Background and Objectives:

In the last decades, we have observed a significant change in nation-state identities in response to the increasing global and regional political reconfigurations. One such case, the European Union, projects a transnational political entity—a union of nations, regions, and localities. What happens to collective identities and citizenship (historically shaped by the boundaries of the nation-state) in a situation where centrifugal forces are undermining the premise of national collectivities and the national closure of cultures? Should we expect to see polities fragmented along ethnic and regional lines, the re-affirmation of national identities, or witness the emergence of new solidarities and responsibilities at the European level? How are boundaries redefined as Europe expands eastwards and southwards? What are the bases of new solidarities and civic communities? As Europe is set to become an assemblage of diverse national and regional identities and institutions, and as continuing migratory flows amplifies its cultural complexity, the issues of identity and loyalty become matters of serious contestation and affect the content of policy debates and political discourses.

Against this background, this project aimed to investigate the transformation of nation-state and citizenship identities in relation to the consolidation of Europe as a transnational entity. Through an analysis and comparison of the development of national school curricula and textbooks, the project examined the changing public definitions of the nation, collective identity, and civic community.

Much of the literature on European integration has conventionally focused on economic and security aspects and the inter-governmental negotiation structures that frame this process. However, European integration and expansion also involve profound social and cultural processes. Social integration puts limitations on Europe as an economic and political project, and the creation of the new Europe not only implicates state and inter-governmental actors but increasingly the non-governmental sector, whose part in the process is seriously neglected so far. Moreover, despite its apparent relevance in affecting public understandings and opinion about prospective Europe and European identity, education remains to be an understudied policy field. By bringing in a marginalized but crucial policy field under scrutiny, and privileging actors outside the strict inter-governmental negotiation structures, this project provided a more expansive understanding of the dynamics of change and creation of new inclusions and exclusions in Europe.

More specifically, the project had the following objectives:

1. Theoretically, the project aimed to further our conceptual tools to understand the processes by which transnational processes and institutions (such as Europeanization) generate change and convergence in nation-state policy patterns and structures. The project set to achieve this goal by focusing on education, a non-prioritized EU policy field, and on actors outside the strict inter-governmental negotiation structures, hence to remedy an important gap in our scholarly inquiries into Europe. The project investigated the role of non-governmental actors not only as implementing agencies but also as active contributors to shaping and negotiating policy in Europe.

2. Methodologically, the project aimed to develop a systematic approach to the study of identities and boundaries and produce a thematic coding scheme for comparative analysis of textbook and curricular data. Even though the project involved only five countries, the coding scheme developed can successfully serve as a blueprint and be extended to other case countries. By operationalizing identities as official projections embedded in the institution of education, curricula and textbooks, and by analyzing changes not only cross-sectionally but also longitudinally, the project managed to
systematically reveal the patterns of reformation of nation-state identities vis-a-vis European expansion and integration.

. Among the objectives of the project was to accumulate a comprehensive body of new information and knowledge. For this purpose, the project expanded on comparative textbook and curricular data collected in four case countries—Germany, France, Britain, and Turkey. We have subsequently included Greece as a comparison case as well. By bringing into comparative focus the European core and its southern periphery, we were able to study European integration not only from its core but also from its margins, which proved to be crucial in understanding the conceptual borders of Europe

. The project also promised to contribute to the development of well-informed policies toward a politically and socially integrated European space. For this, the project attempted to advance our understanding of how education, as an ideological and organizational resource, promotes and shapes not only national, but increasingly, local and transnational identities. This has direct relevance to European-and national level policy making and the activities of non-governmental actors working in the field of education, teachers’ unions and associations, and immigrant and minority advocacy groups. The output of the research makes available a substantial information base to policy makers and practitioners in the field of education. The dissemination of this information however has proved to be the most difficult aspect of our research. Even though we have organized two conferences involving practitioners from national and European level, given their diverse goals and interests in the field, it has been difficult to create an effective exchange among them.

**Methods:**

The analysis involved a cross-sectional and longitudinal investigation of national school curricula and textbooks to scrutinize the redefinitions of Europe, nation and citizenship through public education systems. Even though collective identities and boundaries have been subject to scrutiny from various disciplines, many of the studies are interpretive, under-conceptualized and not systematically operationalized. By examining identities as official projections embedded in the institution of education and textbooks, this project aimed to provide a systematic approach to understand the dynamics involved in the reformation of identities vis-a-vis European expansion and integration.

Data sources for the project included national textbooks and public school curricula for lower secondary schools (6th through 9th grade), since they reflect more standardized, mass aspects of education. National textbooks and curricula are representative of officially selected, endorsed, organized, and transmitted knowledge. Thus they are indispensable to the explication of public representations of national collectivities and identities. Curricular and textbook data were complemented by interviews with officials from state educational boards and ministries, school authorities, teachers’ and parents’ associations, immigrant organizations, and the representatives of European and national networks on textbook and curricular study. These interviews proved helpful in tracking down policy debates and conflicting claims regarding the Europeanization of education and the incorporation of ethnic, religious, and regional diversity into public education systems.

Three core European states (Germany, France, and Britain), which have different positions in the European Union and have either large number of immigrant populations and/or indigenous minorities, and a southern peripheral country, Turkey. The core countries selected have been, and are, the major players in boundary-making in Europe but also shape policies and projects that underwrite the prospect of Europeanization. Turkey, on the other hand, provides especially an interesting case in understanding the construction of boundaries within and vis-a-vis Europe, thus the dynamics of expansion. Not only Turkey constitutes the ‘other’ in the current reconfiguration of
the European Union, but also, as the source of a large immigrant minority population, it also delineates internal boundaries within the core.

In constructing the data set for the project, we specifically focused on the social science curricular subjects (history and civics). For each country, we examined these curricular subjects and the content of textbooks roughly for three time-points: the 1950s, 1970s, and 1990s, when major educational reforms took place. Our analysis involved a coding of the curricula devoted to European, national, and minority topics, as well as a content analysis of textbooks through a thematic, multi-level coding scheme. We examined specific dimensions of curricular subjects and textbooks: transnational focus (e.g., expanded areal coverage, from European core to a broader range of nation-states, to include eastern Europe, Balkans, and southern and eastern Mediterranean; articulation of issues, values, and responsibilities as regional, national, or European; coverage of topics such as democracy, human rights, environment, which have a transnationalizing content and defined as typical European civic values); inclusion of subgroups (e.g., expanded coverage of different religious beliefs, immigrant traditions, group histories, regional languages); marking of national and group boundaries (e.g., symbols used to demarcate boundaries of groups; varying emphasis on class, sex, race and ethnic traits, life-styles, folklore, and customs); and the degree of valorization of the nation (e.g., mythical genesis and naturalistic canonizations of nationhood versus the equal and participatory membership of the nation within the larger community of Europe). From the coded data, we have determined the changing percentage of curricular time and content devoted to each dimension, and their relative weight and importance in textbooks. We have also carried out a systematic survey of topics covered in textbooks to facilitate a more in-depth and contextual analysis.

Data collection required several field trips to Braunschweig, Frankfurt, Paris, and Ankara, which proved to be extremely productive. The Georg-Eckert Institute for International Textbook Study in Braunschweig holds particularly good collections of curriculum materials and official textbooks in the subject countries of this study. In Frankfurt, the collections in the public library were utilised. In Paris, we used the archives of the UNESCO and the Institut National de Rescherce Pedagogique (INRP). The INRP has a complete collection of French textbooks and an extensive library of published research on French textbooks. In Ankara, we used the National Library and the archives of the Ministry of Education, which host official publications, curricula and textbook samples.

In England, given the decentralized and more market oriented nature of textbook production, the data collection proved to be more difficult. Unlike the other case countries in the study, in England, national curricula are recent inventions (since 1987) and there are no centralized archives. Thus, the main sources of information were the interviews we have conducted with teachers, teacher associations and publishers (we also contacted by mail a sample of schools around the country to verify this information). The publishers were not too willing to share information regarding their textbook sales, which means that we had no way of knowing which textbooks had widespread usage. However, through interviews with head teachers and teachers, as well as researchers working on textbooks, we were able to focus our investigation on a fewer number of publishers and textbook series. Similar investigations in France have produced useful information, especially given that textbook production is a specialty of a small number of publishers (also in Turkey, where the textbooks were exclusively published by the Ministry of Education until 1996). In Germany, each state approves a limited set of textbooks for school use. This information is available at the Georg-Eckert Institute, from which we were able to sample the most widely approved (by the states) textbook series.

For each country, we prepared reports on organizational structure of their education and curricular developments since 1945. These reports proved to be crucial in refining the periodization of our coding. In France, the dates for major curricular changes are clearly marked: 1963, 1969, 1977, 1985 and 1995. Each of these dates correspond to significant changes in textbooks as well, especially the first two and the last one. In Germany, 1970 and 1990 mark two most substantial
curricular and textbook changes. For Turkey, the important curricular dates are 1950, 1985 and 2000, and for Britain 1944 and 1988 (though less marked than others, the 1970s also appear as a period of change). We organized our analytical comparisons on the basis of these dates.

Results:

The research findings can be summarized under the following headings:

Europe and the transformation of the nation:
Our empirical analysis reveals that the notion of ‘Europe’ increasingly penetrates national education, its curricula and textbooks. History curriculum and textbooks celebrates a ‘common’ European past, curiously devoid of conflicts and cleavages. This past regularly refers to and includes all or some of the following: the ancient Greek and Roman heritages, the Christian-Judaic roots of Europe, the Reformation, Renaissance, Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, the (re)birth of democracy, notions of citizenship and freedom, modernisation, and, more recently, the European Union. In civics education, the emphasis is on individual rights and responsibilities broader than the national and European, and even global.

This is not to say that Europe replaces the nation. Schoolbooks and curricula testify to the fact that the increasing space accorded the ‘idea’ of Europe has encroached very little on the substantial proportion of history teaching devoted to the nation, and national or local histories. However, it is the case that these books increasingly situate the nation and even regions within a European context. In that process, the nation and the national space are being re-interpreted and re-cast. We observe three trends:

♦ National narratives become normal: We might describe this as a process of standardization, whereby the unique, the extraordinary, and the charismatic are removed from accounts of nationhood. Ancestral tribes – Germanic and Gallic, Normans, Francs, Celts – are all increasingly depicted, not in heroic but ordinary cultural terms, through such images as quaint village life, hospitality and artistic achievements. Rather than introducing historic ancestors in terms of a national genealogy, the underlying theme is intercultural encounter (e.g., Vikings no longer appear as warrior forefathers but as skilful long distance traders, whose ‘spirited travels’ occasion cultural exchange with local populations).

♦ Heroes and myths are domesticated: National heroes lose their mythical credentials. Jeanne D’Arc, Bismarck and Francis Drake are dealt with in a detached manner and invoked not as personifications of a glorious French, German, British moment but as common historical figures to learn from, or persons with ordinary human weaknesses and qualifications (e.g., Drake appears as a good sailor, but also a rather greedy man who stole from both the natives and the Spanish).

♦ National space is reorganized. Regional specificities emerge as possible identity positions within the ‘Europe of regions’. Within this new space, several historically contested places are dissociated from their problematic existence in national imaginary (e.g., Alsace-Lorraine), and emerge as regions in the heart of Europe: rich, dynamic and with encouraging prospects. This is quite remarkable for France where regions are always undermined in favor of the center, as opposed to Germany and Britain where regional diversity is inclined because of their more federalist and decentralized political structures.

This thread of our research findings relates to the Programme’s topical concern in changing formations of national and regional identities, and reveals the core characteristics of the emerging Europe in the specific field of education. Europe might be defined and constructed differently in other policy fields, which may follow disparate, and at times contradictory, premises. It may prove productive to bring together various research clusters in the Programme to discuss overall theoretical and policy implications of these differences.
Teaching Europe – Involved actors:
My project illuminates the importance of non-governmental actors and networks in the European integration process. This suggests that we should (analytically) separate the processes of Europeanization from the Eu-isation. In the case of education, Europeanization (the creation of Europe) is happening mainly outside inter-governmental structures and formal EU institutions, and through informal institutional processes. This is in stark contrast to policy fields such as monetary and security, where Europe is circumscribed by the boundaries and formal institutions of the EU, giving way to a more exclusively defined identity and process.

A variety of actors have been occupied with the question of how to teach Europe for some time. Teachers’ unions and associations, academics and scientific experts, advocacy groups and international organizations, including UNESCO and the Council of Europe are busy networking, convening numerous meetings and conferences on ‘teaching Europe’, reassessing controversial episodes and personalities in European history, developing tools and texts for educating future generations of Europeans.

The interviews we conducted with these actors reveal significant differences in what Europe means to each of them and show the tremendous complexity involved in achieving a ‘European dimension’ in educational practice and not least in substantial materials and guidelines.

♦ The action scope of organisations, such as the Council of Europe or EUROCLIO goes far beyond Europe in any narrow sense. Their experience is that the desire to teach Europe is growing outside the EU boundaries, be it due to the political objective to approximate Europe by this. While such efforts increase, the groups involved appear to share the impression of slow pace and constraints on the process.

♦ The European Commission directs its effort and resources to student exchange programs within the EU. This indicates that its main interest lies in turning the EU into a competitive region by improving skills and language competency among its citizens, which is a specific interpretation of ‘teaching Europe’.

♦ Textbook publishers have been testing the waters to see whether textbooks that go beyond national perspectives can meet a market in schools. Confined with market concerns, they complain that cross-nationally designed textbooks do not find remarkable echo across the continent, and even the inclusion of Europe does little to improve a textbook’s stand on the market.

♦ Teachers on the other hand manoeuvre in the ambivalence that they have to prepare for examinations in which Europe may not be relevant while many at the same time do consent to the idea that Europe should appear more prominently in school curricula. (Yet the opinions diverge again as to whether this should refer to Europe or the EU itself, to a general ethos or to key skills which one needs in social life and increasingly so in times of global inter-relatedness.)

Despite diverse opinions and orientation, perhaps necessarily so, the actors cited above are strongly engaged and vested in promoting European education and ideals building Europe. Their activities, when taken in its entirety, contribute to the production of an affective and tangible Europeanness.

Interestingly enough, we researchers – as a further group of actors in the field – have found that from a longitudinal perspective changes do occur in teaching programmes across Europe, particularly in the ways that trans-national topics permeate national curricula and Europe and its
‘others’ are defined in textbooks. These changes have not yet entered the practitioners’ discourse of assessment, for each group of actors seem to have their sights on the impact their own efforts might render and thus lack the broader view.

We will continue our analysis along this thread to further elaborate the tensions and incoherence present in the practice and process of Europeanization.

Diachronic convergence, cross-sectional variation:
While the ‘idea’ of Europe is accepted and incorporated into school curricula and textbooks in expansive ways, its appropriation varies in form from country to country. Our findings of cross-sectional variation give support to our starting hypothesis: the disposition of the country vis-à-vis the EU, the institutional structure of its education, and the nature of actors involved in the production of textbooks and curricula are significant determinants of the ways that Europe is appropriated in national education.

♦ In German history books, Europe and also the local regions figure prominently, while the nation disappears. This is certainly bound up with the difficulties of Germany’s specific history. But it also reflects a Germany that feels secure in its place within Europe. Moreover, the German education system and its textbook production are structured to allow close cooperation between the education authorities and other interest groupings: teachers’ associations and unions, parents’ associations, churches and universities. What emerges as a result, in terms of curricula, is a much more consensual outcome. Revisionist historical debates do attempt to legitimise anew the German nation and national identity. But these do not find resonance in educational curricula or schoolbooks. A prudent representation of the nation and its history prevails.

♦ In French textbooks, on the other hand, the French nation has a much more presence. But, in this case, the French nation, which is historically conceptualized as an abstract and universalistic entity, is equalized with Europe. In other words, Europe becomes French. Since the French system is centralized, this universalistic conceptualization easily penetrates and dominates every aspect of education. Even though textbook production is privately organized, not by the state, because of the very detailed nature of centralized curricula, one does not find much difference across textbooks published by different commercial companies. The universalistic conceptualization of France and Europe is present in every textbook.

♦ In contrast to both countries, educational policy in England has always been much more polarised along party lines. The introduction of the first national curriculum in 1987 reflected the priorities of the Conservative government of the day in many ways. Europe was certainly not amongst them. The emphasis was on British, if not English national history. As Europe becomes more normalised in British public discourses, aided by the fact that the current Government is less apprehensive to the idea and reality of Europe, we see a more outward-looking European emphasis in education, particularly in the newly-introduced subject, citizenship. Still Europe and the EU appear in English (and Scottish) textbooks and curricula not standing alone but connected more with global developments.

♦ In the margins, as Europe has increasingly become an official reference point, with Greece’s actual and Turkey’s potential membership, the attempts to clean the textbooks from disparaging depictions of national others and the aspirations for a ‘proper European’ status have become more pronounced. At the same time, the marginal status of both countries vis-à-vis Europe creates possibilities for accentuating common heritages in the Balkan and Mediterranean margins of Europe.
The diachronic and cross-sectional aspects of our findings relate closely to one of the major concerns of the Programme: convergence and divergence in Europeanization process.

In addition to these three main clusters of findings, we are able to observe key shifts in content and style of textbooks and differentiate curricular orientations along the temporal axes. As our coding and analyses have progressed, the periodization scheme we used (1945-1970, 1970-1990, 1990-present) has proved to be pertinent and valid. The convergences and divergences among case countries also make themselves apparent in this temporal classification, as well as broader teaching trends and pedagogical orientations in textbook production.

From our close reading and analysis of the textbook and curricular data, we observe clear differences between the earlier versions of textbooks and the later ones, with substantive turning points around roughly 1970 and 1990.

The turning point 1970 signifies the end of the times when history was history:

♦ A visible shift occurs towards a more socially informed history in place of formal military and political histories—hence increasingly social-scientific nature of history textbooks.

♦ There is an apparent reduction in the teaching of chronological history. Thematic history replaces conventional history, both in terms of textbook space allocated to chronologies and in terms of curricular emphasis.

♦ Relatedly, textual recounting of history gives way to pictorial story telling. Less densely narrated books become the norm. While in previous books the wars and dynasties are described in tedious detail and step by step, the textbooks of the 1970s and thereafter exhibit the historical events with significantly more illustrations, maps, charts, and pictures.

♦ The history of nations as made in wars, hardships, and rivalry gets replaced by accounts of cultural exchanges, trade, civilizational achievements, not always in peaceful terms but definitely with less emphasis on conflicts.

♦ The narrative focus shifts from emperors, principals, knights to societal and political institutions, knighthood, serfdom, marking a conceptual shift in historical narration.

♦ The individual heroes lose their sacrosanct place at the locus of historical progress. Instead the values and principles to which they aspire comes to fore.

♦ The coverage of the 20th century history increases at the visible expense of early civilizations and prior historical periods.

♦ De-colonization enters as a proper topic. European discoveries are presented in a more balanced way; Europeans were after all detrimental to populations and cultures they encountered in the 'new worlds'.

The turning point 1990 underscores the turn to Europe:

♦ Europe is present as a topical entity, as evidenced by the space and emphasis devoted to its narration, not only as a common past for the states comprising the present day Europe but also as a set of principles in the making of the future.

♦ Global awareness and responsibilities become manifest. Human rights are acclaimed as universal principles and prescribed as normative good (this is very explicit in civics studies).
Nation and region is reinterpreted within the European. Regions do not appear as constitutive parts of nations but more and more independent of them and loosely attached to Europe. Nations loose their charisma and get equalized vis-à-vis each other within Europe.

Pictorial and thematic history prevail, even more so than before. Environment, development, gender, and diversity occupy substantive space as historical and present-day concerns.

The shifts in civics education also confirm the periodization we employ. While the early civics textbooks deal with citizenship, rights and responsibilities within the confines of nation-states, the textbooks published after 1990 place the emphasis on universalistic principles such as human rights and democracy and within the context of global/European frames of reference. In these books Europe looms larger than nations in conveying civic ideals and obligations. Again in these books difference (as in diversity) appears as a point of departure for understanding, tolerance, and cooperation among peoples within and without Europe.

Activities:

Throughout the conduct of the project, we have developed a range of practitioner and user-group contacts at local, national and European levels. This has been mainly through a series of conferences. Our project team organized two conferences with the specific goal of engaging non-academic users: the first one in collaboration with the European Commission Office in London (a one day workshop in May 2001) and the other one with the History Department and the Schuman Center of the European University Institute, Florence (June 2001). Both of the conferences aimed to critically reflect upon the ideas about and the experience of teaching Europe and introducing the ‘European dimension’ in schools.

The London Workshop, predominately made up of national educational practitioners and representatives of international organisations such as the Council of Europe, UNESCO, and EUROCLIO, concentrated on the hands-on reality, the necessities and difficulties of teaching Europe in schools. Panels were held on the international experience with incorporating the European Dimension in education, on teachers’ classroom practices, as well as on the question why Europe should be taught at all.

The Florence conference, in addition to practitioners and representatives of the European Union, also included academic scholars working in this field. The conference addressed the more theoretical aspects of locating Europe in the national educational systems and particularly in school textbooks, both within and without the European Union. The conference brought together experts on the topic from Spain, the UK, Italy, France, Turkey, Germany and the USA. The first session of the conference dealt with the historical development of national education systems and how the projected unity of Europe is coloured by accounts of nationalised education. The second session was devoted to the postwar changes in the projections of the nation and citizenship specifically in textbooks and curricula with reference to Europe. The third thematic block provided overarching perspectives on the processes of Europeanisation. The variety of concepts of ‘Europe’ both understood as a geographic as well as a cultural unit, transnational elements in education and the layering of transnational identifications upon national histories were discussed in this frame.

I presented the project findings in five other conferences/workshops that involved varied user groups:

In September 2000, I was invited to join the Southeast European Joint History Project meeting, organised by the Centre for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe,
Thessaloniki, and Sabanci University, Istanbul. The meeting brought together a collection of scholars, historians but mainly school teachers from the region with the goal of improving textbooks (both the quality and content) currently used in the Balkan area. The conference received wide-spread media coverage and debate in Turkey and Greece, reaching the public beyond the interested and devoted academics and practitioners.

♦ In June 2001, I was invited as a speaker for the conference on 'Citizenship and Community in an Era of Globalization', organized by the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University. This was an annual gathering of international participants, in Talloires, France, and the audience included 50 journalists, senior corporate executives, government officials, and other academics.

♦ In September 2001, I was a discussant in an international colloquium on 'Culture and Identities in Global Societies', invited by Julian Nida-Ruemelin, the German Secretary of State for Culture and Media and Thomas Krueger, the President of the Federal Agency for Civic Education. The colloquium was hosted by Konrad-Adenauer Stiftung and participants were politicians, journalists, academics and educational specialists.

♦ In November 2001, I was invited to lead a workshop discussion organized by Citizens4Europe, a London based NGO with the goal of furthering informed discussions on a pluralist Europe. The workshop was on 'Towards a Culturally Diverse Europe' and attended by politicians, trade unionists, campaigners, and members of a variety of local NGOs. A short piece on Teaching Europe is now posted on the website of OpenDemocracy, an internet discussion forum.

♦ In May 2002, I was a participant in the ‘European History’ workshop organized by the Koerber-Stiftung Foundation in Berlin. The workshop focused on the question of ‘how European History should be written’ and was attended by educational specialists, teachers, and academics, who were involved with the project.

♦ In December 2002, I gave a talk on "How not to teach European History" as the invitee of Wyndham Place Charlemagne Trust at the London European Parliament Office. Participants included educational specialists, members of minority advocacy groups, and interested public.

During the course of my project, I also gave invited talks on various aspects of my research at the British Council in Nicosia, the ARENA in Oslo, Panteon University in Athens, University of Lisbon, Pomona College in Los Angeles, London School of Economics, Oxford University, University of London, Munich University, Free University in Berlin, Wissenschaftskolleg in Berlin, and the Max-Planck Institute in Berlin. I gave a plenary talk on "Teaching Europe" at the fifth meeting of the European Sociological Association (ESA) in Helsinki (August 2001). I am now the elected president of the ESA, and an excerpt of this talk was published in the Association's Newsletter, European Sociologist.

**Outputs:**


Yasemin Soysal, Teresa Bertilotti, and Sabine Mannitz, "Projections of Identity in French and German History and Civics Textbooks". To be included in the above volume.

Vasilia Antoniou and Yasemin Soysal, "Conceptualisations of the 'Nation' and the 'Other' in Recent Greek and Turkish Textbooks". To be included in the above volume.

In addition to the above publications, I am planning:
- a book length manuscript based on the findings of the project
- a co-authored paper (with Teresa Bertilotti) on Europeanization of regions
- a policy paper or brief to be distributed among European and national level policy and administrative agencies in the field of education, including a variety of NGOs.

**Future Research:**

The project has laid ground for further research and collaborations. Jointly with the European University Institute Florence, we will be applying to the EU Sixth Call for funding of a three-year project titled 'Diversity and Uniformity in Knowledge Offerings to European Youth.' The project, if funded, will examine the diversity/uniformity of knowledge that is actually offered, as opposed to intended to be offered (as in official curricula), to European youths (aged 12-15). The actual analysis will involve comparisons of the implemented curriculum within school types (public, private, religiously provisioned), countries and across Europe. The study is expected to contribute to our understandings of bases of educational stratification within countries and across Europe. In addition to academic dissemination of our results, we plan to consult with local/national policy-makers and practitioners through workshops, hold public meetings with European stakeholders, and circulate comparative database among educational researchers.