

**Attitudes toward Migration across European Countries:  
Results from ICCS 2009**

Wolfram Schulz  
Australian Council for Educational Research  
Melbourne/Australia  
wolfram.schulz@acer.edu.au

Bruno Losito  
Roma Tre University  
Rome, Italy  
bruno.losito@uniroma3.it

Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER)  
in Dublin, 23-26 August 2016.

## **Introduction**

The European Union is a region with high levels of migration, both from outside the EU as well as between member countries (OECD, 2012). The movement of people into some European countries from former colonies, as well as the recent increased movement of people between countries in Europe, is leading to more multicultural communities in many European countries. Recent events resulting from the Syrian refugee crisis have highlighted the challenges that result from having to balance the rights, cultures and traditions of diverse groups in society. Education plays an important role in facilitating cohesion in society (Ajegbo, Kiwan, & Sharma, 2007; Osler & Starkey, 2005) while at the same time education systems are facing new challenges when dealing with students with an immigrant background (Olson, 2013). These changes resulting from migration from outside Europe and between European countries have had an impact on educational policies and school curricula which have begun to put more emphasis on diversity, social cohesion and European issues (Eurydice, 2009, 2012).

The recent increase in refugees coming into Europe is originating proposals to reintroduce border controls and to call for limiting the freedom of movement across EU member countries. Using survey data from 2009, this paper investigates factors that influence European lower secondary students' attitudes towards migration. Based on a conceptual framework that posits students' dispositions toward civic issues as influenced by contextual factors related to the home and peer context, to the school and classroom environments, as well as to the wider community (see Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito, & Kerr, 2008), it reviews the associations of students' attitudes toward migration with factors related to students' background (gender, home context, immigration background), students' civic knowledge, European identity as well as school-related contexts (such as reports on opportunities to learn about Europe). The findings provide comparative evidence across a range of European countries and with regard to the influence of possible context factors and related perceptions or beliefs on how lower secondary students viewed migration issues in 2009.

## **Conceptual Background**

The context for civic and citizenship has changed rapidly in Europe in the last decade. One of the main drivers for change has been the movement of peoples, from countries outside Europe, as well as between countries in Europe. This phenomenon has had considerable political, economic, social, cultural and, increasingly, educational impact (Kerr, Sturman, Schulz, & Burge, 2010). It has brought challenges for civic and citizenship at national and supra-national level in Europe (Banks, 2009) as well as for citizenship education.

Scholars have highlighted the challenge brought to established notions of identity and citizenship built around the dominant national/nation-state identity that confers citizenship rights and status (Modood, 2007). There are now rival, competing identities at local, regional (European) and global levels. The notion of 'cosmopolitan citizenship' is becoming of increasing interest in the political debate (Nussbaum, 1996, 2002; Soysal, 1998). UNESCO (UNESCO, 2014) developed the notion of global citizenship, defines as "a sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity, promoting a «global gaze» that links the local to the global and the national to the international, it is also a way of understanding, acting and relating oneself to the environment in space and time, based on universal values, through respect for diversity and pluralism. In this

context, each individual's life has therefore implications in day-to-day decisions that connect the global with the local and vice versa" (UNESCO, 2014, p.14).

Furthermore, changes to the notion of how citizenship and migration are viewed are due to the increasing reality of ethnic, cultural, religious and language diversity in countries across Europe and society in general. The result is an increasing multiculturalism to countries and communities (Merryfield and Duty, 2009).

In addition, concerns about social and community cohesion are related to the rise of xenophobia, intolerance and racism in society with increasing cases of violence and prejudice in European countries shown to certain groups in society, such as recent immigrants or migrants and ethnic or racial minorities. Some studies show an increase in anti-immigrant attitudes among European youth and, even though no systematic data have yet been collected on this issue, further growth in refugee intake from the Middle East and from North Africa may have resulted in further changes (Schulz et al., 2016). It has to be noted that the available data on refugees in Europe show a rapid growth of the number of asylum seekers from non-member countries within the European Union rose to 431 thousand in 2013, 627 thousand in 2014 and close to 1.3 million in 2015 (EUROSTAT, 2016).

### **Study design and methods**

The paper is based on data from ICCS 2009 (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010), which were collected through a student test and questionnaire, as well as contextual questionnaires for schools and teachers (see Schulz, Ainley, & Fraillon, 2011). Twenty-four European countries participated in a European module of ICCS 2009, which employed a regional student test and questionnaire designed to address aspects specific to the European region (Kerr, Sturman, Schulz, & Burge, 2010). The regional instrument gathered additional data on students' knowledge and understanding about the European context as well as their attitudes, perceptions and behaviours in relation to specific European-related civic and political issues, institutions and policies.<sup>1</sup> The analyses presented in this paper focus on students' attitudes towards equal rights for immigrants, attitudes towards restricting migration within Europe, and attitudes towards equal opportunities for other European citizens. In addition, it makes use of student background data (gender, home background, engagement in political discussions), student perceptions related to European issues (language learning, sense of European identity) and school context data (social intake, opportunities to learn about Europe).

Through the use of multivariate models the paper explores relationships between attitudes towards migration and student background and school-related factors at student and school levels. Criterion variables were three questionnaire indices derived from IRT scaling, while criterion variables include questionnaire scales (e.g. SES), plausible values (reflecting students' civic knowledge), and simple indicator variables (e.g. student gender).

The analyses were conducted as a two-level analysis with students nested within school using the software package MPLUS 7.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Missing data were

---

<sup>1</sup> Twenty-four European countries administered the regional questionnaire: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands.

typically below 10 percent and, for the purpose of these exploratory analyses, listwise exclusion of missing values was applied. Due to failure to meeting IEA standards for sample participation, very low numbers of school in smaller countries, or deviations from the standard sample design (census data with two classrooms per school instead of one), only 19 national data were included in the multilevel analyses presented in this paper.

### *Criterion variables*

ICCS 2009 investigated student attitudes toward migration, both through an international student questionnaire and a European regional questionnaire. In particular, one scale was included in the international Student Questionnaire and two in the European Regional Module:

- Students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants
- Students' attitudes toward equal rights for citizens from other European countries
- Students' attitudes toward restricting movement between European countries

ICCS 2009 included a five-items scale derived from CIVED '99. The five items were the following:

- Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue speaking their own language;
- Immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have;
- Immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in elections;
- Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyle;
- Immigrants should have all the same rights that everyone else in the country has.

The five items formed a scale with a high reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.90). The average score across all the European countries was 49 points. Overall, students' attitudes towards immigrants were quite positive. However, there were differences across participating countries. Within the European context, students in Luxembourg, Norway and Sweden showed higher levels of agreement with equal opportunities, while those in Austria, Belgium (Flemish), Bulgaria, Finland, Malta, and Slovak Republic expressed relatively lower levels of endorsement (see Schulz et al., 2010). Existing differences may be related to the history of and reasons for immigration, the size of immigrant population and how this phenomenon is perceived within each country.

The European regional questionnaire included a question exploring student attitudes towards equal opportunities for different groups within Europe. Students were asked to rate their agreement with equal opportunities regardless of:

- their ethnic or racial background
- their religion or beliefs
- the language they speak
- whether they come from a rich country or a poor one
- their level of education.

The scale had a reliability coefficient of 0.85 (Cronbach's alpha) and was standardized to have a mean of 50 (SD = 10). Overall, the majority of students agreed with positively worded statements relating to the equal opportunities of all groups within Europe. Very little differences between countries were found, with the national average scores ranging from 47 to 52. The highest national averages reflecting the most positive perceptions were found in Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Slovenia and Spain (see Kerr et al., 2010).

#### *Students' attitudes toward restricting movement between European countries*

The ICCS European instrument included eight items aiming at investigating students' attitudes towards the freedom of movement of citizens within Europe. Five Likert-type items (with response categories 'strongly agree', 'agree', 'disagree', and 'strongly disagree') were used to derive a scale measuring students' attitudes towards free movement:

- The travel of European citizens in Europe should be more restricted to help fight terrorism.
- Other Europeans living in <country of test> leads to conflict and hostility between people of different nationalities.
- Citizens of <country of test> will be safer from crime if they close their borders to immigrants from other European countries.
- Allowing citizens of other European countries to come and work here leads to more unemployment for citizens of <country of test>.

The scale had a reliability coefficient of 0.68 (Cronbach's alpha) and was standardized to have a mean of 50 (SD = 10). About half of the student (on average) supported statements of this kind across countries. Differences between national averages were generally small with students from England, Ireland, Luxembourg and Malta most in favour of restricting free movement and students from Denmark, Finland and Poland least in agreement with such restrictions (see Kerr et al., 2010).

On average, students from immigrant background were less supportive of the restrictions of freedom of movement.

#### *Predictor variables*

The following student-level variables were used to predict variation in student attitudes towards immigrant rights, equal opportunities for other European citizens, and restrictions of movement between European countries:

- Student's gender (1 = female, 0 = male)
- Student's immigrant background (1 = yes, 0 = no)
- Students' socioeconomic home background (SES), using a composite index based on data about parental occupation, parental education and books at home, standardised to have means of 0 and standard of 1 within each national sample
- Students' participation in political discussions with friends and parents, a nationally standardised IRT score based on four items with an average reliability of 0.72 (Cronbach's alpha) across ICCS 2009 countries.

- Civic knowledge, a test score based on 79 items reflecting students' knowledge and understanding of civic issues (see Schulz, Ainley & Fraillon, 2013)
- Students' attitudes towards learning of another European language, a nationally standardised IRT score based on six items with an average reliability of 0.82 (Cronbach's alpha) across European ICCS 2009 countries
- Students' sense of European identity, a nationally standardised IRT score based on five items with an average reliability of 0.74 (Cronbach's alpha) across European ICCS 2009 countries
- Students' perceptions of opportunities to learn about Europe at school, a nationally standardised IRT score based on nine items with an average reliability of 0.83 (Cronbach's alpha) across European ICCS 2009 countries

At the school level, the following three predictor variables were included in the model:

- Socioeconomic school context, an aggregate score based on the student-level composite index reflecting the socioeconomic home background
- The proportion of students who reported to have an immigrant background
- The school average of students' perceptions of opportunities to learn about Europe at school

## Results

Table 1 shows the results of multilevel analyses of students' attitudes towards immigrant rights across 19 European countries. Multilevel regression coefficients are reported with their corresponding standard errors.

**Table 1 Multilevel regression results for students' attitudes towards immigrant rights**

	Gender (female)	Immigrant background	SES	Political discussions	Civic knowledge	Attitudes to European languages	European identity	School opportunities to learn about Europe	School average: SES	Proportion of immigrants at school	School average: opportunities to learn about Europe
Austria	2.9 (0.45)	7.5 (0.65)	0.5 (0.29)	-0.4 (0.28)	1.7 (0.26)	1.6 (0.26)	-0.5 (0.25)	1.5 (0.28)	-0.3 (0.62)	3.3 (1.65)	1.1 (1.06)
Belgium (Flemish)	1.7 (0.38)	5.8 (0.90)	-0.1 (0.20)	0.3 (0.20)	1.1 (0.20)	1.4 (0.21)	-0.2 (0.25)	0.9 (0.22)	-0.2 (0.49)	2.4 (1.29)	-1.1 (0.57)
Bulgaria	1.6 (0.46)	7.7 (2.34)	0.0 (0.35)	0.0 (0.32)	2.3 (0.38)	1.5 (0.24)	0.8 (0.31)	0.5 (0.28)	-0.5 (0.58)	-10.9 (6.66)	0.1 (0.74)
Czech Republic	2.1 (0.27)	4.7 (0.85)	-0.2 (0.16)	0.1 (0.13)	1.4 (0.16)	1.2 (0.15)	0.7 (0.17)	1.2 (0.18)	-0.4 (0.40)	-1.7 (4.59)	-0.9 (0.66)
Denmark	2.1 (0.38)	7.3 (0.72)	0.5 (0.18)	0.4 (0.19)	1.9 (0.19)	0.8 (0.18)	0.0 (0.21)	0.5 (0.26)	1.7 (0.62)	7.0 (1.95)	0.5 (0.46)
England	1.7 (0.42)	4.8 (0.99)	0.4 (0.29)	0.3 (0.24)	2.3 (0.33)	1.4 (0.24)	0.2 (0.37)	1.5 (0.31)	0.3 (0.65)	4.6 (1.82)	0.2 (1.11)
Estonia	1.5 (0.36)	1.2 (0.88)	0.0 (0.22)	-0.2 (0.21)	0.6 (0.20)	1.1 (0.28)	0.1 (0.24)	0.8 (0.20)	-0.6 (0.43)	15.3 (2.21)	0.6 (0.72)
Finland	4.4 (0.49)	9.2 (1.83)	-0.2 (0.24)	0.4 (0.22)	2.2 (0.20)	1.7 (0.28)	0.4 (0.22)	1.2 (0.24)	0.7 (0.77)	8.7 (3.42)	0.5 (0.86)
Greece	1.9 (0.41)	5.1 (0.77)	0.1 (0.27)	0.4 (0.27)	3.6 (0.24)	1.5 (0.35)	0.7 (0.25)	0.4 (0.30)	-0.4 (0.55)	-1.3 (1.94)	-1.6 (0.99)
Ireland	2.4 (0.39)	5.4 (0.75)	0.2 (0.21)	0.4 (0.22)	1.9 (0.21)	1.8 (0.26)	0.7 (0.21)	1.3 (0.29)	-0.5 (0.70)	1.9 (1.96)	-0.3 (0.87)
Italy	1.4 (0.49)	7.4 (0.66)	0.0 (0.24)	0.4 (0.20)	1.4 (0.21)	2.0 (0.21)	-0.1 (0.22)	1.0 (0.23)	-1.6 (0.57)	-8.1 (3.07)	2.3 (0.77)
Latvia	0.8 (0.43)	0.4 (1.43)	-0.3 (0.25)	0.2 (0.20)	0.6 (0.24)	1.1 (0.25)	0.7 (0.28)	0.5 (0.30)	-1.1 (0.52)	9.2 (2.74)	0.1 (0.70)
Lithuania	1.3 (0.46)	-0.3 (1.34)	0.3 (0.24)	0.2 (0.20)	1.7 (0.30)	1.5 (0.29)	0.8 (0.24)	1.0 (0.23)	-0.4 (0.56)	8.4 (2.69)	0.2 (0.60)
Poland	1.4 (0.35)	-2.3 (1.78)	-0.1 (0.18)	-0.1 (0.18)	1.2 (0.27)	1.8 (0.24)	0.7 (0.26)	0.4 (0.28)	1.0 (0.54)	-5.5 (5.47)	0.1 (0.43)
Slovak Republic	1.3 (0.38)	4.8 (1.83)	0.0 (0.22)	-0.1 (0.15)	0.8 (0.24)	1.5 (0.22)	1.2 (0.24)	0.3 (0.21)	0.3 (0.49)	-7.9 (12.88)	0.6 (0.96)
Slovenia	2.6 (0.39)	3.1 (0.74)	-0.5 (0.22)	0.0 (0.22)	1.5 (0.22)	1.6 (0.23)	0.3 (0.28)	0.8 (0.32)	0.8 (0.55)	4.5 (1.89)	-0.8 (0.67)
Spain	1.0 (0.48)	7.4 (0.84)	0.3 (0.28)	0.3 (0.22)	1.6 (0.21)	1.6 (0.25)	0.6 (0.28)	1.2 (0.30)	-0.4 (0.48)	1.2 (2.27)	0.0 (0.90)
Sweden	4.1 (0.62)	8.1 (0.74)	0.4 (0.28)	0.6 (0.24)	2.3 (0.30)	1.6 (0.28)	-0.3 (0.27)	1.0 (0.27)	1.7 (0.91)	6.3 (1.65)	0.2 (1.30)
Switzerland	2.5 (0.55)	6.8 (0.66)	-0.6 (0.30)	0.0 (0.28)	2.0 (0.28)	2.2 (0.26)	0.6 (0.28)	0.7 (0.24)	0.5 (0.61)	4.3 (1.89)	-0.2 (0.67)
European ICCS average	2.0 (0.10)	5.0 (0.27)	0.0 (0.06)	0.2 (0.05)	1.7 (0.06)	1.5 (0.06)	0.4 (0.06)	0.9 (0.06)	0.0 (0.14)	2.2 (0.97)	0.1 (0.19)

The results show that female gender, civic knowledge and attitudes towards European language learning was consistently (and with statistical significance) positively associated with positive attitudes towards rights for immigrants. In most countries, students with immigrant background were also more likely to endorse positive statements about equal rights for immigrants. In most countries, individual SES and participation in political discussions had no statistically significant associations. Students' sense of

European identity and individual perceptions of opportunities to learn about Europe had positive associations in many countries.

At the school level, only in few countries statistically significant associations were recorded for average SES and school averages of school perceptions about European learning opportunities. However, the proportion of immigrants had school had net (positive) effects on perceptions of immigrant rights in about half of the countries.

Table 2 shows the results of multilevel analyses of students' attitudes towards equal opportunities for other European citizens across 19 European countries. Multilevel regression coefficients are reported with their corresponding standard errors.

**Table 2 Multilevel regression results for students' attitudes towards equal opportunities for other European citizens**

	Gender (female)	Immigrant background	SES	Political discussions	Civic knowledge	Attitudes to European languages	European identity	School opportunities to learn about Europe	School average: SES	Proportion of immigrants at school	School average: opportunities to learn about Europe
Austria	1.8 (0.43)	5.4 (0.68)	0.3 (0.23)	0.4 (0.23)	1.7 (0.24)	1.9 (0.31)	-0.1 (0.29)	1.7 (0.32)	0.3 (0.57)	4.1 (1.39)	-0.1 (0.95)
Belgium (Flemish)	1.4 (0.40)	3.9 (0.76)	-0.1 (0.20)	0.3 (0.22)	0.9 (0.23)	2.4 (0.23)	0.3 (0.22)	1.1 (0.27)	-0.2 (0.65)	3.5 (1.75)	-1.9 (0.68)
Bulgaria	1.3 (0.47)	1.4 (1.85)	-0.7 (0.33)	0.3 (0.23)	0.9 (0.31)	2.5 (0.32)	1.4 (0.28)	0.6 (0.33)	-0.9 (0.57)	-24.4 (6.48)	-0.7 (0.71)
Czech Republic	1.4 (0.26)	5.7 (0.90)	-0.2 (0.15)	-0.1 (0.14)	0.7 (0.15)	1.8 (0.16)	0.8 (0.18)	1.6 (0.18)	-1.1 (0.42)	2.3 (5.29)	-0.5 (0.66)
Denmark	2.5 (0.40)	7.0 (0.69)	0.5 (0.18)	0.3 (0.17)	1.8 (0.20)	1.3 (0.19)	0.1 (0.26)	0.3 (0.31)	2.3 (0.74)	9.0 (2.44)	1.5 (0.44)
England	2.0 (0.39)	3.4 (0.97)	0.3 (0.26)	0.3 (0.23)	1.9 (0.24)	2.3 (0.30)	0.3 (0.39)	1.6 (0.32)	0.1 (0.46)	5.1 (1.56)	-0.2 (0.71)
Estonia	1.4 (0.37)	2.1 (0.80)	-0.1 (0.23)	-0.3 (0.22)	1.5 (0.25)	1.5 (0.26)	0.5 (0.22)	0.7 (0.25)	-0.6 (0.56)	3.8 (1.98)	0.8 (0.62)
Finland	3.9 (0.42)	2.1 (1.09)	-0.2 (0.25)	0.2 (0.19)	1.3 (0.20)	2.4 (0.31)	0.6 (0.22)	1.0 (0.26)	0.6 (0.61)	1.9 (3.32)	0.2 (0.68)
Greece	1.3 (0.50)	3.0 (0.81)	0.1 (0.26)	-0.1 (0.22)	2.2 (0.24)	2.2 (0.26)	1.0 (0.29)	1.4 (0.26)	0.5 (0.93)	1.5 (2.21)	-0.5 (0.91)
Ireland	2.4 (0.48)	4.2 (0.61)	-0.2 (0.21)	0.3 (0.20)	2.2 (0.24)	2.1 (0.24)	1.2 (0.21)	1.4 (0.26)	0.7 (0.66)	2.0 (1.91)	0.2 (0.62)
Italy	0.9 (0.55)	4.7 (0.81)	-0.5 (0.28)	0.3 (0.21)	2.5 (0.21)	2.7 (0.21)	0.2 (0.22)	1.3 (0.23)	-1.5 (0.64)	-2.8 (2.82)	2.1 (0.87)
Latvia	-0.3 (0.41)	0.4 (0.70)	-0.5 (0.19)	-0.5 (0.18)	0.6 (0.24)	2.1 (0.29)	0.8 (0.26)	0.4 (0.23)	0.1 (0.43)	5.3 (1.80)	-0.2 (0.44)
Lithuania	1.4 (0.58)	-0.9 (1.52)	0.0 (0.22)	0.1 (0.22)	1.4 (0.25)	1.8 (0.23)	1.0 (0.25)	1.0 (0.41)	-1.3 (0.63)	10.7 (4.06)	-0.3 (0.68)
Poland	1.0 (0.45)	-2.2 (1.27)	0.1 (0.30)	0.0 (0.19)	0.8 (0.30)	3.1 (0.24)	0.6 (0.23)	0.7 (0.32)	0.6 (0.59)	0.5 (6.64)	-0.4 (0.54)
Slovak Republic	0.9 (0.40)	5.9 (1.67)	-0.3 (0.24)	-0.2 (0.23)	1.5 (0.22)	2.2 (0.24)	1.2 (0.26)	0.9 (0.23)	-0.2 (0.54)	2.3 (17.26)	0.3 (0.87)
Slovenia	2.1 (0.38)	2.8 (0.71)	-0.3 (0.23)	0.3 (0.19)	1.4 (0.21)	2.5 (0.22)	0.6 (0.21)	0.9 (0.26)	0.3 (0.57)	4.8 (1.89)	0.2 (0.80)
Spain	1.0 (0.46)	4.6 (0.76)	0.3 (0.23)	-0.1 (0.24)	2.0 (0.24)	2.5 (0.22)	1.2 (0.31)	1.1 (0.23)	-0.7 (0.50)	0.6 (1.90)	-0.2 (0.89)
Sweden	3.3 (0.51)	4.2 (0.69)	-0.1 (0.30)	0.3 (0.22)	2.4 (0.28)	2.2 (0.25)	0.4 (0.22)	1.2 (0.20)	1.0 (0.83)	4.4 (1.52)	-0.8 (1.02)
Switzerland	1.4 (0.51)	5.1 (0.65)	-0.5 (0.30)	0.3 (0.25)	1.8 (0.34)	2.9 (0.27)	0.3 (0.28)	0.7 (0.31)	0.7 (0.60)	6.5 (1.63)	-0.6 (0.79)
European ICCS average	1.6 (0.10)	3.3 (0.23)	-0.1 (0.06)	0.1 (0.05)	1.6 (0.06)	2.2 (0.06)	0.6 (0.06)	1.0 (0.06)	0.0 (0.14)	2.2 (1.16)	-0.1 (0.17)

As for attitudes toward immigrant rights, there were consistent positive associations between female gender, civic knowledge and attitudes towards European language learning. Immigrant background students were also more likely to endorse equal opportunities for other European citizens. Amongst the school level variables, the proportion of immigrants at schools was positively associated with the criterion variable in eight countries.

Table 3 shows the results of multilevel analyses of students' attitudes towards equal opportunities for other European citizens across 19 European countries. Multilevel regression coefficients are reported with their corresponding standard errors.

**Table 3 Multilevel regression results for students' attitudes towards restricting migration within Europe**

	Gender (female)	Immigrant background	SES	Political discussions	Civic knowledge	Attitudes to European languages	European identity	School opportunities to learn about Europe	School average: SES	Proportion of immigrants at school	School average: opportunities to learn about Europe
Austria	-2.8 (0.49)	-2.4 (0.67)	-0.7 (0.25)	-0.4 (0.26)	-1.5 (0.27)	2.0 (0.32)	1.0 (0.23)	1.0 (0.36)	-1.5 (0.53)	-0.1 (1.31)	1.4 (1.18)
Belgium (Flemish)	-2.1 (0.46)	-3.6 (0.76)	-0.8 (0.22)	0.0 (0.23)	-2.0 (0.23)	0.4 (0.31)	1.0 (0.25)	0.7 (0.30)	-0.2 (0.70)	-0.3 (1.99)	-0.1 (0.84)
Bulgaria	-1.6 (0.45)	-6.0 (4.06)	0.7 (0.41)	-0.5 (0.29)	-3.9 (0.38)	1.9 (0.30)	0.9 (0.33)	1.1 (0.36)	-0.4 (0.77)	12.8 (12.68)	-0.4 (0.86)
Czech Republic	-2.7 (0.26)	-1.9 (0.98)	-0.3 (0.16)	-0.1 (0.15)	-2.3 (0.15)	0.9 (0.18)	0.7 (0.18)	0.7 (0.20)	-0.5 (0.38)	6.5 (5.48)	-0.6 (0.54)
Denmark	-1.5 (0.30)	-4.1 (0.63)	-1.2 (0.20)	-0.4 (0.17)	-2.8 (0.16)	0.5 (0.22)	1.1 (0.22)	0.5 (0.33)	-0.9 (0.50)	-1.7 (1.72)	-1.5 (0.44)
England	-1.7 (0.47)	-2.5 (0.72)	-1.1 (0.28)	-0.1 (0.22)	-1.3 (0.23)	1.3 (0.35)	1.3 (0.25)	0.0 (0.41)	-0.3 (0.54)	-3.1 (1.58)	-2.0 (1.01)
Estonia	-1.3 (0.39)	-1.0 (0.91)	-0.5 (0.24)	0.3 (0.18)	-3.2 (0.21)	1.1 (0.23)	0.5 (0.24)	0.1 (0.25)	-1.0 (0.50)	-4.4 (1.78)	-0.9 (0.57)
Finland	-3.8 (0.48)	-3.7 (1.09)	-0.4 (0.23)	-0.1 (0.20)	-2.3 (0.23)	0.6 (0.51)	0.7 (0.20)	-0.2 (0.25)	-0.8 (0.55)	0.0 (1.69)	0.4 (0.53)
Greece	-1.0 (0.58)	-2.5 (1.02)	-0.5 (0.35)	-0.4 (0.36)	-2.1 (0.35)	1.5 (0.35)	1.3 (0.33)	0.4 (0.37)	0.0 (0.70)	-2.9 (1.76)	-1.0 (1.09)
Ireland	-1.6 (0.42)	-2.8 (0.69)	-0.7 (0.24)	-0.5 (0.20)	-2.2 (0.24)	0.8 (0.29)	1.0 (0.28)	-0.3 (0.29)	0.0 (0.60)	-0.7 (1.63)	-1.4 (0.82)
Italy	-0.7 (0.49)	-4.4 (0.80)	-0.7 (0.36)	-0.1 (0.28)	-3.0 (0.26)	0.2 (0.26)	1.2 (0.20)	0.7 (0.33)	0.4 (0.72)	-1.3 (3.78)	-1.2 (1.02)
Latvia	-1.5 (0.42)	-0.1 (0.66)	0.1 (0.22)	-0.1 (0.25)	-2.1 (0.29)	1.6 (0.24)	0.5 (0.25)	0.6 (0.30)	-1.5 (0.57)	-2.6 (1.48)	0.0 (0.73)
Lithuania	-1.4 (0.39)	-2.8 (1.57)	-0.3 (0.24)	-0.3 (0.19)	-3.4 (0.24)	1.2 (0.29)	0.8 (0.29)	0.8 (0.35)	0.7 (0.46)	-1.6 (2.18)	-0.5 (0.65)
Poland	-2.4 (0.44)	-1.4 (1.94)	-0.1 (0.27)	-0.2 (0.26)	-3.3 (0.29)	0.6 (0.30)	0.7 (0.36)	0.5 (0.46)	0.2 (0.74)	3.5 (10.15)	0.0 (0.80)
Slovak Republic	-1.0 (0.38)	0.2 (2.58)	0.2 (0.24)	0.0 (0.22)	-3.3 (0.24)	0.6 (0.29)	1.0 (0.24)	0.1 (0.30)	-2.1 (0.58)	1.3 (15.52)	0.8 (0.82)
Slovenia	-2.9 (0.40)	-1.2 (0.69)	0.0 (0.24)	0.1 (0.22)	-3.3 (0.26)	1.7 (0.28)	0.5 (0.28)	0.1 (0.31)	0.5 (0.56)	-5.5 (1.92)	-1.2 (0.72)
Spain	-1.5 (0.39)	-2.4 (0.65)	-0.4 (0.28)	-0.3 (0.22)	-4.0 (0.23)	1.8 (0.25)	1.2 (0.26)	0.1 (0.31)	-0.4 (0.47)	2.6 (2.49)	-0.3 (0.78)
Sweden	-2.4 (0.38)	-4.5 (0.57)	-0.5 (0.26)	-0.7 (0.19)	-3.2 (0.22)	1.2 (0.28)	1.0 (0.24)	0.2 (0.41)	0.1 (0.44)	1.3 (1.28)	-0.5 (0.83)
Switzerland	-3.4 (0.49)	-3.3 (0.69)	-0.4 (0.35)	-0.4 (0.24)	-1.8 (0.29)	0.5 (0.36)	0.7 (0.29)	0.0 (0.33)	-0.4 (0.64)	-2.7 (1.65)	-0.7 (0.72)
European ICCS average	-2.0 (0.10)	-2.6 (0.33)	-0.4 (0.06)	-0.2 (0.05)	-2.7 (0.06)	1.1 (0.07)	0.9 (0.06)	0.4 (0.08)	-0.4 (0.13)	0.1 (1.28)	-0.5 (0.19)

Table 3 illustrates that female students and those with higher levels of civic knowledge were less likely to endorse restriction of migration across Europe. In most countries, immigrant background students tended to be less favourable of restricting migration in Europe. Interestingly, after controlling for other variables, a sense of European identity and positive attitudes towards learning another European language were positive predictors of this criterion variable, which is counterintuitive given that these variables were also positive predictors of equal opportunities for immigrants and other European citizens living in the country<sup>2</sup>.

To obtain estimates of explained variance, the model variance estimates were compared with those from an “empty” model without predictors which provided estimates of the variance at each level. Table 4 shows the percentages of variation in total between schools, as well as the percentages of explained at the school and student level.

**Table 4 Percentages of variance between schools, percentages of variance explained at school and student level for the three attitude scales**

<sup>2</sup> For example, attitudes toward equal opportunities and toward restricting migration in Europe tended to be negatively associated (see Schulz & Friedman, 2011).

Country	Immigrant Rights			Opportunities for other European citizens			Restrictions of Movement for European citizens		
	% between schools	% explained at school level	% explained at student level	% between schools	% explained at school level	% explained at student level	% between schools	% explained at school level	% explained at student level
Austria	7	55	16	5	76	16	2	76	10
Belgium (Flemish)	7	72	10	7	55	13	5	76	9
Bulgaria	3	74	9	5	31	14	7	54	15
Czech Republic	3	11	12	3	14	13	4	75	9
Denmark	10	70	12	11	79	11	8	79	15
England	10	68	13	8	88	16	6	72	7
Estonia	6	80	5	3	38	10	6	63	14
Finland	6	33	23	3	25	21	1	36	13
Greece	4	14	20	6	18	18	4	-12	8
Ireland	5	59	15	5	67	18	4	60	8
Italy	10	22	16	9	20	21	5	16	13
Latvia	5	47	5	1	55	11	4	34	12
Lithuania	3	22	14	2	11	13	3	8	20
Poland	6	46	11	5	38	17	8	27	14
Slovak Republic	7	12	10	6	15	14	8	86	12
Slovenia	4	34	10	5	31	16	3	38	14
Spain	6	35	11	5	51	15	8	62	17
Sweden	13	68	18	8	55	17	4	72	15
Switzerland	5	69	19	5	84	17	4	42	9
European ICCS average	6	47	13	5	45	15	5	51	12

The results in Table 4 show that on average only about five percent of the total variation was found between schools. However, there was considerable variations across countries, in particular for attitudes towards immigrant rights. For all three scales, the explained variance between schools was typically between 40 and 50 percent, while at the student level 10 to 15 percent of the variation were accounted for by the predictor variables.

## Conclusion

Findings from ICCS 2009 results showed that there are differences across European countries with regard to how young people view immigration and free movement across member countries. It is plausible to relate such differences to the considerable diversity across European countries in the history of and reasons for immigration, the size of the immigrant population, policies on immigration and how immigrants are perceived and received in society.

As the results from multilevel analyses exploring factors influencing these perceptions show, not unexpectedly, students from immigrant families displayed significantly more positive attitudes towards the rights of immigrants than those from non-immigrant families. Furthermore, higher levels of civic knowledge were positively associated with positive attitudes toward immigration and female students generally expressed more positive attitudes toward equal opportunities for immigrants and citizens from other European countries as well as more negative views of restricting free movement within Europe. In a number of countries, student reporting more opportunities to learn about Europe were also more likely to endorse equal opportunities for citizens from other European countries as well as for immigrants in general.

Among school-level factors, only the proportion of immigrants at the school showed associations with students views of immigration in almost half of the countries, other

aggregate measures were not found to have any consistent statistical associations with the criterion variables. However, the strong and consistent relationship between civic knowledge and attitudes toward migration suggests that learning about civic and citizenship issues has the potential of leading to more openness and more tolerant attitudes among young people.

## References

- Ajegbo, K., Kiwan, D., & Sharma, D. (2007). Diversity and citizenship curriculum review. London, UK: Department for Education and Skills (DfES).
- Banks, J. (2009). Diversity and Citizenship education in global times. In J. Arthur, I. Davies & C. Hahn (Eds.), *Education for citizenship and Democracy* (pp. 57-70). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- EUROSTAT (2016). Asylum Statistics. [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum\\_statistics](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics)
- Eurydice (2009). *Integrating Immigrant Children into School in Europe*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- Eurydice (2012). *Citizenship Education in Europe*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.
- Kerr, D., Sturman, L., Schulz, W., & Bethan, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 European Report. Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in twenty-four European countries*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Merryfield, M. & Duty, L. (2009). Globalization. In J. Arthur, I. Davies & C. Hahn (Eds.), *Education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 80-91). London: Sage Publication.
- Modood, T. (2007). *Multiculturalism. A civic idea*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In M. C. Nussbaum, J. Cohen (Eds.), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* (pp. 2-17). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21 (4-5), 289-303.
- OECD (2012). *International Migration Outlook 2012*. Paris: OECD.
- Olson, M. (2013). Citizenship Education without Citizenship? The Migrant in EU Education Policy on European Citizenship. *Toward the Margin through 'Strangification'*. In R. Hedtke & Tatjana Zimenkova (Eds), *Education for Civic and Political Participation. A Critical Approach* (pp. 155-170). New York & London: Routledge.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., (Eds.) (2011). *ICCS 2009 Technical Report*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D. & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report. Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Study 2016*. London, UK: Springer Open.
- Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B. & Kerr, D. (2008). *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study. Assessment Framework*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W. & Friedman, T. (2011). *Scaling procedures for ICCS questionnaire items*. In W. Schulz, J. Ainley, J., & J. Fraillon (Eds.). *ICCS 2009 Technical Report* (pp. 157-259). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship. Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- UNESCO (2014). *Global citizenship education. Preparing learners for the challenges for 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.