



CHAPTER 2:

Students' perceptions of their being European and students' opportunities to learn about Europe at school

Chapter highlights and summary

Surveyed students expressed a strong sense of European identity and belonging.

- Across participating countries, majorities of students indicated that they saw themselves as Europeans, were proud to live in Europe, and felt they were part of Europe. ([Table 2.1](#))
- During the period between ICCS 2009 and 2016, students' positive perceptions of their European identity increased in the majority of countries. ([Table 2.2](#))
- In most participating countries, male students tended to express a slightly stronger sense of European identity than female students did. ([Table 2.3](#))
- Majorities of students from an immigrant family held a weaker sense of European identity than did students from a non-immigrant family. ([Table 2.3](#))
- Consistent and statistically significant positive associations were observed between students' sense of European identity and students' level of trust in civic institutions. ([Table 2.3](#))

Majorities of students said they had opportunities to learn about Europe at school.

- Most surveyed students reported having learned about the history of Europe at school. ([Table 2.4](#))
- Opportunities, as reported by students, to learn about political and economic systems at the European level, about political and social issues in European countries, and about political and economic integration between European countries varied across the ICCS 2016 participating countries. ([Table 2.4](#))

This chapter examines students' sense of their European identity, a construct that reflects the degree to which students identify with the European region and that is related to the affective-behavioral domain *attitudes* in the ICCS 2016 assessment framework (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, & Agrusti, 2016). The chapter also presents findings on students' opportunities to learn about Europe at school.

Students' perceptions of European identity

European identity and citizenship have been studied extensively over the past decades. Numerous studies have focused on Europeans' perceptions of European identity and the extent to which these people feel they belong to Europe and/or to the European Union (Alnæs, 2013; Bellamy, Castiglione, & Shaw, 2006; Checkel & Katzenstein, 2009; Delanty, 1995; Duchesne, 2008; European Commission, 2012; Herrmann & Brewer, 2004; Karolewski & Kaina, 2006; Lehning, 2001; Lepsius, 2001; Spanring, Wallace, & Datler, 2008; Westle & Segatti, 2016). These studies highlight the different elements that contribute to the construct of "European identity." However, the multifaceted nature of this construct makes it difficult to define European identity unambiguously.

Some researchers have focused their studies on level of identification with the nation and with Europe through the influence of EU policies and symbols, defining, for instance, the civic/political and cultural components of European identity (Bruter, 2004a, 2004b, 2005; Pichler, 2008) and exploring the relationship between European sense of belonging and the EU's foreign policy (Cerutti & Lucarelli, 2008). Some scholars have also analyzed the various attributes of European identity in Central and Eastern European countries prior to their accession to the EU (Schilde, 2014). Although a number of scholars argue that national and European identities can positively coexist (Castano, 2004; Citrin & Sides, 2004; Diez Medrano & Gutierrez, 2001; Risse, 2010), others claim that nationalist convictions represent an obstacle to effective integration (Fligstein, Polyakova, & Sandholtz, 2012). Several researchers also claim that European identity is characterized by post-national and cosmopolitan thinking (Delanty & Rumford, 2005).

The Standard Eurobarometer 85 survey of spring 2016¹ (European Commission, 2016) showed an increase (since autumn 2015) in the extent of identification with EU citizenship. This increase was evident among majorities of respondents in all member states. Of the European countries participating in ICCS 2016, Malta and Finland recorded the highest percentages of respondents seeing themselves as EU citizens. The lowest percentages were recorded in Italy and Bulgaria. The results also revealed younger generations expressing a stronger sense of EU citizenship than older ones (77% of the respondents 15 to 24 years of age identified themselves as EU citizens compared to 59% of the respondents 55 years of age or above).

The European ICCS 2009 questionnaire included a question asking students about their agreement or disagreement with a series of statements on European identity and belonging. Five items with a four point-Likert response scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" were used to derive a European identity perception scale (Kerr, Sturman, Schulz, & Burge, 2010). Large majorities of the 2009 lower-secondary students across the European countries showed a strong sense of European identity, with male students expressing stronger feelings of European identity than females. Students from immigrant families were somewhat less inclined to express a sense of European identity than students from non-immigrant families.²

1 The background sections of the chapters in this report contain several references to the Eurobarometer survey results. These references should offer a better understanding of the European contexts and issues related to questions included in the regional instrument and are not intended as comparative data. Please note also that (i) the Eurobarometer surveys taken into consideration refer to year of the administration of the European regional questionnaire, (ii) Eurobarometer surveys are not conducted in Norway; and (iii) the survey respondents are older than the young people in the ICCS 2016 target group.

2 ICCS 2009 used the categories "students with immigrant background" and "students without immigrant background". ICCS 2016 divided students into two categories. "Students from immigrant family" included students who reported all parents as born abroad (regardless of where the student was born). "Students from non-immigrant family" comprised students who reported at least one parent born in the country where the survey was conducted. For details see Chapter 3 of the international report (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, Agrusti, & Friedman, 2018).

The ICCS 2016 European regional questionnaire included four items from the European ICCS 2009 questionnaire. The items (with Likert-style response categories of “strongly agree,” “agree,” “disagree,” “strongly disagree”) were used to measure students’ perceptions of their European identity: (a) “I see myself as European;” (b) “I am proud to live in Europe;” (c) “I feel part of Europe;” and (d) “I see myself first as a citizen of Europe and then as a citizen of the world.”

The resulting scale had a satisfactory average reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.80 for the pooled international sample). The higher scores on the scale indicate higher levels of students’ sense of European identity (see item map in Figure 2.1, Appendix C).

The question on students’ sense of European identity in the ICCS 2016 instrument contained two items (unchanged from ICCS 2009) that were optional for EU member countries.³ These items used the following statements to measure students’ sense of identification with the European Union: (a) “I feel part of the European Union;” and (b) I am proud that my country is a member of the European Union.

According to the responses to these items (summarized in Table 2.1), majorities of students in all participating countries saw themselves as Europeans (95% on average across the participating countries), were proud to live in Europe (94%), and felt part of Europe (87%). In Latvia, the national percentage of students agreeing or strongly agreeing with the third of these statements was more than 10 percentage points (at 73%) below the European ICCS 2016 average of 87 percent. On average across the participating countries, about 78 percent of students saw themselves first as citizens of Europe and then as citizens of the world. The highest national percentage for this item was found in Croatia (89%) and the lowest in Latvia (67%), where the proportion of students agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement was 10 points below the European ICCS 2016 average.

The average percentage of students across the European countries who felt that they were part of the EU was also 78 percent. National percentages ranged from 61 percent to 89 percent. The highest percentages for this item were observed in Italy (more than 10 percentage points above the European ICCS 2016 average), and the lowest in Latvia (67%) and the Netherlands (61%). Cross-nationally, 90 percent of surveyed students, on average, were proud that their country was a member of the European Union.

The average student in the European countries participating in ICCS 2016 expressed a strong sense of European identity (Table 2.2). Croatia, Finland, Italy, Malta, Norway, and Slovenia recorded average scores significantly above the ICCS 2016 European average. The national average for Latvia was more than three score points below the ICCS 2016 average, however. Between 2009 and 2016, we observed an increase in students’ positive perceptions of their European identity in almost all countries participating in both surveys. The European average in ICCS 2016 was more than three score points higher than in 2009, which is equivalent to about a third of a standard deviation. The highest increases in average scores between 2009 and 2016 (four score points or more) were recorded in Denmark, Finland, Lithuania, Malta, and Sweden.

Table 2.3 presents the average scale scores by gender group, immigrant background, and trust in civic institutions. The data for students from an immigrant family⁴ includes only the data for those countries that had a sufficiently large sample size for this sub-group (at least 50 cases). The columns show the average scores in each comparison group (e.g., for males and females), while the bar chart in between graphically illustrates the direction of each association: the red bars to the left of the zero line indicate score-point differences where students in the first (left-hand side)

3 Denmark and Norway did not administer these optional items.

4 See footnote 2.

Table 2.1: Students' perceptions of their European identity

Country	Percentages of students who agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:						
	I see myself as European	I am proud to live in Europe	I feel part of Europe	I see myself first as a citizen of Europe and then as a citizen of the world	I feel part of the European Union	I am proud that my country is a member of the European Union	
Belgium (Flemish)	94 (0.6) ▽	96 (0.4) △	84 (0.9) ▽	72 (1.2) ▽	73 (1.2) ▽	93 (0.6) △	
Bulgaria	91 (0.7) ▽	90 (0.6) ▽	84 (0.9) ▽	79 (1.0)	74 (1.1) ▽	88 (0.8) ▽	
Croatia	98 (0.3) △	95 (0.5) △	91 (0.6) △	89 (0.6) ▲	85 (0.7) △	90 (0.8)	
Denmark [†]	96 (0.4) △	96 (0.4) △	92 (0.5) △	76 (0.8) ▽	-	-	
Estonia [†]	95 (0.3)	92 (0.6) ▽	87 (0.9)	74 (1.1) ▽	81 (1.1) △	88 (0.8) ▽	
Finland	98 (0.3) △	96 (0.4) △	90 (0.6) △	85 (0.8) △	86 (0.7) △	92 (0.6) △	
Italy	97 (0.4) △	94 (0.5)	93 (0.5) △	78 (0.8)	89 (0.8) ▲	91 (0.6)	
Latvia [†]	92 (0.7) ▽	87 (0.9) ▽	73 (1.2) ▼	67 (1.1) ▼	67 (1.1) ▼	84 (0.9) ▽	
Lithuania	97 (0.4) △	95 (0.4) △	86 (0.8)	79 (0.9)	81 (0.8) △	93 (0.5) △	
Malta	95 (0.4)	94 (0.4)	91 (0.5) △	83 (0.6) △	84 (0.7) △	91 (0.5) △	
Netherlands [†]	94 (0.6)	94 (0.5)	82 (0.9) ▽	69 (1.2) ▽	61 (1.2) ▼	85 (0.8) ▽	
Norway (9) [†]	92 (0.5) ▽	96 (0.3) △	90 (0.5) △	77 (0.8)	-	-	
Slovenia	98 (0.3) △	95 (0.5) △	88 (0.8)	83 (0.8) △	83 (0.9) △	92 (0.8) △	
Sweden [†]	91 (0.8) ▽	95 (0.5) △	87 (0.9)	77 (0.8)	75 (1.1) ▽	90 (0.8)	
European ICCS 2016 average	95 (0.1)	94 (0.1)	87 (0.2)	78 (0.2)	78 (0.3)	90 (0.2)	
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements							
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹	91 (1.0)	90 (0.9)	76 (1.5)	63 (1.5)	67 (2.0)	80 (1.2)	

National ICCS 2016 percentage:

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above European ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above European ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below European ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below European ICCS 2016 average

Notes:

- () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- 1 National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.
- No comparable data available.

Table 2.2: National averages of students' sense of European identity

Country	2016	2009	Differences (2016-2009)	40	45	50	55	60
Belgium (Flemish)	52 (0.3) ▽	49 (0.2)	2.8 (0.8)			■	■	
Bulgaria	52 (0.3) ▽	50 (0.2)	2.1 (0.8)			■	■	
Croatia	55 (0.3) △	-	-				■	
Denmark [†]	53 (0.2) ▽	49 (0.2)	4.1 (0.8)			■	■	
Estonia [‡]	53 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	3.1 (0.8)			■	■	
Finland	56 (0.2) △	52 (0.2)	4.4 (0.8)			■	■	
Italy	54 (0.2) △	54 (0.2)	0.3 (0.8)				■	
Latvia [‡]	48 (0.2) ▼	45 (0.3)	3.1 (0.8)		■	■		
Lithuania	54 (0.3)	49 (0.2)	4.4 (0.8)			■	■	
Malta	54 (0.2) △	48 (0.3)	5.8 (0.8)			■	■	
Netherlands [‡]	52 (0.3) ▽	-	-				■	
Norway (9) [‡]	55 (0.2) △	-	-				■	
Slovenia	55 (0.2) △	53 (0.3)	1.3 (0.8)			■	■	
Sweden [‡]	53 (0.3)	50 (0.2)	4.0 (0.8)			■	■	
European ICCS 2016 average	53 (0.1)							
Common countries average	53 (0.1)	48 (0.3)	3.2 (0.2)					

Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements

North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) [‡]	51 (0.3)	-	-				■	
---	----------	---	---	--	--	--	---	--

■ 2016 average score +/- Confidence interval
 ■ 2009 average score +/- Confidence interval

National ICCS 2016 average

- ▲ More than 3 score points above European ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above European ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below European ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 3 score points below European ICCS 2016 average

On average across items, students with a score in the range with this color have more than a 50% probability of indicating:

	No strong agreement with positive statements
	Strong agreement with positive statements

() Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Statistically significant changes ($p < 0.05$) between 2009 and 2016 are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

[‡] National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

- No comparable data available.

group had significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher values; the green bars indicate score-point differences where the other group had significantly higher averages.⁵

In most countries, male students tended to express a slightly stronger sense of European identity than females (as already observed in ICCS 2009). On average, we recorded a small but statistically significant difference of one score point between males and females. Students from an immigrant family expressed a weaker sense of European identity compared to students from a non-immigrant family. On average, the difference between the two groups was four scale score points. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the Netherlands recorded the largest differences (seven score points or more).⁶


We recorded consistent and statistically significant positive associations between students' sense of European identity and students' trust in civic institutions. On average across the European

5 Results from the benchmarking participant North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) were not included because North Rhine-Westphalia's very low sample response rates do not permit comparison across sub-groups within the sample.

6 In all participating countries, the socioeconomic status (SES) of students from a non-immigrant family was statistically significantly higher than the socioeconomic status of students from an immigrant family. Latvia was the only country not to register a statistically significant difference between the SES of students from an immigrant family and those from a non-immigrant family.

Table 2.3: National average scale scores indicating students' sense of European identity by gender, immigrant background, and students' trust in civic institutions

Country	Scale score average by gender group					Scale score average by non-immigrant family					Scale score average by immigrant background					Scale score average by students' trust in civic institutions				
	Male students		Female students			Non-immigrant family		Immigrant family			Students with low level of trust		Students with high level of trust							
Belgium (Flemish)	53 (0.4)	51 (0.4)	53 (0.3)	49 (0.7)	50 (0.5)	53 (0.3)	49 (0.7)	50 (0.5)	53 (0.3)	50 (0.5)	53 (0.3)	50 (0.5)	53 (0.3)							
Bulgaria	52 (0.4)	52 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	56 (0.9)	50 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	56 (0.9)	50 (0.4)	54 (0.4)	50 (0.4)	54 (0.4)	50 (0.4)	54 (0.4)							
Croatia	56 (0.4)	52 (0.2)	53 (0.2)	51 (0.5)	54 (0.4)	53 (0.2)	51 (0.5)	50 (0.4)	58 (0.4)	54 (0.3)	58 (0.4)	54 (0.3)	58 (0.4)							
Denmark [†]	53 (0.3)	53 (0.4)	54 (0.3)	47 (0.8)	49 (0.4)	53 (0.2)	47 (0.8)	49 (0.4)	54 (0.2)	50 (0.4)	54 (0.2)	50 (0.4)	54 (0.2)							
Estonia ¹	53 (0.4)	56 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	52 (0.8)	52 (0.5)	54 (0.3)	52 (0.8)	49 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	49 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	49 (0.4)	55 (0.3)							
Finland	56 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	55 (0.2)	51 (0.7)	51 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	51 (0.7)	52 (0.5)	57 (0.2)	52 (0.5)	57 (0.2)	52 (0.5)	57 (0.2)							
Italy	55 (0.2)	48 (0.3)	49 (0.3)	42 (0.7)	46 (0.3)	55 (0.2)	42 (0.7)	51 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	51 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	51 (0.3)	56 (0.2)							
Latvia ¹	49 (0.4)	53 (0.3)	49 (0.3)	47 (1.5)	51 (0.4)	49 (0.3)	47 (1.5)	46 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	46 (0.3)	50 (0.3)	46 (0.3)	50 (0.3)							
Lithuania	54 (0.4)	53 (0.2)	54 (0.2)	51 (0.7)	51 (0.3)	54 (0.3)	51 (0.7)	51 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	51 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	51 (0.4)	55 (0.3)							
Malta	55 (0.3)	51 (0.4)	53 (0.3)	45 (0.9)	48 (0.5)	54 (0.2)	51 (0.7)	51 (0.3)	55 (0.2)	51 (0.3)	55 (0.2)	51 (0.3)	55 (0.2)							
Netherlands ¹	53 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	52 (0.4)	50 (0.5)	53 (0.3)	45 (0.9)	48 (0.5)	53 (0.3)	48 (0.5)	53 (0.3)	48 (0.5)	53 (0.3)							
Norway (9) ¹	55 (0.3)	54 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	53 (0.6)	53 (0.3)	56 (0.2)	52 (0.4)	50 (0.5)	57 (0.2)	50 (0.5)	57 (0.2)	50 (0.5)	57 (0.2)							
Slovenia	55 (0.3)	53 (0.4)	55 (0.3)	52 (0.6)	53 (0.3)	55 (0.3)	53 (0.6)	53 (0.3)	56 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	56 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	56 (0.3)							
Sweden ¹	54 (0.4)	53 (0.4)	54 (0.3)	52 (0.6)	50 (0.7)	54 (0.3)	52 (0.6)	50 (0.7)	54 (0.3)	50 (0.7)	54 (0.3)	50 (0.7)	54 (0.3)							
European ICCS2016 average	54 (0.1)	53 (0.1)	54 (0.1)	50 (0.2)	50 (0.1)	54 (0.1)	50 (0.2)	50 (0.1)	55 (0.1)	50 (0.1)	55 (0.1)	50 (0.1)	55 (0.1)							

 Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

 Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Notes:

() Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Score averages that are significantly larger ($p < 0.05$) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

¹ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

^ Number of students too small to report group average scores.

countries, the difference between students reporting a high level of trust and the students reporting a low level of trust was five score points on the European identity scale.⁷

Students' opportunities to learn about Europe at school

Most European countries consider civic and citizenship education a relevant area of school education (Eurydice, 2005, 2012; Kerr et al., 2010). At the same time, as evident in several studies, this area of the school curriculum is still characterized by gaps between policies and practices and between intended and implemented curricula (see, for example, Bîrzéa et al., 2004; Veugelers, de Groot, & Stolck, 2017). Although these studies emphasize the extent of difference across the European countries in how they deliver civic and citizenship education, they identify five approaches overall:

- (1) Taught as a separate subject by teachers of subjects related to civic and citizenship education;
- (2) Taught by teachers of subjects related to human and social sciences;
- (3) Integrated into all subjects taught at school;
- (4) Taught as an extracurricular activity; and/or
- (5) Considered to be a result of school experience as a whole.

The ICCS 2009 results showed that these five approaches often coexist across the participating European countries (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010).

Data relating to the aims of civic and citizenship education drawn from the ICCS 2016 national contexts survey revealed a great deal of commonality in civic and citizenship education learning objectives across the European countries. Results from questions in the ICCS 2016 school and teacher questionnaires that asked principals and teachers to select the three most important aims of civic and citizenship education also showed general cross-national agreement that these three aims related to development of students' civic and political knowledge and skills (e.g., promoting knowledge of social, political, and civic institutions; promoting students' critical and independent thinking). The other aims included in the question concerned the development of a sense of responsibility (e.g., promoting the capacity to defend one's own point of view) and the development of active participation (e.g., preparing students for future political engagement).⁸

Having examined the European dimension included in civic and citizenship curricula, the authors of the 2012 Eurydice report (Eurydice, 2012) concluded that this dimension is relevant in the majority of European countries. They also observed that this dimension addresses such matters as European identity and belonging; European history, culture, and literature; the main economic, political, and social issues facing Europe; the functioning of European Union institutions; and European Union perspectives.

According to the Eurydice report, national curricula at the lower secondary level of education (ISCED Level 2) in the majority of the European countries participating in ICCS 2016 cover the themes identified in the report.⁹ Norway and Sweden were the only countries where the issue of European identity and belonging was not a recommended topic in the curriculum. Norway also, along with Malta, did not include content relating to Europe's main economic, political, and social issues. The Norwegian curriculum at lower secondary level, moreover, gave no consideration to issues related to how institutions function; nor did it include European Union perspectives.

⁷ ICCS 2016 used six items (national government, local government, national parliament, police, courts of justice, political parties) to derive a scale reflecting students' trust in civic institutions (see Chapter 5 of the ICCS 2016 international report; Schulz et al., 2018). Chapter 4 of this current report presents results for students' trust in the European Parliament and in the European Commission (see, in particular, Table 4.6).

⁸ For more detailed information on the European school contexts, see Chapters 2 and 6 of the international ICCS 2016 report (Schulz et al., 2018).

⁹ Data for Croatia on citizenship education themes included in national curricula (ISCED 1–3) for school year 2010/2011 were not available in the 2012 Eurydice report.

The European Union is strongly committed to promoting inclusion of EU topics in the national curricula of its member states (Nicaise & Blondin, 2003). The EU also carries out initiatives aimed at supporting active citizenship, democracy, tolerance, and human rights. However, as a number of scholars have pointed out, substantial gaps between educational policies and practices still persist (Keating, 2014; Van Driel, Darmody, & Kerzil, 2016; Veugelers et al., 2017).

The majority of respondents to the Standard Eurobarometer 85 survey (European Commission, 2016) indicated that they knew their rights as European citizens. In Finland, Estonia, Sweden, Lithuania, Denmark, Slovenia, the Netherlands, and Malta, more than half of the respondents said they knew their rights as citizens. The lowest subjective rates of knowledge recorded were those for Croatia, Bulgaria, and Italy.

The ICCS 2016 European regional questionnaire included four items (all modified versions of those used in the European ICCS 2009 questionnaire) designed to capture students' reports on the opportunities they had to learn about topics relevant to Europe at school ("to a large extent," "to a moderate extent," "to a small extent," "not at all"). The four items were (a) "political and economic systems of other European countries;" (b) "the history of Europe;" (c) "political and social issues in other European countries;" and (d) "political and economic integration between European countries (e.g. the European Union)." The four-item scale had a satisfactory average reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.77 for the combined international dataset) (see the item map in Figure 2.2, Appendix C).

The extent to which students said they had opportunities to learn about Europe at school varied substantially across countries (Table 2.4). Four countries, namely Croatia, Finland, Italy, and Lithuania, recorded percentages above the European ICCS 2016 average for all four items.

On average across the participating countries, 83 percent of the surveyed students reported having opportunities to learn about the history of Europe. The highest national percentages were those for Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, and Norway. Only Malta (66%) had an average percentage more than 10 percentage points below the European ICCS 2016 average.

In Croatia, Finland, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, and Slovenia, more than 70 percent of the students said they had opportunities to learn about the political and economic systems of other European countries. The lowest percentages that we recorded for this item were those for Estonia (52%) and the Netherlands (53%).

About 63 percent of students, on average, reported having opportunity to learn about political and social issues in other European countries. The percentages in Estonia, Malta, and the Netherlands were more than 10 points below the European ICCS 2016 average. Higher percentages were found in Croatia, Italy, and Lithuania.

On average, 65 percent of students had, according to them, opportunities to learn about political and economic integration between European countries (e.g., the European Union). The percentages in Estonia, Latvia, and the Netherlands were more than 10 points below the European ICCS 2016 average. Italy and Lithuania recorded the highest percentages.

Table 2.4 also records the national averages for participating countries on the learning about Europe at school scale. Croatia, Italy, and Lithuania recorded the highest scores; Belgium, at more than three points below the European ICCS 2016 average, recorded the lowest score. The scale scores in Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Malta, the Netherlands, and Sweden were significantly below the European ICCS 2016 average.

Table 2.4: Students' reports on their opportunities for learning about Europe at school

Country	Percentages of students who have had opportunities to learn to a large or to a moderate extent at school about the following topics:				Average scale scores for students' reporting on opportunities for learning about Europe at school
	Political and economic systems of other European countries (%)	The history of Europe (%)	Political and social issues in other European countries (%)	Political and economic integration between European countries (%)	
Belgium (Flemish)	57 (1.5) ▽	74 (1.6) ▽	53 (1.3) ▽	57 (1.3) ▽	47 (0.3) ▼
Bulgaria	58 (1.2) ▽	77 (1.0) ▽	58 (1.3) ▽	60 (1.3) ▽	48 (0.3) ▽
Croatia	71 (1.2) △	92 (0.7) △	73 (1.1) ▲	74 (1.2) △	53 (0.3) ▲
Denmark [†]	70 (1.0) △	77 (0.8) ▽	65 (1.0) △	68 (1.0) △	50 (0.2)
Estonia [†]	52 (1.4) ▼	89 (0.8) △	51 (1.2) ▼	50 (1.4) ▼	48 (0.2) ▽
Finland	71 (0.9) △	92 (0.6) △	67 (1.0) △	71 (1.0) △	52 (0.2) △
Italy	81 (0.8) ▲	89 (0.7) △	80 (0.9) ▲	81 (0.9) ▲	54 (0.3) ▲
Latvia [†]	59 (1.4) ▽	82 (0.9)	54 (1.1) ▽	50 (1.1) ▼	48 (0.3) ▽
Lithuania	78 (1.1) ▲	93 (0.6) ▲	76 (1.1) ▲	83 (0.9) ▲	55 (0.3) ▲
Malta	59 (0.8) ▽	66 (0.7) ▼	52 (0.7) ▼	58 (0.8) ▽	47 (0.2) ▽
Netherlands [†]	53 (1.4) ▼	83 (1.3)	52 (1.5) ▼	53 (1.3) ▼	47 (0.3) ▽
Norway (9) [†]	71 (1.0) △	91 (0.5) △	69 (0.9) △	66 (1.0)	52 (0.2) △
Slovenia	74 (1.1) △	78 (0.9) ▽	65 (1.2) △	71 (1.0) △	50 (0.2)
Sweden [†]	63 (1.7)	80 (1.0) ▽	62 (1.4)	63 (1.2)	49 (0.3) ▽
European ICCS 2016 average	66 (0.3)	83 (0.2)	63 (0.3)	65 (0.3)	50 (0.1)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements					
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹	66 (1.8)	72 (1.6)	73 (2.1)	64 (1.8)	49 (0.5)

National ICCS 2016 percentage or average:

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points or 3 score points above European ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above European ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below European ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points or 3 score points below European ICCS 2016 average

Notes:

- () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- ¹ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

References

- Alnæs, K. (2013). *Roots of European identity: Challenges and threats. Debates on European identity (2013–2014)*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/168046e767>
- Bellamy, R., Castiglione, D., & Shaw, J. (2006). *Making European citizens: Civic inclusion in a transnational context (one Europe or several?)*. London, UK: Palgrave.
- Bîrzéa, C., Kerr, D., Mikkelsen, R., Froumin, I., Losito, B., Pol, M., & Sardoc, M. (2004). *All-European Study on Education for Democratic Citizenship Policies*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Bruter, M. (2004a). Civic and cultural components of a European identity: A pilot model of measurement of citizens' levels of European identity. In R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, & B. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 186–213). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bruter, M. (2004b). On what citizens mean by feeling "European": Perceptions of news, symbols and borderless-ness. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30(1), 21–39.
- Bruter, M. (2005). *Citizens of Europe? The emergence of a mass European identity*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castano, E. (2004). European identity: A social-psychological perspective. In R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, & B. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 40–58). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Cerutti, F., & Lucarelli, S. (Eds.). (2008). *The search for a European identity: Values, policies, and legitimacy of the European Union*. London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Checkel, J. T., & Katzenstein, P. J. (2009). *European identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Citrin, J., & Sides, J. (2004). More than nationals: How identity choice matters in the new Europe. In R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, & B. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 161–185). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Delanty, G. (1995). *Inventing Europe: Idea, identity, reality*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Delanty, G., & Rumford, C. (2005). *Rethinking Europe: Social theory and the implications of Europeanization*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Diez Medrano, J., & Gutierrez, P. (2001). Nested identities: National and European identity in Spain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 753–778.
- Duchesne, S. (2008). Waiting for a European identity: Reflections on the process of identification with Europe. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 9(4), 397–410.
- European Commission. (2012). *The development of European identity/identities: Unfinished business. A policy review*. Brussels, Belgium: Author. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/pdf/policy_reviews/development-of-european-identity-identities_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2016). *Standard Eurobarometer 85 "European citizenship" report*. Brussels, Belgium: Author. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/2130>
- Eurydice. (2005). *Citizenship education at school in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Eurydice. (2012). *Citizenship education in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Fligstein, N., Polyakova, A., & Sandholtz, W. (2012). European integration, nationalism and European identity. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 50(1), 106–122.
- Herrmann, R. K., & Brewer, B. M. (2004). Identities and institutions: Becoming European in the EU. In R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, & B. M. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 1–25). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Karolewski, I. P., & Kaina, V. (2006). *European identity: Theoretical perspectives and empirical insights*. Berlin, Germany: LIT Verlag.
- Keating, A. (2014). *Education for citizenship in Europe: European policies, national adaptations and young people's attitudes*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Kerr, D., Sturman, L., Schulz, W., & Burge, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 European report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in twenty-four European countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Lehning, P. B. (2001). European citizenship: Towards a European identity? *Law and Philosophy*, 20(3), 239–282.

Lepsius, M. R. (2001). The European Union: Economic and political integration and cultural plurality. In K. Eder & B. Giesen (Eds.), *European citizenship: Between national legacies and post-national projects* (pp. 205–221). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Nicaise, J., & Blondin, C. (2003). *The European dimension in secondary education in Europe: A comparative study of the place occupied by the European Union in the secondary education curriculum in the member states and in the candidate countries* (Education and Culture Series EDUC 113 EN). Luxembourg: European Parliament. Retrieved from <http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/the-european-dimension-in-secondary-education-in-europe-pbQAEDUC113/>

Pichler, F. (2008). European identities from below: Meanings of identification with Europe. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 9(4), 411–430.

Risse, T. (2010). *A community of Europeans? Transnational identities and public spheres*. Ithaca, NY and London, UK: Cornell University Press.

Schilde, K. E. (2014). Who are the Europeans? European identity outside of European integration. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 52(3), 650–667.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 international report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016: Assessment framework*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., & Friedman, T. (2018). *Becoming citizens in a changing world: IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 international report*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Spanning, R., Wallace, C., & Datler, G. (2008). What leads young people to identify with Europe? An exploration of the impact of exposure to Europe and political engagement on European identity among young Europeans. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 9(4), 480–498.

Van Driel, B., Darmody, M., & Kerzil, J. (2016). *Education policies and practices to foster tolerance, respect for diversity and civic responsibility in children and young people in the EU* (NESET II report). Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/library/study/2016/neset-education-tolerance-2016_en.pdf

Veugelers, W., de Groot, I., & Stolk, V. (2017). *Research for CULT Committee: Teaching common values in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: European Parliament Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies. Retrieved from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/585918/IPOL_STU\(2017\)585918_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/585918/IPOL_STU(2017)585918_EN.pdf)

Westle, B., & Segatti, P. (Eds.). (2016). *European identity in the context of national identity: Questions of identity in sixteen European countries in the wake of the financial crisis*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

