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Overview

- Very brief summary of previous research in this area

- Presentation of some findings from two cross-national projects on:
  - the development of children’s attitudes to national ingroups and outgroups
  - the factor structures underlying children’s attitudes to national ingroups and outgroups

- Presentation of some findings from the two cross-national projects, and from a third British study, on:
  - the development of children’s national identifications

- A presentation of the kind of theoretical model which (I think) is required to explain the development of children’s national identifications and attitudes
Previous studies in this area

- There are many previous studies in this field

- These previous studies have examined four main issues
Issues studied

- Children’s knowledge of the geographies of different countries, including their knowledge of the geography of their own country
  - Names, locations and shapes of countries; names and locations of cities and towns, rivers, lakes, mountains, etc.; climates; typical flora and fauna; patterns of land use; etc.

- Children’s knowledge of national emblems
  - Flags; national costumes; national monuments and buildings; national ceremonials and traditions; typical foods and drinks; historical figures and historical events; etc.

- Children’s feelings towards national groups, including their feelings towards their own national group
  - Levels of liking and disliking

- The contents of children’s national stereotypes, including their stereotype of their own national group
Principal findings of these previous studies

- Children’s knowledge, attitudes, feelings and stereotypes about nations and national groups begin to develop from about 5 years of age.

- By mid-adolescence, children hold very detailed stereotypes of the people who live in many different countries, including their own.

- However, geographical knowledge (particularly of other countries) is often very poor, even in mid-adolescence.

- Children typically show a preference for their own national ingroup right from the outset, at the age of 5.

- However, many national outgroups are still positively liked by most children, just to a lesser extent than the ingroup.

- But national groups which are the traditional enemies of the child’s own nation are often strongly disliked.
Limitations of these previous studies

- Most of these previous studies have collected their data in just a single country (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967, is a notable exception)

- Most of these studies have also only collected data from a single ethnic group within that country (usually the dominant majority group)

- As a result, these studies commonly find just a single pattern of development, which is then often either implicitly or explicitly generalised to all children by the researcher

- This emphasis upon universal patterns in children’s development fits well with the currently dominant mode of theorising in developmental psychology (especially cognitive-developmental theory)

- In addition, none of these previous studies have examined how children’s own national identifications, and their subjective sense of belonging to their own national group, develop
Our studies

In our studies, we have collected data in many different countries, and from different groups of children living within those countries, in order to find out:

- What remains constant in children’s development irrespective of the specific country in which they live?
  - In other words: are there universals in children’s development?

- What varies in children’s development depending on the specific national and cultural context in which they live?

In addition, and unlike all previous studies, we have also examined how children’s national identifications, and their subjective sense of belonging to their own national group, develop.
Project 1: The CHOONGE project

- This project used a cross-sectional design to collect data from children aged 6, 9, 12 and 15 years old living in:
  - London (England, UK)
  - Dundee (Scotland, UK)
  - Girona (Catalonia, Spain)
  - San Sebastian (Basque Country, Spain)
  - Malaga (southern Spain)
  - Vicenza (northern Italy)
  - Rome (central Italy)

- In other words, we studied children living in:
  - two capital cities (London, Rome)
  - two provincial cities (Vicenza, Malaga)
  - three locations where there are prominent nationalist-separatist political movements (Scotland, Catalonia, Basque Country)

- The total sample size in this study was 1,926 children
Project 2: The NERID project

- This project also used a cross-sectional design to collect data from children aged 6, 9, 12 and 15 years old living in:
  - Moscow (Russia)
  - Smolensk (Russia)
  - Kharkov (Ukraine)
  - Tbilisi (Georgia)
  - Baku (Azerbaijan)

- Russia, Ukraine, Georgia and Azerbaijan are all New Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, which became independent countries when the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991.

- Because of their historical, political and economic circumstances, these countries provide a very different type of context from western European countries for children’s development in this domain.

- The total sample size in this study was 2,285 children.
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Project 3: The British study
BPS Developmental Psychology Section Centenary Project

- This study used a cross-sectional design to examine children aged between 5 and 16 years old living in different parts of Great Britain.

- These children were all born in Britain but were of varying ethnicity, including:
  - White English heritage
  - Black African heritage
  - Indian heritage
  - Pakistani heritage

- The total sample size in this study was 1,208 children.

- Principal collaborators in this project were:
  - Mark Bennett, Rupert Brown, Charles Crook, Paul Ghuman, Karen Trew, Eithne Buchanan-Barrow, Claire Byrne, Adam Rutland, Paul Webley.
Methods used for testing the children

- In all three studies, the children were either interviewed individually or completed individual questionnaires.

- Analogous questions and measures were used in all three projects.

- The interviews and questionnaires used:
  - open-ended questions
  - multiple-choice questions
  - rating scales
  - adjective selection tasks
  - adjective rank ordering tasks
  - trait attribution tasks
  - map interpretation tasks
  - picture identification tasks
The variables which were measured

- The children’s strength of national identification
- The children’s sense of national pride
- The children’s geographical knowledge of countries
- The children’s knowledge of national emblems (including flags, currencies, traditions, foods, etc.)
- The children’s beliefs about the typical characteristics of specific national groups
- The children’s feelings about specific national groups
- Demographic information about the children and the children’s parents

In this talk, I am only going to talk about the children’s attitudes to national ingroups and outgroups, and the children’s national identifications
Measuring national attitudes: the trait attribution task

- In the interview, the children were given a set of 12 cards containing 6 positive and 6 negative adjectives: clean, dirty, friendly, unfriendly, clever, stupid, hardworking, lazy, happy, sad, honest and dishonest.

- The instructions were: “Here are some cards with words on them that describe people. What I want you to do is to go through all these words one by one, and I want you to sort out those words which you think can be used to describe X people [X = name of the target group]. Can you do that for me? Sort out the words which you think describe X people.”

- If there was any doubt about the child’s reading ability, the cards were read out to the child by the interviewer.

- From this task, two scores were derived:
  - the total number of positive traits assigned to the target group
  - the total number of negative traits assigned to the target group

- The task was administered separately in relationship to the child’s own ingroup(s) and in relationship to a number of specified outgroups administered in a random order.
Example 1: The attribution of **positive** traits to an **ingroup**: Northern Italian children’s attributions to Italian people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 9 vs. 12
Example 2: The attribution of *positive* traits to an *ingroup*: Scottish children’s attributions to Scottish people. Significant differences: 6 vs. 9
Example 3: The attribution of positive traits to an *ingroup*: Russian (Smolensk) children’s attributions to Russian people
Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 9 vs. 12
Example 4: The attribution of **positive** traits to an *ingroup*: Ukrainian (ULS) children’s attributions to Ukrainian people

Significant differences: none
Example 5: The attribution of negative traits to an ingroup: Russian (Moscow) children’s attributions to Russian people

Significant differences: 9 vs. 15
Example 6: The attribution of **negative** traits to an **ingroup**: Scottish children’s attributions to Scottish people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 15
Example 7: The attribution of **negative** traits to an **ingroup**: Basque children’s attributions to Basque people

Significant differences: none
Example 8: The attribution of positive traits to an outgroup:
Scottish children’s attributions to Italian people
Significant differences: 6 vs. 12
Example 9: The attribution of positive traits to an outgroup:
Northern Italian children’s attributions to German people
Significant differences: 6 vs. 15
Example 10: The attribution of *positive* traits to an *outgroup*: Southern Spanish children’s attributions to British people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 12 vs. 15
Example 11: The attribution of positive traits to an outgroup: Georgian (GLS) children’s attributions to Azeri people

Significant differences: none
Example 12: The attribution of negative traits to outgroups: Russian (Moscow) children’s attributions to English people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9
Example 13: The attribution of *negative* traits to *outgroups*: Georgian (RLS) children’s attributions to Russian people

Significant differences: 9 vs. 15
Example 14: The attribution of *negative* traits to *outgroups*: Azeri (ALS) children’s attributions to German people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 12 vs. 15
Example 15: The attribution of *negative* traits to *outgroups*: Basque children’s attributions to French people

Significant differences: none
Conclusions from the trait attribution task

- There is no standard pattern in the development of children’s trait attributions to national ingroups and outgroups.

- Instead, we found all of the following patterns in the development of children’s attributions of positive and negative traits to national groups:
  - increases with age
  - decreases with age
  - U-shaped changes with age
  - inverted U-shaped changes with age
  - no changes with age
The affect measure

- This consisted of a pair of linked questions which assessed how much the child liked or disliked people from their own ingroups and from the various outgroups.

- Scores ranged from 1 to 5 where:
  - 1 = dislike a lot
  - 2 = dislike a little
  - 3 = neutral
  - 4 = like a little
  - 5 = like a lot
Example 16: Affect towards the *ingroup*: North Italian children’s affect towards Italian people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 12 vs. 15
Example 17: Affect towards the *ingroup*: English children’s affect towards British people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9
Example 18: Affect towards the *ingroup*: Ukrainian (ULS) children’s affect towards Ukrainian people

Significant differences: none
Example 19: Affect towards *outgroups*: Central Italian children’s affect towards Spanish people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9
Example 20: Affect towards *outgroups*: Georgian (RLS) children’s affect towards Russian people

Significant differences: 9 vs. 15
Example 21: Affect towards outgroups: Ukrainian (ULS) children’s affect towards German people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 9 vs. 12, 12 vs. 15
Example 22: Affect towards outgroups: Russian (Moscow) children’s affect towards American people

Significant differences: 6 vs. 9, 9 vs. 15
Example 23: Affect towards *outgroups*: Northern Italian children’s affect towards Spanish people

Significant differences: none
Conclusions from the affect task

- There is no standard pattern in the development of children’s affect towards national ingroups and outgroups.

- Instead, there are all of the following patterns in the development of children’s affect towards national groups:
  - Increases with age
  - Decreases with age
  - U-shaped changes with age
  - Inverted U-shaped changes with age
  - No changes with age
Why so many different developmental patterns?

- Could it be that the target groups were not sufficiently salient for the children?
  - I would argue no, because they were chosen on the basis of pilot work which had shown that they were all salient groups for these children

- Could it be that the traits used in the trait attribution task were not suitable for assessing children’s judgements of these national groups?
  - I would argue no, because they were chosen on the basis of pilot work which had shown that these were the appropriate traits for these children

- Could it be that the measures had poor psychometric properties?
  - I would argue no for the trait attribution task because internal reliabilities on the attribution task were reasonable: for most groups of children on most target groups, reliabilities were above 0.60, with many being above 0.70

- I would also say no to all of these questions because of the outcomes of factor analyses
We began by subtracting the total number of negative traits which each child attributed to a particular target group from the total number of positive traits which that child attributed to that group.

The resulting score is a measure of the child’s overall level of positivity towards that particular group.

We then ran the factor analyses on these overall positivity scores.
Example 24: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Central Italian children’s factor structure

Straightforward ingroup-outgroup factor structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British 0.78</td>
<td>Italian 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French 0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>42.02%</td>
<td>20.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 25: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Russian (Moscow) children’s factor structure

Straightforward ingroup-outgroup factor structure (common)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian 0.83</td>
<td>Azeri 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgian 0.81</td>
<td>Georgian 0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukrainian 0.76</td>
<td>Ukrainian 0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 0.69</td>
<td>German 0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 0.58</td>
<td>English 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American 0.57</td>
<td>American 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>43.86%</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 26: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: English children’s factor structure

Multiple ingroups-outgroups two-factor structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian 0.73</td>
<td>English 0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 0.67</td>
<td>British 0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French 0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish 0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>31.21%</td>
<td>22.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 27: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Ukrainian (ULS) children’s factor structure

One-factor structure (comparatively rare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgian 0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azeri 0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian 0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukrainian 0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American 0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>36.97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 28: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Catalan children’s factor structure

Multiple ingroups-outgroups structure (same as English children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French 0.75</td>
<td>Spanish 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian 0.70</td>
<td>Catalan 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British 0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigenvalue</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>31.47%</td>
<td>22.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 29: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Basque children’s factor structure

Note difference from Catalan children’s factor structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>44.16%</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 30: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Scottish children’s factor structure

Three-factor structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 31: Factor analysis of overall positivity scores: Georgian (GLS) children’s factor structure

Different kind of three-factor structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American 0.86</td>
<td>Russian 0.82</td>
<td>Georgian 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 0.72</td>
<td>Azeri 0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German 0.60</td>
<td>Ukrainian 0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigenvalue</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% variance explained</td>
<td>26.36%</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>14.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions from the factor analyses of the trait attribution data

- All of the obtained factor structures are readily interpretable, which gives confidence in the quality of the trait attribution data.

- However, any simple generalisation about the relationship which exists between ingroup and outgroup attitudes is not viable.

- Instead, the relationship between ingroup and outgroup attitudes appears to vary depending on:
  - the particular country in which children live
  - the specific situation within that country of the particular group of children involved (cf. Catalan vs. Basque children, English vs. Scottish children)

- The specific factor structures which are found can usually be interpreted in terms of the prevailing pattern of intergroup relationships within which the child’s own national and/or state groups are embedded.
Factor analysis of the affect data

- We ran comparable factor analyses on the affect data
- A similar variety of interpretable factor structures emerged

Conclusion: There is substantial and pervasive variability in the development of children’s attitudes to, and feelings about, national ingroups and outgroups.
One of the tasks used to assess the strength of national identification: the relative importance task

- The child was given a large set of cards containing the names of possible age, gender, city, national, and supranational identities.

- For example, in England, the children were given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>6 years old</th>
<th>9 years old</th>
<th>12 years old</th>
<th>15 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boy</td>
<td>Londoner</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The child was asked: “Have a look at these cards. All of these words can be used to describe people. Which ones do you think could be used to describe you? Which ones do you think you are? You can choose as many as you like.”
The cards chosen by the child were then laid out on the table.

The child was asked: “If you had to choose just one of these cards because it was the most important to you, which one would you choose?”

The card which the child chose was then removed from the set, and the question was repeated.

This process continued until all the cards had been chosen by the child.

The order in which the cards were chosen by the child was used as a measure of how important each individual identity was to that child.
The findings

- At 6 years of age, in the first part of the task, the children did usually select a correct national identity term in order to describe themselves.

- However, in the second part of the task, two different developmental patterns were found.
Pattern one

- In the first pattern, the 6 year olds did not attribute very high importance to their national identity.

- Instead, these children attributed much higher importance to their age, to their gender, and to their city identities.

- However, by 9 years of age, the importance attributed to the national identity by these groups of children had usually increased significantly.

- The importance attributed to national identity then continued to remain high, or even increased still further, at 12 and 15 years of age.
Pattern two

- However, in some countries (e.g. Spain and Italy), a different pattern occurred

- In these countries, relatively high importance was attributed to national identity already at 6 years of age

Conclusion: There is cross-national variability in the importance which is attributed to national identity by children
Example 32: Italian vs. Scottish children
Variability within countries

- However, we found that there is not only variability in development between different countries - there is also variability in development within individual countries.

- For example, we found differences in the development of children who were growing up in different places within the same country.

- In Russia, for example, children who were growing up in Moscow attributed greater importance to their national identity than children who were growing up in Smolensk.

- We also found in the British project that, in England, children who were growing up in London attributed greater importance to their national identity than children who were growing up outside London.
Example 33: Russian children living in Moscow vs. Smolensk

Bar chart showing the comparison of Russian children living in Moscow and Smolensk at different ages (6 years, 9 years, 12 years, 15 years). The chart indicates a trend where children in Moscow have a higher prevalence compared to those in Smolensk.
Why are there higher levels of national identification in capital cities?

There are at least three possibilities:

- Knowing that you live in the capital city of a country might enhance your awareness of your own national identity.

- Living in the capital city might mean that you have greater access to the most important emblems of your own nation (e.g. the Kremlin, Red Square, etc.), which then enhances your awareness of your own national group.

- Living in the capital city might mean that you are more likely to encounter tourists and people from other national groups in your everyday environment, which enhances your awareness of your own national identity.
Example 34: Exception to the general rule - Italy

![Bar chart showing data for Vicenza and Rome over different age groups (6, 9, 12, 15 years). The y-axis represents a scale from 0 to 4.5, and the x-axis represents the age groups. The chart compares the data for Vicenza and Rome, with Vicenza shown in blue and Rome in green.]
Why is Italy an exception?

There are at least three possibilities:

- In Italy, national emblems are not concentrated in the capital city as much as they are in other countries (e.g. Tower of Pisa, Rialto Bridge, etc.)
- Vicenza is located in Veneto, not far from Venice, and both Rome and Venice attract over 12 million visitors per year.
- In Vicenza, the Lega Nord is a prominent political party, which might make everyday discourse about the nation more pervasive and salient than it is in Rome.

Conclusion: There is variability in the importance which is attributed to national identity by children according to where they live within the nation.
The situation within Spain

- In Spain, we collected data from children living in three different locations: Girona (Catalonia), San Sebastian (Basque Country) and Malaga (Andalusia).

- We found a major difference in the children’s levels of identification with being Spanish in Andalusia vs. the other two locations.

- The children’s levels of identification with being Spanish were very much higher in Andalusia than they were in both Catalonia and the Basque Country.
Example 35: Spanish children’s levels of identification with being Spanish
Why should these differences arise?

- Because Spanishness is interpreted very differently in Andalusia vs. in Catalonia and the Basque Country.
- In Andalusia, Spanishness is interpreted by most adults as being both their national and their state identity, and they do not see any incompatibility between being Andalusian and being Spanish.
- However, in both Catalonia and the Basque Country, many adults view being Spanish as an imposed state/legal citizenship category, not as their national identity.
- Instead, many adults in Catalonia and the Basque Country construe their national identity as being Catalan or Basque, rather than as being Spanish.
Catalan and Basque identity vs. Spanish identity

- These adults are very concerned to protect the distinctive linguistic and cultural heritage of their own region (Catalan or Basque) against the dominance of Spanish language and culture.

- Notice that the variability which occurs in children’s levels of identification with Spanishness mirrors that of many adults within their local environments.

Conclusion: There is variability in the importance which is attributed to the state identity by children according to how the state category is interpreted by adults living within their local environments.
Variability across different ethnic groups within a country

- In our studies, we have also found significant differences in levels of national identification within countries according to children’s ethnicity.

- For example, in the British study, we found that amongst teenagers living in London, ethnic majority teenagers and ethnic minority teenagers exhibited different levels of identification with being British.

- This difference was exhibited on four different identification measures which we used in this study.

- All four of these measures were of Britishness rather than Englishness (i.e., they involved the superordinate and supposedly inclusive category).
The four measures

- Importance: “How important is it to you that you are British?”
  - very important, quite important, a little bit important, not at all important

- Degree of identification: “Which one of these do you think best describes you?”
  - very British, quite British, a little bit British, not at all British

- National pride “How do you feel about being British?”
  - very happy, quite happy, neutral, quite sad, very sad

- Internalisation “How would you feel if someone said something bad about British people?”
  - very sad, quite sad, neutral, quite happy, very happy
Example 36: Levels of identification with being British amongst London teenagers

The graph illustrates the levels of identification with being British for different ethnic groups among London teenagers. The categories include 'import.', 'degree', 'pride', and 'internal.'

- White English
- Black African
- Indian
- Pakistani

The graph shows varying levels of identification across these categories and ethnic groups.
Why do these minority groups identify with Britishness less than the majority group?

One possible explanation is as follows:

- Hall (1999) and Parekh (2000) have both argued that the concept of Britishness is embedded in a set of implicit beliefs and stories about the imperial and colonial past of Great Britain.

- In these stories, English people are the major players, and ethnic minority groups are relegated to a subordinate and minor role (along with Scottish, Welsh and Irish people).

- Ethnic minority individuals may therefore find it harder to identify with the category of British because it relegates their own ethnic group to a subordinate and minor position in the story of what Britishness is all about (as are Scottish, Welsh and Irish people).
A second possible explanation

- The category of Britishness is defined, at least partially, in terms of race. In the words of Shah (2000):

“The word ‘British’ – rather like ‘Chinese’ – conjures up many images. And just as I would be unlikely to imagine a black or brown face when thinking of the word ‘Chinese’, so the images brought to mind with the word ‘British’ are more likely to be of an Anglican church rather than a Sunni mosque, warm beer rather than a cold lassi, a white face rather than a black or brown one.”

- In other words, people’s mental representations of Britishness possibly contain a racial dimension

- If this is the case, then it is not surprising that members of visible ethnic minority groups find it harder to identify as British
Ethnic minority children

- This pattern of differences in levels of national identification between ethnic minority and majority group children does not only occur in Britain.

- For example, in Georgia, we examined patterns of national identification in ethnic minority Armenian children.

- These Armenian children also showed very different patterns of national identification compared with majority group Georgian children who were attending the same schools.

Conclusion: Patterns of national identification vary within countries according to children’s ethnicity.
Another aspect of variability: the use of language in the family home

Example: the case of the Basque Country

- In the Basque Country, many people speak two languages, Spanish and Basque
- In families with children, parents often make a conscious decision when their first child is born whether to speak only Spanish in the home, only Basque in the home, or both languages in the home
- We found differences in children’s patterns of national identification depending upon which languages were spoken in the family home
Example 37: Importance of being Spanish vs. importance of being Basque

![Bar chart showing the comparison between the importance of being Spanish and the importance of being Basque. The categories are 'Basque at home', 'Both languages at home', and 'Spanish at home'.]
Another example: the case of Catalonia

- In Catalonia, many people also speak two languages, Spanish and Catalan.
- So Catalan parents also have to make a similar decision about whether to speak only Catalan, both Catalan and Spanish, or only Spanish in the family home.
- Once again, we found differences in children’s patterns of national identification depending upon which languages were spoken in the family home.
Example 38: Importance of being Spanish vs. importance of being Catalan

- Catalan at home
- Both languages at home
- Spanish at home

Importance of being Spanish

Importance of being Catalan
Why should these differences arise?

- Because, in the Basque Country and Catalonia, adults use language as an expression of their own national identity.

- Adults who frequently use Basque or Catalan in their everyday interactions have been found to have higher levels of identification with being Basque or Catalan.

- Adults who frequently use Spanish in their everyday interactions have been found to have higher levels of identification with being Spanish.

- The use of language in the family home therefore reflects parents’ own ideological and national orientations.

Conclusion: Children’s patterns of national identification vary within countries according to the use of language within the family home.
A further aspect of variability: children’s language of schooling

- In Ukraine, Georgia and Azerbaijan, parents can choose to send their children either to schools which deliver all their teaching in the national language (Ukrainian, Georgian or Azeri) or to schools which deliver their teaching in Russian.

- In the NERID project, we assessed the national identifications of children who attended national language schools and children who attended Russian language schools.

- We found systematic differences in national identification according to the children’s language of schooling.
Example 39: The importance of being Ukrainian in Ukrainian children

![Bar chart showing the importance of being Ukrainian in Ukrainian children at different ages between Ukrainian language schools and Russian language schools.](chart.png)
Example 40: The importance of being Georgian
in Georgian children

![Graph showing the importance of being Georgian in Georgian children]

- **Georgian language schools**
- **Russian language schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Georgian Language Schools</th>
<th>Russian Language Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why should these differences arise?

- Because parents choose which school their children should attend based upon their own ideological and national orientations.
- Parents who support the independence of their country from Russia and who value their own national language and culture send their children to the national language schools.
- Other parents who instead support closer relations with Russia and who value Russian language and culture send their children to the Russian language schools.
- The schools which children attend therefore reflect parents’ own ideological and national orientations.
- In addition, the schools themselves vary in their ethos and in the respect they accord to the local language and culture.

Conclusion: Children’s patterns of national identification vary within countries according to their language of schooling.
Summary of the main findings on children’s national identifications

Children’s strength of national identification varies according to six main factors:

- the child’s nation
- the child’s geographical location within the nation
- the way in which the state category is interpreted within the child’s local environment
- the child’s ethnicity
- the use of language in the family home
- the child’s language of schooling
The big theoretical question

- Is there a more comprehensive theoretical explanation which we can offer of why there is so much variability in children’s development in this domain?
Possible factors influencing children’s development: a rapid review of the literature

- School curriculum
  - e.g., Barrett & Short (1992), Byram et al. (1991), Wills (1994)

- School textbooks

- School practices
  - e.g., Baumann & Sunier (2004), Mannitz & Schiffauer (2004), Sunier (2004)

- Media representations (television, movies, comics, books, posters, etc.)
  - e.g., Byram et al. (1991), Himmelweit et al. (1957), Johnson (1966), Lambert & Klineberg (1967), Roberts et al. (1974), Stillwell & Spencer (1973)

- Travel to other countries
  - e.g., Barrett & Short (1992), Bourchier et al. (2002), Wiegand (1991a, 1991b)

- Family discourse and practices in relationship to nations
  - e.g., Tulviste & Wertsch (1994), Valencia et al. (2003), Vila (1996)
The role of cognitive and motivational factors

Children’s representations of national groups must also be driven, at least in part, by their cognitive and motivational processes:

- Firstly, children’s uptake of information from all environmental sources is necessarily affected by their perceptual, attentional, retentional and cognitive-representational processes.

- Secondly, children’s uptake of information is also influenced by the affective valence and salience of the available information for the individual child, and by the child’s own motivational state and affective preferences.

- It is precisely because children’s uptake of information from the environment is driven by their own cognitive and motivational processes that children are active social agents in their own national enculturation.
Putting all this together means that we need a model of children’s national enculturation along the following lines:

- Geographical, historical, economic, and political circumstances of the child’s own state and nation, including the situation of that state and nation in relationship to other states and nations.
- Beliefs, attitudes, values, and practices of individual members of the child’s own state and nation (including those of parents, teachers, and the producers of school curricula, textbooks, media texts, internet texts, and other literacy and visual resources).
- Parental choice of place of abode, family holidays, kinship relations.
- Parental choice of school.
- Parental discourse and practices.
- Parental control of access to the mass media and the internet, and purchase of home literacy and visual resources.
- Direct personal contact with foreigners and foreign places.
- School curriculum and school textbooks to which the child is exposed.
- Teacher discourse and practices to which the child is exposed.
- Peer group discourse and practices to which the child is exposed.
- Representations of states and nations in the mass media, the internet, and other literacy and visual resources to which the child is exposed.
- The child’s perceptual and attentional processes.
- The child’s retentional and representational processes.
- The child’s affective and motivational processes, including levels of national and state identification.
Further information about the research which has been discussed in this presentation can be obtained from: