Metodika 18 (1/2009), 188-202
Review paper
Paper submitted: 10th November 2008

CIVIC EDUCATION IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Vjeran Katunarić

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb

Summary *– There is an ongoing renewal of interest in civic education (CE) in many developed countries with democratic constitutions. In this regard, school is viewed, and CE in particular, as a key element in the process of political socialization of a democratic citizen. In its first part this paper gives an overview of the policies and state-of-the-art of CE in the EU countries. In the second part, it refers to results of a research project in Croatia, which focuses on a comparative analysis of national curricula in compulsory education in eleven European countries. Furthermore, it discusses the questionable impact of CE on pupils. In its third and closing part, in addition to summarizing the established facts on policies and curricular aspects of CE, the author reflects on the importance of extra-curricular aspects of CE and on the relationships between CE and history teaching in view of the emergence of a contemporary multicultural Europe.*

Key words: *Civic education, curricula, Europe, the impact of civic education, linkage to history teaching*

«The whole purpose of education is to turn mirrors into windows».

Sydney J. Harris

INTRODUCTION: WHY IS CIVIC EDUCATION IMPORTANT?

Virtually all countries, whether democratic or non-democratic, provide some forms of civic education (CE), although with different aims. In non-democratic states, thus, the central aim of the civics is to teach schoolchildren to loyalty and obedience to the regime or its leaders.[1] In a liberal democracy, on the other hand,

[1] This paper has resulted from my work in two research projects. One, entitled "National Curriculum in the European Countries and in Croatia", was carried out in 2006 in the Institute for Social Research in Zagreb (IDIZ), and was run by Branka Baranović. The other, entitled "National Approaches and Practices in the European Union in Relation to Intercultural Dialogue.

the aim of civic education is to educate children to appreciate the public value of toleration. This understanding is central to different approaches to education within liberal-democratic constitution. Nevertheless, it seems that the possibility of discerning the impact of such an education on pupil's attitudes and behavior in terms of democratic responsible citizenship, and especially with regard to the others, is still in the embryonic phase.[2]

There is an ongoing renewal of interest in civic education (CE) in many developed countries with democratic constitutions, including France and the United States (Ruget, 2006). Especially in the USA, an alarm has been raised both in academia and in centres for public education, expressing "deep concerns about the viability of democracy in America" because of the perceived "decline in civic engagement, political efficacy, and in the capacity of citizens to organize themselves" (Dudley and Gitelson, 2002: 263). Obviously, democracy is not a unilinear nor a completed process, nor a learning democracy through CE could be considered as such.

In this regard, school is viewed, and CE in particular, as a key element in the process of political socialization of a democratic citizen. In France too – where civic education was introduced, as a distinctive subject, into secondary school curricula as late as in 1999 – the declining social capital of democracy, due to the declining influence of other societal institutions (e.g. churches, families, youth organizations, political parties and trade unions), school is expected to fulfill new missions (i.e., democratic socialization) on top of their traditional charges, i.e. the delivery of specific knowledge and the preparation for professional life.

In its first part, this paper gives an overview of the policy and state-of-the-art or challenges to CE in the EU countries. In the second part, it refers to the results of a research project in Croatia, which focuses on a comparative analysis of national curricula in compulsory schools in eleven European countries. Furthermore, it discusses the impact of CE. In its third and concluding part, the paper provides some reflections on curricular and extra-curricular aspects of CE, and especially the relationships between CE and history teaching in view of the growth of a multicultural Europe.

Nastavak s prethodne stranice

Study for the European Commission", actually a policy study, was carried out in the first half of 2007, and was run by Andreas Wiesand from the European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts) in Bonn. The focus of the latter is on the EU countries, and the former on some of them plus Norway, and this is the reason why the scope of this paper is European as well, and does not specifically focus on any particular country, including Croatia.

[2] See footnote 6. Also, see Kymlicka (2003), who exemplifies the lack of intercultural awareness with the fact that citizens in Belgium, Canada or Switzerland are more interested in distant others than in their neighbors. A similar experience is with citizens in Croatia, who traditionally prefer, for instance, Germans or Americans more than Slovenes or Bosniacs (Katunarić, 1996).

THE POLICY AND CHALLENGES OF *CE* IN EUROPE

CE is set increasingly at the top of the European agenda. The rising awareness of the EU as a large family of multiethnic and multicultural societies, and also witnessing in each state a growing diversity due to the domestic multiculturalism, all contributes to increasing expectations from CE. CE, or some forms of it, are incorporated in the entire school systems (both lower and higher levels) of the EU countries, and also in a variety of informal and NGO activities. Last, but not least, a number of studies exist, both on educational policy and learning/teaching aspects of CE that enrich the experience with CE.

Institutions, policies, surveys

European institutions active in civic, including intercultural, education are: The European Commission, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia, the Council of Europe (The Education for Democratic Citizenship Division), the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, The European Institute for Research on Mediterranean and Euro-Arab Cooperation, and The Council of the European Union. Yet, there is no unique EU policy on CE or IE. Only some proposals or recommendations exist that are mainly directed to the improvement of national policies in these areas.

In 2005, the Commission of the European Communities issued a proposal for a Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on key competences for life-long learning, within which several lines are concerned with intercultural and civic competences. The competences are defined as knowledge and skills that equip individuals to participate in increasingly diverse societies, and to resolve conflict where necessary. In particular, civic competence equips individuals to fully participate in civic life. The competence is based on knowledge of the concepts of democracy, citizenship, and civil rights, including how they are expressed in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and international declarations and applied by various institutions at the local, regional, national, European and international levels. Thereby, knowledge of main events, trends and agents of change in national, European and world history and the present, with a specific view on European diversity, is essential (www.ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/keyrec_en.pdf). Beforehand, the Commission listed the eight key competences as follows: communication in one's mother tongue; communication in foreign languages; mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology; digital competence; learning to learn; interpersonal, **intercultural** and social competences and **civic competence**; entrepreneurship; cultural expression (www.europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11054.htm).

In 2006 the European Commission issued the *White Paper on European Communication Policy*, in which a chapter is devoted to the issue of "improving

civic education". It says that "civic education should not be confined to teaching school pupils about EU institutions and policies. It should help people of all ages to use tools such as the Internet to access information on public policy and to join in the debate. This is particularly important in the case of minorities, disabled citizens or other groups that might otherwise find themselves excluded from the public sphere" (www.ec.europa.eu/communication_white_paper/doc/white_paper_en.pdf).

In the year 2000, the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture published a report on the quality of school education, in which a special chapter addresses civics. Departing from the assessment that young people in EU countries are, in part, inclined to see foreigners as not welcome in their countries, and also that "in the many countries with economic or social difficulties, it is often tempting to blame foreigners for the problem", the report emphasizes the importance of civics as an integral part of the curriculum of education of young people (www.ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/indic/rapinen.pdf).

Yet, the most complete undertaking of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture in this field has been the project EURYDICE entitled *Citizenship Education at School in Europe* (European Commission, 2005), which reports extensively on the results of a survey on "responsible citizenship", the notion staying in close association with CE, in EU countries in the school-year 2004/5. Three key themes aimed at orienting pupils in the contemporary politics of democracy inform CE in these countries: political literacy, critical thinking with certain attitudes and values (such as personal responsibility, social solidarity, and peacefulness), and active participation. One of the most important aspects of the analysis of the policies and curricula in the CE field applies to the impact of this education. This aspect has been explained as the issue of measuring the "success" of the education. The EURYDICE report states that, on the one hand, theoretical knowledge acquired by pupils in CE is relatively easy to assess. On the other hand, it is very difficult to assess the practical issues, such as the adoption of civic attitudes and values and of active participation of pupils, i.e. how much of the cognitive acquisition affected the behavior of pupils. The same applies to the evaluation of schools as regards their effectiveness in providing CE. Nevertheless, the lack of objective methods for evaluating the provision of CE – although the lack was reported by some, not all, countries – seems to be the major difficulty in general. This issue will be addressed in section 3.2 of this paper.

Challenges to CE

CE or Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) has been a priority for the Council of Europe since the middle of the 1990s. According to a collection of papers prepared under the auspices of the Council of Europe (All-European Study…, 2004), EDC (in all grades of schooling) is presented in different regions of Europe with the following challenges or difficulties:

- in the Western European region, there is a gap between policy and practice, the lack of student participation, teacher training, and monitoring and quality assurance;
- in the Northern European region some positive tendencies exist, such as: focusing on values, skills, and participation; increasing use of the web, teacher education, monitoring and evaluation;
- in the Central European region: the formal sector of EDC dominates to the detriment of other sectors such as teacher education and training, out-of-school activities, and EDC in life-long learning; implementation of EDC is partial, inconsistent and too fragmented; methods of how to increase students participation need to be explored; there is a lack of support for monitoring, evaluation, and research.

Next, documents of the European Commission concerning the sphere of informal/non-formal education stress that channels of such education are active and important, but it also remarks that "it is difficult to obtain the full picture in relation to learning outside school. The problem also exists in terms of age group – much less information is available on the adult population than on the school population" (Hoskins, 2006).

In higher education, especially in the universities, a tradition of CE and international education exists. It includes international schools and culturally diverse student bodies with an array of extracurricular activities, as well as curricula or subjects/courses with international or comparative dimensions (Hill, 2006; Knight, 2004). Nevertheless, these international components do not automatically qualify for intercultural competence. In fact, there is a long way to go from the former to the latter. Some observers, thus, speak about international experience of the universities as an "exchange without encounter". For example, a survey among German students found that more than 60% of them had no, or hardly any, contact with foreign students in their campus, and a similar situation occurs in other countries (Otten, 2003). On the other hand, intercultural competence is defined as a long-term change of a person's knowledge (cognition), attitudes (emotions), and skills (behavior) to enable positive and effective interaction with members of other cultures both abroad and at home (Bennett, 1993).

CE IN SOME EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Curricula: contexts and goals

In the next, some results of a research project on national curricula in compulsory schools in eleven European countries are presented briefly. The countries covered by the research are: Sweden, Norway, Finland, the Republic of Ireland, England, Scotland, Netherlands, Austria, Germany, Hungary and Slovenia. Besides a few technical notes on different subjects or curricular areas containing

CE as well as the CE curricular status, the official curricular materials issued in these countries were analyzed with regard to two aspects which are seen as most relevant to the contemporary discussions on CE. One is actual multicultural context in these countries, which becomes increasingly relevant to the politics of democracy in these countries. The other aspect analyzed is the educational goals as expressed in the official documents.

Generally, there is a significant contextual difference as regards the contents of CE in Western and Eastern European countries. The former are virtually immigration societies (most of them with an imperial-colonial past), while the latter (from Slovenia and Hungary to Latvia and Poland, for instance) are (still) emigration countries (with a historical past marked by subjugation to different empires). Or, as Delanty expressed, "/t/he main difference is that western experiences are based on postcolonial immigration while in central and eastern Europe, the main interest is in autochthonous minorities" (Delanty, 2007, 13). As a consequence of that, the multiculturalism of the former is marked with the presence of new immigrants, and multiculturalism of the latter by the relationship toward the old minorities (some of which have been transformed into new minorities which, however, are dissatisfied with their new treatments in the host countries, such as Russians in the Baltic countries).

The CE curricular goals in compulsory schools in the eleven EU countries are formulated, in official documents, in a pedagogically optimistic or idealistic way. They are all-encompassing and they also celebrate democracy and diversity with a common purpose – as expressed, for instance, in the English curriculum – to understand citizens' responsibilities, which is seen as necessary for rights to happen, and also for debunking stereotypes on others and oneself. On the other hand, as a survey on implementation on the national CE curriculum in England indicates, there is not yet a strong consensus about the aims of CE; besides, in a quarter of schools surveyed, provision is still inadequate, reflecting weak leadership and a lack of specialist knowledge (www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/Internet_Content/Shared_Content/Files/towardsconsensus. pdf -).[3] It is reasonable to presume that the situation in other countries is similar to the English situation, if not even worse, for England is among the most advanced countries in fostering modern and immigrant sensitive CE.[4]

[3] This lack of assessment might be one of the most important causes of an apparent weakness of teachers to deliver effective teaching in this field and that they, as many experts remark (e.g. in the recent Conference of Networking European Citizenship Education (NECE) platform: "Rethinking Citizenship Education in European Migration Societies", Lisbon April 26th-28th, 2007), avoid controversial issues in their teaching.

[4] Yet, as some authors notify (Soysal, 2002), in contrast to some other countries, educational policy in England has always been much more polarized along political parties lines. The first national curriculum in 1987 reflected the priorities of the Conservative government, where emphasis was on English national, rather than European or global history. Today, in the era of Labour, the situation is different and more similar to continental Western European countries.

In the above mentioned countries CE appears under different names – from Social studies or as part of a broader subject, such as Environmental Studies or Social Sciences (for the whole list of the names see: Osler and Starkey, 2005: 15). In either of the forms, it is required in all countries, except Slovenia where the subject is partly optional. Yet, CE exists as a particular or separate subject only in Slovenia, England and Sweden, and in the last two grades in Ireland, Scotland and Netherlands. One must also have in mind that some chapters of the CE, such as pluralism and tolerance, are integrated into religion as a subject (e.g. *Religionslehre* in some German regions).

With an exception of Hungary and Slovenia, the CE as a subject is designed conceptually mostly because of the fact that the countries are faced with new democratic experience, and challenge as well, and it is a growing immigration of foreigners. Basically, the institutional shell of democracy which is undergoing change, as a result of this influx, is the *nation-state*. Obviously, other people seek their place under the roofs of the state which was traditionally considered as homeland only for the ethnic majority or titular people in the state. Hence the need for a redefinition of the meaning of the state on the account of extending civil rights to the new foreigners. In other words, the state – and the rule of democracy as well – is for everybody living in its territory, and not only for some. Notwithstanding that the official status of the new others varies – somewhere they are still defined as guest-workers, and elsewhere they became naturalized citizens – it is now taken for granted in the curricular terms that they should be recognized and respected as *equals* in the society.

Furthermore, some curricula, obviously following the ideas of the progressive postmodernism, include (other) sex or gender, and different modes of sexual behavior as well, notably homosexual, into the category of the others who should be respected as equals.

Finally, herein are some extractions from much more extensive curricular descriptions of the goals of CE:

Netherlands: to encourage interest for social life; to tolerate diversities, to understand similarities.

Finland: preparation for the participation in various forms of public life; critical understanding of public information.

Sweden: to understand ethnic and cultural diversity, and especially (*acc. to the Finnish curriculum*) their *mental diversity.*

Norway: to develop a need for humanized forms (and results) of development, and to know how to collaborate with others.

England: to learn and to understand citizens' responsibilities as necessary for rights to happen; also, debunking stereotypes.

Scotland: to educate "young citizens"; to understand the possibility of equality in multiculturality.

Ireland: the capability of exploration of multicultural citizenship; education for equality of diversities of different kinds (gender, ethnic, religious…); to understand and to accept multiple identities; to enhance imagination and empathy toward the others.

Austria: to perceive the formation of new (immigrant) minorities next to the old ones.

Slovenia: to understand cultural tradition of the own country and people in the spirit of pluralism.

Hungary (the subject entitled *History and Civic Life*): independent and critical reasoning about history.

Goals are less extensively elaborated in the case of the curricula in Austria, Hungary and Slovenia. This is possibly due to the broader policy context in these countries, which, particularly in the case of Hungary and Slovenia (which are not seen yet as migration countries), is not suitable enough for turning the current immigrants into the regular case of the countries minorities' landscape.

As the short overview indicates, diversity, others, multiculturality and similar issues increasingly permeate the horizons of CE. In other words, standard themes or contents of CE – i.e. political literacy, civic values, and active participation – cannot be taken as they used to be a few decades ago, i.e. on the basis of cultural homogeneity or the consensus established between old majorities and minorities. Nowadays, the civic sphere and the practice of democracy are more and more infused by the others whose history and mentality, including their understanding of democracy and politics, are different, more or less radically, from "our" idiomatic understanding of those ideas and practices. At any rate, multicultural backgrounds of CE are yet to be recognized, and proper intercultural contents of CE are waited to be written.

The question of the impact of CE

As far as research in the field is concerned, one must reiterate that a reliable assessment of the impact of CE is lacking[5]. This question turns the whole issue back to classic chapters of social psychology on prejudice and stereotypes, and how to combat them. According to Gordon W. Allport (1954), in order to combat prejudices, one must establish *contact* with the 'others'. Yet, simply *knowing* 'others' (e.g. as a member of the same school class) represents a relatively superficial form of contact that may less likely reduce prejudice or disconfirm stereotypes. On the other hand, school provides an excellent interactive setting, although it cannot

[5] This remark is also based on the statement of Robert Stradling, one of the leading experts in methodology of history in the school curricula, which he gave on the Fourth Intercultural Forum of the Council of Europe, held in Bucharest in March 2006. Likewise, as discussion at the NECE Conference in Lisbon in April 2007 has shown, there is no proper knowledge about what happens in school classes, including those in Muslim communities where the Koran is taught as the central curricular topic.

meet all conditions described by Allport as optimal for combating prejudices and discrimination. Other (optimal) conditions (according to Allport) are: whether contact is *voluntary*, the extent to which the contact is between the majority and minority or the others of *equal status*, and whether contact occurs in a competitive or *collaborative* environment. According to research undertaken in the U.S. (Dixon, Rosenbaum, 2004), school is better as a place providing interactive settings than the workplace.

Hence, an extraordinary importance of civic (and intercultural) education is that it would combine ordinary methods of teaching and learning with interaction between members of the majority and minority on the basis of voluntary action, equal status, and collaborative environment. Such a comprehensive approach to anti-bias learning and teaching is aimed at reducing or eliminating a whole bunch of social or cultural exclusions among children (where tendencies occur as early as from the third year of age), that are based on prejudices and discriminations, such as racism, including Anti-Semitism, then sexism, ableism (i.e. discrimination of handicapped), adultism (i.e. discrimination of children against adults), linguicism (i.e. discrimination of someone's language), etc. (Wagner, 2007: 264).

Of course, teaching and learning must predate any other action aimed at reducing prejudices. It is generally supposed that, especially before or without implementing the CE and similar teaching, an amount or intensity of prejudices exists among children, which should not be underestimated, and which may undermine any well-intended interaction between children from different countries or cultures. For example, recent research in Sweden (Hjerm, 2005) indicates that xenophobia is not that widespread among the adolescents examined. Thus, approximately one in eight (or 12.7%) of the adolescents believe that immigrants should not have the same rights as all other people living in the country. On the other hand, for only blatant forms of xenophobia have been measured, it means that xenophobia among Swedish adolescents should not be underestimated. This doubt has been corroborated with presenting negative and positive attitudes respectively, toward different countries or cultures. It came out then that an astounding 77 per cent of the respondents feel that cultures of the Muslim world in a negative sense differ from Swedish culture. Nevertheless, even the amounts of negative difference toward Baltic, African and Asian countries are still high (see Table 1).

Table 1. Proportion of negative and positive attitudes about different cultures and ways of life and mean score

Country of origin	Negative difference	Positive difference	Mean score*
Muslim countries	77	15	2.06
Baltic states	72	15	2.23
African countries	68	24	2.32
Asian countries	67	23	2.36
USA	51	35	2.80

Country of origin	Negative difference	Positive difference	Mean score*
Germany	45	19	2.67
Iceland	37	29	2.90
Finland	32	16	2.79
France	32	40	3.07
UK	25	38	3.12
Denmark	21	15	2.92
Norway	14	12	2.98

*The higher the value on the Mean score the more positive on a 5-point scale

Source: Mikael Hjerm: "What the Future May Bring. Xenophobia among Swedish Adolescents". *Acta Sociologica*. December 2005, Vol. 48, No. 4, p. 296.

Eventually, the question remains as to whether or how it is possible to measure the impact of different educational approaches to prejudices. Perhaps, a relatively simple solution as regards the (questionable) impact of CE or similar education on students can be applied (cf. Jedlicka and Katunaric, 1985). It is that at the beginning and at the end of the class a short questionnaire consisting of the Bogardus scale of social distance be handed out. Presumably, the social distance (toward all communities) will significantly decline after students' completion of the class with CE and IE contents. Of course, this is not an instrument, or argument, that corroborates an absolute and irrevocable change in students' opinion/attitudes. Other, and admittedly strong, influences, including those coming from parents, peers, media or ignorance (due to the lack of contacts with the 'others') – may as easily neutralize the positive educational effect. Nevertheless, the "share" of education in the overall influences on the behavior of students may this way be documented as positive.

CONCLUSIONS WITH SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

1. CE, with related contents such as intercultural education, is placed high in the European agenda. This interest is caused by a growing diversity due to the domestic multiculturalism, especially in the western European or immigration countries. CE, or some forms of it, are incorporated in the entire school systems (both lower and higher levels) of the EU countries, and also in a variety of informal and NGO activities.

2. On the way of moving CE forward, as the key element in shaping of the contemporary democratic citizenship, several difficulties appear which include the gap between policy and practice, the lack of the appropriate teacher training, and uncertainty of the impact of CE.

3. Analysis of the curricula for compulsory schools in the eleven European countries has shown, among other, that curricular goals are formulated, in

official documents, in a pedagogically optimistic or idealistic way. They are all-encompassing and they also celebrate democracy and diversity with a common purpose to understand citizens' responsibilities, which is seen as necessary for rights to happen, and also for debunking stereotypes on others and oneself. CE appears under different names, and it is required virtually in all countries.

4. Next to the findings concerning CE policies, institutional contexts and curricula, here some recommendations may be added that emphasize the importance of extra-curricular activities of teachers and students – including a whole array of non-formal and informal (e.g. hidden, learning from media, etc.) curricula – in order to upgrade their civic (and intercultural) knowledge. This might be done, for instance, through exchange programs between schools from different communities, esp. those whose relations are marked by ignorance or resentment; then, through children's parliaments, school councils, leisure experiences, and common projects or programs that schools from different communities may partly or entirely operate via new information & communication technologies.

5. Among extra-curricular activities, teacher training seems to be one of the most important. It would be necessary to invest more into the quality of teacher training. Also, teaching needs more support infrastructures, such as a variety of academic and administrative support services that have involvement in quality monitoring and enhancement activities in schools. Also, important among the activities is service learning, a method that connects meaningful community service with academic learning, personal growth, and civic responsibility, so as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of CE as a subject, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility (Murphy, 2006), esp. in multiethnic communities.

6. As regards CE and history teaching and textbooks, there is no official and common EU document addressing the issue. There are only books or collections, such as *Contemporary History and Civic Education in Europe* (www.fondazionescuola.it/Eng/attivita/storiacontemporanea.asp), in which authors underline a need for a European perspective in history teaching. This perspective, according to the authors, should contribute to the reduction or eradication of weaknesses of the existing methods or strategies (for tackling "awkward issues"), such as strategies of "silence", "neutral treatment of facts", and "official interpretation of facts" (typical of authoritarian regimes), and likewise a history teaching that is essentially linear, chronological, narrative and strongly focused on political history. Instead, social and economic history along with the history of everyday life should expand the scope of the existing history teaching. Likewise, instead of the erroneous strategies of history teaching about "awkward issues", a strategy of acknowledgement and recreation of controversies is seen as the most adequate: students need to acquire the ability to compare different sources, opinions and interpretations (the multi-perspective learning/teaching) in order to form their own viewpoint (here the

relationship between history teaching and education for citizenship /CE/ is evident). This method may be especially useful in former conflict areas in Europe.

Given that much of how history is presented in the curricula, primarily in the western European countries, has changed in a positive way – e.g. the history of nations as made in wars or rivalries is being replaced by accounts of cultural exchanges and trade, and de-colonisation enters as a proper topic (for Europeans were pretty much detrimental to the "new worlds") – nowadays European history should be presented in a balanced manner: so to speak, somewhere in between the oblivion of the black spots of the Holocaust, genocides and colonialism, and of a gloomy memory and self-blaming which would adumbrate the European present and future. Particularly, European CE for immigrants has to offer both sides of the "dialectic of enlightenment". It should "translate" to them European historical experiences dealing with catastrophes and the resulting culture of self-criticism and argument on history and remembrance. In this, a history of immigration should assume a proper place as well. For example, historical and citizenship education must include "Turks in Berlin" as much as "Turks before Vienna" (cf. www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/GXSPRI,0,0,The_Politics_of_Memory_in_European_Migration_Societies_Consequences...). Currently, immigrants are still presented in most textbooks, like for example in Germany,[6] as "They" who stay apart from the (domestic) "We". This is especially problematic as the third generation of immigrants, according to some experts, has a tendency nowadays to represent itself in terms of the parochial identity. Combining these massive tendencies on the part of the host and the new generation of immigrants, there is an apparent danger of creating a multicultural society in Europe, which would consist of parallel worlds of different communities hardly interacting with each other, thus reminding of the Ottoman *millet* system. As an antidote to such a development, historical and civic education must deconstruct much of what has been idiomatic to the traditional (i.e. national and civilisational) history, and also bravely offer an inspiring vision of a democratic and highly conversational and collaborative multicultural society.

7. Last, but not least, in order to meet such a vision of the common society, the old idea of *home place* or *homeland*, based on the perception of a unique location, i.e. *genius loci*, should be transformed into a vision of a network of related places, i.e. *genius mundi* (cf. Hasse, 2007). The latter is more appropriate to self-representation of an immigration and mobile society, which Europe is increasingly becoming. Of course, all locals cannot be cosmopolitans, and vice versa, but far from such extremes, a spectral diversity of "movers" and "stayers" features a truly democratic multicultural society, based on the market economy.

Sooner or later, CE curricula should reflect such a combination of the "space of places" and the "space of flows", and incorporate such a vision of social

[6] As reported by Franz-Olaf Radtke from the University of Frankfurt/Main, in his paper delivered in the NECE Conference held in Lisbon, April 2007.

reality into the lowest grades of schooling. We become citizens (of Europe and the world) really from the beginning, roughly from the third year of age on, when first appearances of categories 'We' and 'They' take hold in our life-world awareness.

REFERENCES

All-European Study on Policies for Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) – Complete version – DGIV/EDU/CIT (2004) 12

ALLPORT, G. (/1954/1979). *The Nature of Prejudice*, Massachusetts, Addison: Wesley Publishing Company.

BENNETT, M.J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A development model of intercultural sensitivity. In R.M. Page (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press, 21-71.

DELANTY, G. (2007). Peripheries and borders in a post-western Europe. *Eurozine*. www.eurozine.com

DUDLEY, R. L. AND GITELSON, A. R. (2002). «Political Literacy, Civic Education, and Civic Engagement: A Return to Political Socialization?». *Applied Developmental Science*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 175-182.

European Commission (2005). Citizenship Education at School in Europe. www.eurydice.org/portal/page/portal/Eurydice/showPresentation?pubid=055EN

HASSE, J. (2007). Heimat – von der Kunde des Regionalen zur Erkundung von Beziehungen, in: D. Richter (Hrsg.), *Politische Bildung von Anfang an. Demokratie-Lerner in der Grundschule.* Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 140-155.

HILL, I. (2006). Student Types, school types and their combined influence on the development of intercultural understanding. *Journal of Research in International Education.* Vol d, No.1, 5-33.

HJERM, M. (2005). What the Future May Bring. Xenophobia among Swedish Adolescents" *Acta Sociologica*. December, Vol. 48, No. 4, 293-307.

HOSKINS B. (2006). Draft Framework for Indicators on Active Citizenship. European Commission, DG JRC-CRELL crell.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ActiveCitizenship/Conference/01_Hoskins%20_framework_final.pf

JEDLICKA, D. AND KATUNARIC, V. (1985). "Measured Changes in Social Distance as an Outcome of Higher Education Experience." *Improving University Teaching: Contributed Papers.* Utrecht: The State University of Utrecht, July, 842-851.

KATUNARIĆ, V. (1996). «Exotic Friends and Real Enemies. The Impact of the War on the Image of Others in Croatia». In: *Dynamics of Communication and Cultural Change – The Role of Networks.* Ed. by B.Cvjetičanin. Institute for International Relations: Zagreb, 147-154.

KIMLICKA, W. (2003). "Multicultural states and intercultural citizens". *Theory and Research in Education*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 147-169.

KNIGHT, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol. 8, No.1, 5-31.

MURPHY, T. (2006). "Democratic Schooling practices in the Republic of Ireland: the gap between the rhetoric and the reality", Paper presented at CIVICUS International Conference Democracy, Citizenship and Higher Education: Dialogue between Universities and Community, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania, November 23-24.

OSLER, A. AND H. STARKEY (2005). *Education for Democratic Citizenship: a review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005.* www.bera.ac.uk/pdfs/OslerStarkeyBERAReview2005.pdf

OTTEN, M. (2003). Intercultural Learning and Diversity in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. Vol. 7, No.1, 12-26.

RUGET, VANESSA (2006). » The renewal of civic education in France and in America: Comparative perspectives». *Social Science Journal*, Jan2006, Vol. 43, No. 1, 19-34.

SOYSAL, Y. (2002). Locating Europe. *European Societies*. Vol. 4, No.3, 265-284.

WAGNER, P. (2007). Vielfalt respektieren, Ausgrenzung widerstehen – Politisches lernen in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft, in: D. Richter (Hrsg.), 260-274.

SOURCES/DOCUMENTS

http://ec.europa.eu/communication_white_paper/doc/white_paper_en.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/keyrec_en.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/indic/rapinen.pdf

http://fondazionescuola.it/Eng/attivita/storiacontemporanea.asp

http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/GXSPRI,0,0,The_Politics_of_Memory_in_European_Migration_Societies_Consequences...

International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks, Internet Archive www.inca.org.uk

Austria

Hauptschulen HS Lehrplan – Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, 2000, 2003, http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/

Lehrplan AHS – Bundesministerium fuer Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, Wien, 2000, http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/

Lehrplan der Volkschule – Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, Wien, 2001, http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/

England

http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/Internet_Content/Shared_Content/Files/towardsconsenus.pdf –

Ireland

Junior cycle syllabus, Department of Education and Science, Republic of Ireland, Dublin, http://www.education.ie/, February 2005.

Primary School Curriculum, The Stationery Office, Dublin, 1999.

Finland

Framework curriculum for the comprehensive school 1994, National Board of Education, Helsinki 1994

Hungary

Framework Curricula for Primary Education, on behalf of Ministry of Education Dinasztia Publishing Company, Budapest, 2000

Germany

Bildungsstandards im Fach Deutsch für den Primarbereich (Jahrgangsstufe 4), Sekretariat der Staendigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Laender in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Bonn, 2004.

Netherlands

Attainment Targets For Compulsory Education, http://www.minocw.nl/english/education/doc/Kerndoelen_basisonderijs_Engels.doc February, 2005.

Norway

The curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school in *Norway*, The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs*, 1999* http://skolenettet3.ls.no/L97_eng/Curriculum/

Slovenia

Velajvni učni načrti, http://www.mszs.si/slo/solstvo/os/ucni_nacrti/os/9letna/ucni_nacrti/skupni_predmeti.asp , veljača 2005.

Scotland

The Structure and Balance of the Curriculum, 5–14 National Guidelines, Learning and Teaching Scotland, 2000

Sweden

Compulsory school Syllabi, National Agency for Education, 2001.

Curriculum for The Compulsory School, The Pre-School Class and The Leisure-Time Centre (Lpo 94), Ministry of Education and Science in Sweden and National Agency for Education, 2001