



This paper is taken from

*Learning for a Democratic Europe
Proceedings of the third Conference of the Children's
Identity and Citizenship in Europe Thematic Network*

London: CiCe 2001

edited by Alistair Ross, published in London by CiCe, ISBN 1 85377 323 8

Without explicit authorisation from CiCe (the copyright holder)

- only a single copy may be made by any individual or institution for the purposes of private study only
- multiple copies may be made only by
 - members of the CiCe Thematic Network Project or CiCe Association, or
 - a official of the European Commission
 - a member of the European parliament

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as

Edye, D. and Delgado-Moreira, J. (2001) To belong or not to belong? Can we research people's attitudes to European Union citizenship? in Ross, A. (ed) Learning for a Democratic Europe. London: CiCe, pp 337 - 343

© CiCe 2001

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

This paper does not necessarily represent the views of the CiCe Network.



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.

Acknowledgements:

This is taken from the book that is a collection of papers given at the annual CiCe Conference indicated. The CiCe Steering Group and the editor would like to thank

- All those who contributed to the Conference
- Cass Mitchell-Riddle, head of the CiCe Coordination Unit
- The University of North London for financial and other support for the programme, conference and publication
- The SOCRATES programme and the personnel of DGXXII for their support and encouragement.

To belong or not to belong? Can we research people's attitudes to European Union citizenship?

Dave Edye and Juan Delgado-Moreira
University of North London (UK)

This paper falls into two distinct sections. The first examines current attempts to explore attitudes towards Europe, primarily through the Eurobarometer. We conclude that citizenship is shown to have two dimensions: politico-constitutional and identity/multicultural, and in both the attitudes revealed by Eurobarometer show significant cause for concern. We also need to explore the process of opinion formation and the relationship between variables that people make themselves.

The second part of the paper presents the framework of a module that we are developing at MA level that attempts to explore these issues with students.

1 Researching Attitudes to the European Union

Perhaps it is a revealing detail that the unit responsible for the Eurobarometer is called 'Citizens' centre'. It is part of the Directorate-General for Education and Culture and deals with several types of surveys, including the traditional Standard Eurobarometer (EB - established in 1973) and the European Continuous Tracking Survey (CTS).

The Eurobarometer (EB) is the benchmark for researching European citizens' attitudes. The exact questions asked have changed over time, some have been added from time to time to focus on a particular subject, while basic questions about European integration have featured in all Eurobarometers.

The first finding is that citizenship was not included in the Eurobarometers until several years after the Maastricht Treaty, whereas allegiance to the European Union interpreted as 'feeling European' is one of the staple questions of the Eurobarometer and has been asked in the years preceding Maastricht.

Eurobarometer 44 (1995) saw the inclusion of questions about the regions and a federal structure for Europe. The question on the level of attachment to different regional entities was new, and has not been used again until April 1999 (EB 51), perhaps due to the fact that allowing respondents to choose identification has relegated the feeling of Europeanness to a distant fourth behind nationality, region and locality. We have to wait until 1996 to see a clear concern with citizenship. In 1996, EB 45 included several sections dealing with citizens.

The presence of citizenship in the Eurobarometers has been maintained and refined, but after EB 47 it has ceased to have a separate chapter. EB 46 (conducted in November 1996) placed the questions in the different context of 'Media usage and the rights of citizenship'. The variable information about EU issues had been used much earlier, but this was the first time it was used specifically regarding citizens' rights. Europinion 10 (January 1997, Continuous Tracking Survey) also included several questions about immigration, which allowed for further elaboration on the trust variable and the diversity aspects of citizenship.

The Eurobarometer 47 served as the basis for two other reports on young people's and women's attitudes to the European Union, published in December 1997 and March 1998

respectively, in addition to Eurobarometers 47.1 (Racism and Xenophobia in Europe) and 47.2 (Young Europeans).

The Eurobarometer 48 (1998) included a Section 6 on the European Year Against Racism, which asked about acceptance of cultural difference. EB48 must be read in conjunction with EB 47.1 'Opinion poll: Racism and Xenophobia in Europe', which was requested by DGV of the European Commission. The report claims that no similar poll had been carried out since 1988.

From the EB 49 and 50 (1998) up until the most recent one, EB 53 (2000) citizenship is addressed as a matter of information and knowledge of the European Union. These Eurobarometers devote considerable space to current policy issues such as enlargement and the euro. But simultaneously more specific questions appear that link citizenship with the democratic process.

The 1998 Runnymede Trust and the Commission for Racial Equality survey in the UK and the 1994 CIS survey on European feelings of the Spanish people stand out as the most focused on feelings of belonging and European identity among the domestic studies. These two studies focused on loyalty as the key underlying theory that describes the relationship between individuals and government. Accordingly, they ask about 'images' of Europe, of the self, and of the national community. Not surprisingly, the loyalty to Europe scores very low levels. A theoretically-inspired criticism of this approach is that there is a mismatch between the nature of the relationship between citizens and Europe and the theory of emotional loyalty to an institution.

The latter was largely developed in the 19th century to rally support for the nation-state projects, and has been buttressed ever since by a mandatory common language and a mass education/religious system. The distilled product is 20th century emotional loyalty. This is not surprising, but the natural hypothesis derived from a widespread understanding of the nation-state project. Moreover, if that system had been completely successful, then the proportion of people who embrace Europeanness alone (the alternative hypothesis), given these type of questions, could not be more than 5%, a standard level of statistical confidence. We can safely conclude that something is wrong with this hypothesis, in the light of the fact that those who regard themselves more as Europeans are 42% among Italian youth, and 21% in British youth, leaving Germany and France in the middle of that interval, according to the latest MORI survey for Time Fortune (*Time*, April 2, 2001; p. 46).

Defenders of the loyalty model will claim that they still command the majority of the population, or that emotional attachment and loyalty can be shared on a number of levels. But they are well advised to be careful. While it is true that the levels of Europeanness drop dramatically if people are asked to pick a first and second geographic space, if they are given the option of identification with their local towns and cities, the levels of identification with the nation also drop. For example, an above-average pro-European country such as Spain scores only 1% of respondents who select Europe as their first level of geographic identification, and only 4.3% choose it second (1994 CIS survey on European feelings), but the rate of 'national' (i.e. Spanish) identification also plummets and the unified loyalty is shattered.

A similar predominance of the national level is one of the key limitations of the Eurobarometer in testing the loyalty hypothesis. Every variable is presented by country,

and complementary analysis by federal states or by regions is not supplied. Indeed, one could safely assume that this is not made available by the survey agencies, even though they should have used them in sampling.

As far as the practical meaning of European citizenship in Eurobarometers, DGX of the Commission has supplemented the loyalty model by following the Marshall evolutionary, rights-based definition of citizenship as consisting of civil, political and economic rights. Hence, the first question regarding citizenship that becomes a staple question is 'feeling European', with choices that exclude identification with regions and towns. We have argued that it is only in 1996 that a wider concern with citizenship emerges. The second most common citizenship question concerns awareness of citizens' rights (civil/political citizenship), and reliability of institutions of government (political citizenship) which evolves into questions of access to information about citizens' rights (particularly dominant for the period 1998-2000). The loyalty model, which so dominated citizenship questionnaires in Europe, could also be seen in the introduction of questions about fears (negative expectations for the future), trust (between peoples, as in EB 46; of immigrant groups as in Euroinion 10, 1997), and acceptance of cultural difference (EB 48, 1998, including Section 6 on the European Year Against Racism).

Of course, although there have been questions in Eurobarometers about employment and social and economic rights, we are merely describing the fact that they have not been linked with citizenship in formulating questions. Furthermore, the re-focus of citizenship questions on issues of access to information and the media seems to suggest that European citizenship risks becoming and even more a soft-core public relations concern in the age of the internet.

This linkage between questions that tackle citizenship and issues that are related, but are not presented as citizenship, provides the opportunity to put more interesting theories to the test. Even within the loyalty view, also known as the national-liberal model of citizenship, in which all west European countries participate to a large extent, some interesting relationships should be explored. Moreover, the variable 'feeling European' could be cross-tabulated with socio-economic status, to explore if it is only the upper classes who feel European while the worse-off live in fear of cheap imports and globalisation. The factorial analysis conducted in EB 47.2 tells us what types of attitudinal profiles can be found across Europe, but their ultimate theoretical and empirical relevance is limited. What are we to make of the fact that 14% of European women have an attitudinal profile labelled 'middle-of-the-roaders'? Though there is nothing more practical than a good theory, the idea behind this attitudinal profiling is not very practical.

Ideally, the Eurobarometer should ask more specific questions under the overall heading 'benefit from EU membership', so that answers on the benefit to a country from EU membership in health and social welfare could be cross-tabulated with a support of European level of political responsibility in social affairs. Unlike the loyalty/identity theory, the Eurobarometer is not designed in a way that allows an easy test 'off-the-shelf'; our hypothesis is that the relation between the two will not be statistically significant in areas of social and economic policy. It would be more informative to examine the relationship between the actual political participation of citizens in their local, national and European institutions and their support for certain forms of institutional reform.

Unfortunately, sociological imagination alone will not be able to squeeze as much out of the data currently available as if theories of citizenship had informed the design of the questionnaires. We could list examples of best practices that we have encountered which, together with the theoretically-inspired hypothesis-testing outlined above, should ensure that surveys become much more productive.

Conclusion

The reason why the Eurobarometer provides the benchmark for European opinion is because it is run by DGX of the European Commission, perhaps the only institution in the world genuinely concerned about European public opinion. Having reviewed the questions, one cannot help a feeling of dismay at the answers. EB 47.1 opens by stating that the survey shows 'a worrying level of racism and xenophobia in Member States, with nearly 33% of those interviewed openly describing themselves as 'quite racist' or 'very racist'. In the same special report, the EU15 average of opinion about the institutions and political establishment shows that only 24% have a positive opinion, while 43% feel negative and the remaining 33% are critical. Finally, EB 52 (published in April 2000) shows that the average support for EU membership remained almost flat between 1981 and 1999, except for a pick-up in 1991. It is currently 51%, reportedly up from 50% earlier in 1999.

13% think membership is a bad thing – the same percentage as in 1981 - and the 27% who think it is neither good nor bad has not changed over the past 20 years. In other words, the EU might even lose a EU-wide referendum about membership, especially bearing in mind that the likely turnout could be just 57% (the average in 1999 European Parliament elections).

Our conclusion is that citizenship sits at the crossroads of problems in its two dimensions: politico-constitutional, where people's participation in their democratic institutions is conspicuous by its absence, and identity/multicultural, where people's allegiance is to their local groups and they exhibit high levels of racism and xenophobia. In addition to snapshots of what people think of the status quo, we should explore the process of opinion formation and the relationship between variables that people themselves make rather than those derived from secondary analysis. Only by probing in this way can we understand the nature and the likely outcome of this wave of 'watchful consent'.

2 A syllabus for teaching citizenship in the European Union

1. Models of Citizenship

The work of Habermas (1992, 1996) in recent years, has been important in analysing the development of citizenship in Europe and the different forms it has taken. He identifies the Republican and the Anglo-Saxon as two basic models. They are based generally on the individualistic and instrumentalist role of the citizen in the liberal tradition of John Locke, contrasted to the more communitarian model common to Republican systems. Favell (1998) has compared the current distinctions between the idea of citizenship in Britain and France. Kymlicka (1995) has studied combinations of the two, and forms of liberalism that result in different emphasis on community and minority rights.

2. Citizenship and Identity

The link between citizenship and national identity has been clearly outlined in the recent works by Delgado-Moreira (1997) and Colley (1999). See also Edye and Copp (2000) and Rosaldo (1994) for further discussion on this issue.

3. Nations and Nationalism

The debate between Smith (1991) and Gellner (1983) on the origins and strength of nationalism lay the basis for an analysis of this divisive force within Europe. As micro-nationalisms tear apart the fabric of some nation states, is it possible to consider a formation of states beyond the nation state in an inclusive manner? The rise of supranational institutions and the developing forces of regionalism within the EU has posed fundamental questions about the future role of the nation state in Western Europe.

4. Citizenship and Equality

Conceptually as well as in its historical evolution, the idea of citizenship has promised a fundamental equality between citizens. We will review Marshall's (1992) classical formulation and Dahrendorf's (1996) comments on the extent to which citizenship has not undermined differences of social class. The EU also struggles to fight unemployment and foster cohesion between its citizens from different countries, although social and economic rights are not incorporated in EU citizenship as such.

5. The New European Citizen – Maastricht and Amsterdam

Article 8 of the Maastricht Treaty, as amended by Articles 17-22 of the Amsterdam Treaty, creates a new category of European citizen. However, the link between citizen and nationality is reinforced, in a regressive way.

Habermas' (1992) and Meehan's (1993) optimistic prognosis on the development of European polity will be contrasted with Grimm's (1997) critique. Newman (1996) has analysed the arguments of both sides and the chapter on citizenship will be used as a reference. Similarly, Delgado-Moreira's (2000) analysis of multicultural policies in the EU will be contrasted with Shore's (2000) criticism of the new European cultural citizen. Data from Eurobarometer surveys will be included in this part.

6. Immigrants and Citizens – Inclusion and Exclusion

The link between nationality and citizenship continues to exclude the nearly 12 million residents in the EU who do not enjoy the nationality of a member state. The need to develop an inclusive notion of citizenship will be explored in this section. We will compare the work of Soysal (1994) about the limits of citizenship and Shore (1997) about xenophobia in the EU.

7. Gender and Citizenship

Recent work, by among others, Lister (1997), Walby (1994) and Yuval-Davis (1998) problematises the whole concept of citizenship by questioning its inclusive nature in relation to the role and participation of women. Simultaneously, equal opportunities for women have been a long-standing goal of European Union policy. We will study the EU case Meehan (1993), Delgado-Moreira (2000) in light of the conceptual criticism.

Weeks 8 – 12

Themes:

The purpose of the themes is to provide a context within which students can undertake some kind of comparative and collaborative research work.

Citizenship and Democracy – Nation State curricula in Europe

The early parts of the course will aim to highlight some of the different kinds of thinking about citizenship over the past two hundred years, and this theme will take up those ideas and analyse the approaches.

Citizenship and the City

In focussing on the city or district in a city, students can consider some kind of qualitative research project – i.e. by interviews, questionnaires etc on selected groups' concept of citizenship. This approach can be based on Eurobarometer and domestic surveys.

Indicative Bibliography:

Delgado-Moreira, J-M (2000) *Multi-Cultural Citizenship of the European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate

Dreyfuss, L et Marchand, A (1996) *De la région à la Cité- Etat, Avis de Recherche*, no 40, Marseille

Edye, D and Copp, G (2000) *Citizens 'R Us?* (CICE 2000).

Favell, A. (1998), *Philosophies of Integration. Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain*, London, Macmillan.

Feminist Review (1998) – Issue 57: Citizenship. Pushing the Boundaries. London: Routledge

Grimm, D (1997) Does Europe Need a Constitution? in Gowan, P and Anderson, P *The Question of Europe*. London: Verso

Habermas, J (1992) *Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe*. Praxis International 12:1 pp.1-19

Kymlicka, W. (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* Oxford, Clarendon Press

Lister, R (1997) *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. London: Macmillan

Marshall T.H & Bottomore, T (1992) *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto Press

Meehan, E (1993) *Citizenship and the European Community*. London: Sage

Melich, A. (1999), *Eurobarometer 47.2OVR: Young Europeans, April-June 1997* [computer file], Brussels, Belgium: INRA (Europe) [producer], 1997. Koeln, Germany: Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung/Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributors], 1999.

Shore, C. (1997), 'Ethnicity, Xenophobia and the Boundaries of Europe', *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, vol. 4, pp. 247-62.

Shore, C. (2000), *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*, London, Routledge.

Social and Community Planning Research, British Social Attitudes Survey, 1998 [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: The Data Archive [distributor], 8 June 2000. SN: 4131.

Soysal, Y. (1994), *Limits of Citizenship*. Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Van Kersbergen, K. (2000), 'Political allegiance and European integration', *European*

Journal of Political Research, 37: 1-17.

Yuval-Davis, N (1998) The Citizenship Debate: Women Ethnic Process and the State.
Feminist Review. 39: pp. 58-68