing. Intersectionality refers generally to analyses of how different power structures or principles of ordering society 'intersect'[1]. There are many foundations for power structures ordering society. In addition to nationality, ethnicity and age there are social class, gender, sexuality, religion, disability etcetera. In contrast to the idea that such social categorizations simply could be added to one another such as expressed when talking about black women experiencing double oppression, an intersectional approach emphasizes that the power orders depending on the particularities of each, and one of them, when they interplay, may form varying patterns relating to discourses, distribution of resources, institutional practices, interaction, and identity formation. An intersectional approach hence demands awareness of the differences between structures. For instance is the gender order based on a binary opposition where women and femininity are subordinated men and masculinity, while

[1] The verb 'intersect' is widely used, but reproduces the problems with the often used metaphors from physics giving the idea of that something intersects at a specific point rather than that complex processes of interplay are taking place.

the age order defines both children and young people on the one hand and old people on the other as subordinated due to the ideological dominance of the middle age categories as being of productive age? (Hockey & James 1993). The potential of mobility between status positions also varies a great deal, age being the categorization most open to mobility, but then only in one direction. These obvious differences, as well as more subtle mechanisms in the practices of status ascriptions, are decisive for the way in which opportunities are opened and hindrances are raised as well as for the actions taken by the labelled individuals. An intersectional approach is therefore of importance to understand the social and cultural processes of exclusion and inclusion in intercultural citizenship research.

Theoretical bases

Intersectional approaches have primarily been developed by researchers with a constructionist perspective, but the problems raised by the intersectionality debate – the need to understand the complex processes of interplay between categorizations - may be addressed also from other scientific standpoints such as social realism. The way in which society, the individual and social and cultural phenomena are understood have, however, an impact on how the construction and change of categorizations as well as their interplay is interpreted. The chosen perspective is also decisive of the methodology applied. Which data are relevant? How should data be collected and analysed?

Empirical data

From the comments above it follows that intersectionality studies may use several kinds of data; analyzing legislation, institutional practices, statistics on resource distribution or choices of educational paths, media texts and pictures, ethnographic studies of daily interaction, biographical interviews etcetera. The focus may thus be on how the interplay of categorizations may be found in documents, images and verbal intercourse between people ascribed multiple identities. Studies are focusing on the overarching societal level or interpersonal contacts and some draw linkages from general discourses and institutions to the daily experience of individuals.

Globalization processes, competition, identity and citizenship

Márta Fülöp

Formation of identity

Individual identity is formed by our own acts and their outcomes in relation to our goals and by a continuous comparative process between the self and others. Festinger (1954) in his theory of social comparison postulates that in order to evaluate ourselves, to know about our characteristics and strengths and weaknesses we have to compare ourselves to others and as a result of this comparison we can establish who we are. Psychologists agree that the desire to learn about the self through comparison with others is universal. According to Festinger, this comparative process can have the result of being 'better or worse' than the other. In the case of the result being 'worse', that tends to initiate a unidirectional, upward striving not to be 'worse', but to be a little bit 'better' than the other. This unidirectional, upward striving can be conceptualized as competition.

In case of group identity a similar process exists. Tajfel (1978) designed an experiment that revealed the so called 'minimal group paradigm', meaning that if people are placed into 'minimal' groups (based on arbitrary characteristics) that can lead to in-group favouritism. In his well-known experimental procedure he assigned schoolboys randomly to two groups. The groups were called 'Klee' and 'Kandinsky'. The boys were then asked to allot rewards to members of their own group and to members of the other group. In spite of the fact that the participants had no previous contact with each other, they nevertheless tried to maximize the difference between the rewards of their group and the rewards of the other group. When we consider the arbitrary and artificial way in which these groups were constructed, this is a remarkable finding. Tajfel argued that this favouritism arises because the differentiation between one's group and another group serves to create a meaningful definition of one's social identity in that situation. This tendency to favour the in-group compared to the out-group can be conceptualized as the basis of inter-group competition.

Levels of identity – levels of competition

In the two previous examples individual identity was connected with inter-personal competition and group identity with inter-group competition. If we look at other forms or levels of identity they can also be connected to different forms and levels of competition: ethnic identity to inter-ethnic competition, regional identity to inter-region competition (that many times focuses on control of scarce but valued material resources and rewards such as land, or natural resources, explained by Sherif et al.'s (1961) Realistic Conflict Theory), national identity to competition among nations, ideological identity and competition among ideologies (i.e. the Cold War),

religious identity to inter-religion competition (e.g. between Judaism and Christianity or Christianity and Islam), or cultural identity to inter-culture or inter-civilization competition (the notion of the clashes of civilizations) (Fülöp, 2008).

Processes of competition – processes of homogenization and differentiation

Processes of competition, however, can be qualitatively different, and a differentiation can be made first of all between vertical and horizontal competitive processes (Fülöp, 1995). In the case of *vertical competition*, - that is the traditional conceptualization of competitive processes, - there is a certain competitive dimension (e.g. mathematical achievement, quality of a product etc.) and within this dimension the competing parties strive to be different. Difference in this respect is defined in terms of being better – worse or having more/less within a given, common dimension e.g. achievement, talent, power and influence etc.). Therefore vertical competition implies that the competitive parties have a basic agreement over the comparative dimension and they both try to improve their quality and relative ranking within the same dimension. This, paradoxically, might result in homogenization, rather than differentiation, as the competing parties concentrate on the competitive dimension and elaborate themselves within that particular dimension while paying less attention to other potential comparative dimensions (Fülöp, 2008).

The notion of globalisation tends to imply homogenization. As production and consumption are operating at a global scale, and competition is also functioning at the global (world-wide) level , the 'comparative areas' become reduced and dominated and dictated by the 'winners' of this process. As such competitors are forced into this framework.

However, there is another process of competition, what we can call horizontal competition (Fülöp, 1995) that functions against homogenization. Lemaine (1974) postulated the Social Differentiation Theory, according to which if there is no chance for 'winning' within an already established competitive dimension, those who want to win, might create a new comparative dimension, or, in his words, find an 'empty space', where they are the ones who dictate the comparative qualities and standards. This leads to a differentiation process, because the competing parties cannot be compared within the same dimension anymore. This requires a kind of creativity or innovation, an inner differentiation process, during which the competing party recognizes a quality of his or hers that has not been previously fully recognised, or discovers a new product etc. in which or with which he or she can have a comparative advantage.

Globalisation and identity threat

When the 'identity' and the self-respect of an individual or a group is threatened by an unfavourable comparison (i.e. losing) then the individual or the group will start to emphasize the difference, and will not want to be channelled into the existing competitive framework. In certain contexts this may mean that anti-globalisation processes start to function. We can follow this when we recognize that territorial identities are reappearing in a time when physical space seems to be less significant and when the idea of a network is being substituted for the concept of frontier. Their presence in a globalised world could be considered as a new paradox: the claim for differences in parallel to the need for integration (Villanueva and Maiztegui, 2005). This defence of one's own places versus the non-place spaces created by the informational era, or defence of one's own culture, value system, religion etc. against those cultures, values systems and religions etc. that have been able to take influential positions in the global competition is not an innovative version of the horizontal competition, and sometimes leads to the conservation and rigid maintenance of qualities that do not necessarily benefit the group that chooses this existential strategy.

Simultaneous existence of two types of competition

On a global scale there is a parallel and simultaneous existence of both vertical competitive processes (leading more to homogenization) and horizontal competitive processes (leading to differentiation both in the innovative and conservative senses). Identity maintenance (both individual and group) is a core psychological process. Therefore our theoretical suggestion is that globalization leads neither to homogenization, nor to differentiation, but rather that these processes are both present in their full functioning – in competition with each other (Fülöp, 2008).

Questions of citizenship

Identity processes and, in relation to them, competitive processes have an obvious link to citizenship. Citizenship, on one hand is typically connected with social identity and this social identity is defined at different levels, mostly at the level of nation. On the other hand, - in connection with globalisation and with the idea of cosmopolitanism - citizenship can be connected to the whole world in the form of world or global citizenship. However, at this level we face a certain kind of paradox. If – in theory - somebody would feel a sense of belonging exclusively to all citizens of the world, meaning that identification with a certain sub-group (nation, ethnic group etc.) and therefore preference towards a particular group of people would be missing, then this person would shift from a group identity to an individual one and would form relationships with other people only based on individual preferences and would compete only at the

individual level etc. Thus, taken to its logical extreme, global citizenship is an individual identity, with no group belonging (Fülöp, 2008).

These theoretical thoughts about the effects of globalisation would require operationalisation and thorough research at the field of citizenship, identity and competition and certainly the cooperative effort of researchers of different disciplines.

From the home town to the world: spaces and identity

Luigi Cajani

The role of cultural elements in the construction of individual identity can be usefully indicated by the degree to which one feels connected to geographical spaces, from the home town to the wide world – passing through intermediate dimensions, such as the state, or macro-regions such as Europe. This relationship between space and identity is often present in sociological research, either as a specific focus (Haubrich, Schiller, Wetzler 1990), or as part of a wider problematic (Lorcerie 2005). In order to exemplify the kind of results which can be obtained and their importance for citizenship education I discuss below some results from *Youth and History*, a large scale European research project undertaken in 1995 on the historical consciousness and political attitudes of adolescents (Angvik, von Borries 1997). This research involved a sample of more than 30,000 14-15 years old pupils from almost all European countries, extended to Israel and Palestine, and including two national sub-samples, the Italian South Tyrol, which has a mixed population of German, Italian and Ladino speaking, and the Palestinians who live in Israel as citizens[2]. One of the questions was: "How much interest do you have in the history of these geographical areas?", with respondents given the following options: your immediate locality; your region; your country; Europe; and, the world outside Europe. The answers were to be given on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "very little" (1) through "some" (3) to "very much" (5). It must be considered that the formulation of the question was influenced by the focus on history: in other cases the sense of belonging is directly addressed by questions like: "Do you feel French, Alsatian, European?" and so on. The answers provide very significant indicators of one's sense of belonging because historical knowledge acquired at school combines and interacts with the knowledge and values acquired outside school, in the family, through mass media and through social representations. One more fundamental observation is needed to help understand the data of *Youth and History*: in all the European states the teaching of history focuses on national and European history, with varying emphasis on the former or on the latter. World history is absolutely marginalized, with a limited exception for the history of the 20th century. Local history is similarly, generally, neglected in textbooks and curricula. Therefore historical knowledge gained at school orientates pupils' interest towards the nation and to Europe.

[2] The complete list of countries: Belgium (Flemish community), Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain (England/Wales), Great Britain (Scotland), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Israel - Arab Citizens, Italy, Italy - South Tyrol, Lithuania, Norway, Palestine, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, Turkey.

The following table gives the overall means, which serve as reference for the further examination of country cases:

Interest in the history of different areas (overall sample)

	immediate locality	own region	own country	Europe	outside Europe
Mean	3.37	3.27	3.71	3.33	3.34

We can observe here a general positive appreciation for all these areas, but with a clear stress in favour of the respondents' own country, whilst the other areas follow at a considerable distance and are more or less at the same level.

There are nevertheless some significant differences in the interest expressed towards the history of one's own country. In some cases we find a lower interest, with means which range from 3.50 (Estonia) to 3.09 (Finland). The other countries in this sub sample are: Belgium (Flemish), Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain (both England and Wales, and Scotland), Iceland, Italy (South Tyrol), Norway, Slovenia and Sweden. At the opposite end of the scale, with means which range from Spain (3.82) to Greece, which reaches the highest level with 4.54, we also find Bulgaria, Croatia, Lithuania, Palestine, the Palestinian Israeli citizens, Portugal and Turkey.

Other findings may be seen in the context of the significance of respondents' attachment to national history. Across the overall sample local history occupies second place after national history, but the comparison between the countries shows a great difference between Greece at the top (4.42) and France at the bottom (2.49), which thus reaches the negative record for the whole sample. Also negative are Denmark, Finland, England and Wales, Iceland, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden. In the positive field, only Greece scores above 4.00. At the second place we find Lithuania (3.92), then the Israeli Palestinian citizens (3.90), Palestine (3.86), Croatia (3.80) and Portugal (3.71). Also Scotland, unlike the two other British regions, scores positively (3.31).

Regional history, which is at the bottom in the overall sample, shows a similar trend to local history, but with less extreme scores, both in the positive and the negative field: Finland scores negatively 2.58, followed by Denmark, France, England and Wales, Iceland, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden, all in the negative field under 3.00. At the top we find Bulgaria (3.92), followed by Lithuania (3.90), the Palestinian Israeli citizens (3.80) and Scotland (3.77), which thus shows again a clear divergence to England and Wales.

The interest in European history shows in the lower field means which range from 2.88 (England and Wales) to 3.14 (Denmark), also including Belgium (Flemish), Finland, Scotland , Israel, Palestine, and the Palestinian Israeli citizens. The highest interest expressed in European history is reached in Bulgaria (3.83), and inside this upper field, down to a mean of 3.55 (Russia), we find Croatia, Greece, Lithuania, Ukraine and Portugal.

A final look to non European history: the lowest interest is shown by all British sub-samples (England and Wales: 2.88, Scotland 2.97), and close to them there are Belgium (Flemish) (3.00), Spain (3.02), Finland (3.03), Norway (3.08), Denmark (3.10) and Italy (3.13). The highest mean is reached by Bulgaria (3.70), followed by the Palestinian Israeli citizens (3.68), by Ukraine (3.64) and by Lithuania (3.58).

This rough data already suggest some initial reflections. For instance the difference between Scotland on one side and England and Wales on the other side concerning local and regional history can be an indication of a striving for independence from Westminster government. On the other hand, the fact that Greece scores the maximum interest for national history is an indication of the strong nationalistic tradition of the teaching of history in that country. The slightest interest in European interest is shown in European countries where a certain scepticism toward the European Union is widespread, and in the countries of the Near East, where Europe is perceived as being far away.

More hints for an interpretation can be discovered by more complex analysis with other questions from the same research project. For instance, in the overall sample the interest for the history of one's country is positively correlated with the general importance that each pupil gives to one's country (= 0.382) and also (but less) with the general importance of one's ethnic group (= 0.268). Conversely, the interest for non-European history is not significantly correlated with the importance of one's country (= 0.111).

The research Youth and History thus offers many interesting opportunities for a synchronic cross-cultural comparison among nations and states. A further step should be the repetition of this survey at a certain distance, let's say 5 or 10 years, for a diachronic comparison of these attitudes inside a national context. Unfortunately it has not been the case yet. One can find some hints of an evolution looking at other research, like the one on young people attending the upper secondary school in Marseille made by Françoise Lorcerie in 2004. She observed in this sample, characterized among others by a high level of multiethnicity, a diffused cosmopolitical tendency combined with a sense of attachment to Marseille and with a valorisation of the political and social features of the state (Lorcerie 2005).

Finally, this kind of research is not only useful for sociologists and politicians, but also for teachers: they can indeed understand the fundamental attitudes of their students which will influence the reception and elaboration of the cognitive message the teachers transmit. Knowledge of these matters will help teachers to tune more precisely their work with young people in order to improve its effectiveness.

Researching economic issues from a crosscultural perspective[3]

Alejandra Navarro Sada,

Children and adolescents are an important part of the economic world, and their every-day practices connect them closely to both the consumer and the work area of the economy. The economic world is a significant socializing force in the lives of people all around the world. The economy encompasses the daily lives of children, as well as adults, and is woven strongly into the environment of their social lives. Fukuyama (1995) has argued that the modern-day economic world "constitutes one of the most fundamental and dynamic areas of human sociability".

Research that deals with the understanding of children and adolescents' notions of economics has tended to follow two major courses: (a) developmental research on what children understand, conducted by psychologists and sociologists; and (b) measures of economic literacy, carried out by economists and economics educators (Gianinno & Crittenden, 2005, pp. 552-553).

Developmental Research on children and adolescents' ideas of socioeconomic inequalities

The bulk of the developmental psychological research that has been carried out on children and adolescents' ideas of socioeconomic inequalities include studies of the concepts of 'rich' and 'poor', and socioeconomic mobility and most research on these concepts has focused principally on traditions in Europe, the United States, Australia, and other English-speaking countries (Berti & Bombi, 1988; Danziger, 1958; Enesco & Navarro, 2003; Furth, 1980; Jahoda, 1959; Leahy, 1981, 1983, 1990; Navarro & Peñaranda, 1998, among others). Almost all of them (until 1990) utilized Piaget's theory on social knowledge as a conceptual framework and were aimed at identifying and explaining age-related changes in children's societal knowledge. From the end of the 1980s onward, studies noted the influence of Moscovici's Social Representations Theory (Dickinson & Emler, 1996; Emler & Dickinson, 1985, Emler, Ohana & Dickinson, 1990) assuming that since children are born into a world already structured by the representations circulating in their communities, they become actors in these communities through a developmental process that implies cultural assimilation.

Developmental research with Spanish and Mexican children and adolescents.

In order to study the development of the conceptions about upward socioeconomic mobility in children from Europe and Latin-America, Spain and Mexico, a developmental study within the Piagetian framework was carried out with one hundred 6- to-14-year-old children. Although both countries share a similar socioeconomic

[3] This vignette is partially based in Enesco and Navarro, 2003.

structure and may be considered western countries, they differ substantially in the social distribution of wealth[4]. Consequently, it made sense to compare Mexican and Spanish children's understanding of economic mobility. The interest of the study was that most research on these concepts was done in Europe or other continents with an Anglo-Saxon tradition (USA, Australia, etc). There were few studies carried out in Latin America and none of them with the same research programme, and the same methodology and objectives, when comparing the data.

Responses to the question *how do people get rich* revealed several categories with factors related to socio-economic mobility (work, inheritance, chance, savings, illegal activities, etc.), and few age differences. At all ages, work is the factor most frequently mentioned by children. There were two main differences between Mexican and Spanish participants: illegal means and random factors, to which Spanish children seem to attach more importance than Mexican children. It actually is quite a paradox that Spanish children give more relevance to illegal activities than Mexican ones. Bearing in mind that corruption is an endemic problem in Mexico, it was only to be expected that Mexican children would refer to illegal activities more often than Spanish ones when explaining ways to become rich. Nevertheless, we should consider that corruption is an integral part of the Mexican *modus vivendi*, while in Spain is a more recent event as far as its coverage by mass media[5] is concerned. This may explain why Spanish children have a greater sensibility to the problem of corruption. Other studies carried out in several countries have reported similar findings: from the age of 10, children become more susceptible to factors that have an impact on their own social environment, incorporating them into their explanations (Berti, & Bombi, 1988; Tan, & Stacey, 1981).

With regard to games of chance (e.g. a lottery) and taking into account the deeply rooted traditions of such games in Spain, it is not surprising that Spanish children refer to them more often than Mexican respondents. Not only are there several kinds of daily lotteries in Spain but Spanish media also provide extensive coverage of their results and winners, especially when they are people from lower socio-economic groups and the prize impacts significantly on their economic status. However, it should be stressed that children's conceptions of chance are very similar in both countries: younger children view the lottery and other games of chance as means of

[4] When this study was carried out, the index for extreme poverty was approximately 20% in Mexico (out of a total of 97 million people) while in Spain it was less than 4% (out of a total of around 39 million people).

[5] From the late eighties, Spanish political scandals were covered at great length by the media. This study was carried out in 1991-92 when some government members and high-ranking civil servants were accused of being directly or indirectly involved in illegal activities. This denunciation was something new in Spanish politics as it has not been a matter of public knowledge since freedom of the press.

becoming rich which are as likely as 'finding a job', saving or asking for money from a bank. In contrast, older children realize that 'winning the lottery' is not the usual means whereby one can become rich.

List of references

Angvik, M. & von Borries, B. (Eds.) (1997) *Youth and History. A Comparative European Survey on Historical Consciousness and Political attitudes among Adolescents*, Hamburg: Edition Körber-Stiftung.

Berti, A.E., & Bombi, A.S. (1988) *The child's construction of economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bodily, C. L. (1994) *Ageism and the Developments of Age: A Constructionist View*. Pp. 174-194 in T. Sarbin & J. Kitsuse (Eds.), *Constructing the Social*. London: Sage Publications.

Bytheway, Bill (1995) *Ageism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill (1999) Moving Beyond Gender. Intersectionality and Scientific Knowledge. Pp. 261-284 in M. Marx Ferree, J. Lorber & B.B. Hess (Eds.) *Revisioning Gender*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Danziger, K. (1958) Children's earliest conceptions of economic relationships. *Journal of Social Psychology, 47*, 231-240.

Emler, N., & Dickinson, J. (1985) Children's representations of economic inequalities: The effects of social class. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 3,* 191-198.

Emler, N., Ohana, J., & Dickinson, J. (1990) Children's representations of social relations. Pp. 47-69 in G. Duveen, & B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Social representations and the development of knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enesco, I. & Navarro, A. (2003). The development of the conception of socioeconomic mobility in children from Mexico and Spain. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 164*(3), 293–317.

European Commission (1998) *Education and Active Citizenship in the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Festinger, L. (1954) A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.

Fülöp, M. (1995) A versengésre vonatkozó tudományos nézetek, III. A versengés a szociálpszichológia tükrében (Scientific Concepts on Competition, III. Competition from the Standpoint of Social Psychology) *Pszichológia, 15, 4.* 435-474

Fülöp, M. (2008) Competition, Identity and Globalization. Paper presented at the *European Network for the Study of Globalisation*. Annual Meeting. March 28-29, Fürstenfeld, Austria

Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Furth, H. (1980) *The world of grown-ups. Children's conceptions of society*. New York: Elsevier North Holland.

Gianinno, L., and Crittenden, V. (2005). Assessing shared understanding of economic exchange among children and adults. *Psychology & Marketing,* 22, 7, 551–576.

Grainger, N. (2003) Perceptions of some key respondents of the Erasmus/Socrates programmes and the European dimension in education. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, UK.

Haraway, D. (1988) Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*. 14, 3, 575-599.

Haubrich, H., Schiller, U., Wetzler, H. (1990) *Regionalbewußtsein Jugendlicher am Hoch- und Oberrhein*, Freiburg: Pädagogische Hochschule Freiburg.

Heater, D. (1997) The Reality of Multiple Citizenship, in Davies, I. abnd Sobisch, A. (eds.) Developing European Citizens. Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University Press, 21-48

Heater, D. (1999) *What is Citizenship?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hockey, Jenny & James, Allison (1993) *Growing Up and Growing Old. Ageing and Dependency in the Life Course*. London: Sage

Isin, E. F. and Wood, P. K. (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage.

Jahoda, G. (1959) Development of the perception of social differences in children from 6 to 10. *British Journal of Psychology*, *50,* 159-177.

Krekula, Clary, Närvänen Anna-Liisa and Näsman, Elisabet (2005) Ålder i intersektionell analys, *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift*, 2-3: 81-94

Leahy, R.L. (1981) The development of the conception of economic inequality. I. Descriptions and comparisons of rich and poor people. *Child Development, 52*, 523-532.

Leahy, R.L. (1983) The development of the conception of economic inequality. II. Explanations, justifications and conceptions of social mobility and social change. *Developmental Psychology, 19,* 111-125.

Leahy, R.L. (1990) The development of concepts of economic and social inequality. *New directions for child development, 46*, 107-120.

Lemaine, G. (1974) Social Differentiation and social originality. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 4, 17-52

Lorcerie, F. (2005) *Cités cosmopolites. Sur les identités sociales des lycéens marseillais. Rapport réalisé avec le soutien du FASILD*, Aix-en-Provence: IREMAM.

Närvänen, Anna-Liisa & Näsman, Elisabet (2005) Age and Intersectionality – the Childhood Case. Paper presented at ESA conference in Torun, Poland, September.

Navarro, A., & Peñaranda, A. (1998). ¿Que es un rico?, ¿y un pobre?: Un estudio evolutivo con ninos mexicanos y espanoles (What is a rich/poor person?: A developmental study with Mexican and Spanish children). *Revista de Psicologia Social, 13,* 67-80.

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (1999) Rights, identities and inclusion: European action programmes as political education. *Oxford Review of Education,* 25, 1&2, 199-216.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O.J., White, B.J., Hood, W.R., Sherif, C.W. (1961) *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robber Cave's experiments*. Norman (OK): University of Oklahoma

Staunaes, Dorthe (2003) Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA.* 11, 2, 101-110.

Tajfel, H. (1978) *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.

Teichler, U. and Maiworm, F. (1997) *The ERASMUS Experience: major findings of the Erasmus evaluation project*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Villanueva, M., Maizgetui, C. (2004) Multicultural states and the construction of identities. The Spanish case: an overview, pp. 41-54 in: M. Fülöp, A. Ross (eds.) *Growing up in Europe today*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books

West, C. and Fenstermaker, S. (1995) "Doing Difference". *Gender and Society*. 9, 1, 8-37.

West, C. and Zimmerman D. H. (1987) "Doing Gender", *Gender and Society*. 1, 2, 125-151.

The Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CiCe) Thematic Network links 28 European states and some 80 universities and college departments which are engaged in educating students about how children and young people learn about and understand their society, their identity and citizenship.

A cross-disciplinary group, we include lecturers in social psychology, pedagogy, psychology, sociology and curriculum studies, and those who educate various professions such as teachers, social pedagogues, psychologists, early childhood workers and youth workers.

CiCe Guides for Research Students and Supervisors
Europe and the World
ISBN: 978-0-9560454-2-3
CiCe Guidelines: ISSN 1741-6353
Published by the CiCe Thematic Network Project
Institute for Policy Studies in Education, London Metropolitan University