

# Handbook of Research on Education for Participative Citizenship and Global Prosperity

José A. Pineda-Alfonso  
*University of Seville, Spain*

Nicolás De Alba-Fernández  
*University of Seville, Spain*

Elisa Navarro-Medina  
*University of Seville, Spain*

A volume in the Advances in Educational  
Marketing, Administration, and Leadership  
(AEMAL) Book Series



Published in the United States of America by  
IGI Global  
Information Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)  
701 E. Chocolate Avenue  
Hershey PA, USA 17033  
Tel: 717-533-8845  
Fax: 717-533-8661  
E-mail: [cust@igi-global.com](mailto:cust@igi-global.com)  
Web site: <http://www.igi-global.com>

Copyright © 2019 by IGI Global. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher. Product or company names used in this set are for identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI Global of the trademark or registered trademark.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Pineda-Alfonso, Jose A., 1958- editor. | De Alba-Fernandez, Nicolas, 1976- editor. | Navarro-Medina, Elisa, 1985- editor.  
Title: Handbook of research on education for participative citizenship and global prosperity / Jose A. Pineda-Alfonso, Nicolas De Alba-Fernandez, and Elisa Navarro-Medina, editors.  
Description: Hershey, PA : Information Science Reference, [2019] | Includes bibliographical references.  
Identifiers: LCCN 2018016419 | ISBN 9781522571100 (h/c) | ISBN 9781522571117 (eISBN)  
Subjects: LCSH: Citizenship--Study and teaching--Research.  
Classification: LCC LC1091 .H248 2019 | DDC 370.115--dc23 LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018016419>

This book is published in the IGI Global book series Advances in Educational Marketing, Administration, and Leadership (AEMAL) (ISSN: 2326-9022; eISSN: 2326-9030)

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material. The views expressed in this book are those of the authors, but not necessarily of the publisher.

For electronic access to this publication, please contact: [eresources@igi-global.com](mailto:eresources@igi-global.com).

## Chapter 25

# Education for Citizenship and Identities

**Antoni Santisteban Fernández**

*Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain*

**Neus González-Monfort**

*Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain*

### **ABSTRACT**

*Individual identity is defined by unique traits and is constructed from the diversity of human beings and, at the same time, in relationships with other people. This gives rise to a plurality of ways of thinking and perceiving the world. The collective identity is constructed through the discourse or the story that is shared in the community, relationships, or in socialization spaces, among others, in the school, through the discourse of the teaching staff or the school texts. Otherness acts as a mirror where we look at ourselves to recognize ourselves. Otherness is the acceptance that there are different views when we interpret the world, different ways of thinking or ideologies, but it also shows that we human beings have much in common. Education for citizenship should aim to enable people to define their diverse identities in an education for freedom, equality, and participation. Education for citizenship must ask what identities are invisible and why, and demand the social change.*

### **INDIVIDUAL IDENTITY, COLLECTIVE IDENTITY AND NARRATIVE IN SCHOOLS**

Individual identity is defined by personal features, by unique characteristics, whereby every person is different from any other. Individual identity is constructed, firstly, from the inherent diversity of human beings; and, secondly, out of interrelation with other people and one's surroundings. This gives rise to the multitude of ways of imagining and perceiving the world, and we could say that each person constructs different social representations of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1986; Moscovici, 1988).

Collective identity is constructed through socialisation processes and on the basis of social experiences shared with other people, in the family, at school, through the media, in interrelationships within one's community, through belonging to an association, in the city or in traditional meeting places, at cultural or religious events and so on. Collective identity is formed both by specific knowledge about

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7110-0.ch025

society and its characteristics, as well as by the established procedures for social organization, leadership, commitment, social responsibility, etc.

Collective identity coexists alongside individual identities. We form part of a community where we must live together with other people who are and think different from us. That is why we organise ourselves and give ourselves rules that, if they are democratic, are the same for everyone, and we establish certain rights and duties. We belong to natural groups or associations where we find common elements or aspects that unite us to others. In these groups or associations we acquire a way of understanding social or political organisation, based on two essential aspects: a) the way that power is understood; b) the processes established to resolve conflicts (Santisteban & Pagès, 2007).

The idea that the group is stronger than the isolated individual is the basis for the creation of a collective identity, which shares goals and, to achieve them, shares strategies for action and seeks cohesion to show strength. So the collective is above the individual and group interests are above personal interests. This is important, for example, in the configuration of a political identity, when the ideals of a certain ideology are shared, which have to do with the ideas that the group shares about change or permanence or, in other words, about a collective's beliefs with regard to the possibilities and convenience of social changes.

Collective identity is also based on the place, on the territory where people of the same ethnicity or culture, with the same language, and with the same common history, coexist. These people share a natural environment and build together a social environment that is adapted to physical conditions, the climate, the vegetation, etc. Territorial identity is associated with a landscape and, at the same time, with traditional ways of life that resist the pressure of globalisation. National identity has to do with ethnicity, culture and language, but it is also possible for there to be national identities that integrate diverse cultures, even those with different languages. On the other hand, a national identity may coincide with the territory of a single state or may be located in different states. Schools have traditionally been spaces for the defence of the nation-state, and have fostered the narrative of the origin and defence of a single identity, in opposition to other more inclusive or more intercultural educational options (Ferro, 2007; Falaize, Heimberg & Loubes, 2013; Lantheaume & Létourneau, 2016).

Collective identity favours the creation of tradition, as a way of honouring the process by which the community was constructed and consolidated, and the drive for coexistence. Collective memory is an instrument of cohesion that is gaining form and strength with the passage of time, and that is fed by new experiences and new challenges, which return time again and time again to memories built on the past, in constant tribute to achievements in times gone by. Sometimes, collective identity is based on the memory of defeat (Amar, 2010) or on resentment (Ferro, 2009). Far too often, teachers transmit an official narrative that highlights 'traumatic' events and the role of the victims, heroes and antiheroes (Anderson, 1983; Kaplowitz, 1990; Carretero, Castorina & Levinas, 2013). Teachers' narratives are also often uncritical, and fail to question the protagonists and their attitudes, and this benefits neither autonomy nor social responsibility.

Identity is evidently constructed through the discourse or narrative that is shared in the community, which is exchanged in social relations and in spaces where people socialise, which include, among others, schools, through the discourse of teachers and textbooks (Atienza & Van Dijk, 2010). Discourse analysis has become an instrument that allows us to analyse gender, age, ethnicity, class and other identities, their relationship with power and their ideological forms (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; De Fina, Schiffrin & Bamberg, 2006; Bamberg, De Fina & Schiffrin, 2011). In this regard, historical narrative is a kind of account that justifies the meaning of identities (Ricoeur, 1984, Falaize, Heimberg & Loubes, 2013).

But when a historical narrative or social account features no people or identities with which our pupils can identify, then there is dissociation between what is taught at school and the reality in which they live. Our pupils hence do not view themselves as protagonists of the story or as social agents that can produce changes in their social environment (Sant, Santisteban, Pagès, González-Monfort & Oller, 2015).

## **IDENTITY AND OTHERNESS: KEY CONCEPTS OF EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP**

When we define ourselves, we do so on the basis of what differentiates us from others. So we are tall compared to others who are shorter, or we are dark compared to others who are blond. When we define ourselves as French or English, it is because there are other different nationalities. When we say that we are Catholic, it is because there are other religions and different types of beliefs to our own. So we know that identity is constructed from otherness. Identity and otherness are two inseparable concepts, one cannot be understood without the other. This reality also helps us to understand that we should always take others into account, for we cannot define ourselves without them. And this is an essential aspect of education for citizenship, since it gives meaning to an education based on plurality, diversity and peace.

Identity and otherness are two key concepts of social studies and education for citizenship (Benejam, 1997 & 1999). Citizenship refers to specific people who live in a certain territory, who communicate, reach agreements or maintain conflicts that need to be resolved. Citizenship is formed by one or more identities, which are defined in relation to all other notions of nationhood or citizenry. But modern-day nations are interdependent and influence each other. There are no isolated peoples that have no contact with the rest of the world. Cultures influence each other and acquire the customs or traditions of other cultures. Identification in relation with a single territory is becoming weaker and weaker in this globalised world. For these reasons, the binomial between identity and otherness is increasingly more complex. We have aspects that differentiate us, but we also share things in common with any other culture.

‘Otherness’, otherwise known as ‘alterity’, in reference to ‘the others’, acts as a mirror in which we look in order to recognise ourselves. The ‘others’ are defined on the basis of an ‘us’. We observe ourselves through others, as if we were looking at ourselves in a mirror that returns an image to us that is conditioned by our social values. Being aware of otherness allows us to understand the other and to put ourselves in their place, i.e. it helps us to develop empathy (Eisenberg & Strayer, 1992; Lee & Ashby, 2001; Yuste, 2017), thereby recognising, understanding, respecting and putting oneself in the place of the other. These skills and values are the basis for resolving conflicts and peaceful coexistence. The skills for historical empathy or for empathy in social studies are fundamental aspects of education for citizenship.

Those who we call the ‘others’ represent our insecurity, our fears, the threat that endangers our identity, that most precious thing that identifies us, that is what we are. To differentiate ourselves from the ‘others’ we construct a narrative to define the ‘we’, based on the characteristics that we associate with and that we do not believe that other identities share. We create an image of the enemy and blame it for anything negative that happens in our lives and we develop a narrative of hate against that enemy, against everything that defines it or that makes up its identity, and which helps us to justify our own attitudes (Spillmann & Spillmann, 1991; Oppenheimer, 2006). For Spillmann & Spillmann (1991), enemy image construction is based on the following series of negative attitudes:

- **Refusal to Show Empathy:** We have nothing in common with our enemy; no kind of information will make us change our perception.
- **Identification With Evil:** It represents the opposite of what we are.
- **Distrust:** Everything that comes from the enemy is bad or deceptive.
- **Simplification:** Everything that benefits the enemy is damaging to us.
- **De-Individualisation:** Everything that belongs to a certain group is our enemy.

Education for citizenship should foster communication with and knowledge of other cultures, of identities different from our own or that we believe are different. It is important to consider the way we think and why we think that way, and about our prejudices and where they come from. It is essential to understand that there is no sense in confronting 'us' with 'others', because there is no homogeneity among groups or identities, because they are diverse, dynamic and constantly changing. The idea of one group that we can call 'us' and another different one that we can call the 'others' suggests a homogeneity that comes into serious question when we carefully analyse who forms part of or could form part of those groups. It also means entering into a duality that does not reflect the complexity of social reality, of ideas or of plurality, which is something so essential in a democratic society.

In a study of school textbooks, Atienza (2007) describes the characteristics of how textual identities are constructed:

*The teaching of the social sciences should be a good place to reasonably and critically consider the identities that textbooks construct for ourselves and for others: who speaks (the construction of 'us'), who is spoken about (the construction of 'the others') (...). What is silenced, and what is highlighted, is different from one case to another. From the position of us, the positive is emphasised and the negative is silenced or mitigated (...). From the position of the others, the opposite occurs: the negative is emphasised and the positive is silenced or mitigated (p. 566).*

Van Dijk's study (1998) takes a similar line in its ideological analysis of discourse in textbooks by relating ideology, narrative, power, citizenship, identity and otherness.

Otherness is the acceptance that there are different perspectives when interpreting the world, different ways of thinking, different interests and ideologies, but it is also the acceptance that we human beings have a lot in common, even though we belong to different ethnicities, religions or nationalities, and although the way we think might have been configured differently. Our identity is defined, to a large extent, by our capacity to recognise the other, to recognise the sense of otherness, that which unites us to other people and that which makes us different. We should only look upon others in awareness that we belong to the same human race and that there is much more that unites us than separates us.

## **IDENTITY OR IDENTITIES?**

A person defines themselves based on their unique characteristics as a human being, with an identity of their own. At the same time, the same person can define themselves on the basis of a cultural identity, with certain values or beliefs, and with certain symbols that are shared with other people of the same culture. There is a national identity, as a sense of belonging to a group with a history and a culture, which may be more localised or more global, and which may be identified with a State or be defined based on one's

### ***Education for Citizenship and Identities***

opposition to a State. Another type of identity is political identity, the fruit of the process of political socialisation that endows people with a political culture and helps to construct an ideology.

Together with other identities, territorial identity situates us in a geographical enclave, with a landscape that we feel is our own (Annette, 2003). The place to which we belong is akin to the stage on which our life unfolds. The space where our childhood happens fulfils the function of helping us to interpret the natural or social elements of the landscape, old or new, as the basis for interpreting other different landscapes that are far-removed from our usual environment. Over time, our knowledge of other places presents possibilities to relate with or identify with other territories, to the extent that our sense of belonging can be divided between different places. For instance, we might feel both Italian and European at the same time.

The crossover between individual and collective identities also produces a simultaneous coexistence with these identities, as we may feel that we are women, of a certain social class, and at the same time of a certain nationality. When someone feels that they have only one identity, this also limits their possibilities to feel part of more than one group with other objectives that are also shared (Sant, Davies & Santisteban, 2015). Someone who only has a single identity also views a higher number of people as ‘the others’, who are different, and tends to emphasise what separates us more than what unites us to other human beings.

Amin Maalouf (1999) explains that since leaving Lebanon in 1976 to settle in France, he is forever being asked if he feels ‘more French’ or ‘more Lebanese’, to which he responds that he feels Lebanese and French alike: “This is why I am myself and not another, at the edge of two countries, two or three languages and several cultural traditions. This is precisely what determines my identity” (Maalouf, 1999, p. 4). For Maalouf, insistence on trying to define a single identity is to assume that a person has only one sense of belonging that matters, which is determined from birth and cannot be modified:

*And when we push our contemporaries to state their identity, which we do very often these days, we are asking them to search deep inside of themselves for this so-called fundamental belonging, that is often religious, nationalistic, racial or ethnic and to boast it, even to a point of provocation. Whoever claims a more complex identity becomes marginalized (Maalouf, 1999, pp. 4-5).*

In social studies, identity is a combination of individual traits and a sense of belonging to certain groups, according to genetic origin, social or economic position, territory or gender identity. The identities that define a person can present contradictions or can be considered as a whole. The goal of education for citizenship should be to teach people to rationalise their identity-related emotions, by posing questions and problems, and bringing out the contradictions involved in social representations of the identities with which students define themselves or with which other people or groups define themselves (Schwartz, Luyckx & Vignoles, 2011).

One concept that synthesises a person’s different identities is that of social identity (Abrams & Hogg, 1999; Brown, 2000), which in recent times and due to the processes of immigration and globalisation towards a multicultural society has acquired more complex meanings. Identity is understood to be obtained in a similar way to the acquisition of a language, although we can learn several languages, just like we can also define ourselves with several identities. Social identities are social representations that are shared by the members of a community (Moscovici, 2000), which are organised on the basis of a series of relevant categories, such as nationality or gender, religion or professional identity, as well as political or ideological ideas, the symbolic representation of values or social relations depending on the



economic context. Social representations thus serve both to define who we are and to assess who the others are and whether they are able belong to our community or not. We could therefore say that the social representations that make up social identities define ideologies with regard to such diverse and complex aspects as immigration, racism, equality and justice.

## **EDUCATION FOR A GLOBAL HUMAN IDENTITY**

The concepts of citizenship and education for citizenship are in crisis (Oxley & Morris, 2013; Arthur, Davies & Hahn, 2008). When asked who forms part of citizenship, we cannot respond with the classic definitions that we have been using until now. It is clear that the answer is that all human beings are citizens, at least in terms of the concept of citizenship that we are defending, i.e. that all people have rights and duties as part of citizenship, and there are such things as local, national and global citizenship. In this regard, a person has multiple identities that complement each other. In a global world, radical humanism is an option to present the claim that all identities are citizenship. That is why we defend the idea of education for global citizenship or for a global human identity.

Citizenship, as recognition of a certain identity, cannot be mere legal recognition. The possession of an official document cannot be the only condition for assuming the necessary rights and duties to coexist within a community. Citizenship must go beyond legal recognition and be situated in the realm of morality and human dignity (Delanty, 1997; Janoski & Gran, 2009; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). The recognition of a worldwide or global identity, to enable people to seek a better life, transcends any type of legal impediment. This concept of a global human identity is an idea that makes sense in terms of education for social justice (Carr, 2007; Ross & McCrary, 2014; Totten, 2015).

Citizenship is all men and women with the same identity or with different identities. So, one possibility for education for citizenship in the field of identities is to teach that, as well as the multiple identities of people and groups, there is a global identity, that of belonging to humanity, that of being human, and which unites us above all other identities. Education for citizenship must answer the question: What makes us human? (Levstik, 2014). Human identity stresses everything that unites us as people and as human beings who live on the same planet. We are all of the same species and live in the same huge, shared home.

To work on the idea of a global human identity, we must propose a form of education that shows what happens outside of school, that connects with reality and with the people around us and other parts of the world: “finding ways to connect students’ lives together, connecting curriculum with the world outside of school... and connecting students with real lives/stories/faces in local, national, and global communities” (Renner, 2009, p. 72). Identity is not an easy thing to explain, but in everyday life we come across many examples of how people are defined, what they identify with, and what prejudices or what stereotypes they associate with certain individual or group identities. The idea is for these living social issues to enter schools (Legardez & Simonneaux, 2006; Pagès & Santisteban, 2011) and to get our students thinking in a dialectical way:

*Dialectical thinking, on the other hand, is an effort to understand the world in terms of interconnections—the ties among things as they are right now, their own preconditions, and future possibilities. The dialectical method takes change as the given and treats apparent stability as that which needs to be explained (and provides specialized concepts and frameworks to explain it). Dialectical thinking is an*



### ***Education for Citizenship and Identities***

*approach to understanding the world that requires not only a lot of facts that are usually hidden from view, but a more interconnected grasp of the facts we already know (Ross, 2016, p. 212).*

Dialectical thinking does not take the examined facts as its sole basis, but also the interconnection between evident events and those that are hidden. It also examines the relationships between what has happened, how that has conditioned the present and how we can make a prospectus to analyse future possibilities. Dialectical thinking is divergent; it feeds off changes that are observed or that might occur, beyond what might be considered a normalised situation. Such thinking analyses, in addition to the causes, the intentions of the protagonists, and their ideologies, to guide them towards social action. Dialectical thinking is the basis for understanding ourselves as human beings with identities, to overcome prejudices and stereotypes in relation to different identities and to construct a global human identity.

### **IDENTITIES THAT EXCLUDE AND IDENTITIES THAT INCLUDE**

Education for citizenship takes the fundamental objective, first, for people to be able to define their identity or identities, to know their origins, and be recognised as people with roots in a certain territory, with social, family and personal characteristics. But, secondly, the most important thing is that the fact of knowing ourselves must serve to know other people with other identities better. This is the most important purpose of an education for freedom, equality and social justice. What is the use of recognising our identity if we are not able to recognise and respect other identities?

An identity that is not permeable, that closes in on itself, that is based on fear of others, is an identity that excludes those who think different or are different. A permeable identity, that is open to change, even though it defends its traditions, that is based on respect for others, is an identity that includes, that converses with other identities and that finds common spaces. Let's take the case of religions. In fact, all religions agree on common elements, such as a metaphorical explanation for the creation of the world and a narrative about the way it will end, about good and evil, etc. A sense of spirituality is not an exclusive characteristic to any religion, but a common feature shared by all of them. People feel the need to find an explanation for things that we do not understand, that make us feel afraid and that are beyond our understanding. Religions fill the void that rationality cannot fill. So, all religions have common aspects, although the actual details differ between confessions.

Identities that are construed as being superior to other groups are presented as being dominant and make other people with other identities invisible. Education should serve to make these identities visible, be they, for example, sexual, ethnic, cultural, linguistic or national identities. For example, the invisibility of the 'female' identity in the teaching of history and the social sciences (Smith Crocco, 2008) or of certain minority cultural or ethnic identities (Calvo, 1989) is common in school textbooks, curricular materials and in educational proposals of all kinds. Girls, boys, women, the elderly, the sick, the indigenous, homosexuals, among others, do not exist in most social studies programmes or, if they do, only do so in an occasional or superficial manner. This is the main goal of education for citizenship: to make invisible identities visible (Santisteban, 2015).

In a study conducted in Barcelona with 246 primary (12 years old) and 41 secondary (16 years old) school pupils, who were asked to highlight the most important events in their country's history (González-Monfort, Pagès & Santisteban, 2015), the results show, without too many differences between the two educational stages, that most of the people that appear in the narratives that the pupils mention are men

who had a political role, followed by references to central groups (Iberians, Greeks, Romans, Muslims, etc.) and fictional characters (Saint George, for example). These narratives can also be interpreted inversely, i.e. we can consider the people that do not appear in their narratives: minority ethnic groups (Gypsies, Jews, Moriscos, Muslims...), the poor, children, the elderly, women... All these identities are invisible in the teaching of the social sciences. But, there are also a remarkably high number of narratives featuring no protagonists of any kind. In other words, these are narratives in which the described events do not feature any people or human groups. This process of dehumanisation should lead us to consider distancing the teaching of history from the pupils' interests.

In the teaching of history and social studies, the protagonists are often nations or places: France won a war, Italy suffered a crisis, the towns were depopulated... This is one of the characteristics of the construction of national identity at school, in an attempt to homogenise its population to create a transversal sense of belonging, whatever one's social class, origin or ethnic group. The national identity reasserts one's belonging to a territory, a culture, a language, etc. The concept of nationalism is sometimes related to an attitude of rejection of other nationalities or to an attitude of exclusion or superiority with regard to other nationalities. Nationalism is neither negative nor positive by definition, and neither should belonging to or being identified with a nation be so. The origin of the concept of a 'nation' comes from the Latin *nascere* (to be born), so nationality has to do, first, with the place of birth, although feeling part of a nation does not always imply having been born in its territory. In fact, nationalism is associated with emotions and with a symbolism represented by a flag, an anthem, certain traditions, a language, and many other aspects that form part of a culture, such as songs, customs, holidays, the landscape, etc.

National identity is acquired through education, but like all religions of the world have much in common, as we said earlier, nationalist sentiments also have much in common, beginning with the way they are constructed or expressed. Nationalism can emphasise what brings its compatriots closer to other nations as well as what separates them. Education for citizenship must clearly focus on what unites nations, without neglecting to show what makes them unique (Pagès, 2007; Carretero, 2011). The feelings related to nationalism can help to understand the 'others', whereby we can understand their sense of belonging, which may be similar to our own. But this is not something that needs to separate us. Instead it should be something that can unite people of different nations.

Any national identity ends up being a blend of cultures, of encounters, of hybridisation over time. And this characteristic of miscegenation is the most prized asset of every nation. Nationalisms are more inclusive when their view of history is broader and not limited solely to an analysis of the present day and local features, but instead seeks temporal and spatial relationships. On the other hand, the future must be represented as a time for inclusion through our national identity, in such a way that our identities are transversal and are projected both inside and outside of the nation. In other words, we should have an identity that we can share with our compatriots, but also an identity that we can share with people from other nations. In this sense, transnational identities can also be projects for inclusion.

## **IDENTITY AND DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION**

We can only participate if, firstly, we know ourselves well, who we are, what our limitations are, what we are able to contribute to the group or to the community, what responsibilities we are able to take on, what leadership abilities we possess, what our fears, prejudices and stereotypes are, what skills we have for communicating with others, for making agreements, for resolving conflicts, for reaching consensus.

### ***Education for Citizenship and Identities***

This leads us on to the need to understand our identity or our identities, to be able to coexist with other identities that are different from ours, to recognise ourselves and to recognise the 'other'. Democratic participation is based on an understanding that, though we might have different identities, we are capable of reaching agreements, establishing rules, organising ourselves socially and resolving any conflicts that might arise in the community.

Of the goals of education for citizenship, social participation and action are the most important. This is the greatest endeavour of education for citizenship. The relationship between participation and identity is a close one, for we participate on the basis of our convictions, together with the people with whom we share the same ideas and demands. Participation in our social context requires social, cultural and political relationships. Associationism has much to do with the search for similar identities. In order to achieve our goals, we must join up with other people who have the same goals. For example, the struggle for women's equality is based on the need to recognise a female identity, one that is different in terms of gender, but equal in terms of political, social, labour and any other kind of rights.

Democratic participation is related with political socialisation, a process that happens in the family, at school, through the media or in the social context. Our political culture is acquired through our experiences of participation in the different areas where we relate and live together, and around which we build ideas or ideals about social change. At the same time, our concept of social change, whether as stability, order, revolution, utopia or any other option, defines our ideology. Ideology is fundamental in the configuration of political identity, which can influence other identities or modify them, in the same way that other identities, such as religious, ethnic or cultural identity, can influence ideology.

What demands does our cultural identity have? What injustices do certain identities face? What sense does it make that certain identities have political goals and join associations to achieve them? Does our identity suffer inequalities or injustices? Is our identity dominant or dominated? Which identities hold the power? Which identities are calling for a voice to demand social justice? It is fundamental for education for citizenship to address the problems and conflicts of identities, since ignoring the conflict is akin to educating in an unreal world. Conflict forms part of our lives and is not negative; it helps us to question reality and to change and improve. Treating conflict in the field of identities is part of learning about democracy.

For Audigier (2008) there is a pragmatic identity that is defined on the basis of our actions, of what we do and our behaviour in the different contexts of our lives, such as family, work or the different groups to which we belong, with the way we behave on a daily basis and how we relate to others. This identity is directly related with citizenship and our attitudes in everyday life, with our idea of freedom, of equality and of justice. Democracy is not just a political system or a way of understanding power; democracy is a way of living and coexisting in all areas of our lives. Our identity is ultimately defined by our democratic values.

### **IDENTITY IS DEFINED FROM OUR CONCEPTS OF THE PAST AND THE FUTURE**

Identity is, first, a historical concept, as it is defined by one's own personal history, by everything that enables us to have a place in the world, a family, certain origins, a place of birth, a calendar, certain beliefs, etc. And our personal history is related to the history of our people, our country, as well as the changes that have occurred in our family environments, but also our social and political ones. Identity is

individual memory and collective memory. All identities construct a historical narrative of their origins and the justification of their goals. However, this historical narrative might be based on romanticism or it can be grounded in the demands of historical science. Configured identities are very different from one case to another. Some are more based on emotions and others are more aimed at constructing a coherent and critical historical narrative.

The teaching of history was always an instrument for constructing the idea of a nation in the 19th century, based on a narrative that also justified the established social order. Schools hence ensure the reproduction of common cultural symbols and references, as well as the social order and established power. Although social history and new history or global history have modified part of the narrative, history as an academic discipline in compulsory and university education has not evolved much compared to other knowledge associated with globalisation or multiculturalism. It is still very closely linked to national identity and to a very Eurocentric view of the world. The most interesting changes have occurred in terms of philosophical thoughts about historical knowledge and of the teaching of history itself as school knowledge.

Collective identity needs a historical memory or a collective history to give meaning to the community, which can be projected into the future to become historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2001, 2004 & 2007; Pagès & Santisteban, 2008). This author differentiates between historical memory and historical consciousness, in the sense that while memory vindicates the past, historical consciousness defends the inevitable continuity between past, present and future. Memory is stuck in the past, historical consciousness is interpreted in time; it is a mental process of interpreting human experience that helps us to understand the present and to draw the future or futures. In relation to the concept of the future, memory acts as an example or as a moral lesson, while historical consciousness acts as an analysis of the possibilities, as an evaluation of social changes and continuities or fractures.

Ideas about the formation of historical consciousness can be related to the formation of a critical consciousness, as history is an essential contribution to democratic education (Santisteban, González-Monfort & Pagès, 2010; Santisteban, 2010). Historical consciousness is an essential element of critical consciousness (Freire, 1978, 1979; Schmidt, 2011). In fact, Freire (1978) considers that the acquisition of a social conscience and a political culture is achieved through an awareness of temporality, of our orientation in time and in history. Without this process, freedom is not achieved. For him and for Rüsen (2001), historical consciousness helps us to make decisions about the current social reality, since it implies procedures of understanding the past and projection into the future. The teaching of history is a key element of education for citizenship and is useful for building a better future (Santisteban & Anguera, 2014). For Barca & Schmidt (2013) the development of historical consciousness should contemplate the interrelation between local, national and other more global identities.

For Ferro (1999) there are four sources of historical consciousness: a) institutional or official history, constructed by the powers-that-be, concealing embarrassing events and establishing what are considered taboos; b) counter-history, constructed from the silences of the minorities, of the persecuted or of the vanquished; c) written or oral individual or collective memory, with all its gaps and objections; d) and, the final source, historical science, which is in permanent construction, and which must overcome the contradictions between the different sources. The author proposes the establishment of interactions of all kinds: spatial and temporal, from micro to macro-history. The relationship between past, present and future helps us to broaden our perspective of events and historical changes, of past experiences and those that have yet to come. The development of historical consciousness helps us situate and understand

### ***Education for Citizenship and Identities***

ourselves in time (Gadamer, 1993) and is a fundamental element for constructing identity, both on an individual and on a collective plane.

Our identity is configured as historical consciousness, i.e. it is rooted in the past, but it is also largely defined by our future expectations. For Suchodolski (1983) the future is implicit in our social representations and in our actions:

*We are just as we are, but also just as we will be (...). What is real is also what is hidden, is confused, is being formed; what might exist or what might disappear. What is real is both what exists and also what is possible (Suchodolski, 1983).*

Our identity is constructed from our past history, but also from our ideas about the possibilities for change and permanence in the personal and collective realms.

For Oyserman and James (2011) our identity is shaped by the image that we create of ourselves in the present, but also by our expectations for the future. For these authors, teaching that contemplates the future is essential for democratic education, but we must teach our pupils the idea that the future will not come 'after', otherwise social action will come to a halt as it waits for the future to 'come'. We must teach our pupils that the future starts now, 'at this very moment', in order for social action to be required immediately. In our research, we have found that secondary schoolchildren's social representations of the future are a fundamental part of their democratic attitudes and of their ability to participate (Santisteban & Anguera, 2015).

## **IDENTITIES AND CITIZENSHIPS**

Identity and citizenship, like all concepts that refer to communities of a certain size, are symbolic terms (Chrysochoou, 2003) that refer to imagined realities (Anderson, 1983). National identity has been an essential goal of education for citizenship (Osler & Starkey, 2003; Olssen, 2004; Misiejuk, Rubik & Tutiaux-Guillon, 2004), but the European identity has also been a goal of some national curricula (Delanty, 1997, 2014). So, we are ultimately facing a highly complex and hard-to-define field (Kymlicka, 1995; Osler & Starkey, 2003), unless we assume the reality of the coexistence in the modern-day world of multiple identities, sometimes temporary, like youth, but always dynamic (Ross, 2007).

In a study that we conducted in England and Catalonia, we analysed how secondary school pupils in each country defined themselves as citizens and how they defined their identity or identities (Sant, Davies & Santisteban, 2015, 2016). Both contexts have undergone a questioning of the relationships between the nations that make up their states, the United Kingdom on the one hand, and Spain on the other, as well as the roles of England and Catalonia within those states. In both places, European citizenship has generated much debate as a legal status or as an imagined identity. The similarities and differences between England and Catalonia are useful to understand each historical reality better. The research questions were: a) What are the similarities and differences between English and Catalan pupils when they identify with communities or groups? b) What are the similarities and differences between English and Catalan pupils when they define themselves as citizens? c) To what extent and how do English and Catalan schools contribute to reinforcing the pupils' self-identification?

The data was collected in England and Catalonia and 3 English and 6 Catalan schools participated, all of which are committed to education for citizenship. In total, 583 pupils aged between 13 and 15 years answered a survey and 8 focus groups were held (4 in Catalonia and 4 in England). The children were asked about their perceptions of identity and citizenship. In the focus groups, they debated the relationship between their perception of citizenship and the peer groups with which they identified. Triangulation of the data suggests that English students identify with a diversity of groups related with religion, diverse geographical locations, gender or friendship, while Catalan students identify with the Catalan nation that is demanding an independent state, with age and with being a 'student'. English pupils are defined on the basis of mixture of different identities. Most pupils (88.0%) consider themselves citizens. As for the state to which they belong, 15.5% of English students consider themselves British, as opposed to 4.4% of Catalan students who consider themselves Spanish. And very few pupils feel that they are citizens of Europe or the world (0.3%). We found that, depending on the political situation, culture, status, education, etc., identities are configured differently. And that transnational identities have little impact on schoolchildren.

Education for citizenship must include consideration of people's identities, of which identities they defend and why those and not others, of what our identities are and of otherness. What characteristics of social identities exclude and which identities help to include people with whom we have things in common. Education must ask which identities are invisible and why, and defend education for social justice. We wonder whether, above personal, local or national identities, there are supranational identities, such as the European identity that the European Union has been promoting so much, or even a global human identity, as the essence of humanism and the basis of solidarity and social justice.

For Bauman (2003, p. 40): Indeed, if the modern 'problem of identity' was how to construct an identity and keep it solid and stable, the postmodern 'problem of identity' is primarily how to avoid fixation and keep the options open. In the case of identity, as in other cases, the catchword of modernity was creation; the catchword of postmodernity is recycling.

We have come a long way from identity to identities and from citizenship to citizenships, from citizenship of the place to global citizenships, from political rights to second-generation economic, social and cultural rights. But education for citizenship must continue to work on the relationships between identity and otherness, between democracy and solidarity, between teaching and human rights.

To (Grossberg, 2003): "Identities are thus always contradictory, made up out of partial fragments" (p. 155). Identities are always 'hybrid', although this hybridisation can be very difficult to explain because of its extreme complexity as a social truth. A concept that helps to understand this complexity is that of the 'frontier'; a frontier nature helps to understand how identities are constituted as a space of contact and interdependence. These aspects are essential in education for citizenship, as they help to show the historical nature of the narrative about identities and their mutable nature.

For many authors, the debate about identity is an outlet for our insecurities and our uncertainty with respect to the future:

*One thinks of identity whenever one is not sure of where one belongs; that is, one is not sure how to place oneself among the evident variety of behavioural styles and patterns, and how to make sure that people around would accept this placement as right and proper, so that both sides would know how to go on in each other's presence. 'Identity' is a name given to the escape sought from that uncertainty. Hence 'identity', though ostensibly a noun, behaves like a verb, albeit a strange one to be sure: it appears only in the future tense (Bauman, 2003, p. 41).*



### **Education for Citizenship and Identities**

In any case, identities are dynamic, they change and people can cast aside some of their identities and acquire others. Some identities are more permanent or more stable than others, since some have been acquired in a long process of socialisation, but they all undergo modifications to adapt to the social context of any given time, with the only condition that the process of change is collective, and is never exempt from debate and conflict between those who wish to change and those who wish to remain unchanged. In addition, the processes of globalisation and rapid developments in communications and information are having an increasing effect on the dynamic and shifting nature of identities (De Fina, Schiffrin & Bamberg, 2006; Jensen, Arnett & McKenzie, 2011). This modifiable characteristic of identity tells us that our pupils' social representations could become more complex, and be related with better knowledge about the world and the people who live in it, to make our youngsters more critical and more caring.

### **REFERENCES**

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (Eds.). (1999). *Social identity and social cognition*. Malden. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Amar, M. (2010). *Instrucciones para la derrota: narrativas éticas y políticas de perdedores*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Anderson, B. R. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anguera, C., & Santisteban, A. (2016). Images of The Future: Perspectives of Students from Barcelona. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 21(1), 1–18.
- Annette, J. (2003). Community, politics and citizenship education. In A. Lockyer, B. Crick, & J. Annette (Eds.), *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice* (pp. 139–148). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Arthur, J., Davies, I., & Hahn, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy*. London: Sage.
- Atienza, E. (2007). Discurso e ideología en los libros de texto de ciencias sociales. *Discurso y Sociedad*, 1(4), 543–574.
- Atienza, E., & Van Dijk, T. A. (2010). Identidad social e ideología en libros de texto españoles de Ciencias Sociales. *Review of Education*, 353, 67–106.
- Audigier, F. (2008). Apprendre l'histoire pour comprendre et vivre la diversité culture- lle. Quelques propos pour ouvrir les débats. *Le Cartable de Clio*, 8, 183–187.
- Bamberg, M. G. W., De Fina, A., & Schiffrin, D. (2011). Discourse and identity construction. In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research: Vol. 1. Structures and Processes* (pp. 177-199). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9\_8
- Barca, I., & Schmidt, M. A. (2013). La consciencia histórica de los jóvenes brasileños y portugueses y su relación con la creación de identidades nacionales. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, 31(1), 25–46.



- Bauman. (2003). De peregrino a turista, o una breve historia de la identidad. In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Cuestiones de identidad cultural* (pp. 40-68). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
- Benejam, P. (1997). La selección y secuenciación de los contenidos sociales. In *Enseñar y aprender Ciencias Sociales, Geografía e Historia* (pp. 71–95). Barcelona: ICE-Universidad de Barcelona/Horsori.
- Benejam, P. (1999). La oportunidad de identificar conceptos clave que guíen la propuesta curricular de ciencias sociales. *Íber. Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales. Geografía e Historia*, 21, 5–12.
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1986). *La construcción social de la realidad*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
- Brown, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Social identity processes trends in theory and research*. London: SAGE.
- Calvo, T. (1989). *Los racistas son los otros. Gitanos, minorías y Derechos Humanos en los Textos Escolares*. Madrid: Editorial Popular.
- Carr, C. (2007). Educational policy and the social justice dilemma. In H. Clairey & C. Holden (Eds.), *The challenge of teaching controversial issues* (pp. 15-25). London: Trentham Books.
- Carretero, M. (2011). *Constructing patriotism. Teaching history and memories in global worlds*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Carretero, M., Castorina, J. A., & Levinas, L. (2013). Conceptual change and historical narratives about the nation. A theoretical and empirical approach. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), *International Handbook of Research on Conceptual Change* (pp. 269–287). New York: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203154472.ch14
- Chrysochoou, X. (2003). Studying identity in social psychology: Some thoughts on the definition of identity and its relation to action. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 2(2), 225–241. doi:10.1075/jlp.2.2.03chr
- De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D., & Bamberg, M. G. W. (Eds.). (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511584459
- Delanty, G. (1997, October). Models of citizenship: defining European identity and citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 37–41.
- Delanty, G. (2014). Introduction: Perspectives on crisis and critique in Europe today. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 17(3), 207–218. doi:10.1177/1368431014530922
- Eisenberg & Strayer. (Ed.). (1992). *La empatía y su desarrollo*. Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Falaize, B., Heimberg, C., & Loubes, O. (Eds.). (2013). *L'école et la nation*. Lyon: Éditions.
- Ferro, M. (1999). Las fuentes de la conciencia histórica. ¿Crisis de la historia o de la disciplina? *Signos Históricos*, 1(2), 139-152.
- Ferro, M. (2007). *Cómo se cuenta la historia a los niños en el mundo entero*. Academic Press.
- Ferro, M. (2009). *El Resentimiento en la Historia*. Madrid: Càtedra.
- Freire, P. (1978). *La educación como práctica de la libertad*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

### **Education for Citizenship and Identities**

- Freire, P. (1979). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1993). *El problema de la conciencia histórica*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- Grossberg, L. (2003). Identidad y estudios culturales: ¿no hay nada más que eso? In *Cuestiones de identidad cultural* (pp. 148–180). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
- Janoski, T., & Gran, B. (2002). Political citizenship: Foundations of rights. In E. F. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 13–52). New York: Sage.
- Jensen, L. A., Arnet, J. J., & McKenzie, J. (2011). Globalization and Cultural Identity. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research. Structures and Processes* (pp. 285–301). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9\_13
- Kaplowitz, N. (1990). National Self-Images, Perception of Enemies, and Conflict Strategies: Psychopolitical Dimensions of International Relations. *Political Psychology*, 11(1), 39–81. doi:10.2307/3791515
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lantheaume, F., & Létourneau, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Le récit du commun. L'histoire nationale racontée par les élèves*. Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon (PUL).
- Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2001). Empathy, Perspective Taking, and Rational Understanding. In O. L. Davis, E. A. Yeager, & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 21–50). Lanham, MD: Rowman y Littlefield.
- Legardez, A., & Simonneaux, L. (Eds.). (2006). *L'école à l'épreuve de l'actualité. Enseigner les questions vives*. Paris: ESF éditeur.
- Levstik, L. (2014). What Can History and The Social Sciences Contribute to Civic Education? In P. Pagès & A. Santisteban (Eds.), *Una mirada al pasado y un proyecto de futuro. Investigación e innovación en la didáctica de las ciencias sociales* (pp. 43–51). Barcelona: Servei de Publicacions de la UAB/AUPDCS.
- Maalouf, A. (1999). *Identidades asesinas*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Misiejuk, D., Raubik, R., & Tutiaux-Guillon, N. (2004). *Professional Guidance: Citizenship, Education, and Identity in Courses for Those who Will Work with Secondary-aged Pupils*. London, UK: CiCe Network.
- Moscovici, S. (1988). Les représentations sociales. Exposé introductif. In L. Marbeau & F. Audigier (Eds.), *Seconde Rencontre Nationale sur la Didactique de l'Histoire et de la Géographie. Actes du colloque* (pp. 31–42). Paris: INRP.
- Olssen, M. (2004). From the Crick Report to the Parekh Report: Multiculturalism, cultural difference, and democracy—the re-visioning of citizenship education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(2), 179–192. doi:10.1080/0142569042000205127
- Oppenheimer, L. (2006). The Development of Enemy Images: A Theoretical Contribution. *Peace and Conflict*, 12(3), 269–292. doi:10.120715327949pac1203\_4

- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 243–254. doi:10.1080/0013191032000118901
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301–325. doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.798393
- Oyserman, D., & James, L. (2011). Possible Identities. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research: Vol. 1. Structures and Processes* (pp. 117-145). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9\_6
- Pagès, J. (2011). Quelle est la place de l'identité nationale dans les apprentissages des élèves en histoire? *Le Cartable de Clio*, 11, 174–181.
- Pagès, J., & Santisteban, A. (2008). Cambios y continuidades: aprender la temporalidad histórica. In *Enseñanza de la Historia. Debates y Propuestas* (pp. 91-127). Río Negro, Argentina: EDUCO.
- Pagès, J., & Santisteban, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Les questions socialment vives i l'ensenyament de les ciències socials*. Barcelona: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Col. Documents, 97.
- Renner, A. (2009). Teaching community, praxis, and courage: A foundations pedagogy of hope and humanization. *Educational Studies*, 45(1), 59–79. doi:10.1080/00131940802527209
- Ricœur, P. (1984). *Time and narrative* (Vol. 3). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ross, A. (2007). Multiple Identities and Education for Active Citizenship. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(3), 286–303. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8527.2007.00380.x
- Ross, A., & McCrary, N. E. (Eds.). (2014). *Working for Social Justice Inside and Outside the Classroom. A Community of Students, Teachers, Researchers, and Activists*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ross, E. W. (2016). Broadening the Circle of Critical Pedagogy. In N.E. McCrary & E. W. Ross (Eds.), *Working for Social Justice Inside y Outside the Classroom* (pp. 209-218). New York: Peter Lang.
- Rüsen, J. (2001). *What is Historical Consciousness? A Theoretical Approach to Empirical Evidence*. Paper presented at Canadian Historical Consciousness in an International Context: Theoretical Frameworks, Vancouver, Canada.
- Rüsen, J. (2004). Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function, and Ontogenetic Development. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (pp. 63–85). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rüsen, J. (2007). Memory, history and the quest for the future. In L. Cajani (Ed.), *History Teaching, Identities and Citizenship. European Issues in Children's Identity and Citizenship*, 7, CiCe. Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- Sant, E., Davies, I., & Santisteban, A. (2015). *The Identities of Catalan and English Secondary Students*. European Educational Research Association. Conference: ECER 2015, Education and Transition.
- Sant, E., Davies, I. & Santisteban, A. (2016). Citizenship and Identity: The Self-Image of Secondary School Students in England and Catalonia. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 64(2), 235-260. doi:10.1080/00071005.2015.1070789

### **Education for Citizenship and Identities**

Sant, E., Santisteban, A., Pagès, J., González-Monfort, N., & Oller, M. (2015). How do catalan students narrate the history of Catalonia when they finish primary education? *McGill Journal of Education*, 50(2/3), 341–362. doi:10.7202/1036436ar

Santisteban, A. (2010). La formación en competencias de pensamiento histórico. *Clíoy Asociados. La Historia Enseñada*, 14, 34–56.

Santisteban, A. (2015). La formación del profesorado para hacer visible lo invisible. In A. M. Hernández Carretero, C. R. García Ruíz, & J. L. De la Montaña (Eds.), *Una enseñanza de las ciencias sociales para el futuro: recursos para trabajar la invisibilidad de personas, lugares y temáticas* (pp. 383-393). Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura/AUPDCS.

Santisteban, A., & Anguera, C. (2014). Formación de la conciencia histórica y educación para el futuro. *Clíoy Asociados. La Historia Enseñada*, 18-19, 249–267.

Santisteban, A., González Monfort, N., & Pagès, J. (2010). Una investigación sobre la formación del pensamiento histórico. In R. M. Ávila, P. Rivero, & P. L. Domínguez (Eds.), *Metodología de investigación en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales*. Zaragoza: Institución “Fernando el Católico” (C.S.I.C.).

Santisteban, A., & Pagès, J. (2007). El marco teórico para el desarrollo conceptual de la Educación para la Ciudadanía. In *Educación para la ciudadanía*. Madrid: WoltersKluwer.

Schmidt, M. A. (2011). A cultura como referência para investigação sobre consciência histórica: diálogos entre Paulo Freire e Jörn Rüsen. In *Educação e consciência histórica na era da globalização* (pp. 29–52). Braga: Centro de Investigação em Educação da Universidade do Minho.

Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K., & Vignoles, V. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research: Vol. 1. Structures and Processes*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9

Smith Crocco, M. (2008). Gender and Sexuality in Social Studies. In L. S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 172-196). New York: Routledge.

Totten, S. (Ed.), *The importance of teaching social issues: Our pedagogical creeds*. New York: Routledge.

Yuste, M. (2017). *L'empatia i l'ensenyament-aprenentatge de les Ciències Socials a l'Educació Primària a Catalunya. Un estudi de cas*. Tesis Doctoral. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Santisteban, A. & González-Monfort, N. (2019). Education for Citizenship and Identities. Pineda-Alfonso, J.A., De Alba-Fernández, N. & Navarro-Medina, E. (eds.). *Handbook of Research on Education for Participative Citizenship and Global Prosperity* (pp.551-567). Hershey PA, USA: IGI Global.

-----

Els autors d'aquest capítol formen part de GREDICS (Grup de Recerca en Didàctica de les Ciències Socials / 2017SGR1606) i són investigadors del projecte finançat pel MEC: EDU201680145-P.